

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EAST BAY
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH, LANGUAGE, AND HEARING SCIENCES
NORMA S. AND RAY R. REES SPEECH, LANGUAGE AND HEARING CLINIC

Therapy Note

Client: First name last initial:	Rachel H.	Client Age:	40	Session #:	10
Report Date:	7/15/2020	Diagnosis:	Conduction Aphasia		

S: Client was on time to telepractice session and remained engaged throughout.

TO1, Task D:

Given a picture stimulus and graphic organizer, client will name a target word and 5 associated characteristics (i.e., first sound, 3 first sound associates, and a rhyme) and provide a semantically associated response to a question (e.g. "Where do you find it?" or "What does it remind you of?"), according to a modified Phonological Component Analysis Protocol, given a verbal cue, in 8/10 trials each x 2 consecutive sessions.

Objective:	Given a picture stimulus and graphic organizer, client named a target word and 5 associated characteristics (i.e., first sound, 3 first sound associates, and a rhyme) and provided a semantically associated response to a question (e.g., "Where do you find it?", "What does it remind you of?"), according to a modified Phonological Component Analysis Protocol, given a verbal cue, in 8/10 trials.
Assessment:	Performance is consistent with 8/10 trials last session. Client demonstrated phonetic paraphasia (i.e., responded with "lan" for object "fan") with two instances of self-correction. Criteria met; advance task.
Plan:	Advance task to improve phonological awareness and naming of a target word and 5 associated characteristics (i.e., first sound, 3 first sound associates, and a rhyme) and providing a semantically associated response to a question (e.g., "Where do you find it?", "What does it remind you of?"), according to a modified Phonological Component Analysis Protocol, independently.

TO#2, Task B:

Given 3, 1-2 syllable words, client will independently produce words in sequential order (i.e. alphabetical or size), in 8/10 trials x 2 consecutive sessions.

Objective:	In an advanced task, given 3, 1-2 syllable words, client independently produced words in sequential order (i.e., alphabetical or size) in 3/7 trials (43%), increasing to 4/7 (57%) given a stimulus repetition cue.
Assessment:	Performance is compared to 5/6 trials (83% acc) last session, with client producing 3 words in sequential order (i.e., alphabetical or size) given a verbal cue. Following extended difficulty completing task, client demonstrated improved working memory when stimuli were presented and then reauditorized by client, and/or when augmented with a written stimulus.
Plan:	Continue to improve working memory targeting production of 3, 1-2 syllable words, in sequential order (i.e., alphabetical or size), independently.

TO #3, Task A:

Given 3, randomly presented single-word steps to a familiar task, client will produce words in sequential order (i.e., first to last) , in 4/5 trials, given a repetition cue.

Objective:	Given 3, randomly presented single-word steps to a familiar task, client produced words in sequential order (i.e.. first to last), in 2/4 trials, given a repetition cue.
Assessment:	Performance is a decrease from $\frac{3}{5}$ (60% acc) last session. Client demonstrated circumlocution throughout session (i.e., “put it away” for “hang up”; “sent out” for “mail”), suggesting relative strengths in her general recall of major components of the sequence, with continued challenges with working memory.
Plan:	Continue to improve working memory targeting production of 3, single-word steps in sequential order (i.e., first to last), given a repetition cue.

Student Clinician:

Signature: _____

Supervisor:

Signature: _____