medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Towards Development of Guidelines for Virtual Administration of Standardized Language and Literacy Assessments: Recommendations for Clinicians and Researchers

Emily Wood[1], Insiya Bhalloo[1,2], Brittany McCaig[1], Cristina Feraru[1], and Monika Molnar[1,2]

[1]Department of Speech-Language Pathology, University of Toronto

[2]Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto

Abstract

Previous virtual care literature within the field of speech-language pathology has primarily focused on the implementation of specific *intervention* programs, but recommendations for best practices in virtual *assessment* — particularly standardized assessment of oral language and literacy abilities — are scarce. Given the recent rapid rise in virtual care and research, clinicians and researchers require guidance on best practices for virtual administration of these tools. We informally reviewed the extant literature and conducted semi-structured interviews with a group of 12 clinicians, students and researchers who had administered standardized language and literacy assessments with typically developing children between the ages of four and eight, in a virtual setting. Six themes: candidacy for virtual assessment, communication and collaboration with caregivers, technology and equipment, virtual administration, ethics, consent and confidentiality, and special considerations for bilingual populations were discussed, to develop a set of recommendations to guide the use of standardized assessments in a virtual setting. In line with the Guidelines International Network, these recommendations were rated by group members, and reviewed by external stakeholders. This paper is one of the first to share recommended practices for virtual assessment in the

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

domain of oral language assessment. As research on the reliability of virtual assessment in this realm is still scarce, we hope the current recommendations will facilitate future clinical research in this area, and in turn will lead to the development of formal Clinical Practice Guidelines.

Keywords: Oral Language, Literacy, Assessment, Telepractice, Virtual Care, Recommendations, Speech-Language Pathology

Financial Support and Sponsoring Organisation

This study has been partially funded by the University of Toronto's COVID-19 Student Engagement Award (RIS Human Protocol Number: 38608).

Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, are declared by the authors or members of the guideline development group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Virtual care, formerly or alternatively known as telepractice, is any interaction between patient or client and a member of their circle of care, occurring remotely, using any form of communication or information technologies with the aim of facilitating or maximizing the quality and effectiveness of patient care (Shaw et al., 2018). The use of virtual care has been steadily growing. In the United States, virtual care visits have increased by 50% from 2019 to 2020 (Koonin et al., 2020). Similarly, Canada Health Infoway (2011) reports a 35% increase in use of virtual care from 2005 to 2011. Virtual care is advantageous for various reasons: clinicians can save time and provide care to a greater number of individuals (Brandel & Loeb, 2011); clients who live in rural areas without clinics or those without transportation can access clinical services remotely (Houn & Trottier, 2006); those with physical disabilities that make travelling challenging, or those who feel more comfortable undergoing assessment in their own homes, also benefit from virtual care (American Speech Language and Hearing Association [ASHA], 2005). Furthermore, bilingual clients seeking clinicians who speak their language(s), and those seeking practitioners with knowledge in a specific area of practice may be more likely to find a match when they can search a broader geographical area (Edwards-Gaither, 2018).

Despite these many advantages, an ASHA survey in 2011 reported that only 2.3% of delivery of any S-LP service was conducted via virtual care, and only 11% of clinicians had used virtual care (ASHA, 2011). The widespread integration of virtual care accelerated in spring 2020, with the intensification of the COVID-19 pandemic, when a large segment of the population was required to begin working from home. Clinicians and researchers adjusted and modified their work as schools, clinics and laboratories began operating virtually during the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

pandemic. Now that working remotely is so commonplace, it is likely that virtual clinical assessment and research techniques will remain a trend in the future (Global Workplace Analytics, 2020).

Given that virtual care is a relatively new tool in both clinical work and research, there is a subsequent paucity of literature related to its application (Mashima & Doarn, 2008). The few existing studies suggest that virtual care is a feasible, effective, and appropriate alternative or addition to face-to-face practice (Mashima & Doarn, 2008). Thus far, many studies have focused on the implementation of specific treatment programs or therapy methods through virtual means (Mashima & Doarn, 2008). In contrast, fewer studies have examined the validity and feasibility of conducting assessments online. Previous studies focusing on assessments indicate high rates of agreement between online and in-person evaluation for standardized assessment of neurogenic communication disorders (Palsbo, 2007), non-standardized evaluation of voice disorders (Ward et al., 2007) and standardized evaluation of speech sound disorders (Waite et al., 2006). There have been fewer studies that have evaluated validity of oral language and literacy assessments for virtual use. There is evidence to suggest that certain subtests of oral language assessments, like the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals –4 (CELF-4), are valid for use in a virtual setting (Waite, 2010). However, not all in-person tests are validated for virtual use. In response, many test makers have created online or virtual versions of their most common tests and recommend use of these products in a virtual setting. For example, Pearson indicates that the online Q-global version of the CELF-5 can be used reliably in a virtual setting (Administering the CELF-5 via telepractice, 2021).

Despite the lack of evidence validating virtual standardized assessment for all tests, regulatory bodies such as Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Canada [SAC] (2006),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ASHA (2005), Royal College of Speech Language Therapists (2020), Speech-Pathology Australia (2014) and the Indian Speech and Hearing Association (Mohan et al., 2017) have authorized clinicians to proceed with assessment via virtual care. They are cognizant that as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, clinicians are in unique position where they have a requirement to continue to provide accurate, timely and informative assessment through virtual care, while research into the validation of their assessment materials is ongoing. In response to the need for virtual versions of tests, several test makers like Pearson (2020), which produces oral language measures such as the Expressive Vocabulary Test [EVT] (EVT-2; Williams, 2007), and Pro-Ed (2020), which develops the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing [CTOPP] (CTOPP-2; Wagner et al., 2013) have issued No Objection orders, allowing S-LPs and researchers to use portions of these test materials virtually through non-public facing teleconference software, provided they follow their rules for administration, and in certain occasions, ask for their permission (*Administering the CELF-5 via telepractice*, 2021).

Permission to continue these evaluations is critical, as oral language and literacy tests measure fundamental skills for later verbal communication such as *vocabulary*, literacy development such as *phonological awareness*, and academic success such as *reading* development (see, Lervåg et al., 2017; Kim et al., 2016; Prevoo et al., 2016). Researchers and clinicians commonly use these measures (vocabulary, phonological awareness, reading) to assess, identify difficulties, and provide early intervention for mitigating potential speech-language or literacy difficulties. While the ultimate goal of intervention is the functional use of language in real life scenarios, this contextual support could be more challenging to promote in a virtual care setting, where clinicians and clients are experiencing different circumstances. Standardized oral language assessments, however, aim to evaluate the building blocks of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

language in the absence of this contextual support. These assessments are designed to evaluate specific language competencies in isolation. Consequently, it is possible that standardized assessments may be well-suited to virtual administration. Given that standardized oral language and literacy assessments are a critical piece of a comprehensive speech and language assessment from both clinical and research perspectives (e.g., ASHA, 2004; van den Bosch et al., 2020; Hsu et al., 2019), and those using these tools may be required to conduct these assessments virtually, clinicians and researchers should have access to up-to-date guidelines to inform their virtual practice. Unfortunately, position papers from regulatory bodies like (SAC, ASHA and Speech-Pathology Australia), and papers published in academic journals (e.g., Richmond et al., 2017) have focused primarily on technical, administrative and ethical considerations, and less on the clinical and practical components of assessment, such as the role of the caregiver, organization of the testing space or manipulation of testing materials (SAC 2006, ASHA 2006, CASLPO 2020).

In order to address this gap in the literature, the recommendations presented here, consider the practical components of assessment. They explore themes commonly discussed in the existing virtual care literature, as well as those that pertain to issues raised by group members engaging in virtual administration of assessments. The themes include candidacy for virtual assessment (Mashima and Doarn, 2008), technology and equipment management (Richmond et al., 2017), virtual administration of test protocols (Brennan et al., 2011), ethics, consent, and confidentiality (Brennan et al., 2011), in addition to communication and collaboration with caregivers and special considerations for bilingual populations – the latter two themes emerged based on the current study.

Development of Recommendations

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The following recommendations have been developed based on the Guidelines International Network framework (G-I-N; Qaseem et al., 2012). These recommendations are intended to act as a step toward the development of Clinical Practice Guidelines for virtual standardized assessment, and as additional research becomes available, should be revised, and updated.

Scope of the Recommendations

The objective of this paper is to provide recommendations for using standardized assessment tools in a virtual setting. These recommendations are intended for clinicians and researchers who use standardized language and literacy assessments in the context of virtual care or research.

The recommendations are based on the experience and reports from the 12 group members (composition described below), using a virtual platform (Zoom) to conduct standardized assessment measures on a group of typically developing English-speaking monolingual (n=81) and linguistically diverse bilingual children (n=99), aged 4-8 years (n total=180). The bilingual children were dominant in English, and spoke an additional heritage language, such as Cantonese/Mandarin, French, and Hindi/Urdu. As such, the recommendations have a section specific to bilingual populations (see Considerations for Bilingual Populations). Group members participating in this study, evaluated expressive vocabulary (via the Expressive Vocabulary Test-2; EVT-2), phonological awareness (via the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing – 2; CTOPP-2), and word and non-word reading (via the Woodcock Reading Mastery tests).

It should be noted that as is the case for the majority of available standardized tools, these assessment measures were developed for in person-use with monolingual-English speaking

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

children. Nevertheless, SLPs working virtually in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, have had to use tests normed for in-person use (with permission from test makers), in virtual settings despite limited test validation studies for online use (e.g., the CELF-4; Hodge et al., 2019; Waite et al., 2010). Further research comparing child performance on virtual, and in-person administered tests, along with accompanying evidence-based and test-specific virtual assessment guidelines, is therefore needed. These recommendations cannot act as a basis for conclusive guidelines for all virtual clinical scenarios involving assessment of oral language and literacy skills. However, these findings provide a foundation for clinicians and researchers who are embarking on virtual assessment and who are seeking practical and useful suggestions to guide their practice and studies. They also provide a framework for future research into the feasibility and execution of online standardized assessments, as well as developing additional or revised guidelines.

Composition of Guideline Development Group

The initial guideline development group was comprised of 10 individuals conducting virtual assessments as part of a study at the University of Toronto (Department of Speech-Language Pathology); a clinical speech-language pathologist with six years of experience working for a school board, a second-year research MSc student studying bilingual literacy development, two second-year clinical S-LP students and 6 research assistants from the University of Toronto. Two additional clinical S-LPs each with over 15 years of experience, were recruited prior to the first draft of the recommendations to provide additional clinical insight during the development process. All members of the group have experience completing standardized assessments virtually, whether in the context of the lab, or in their work. The final

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

group therefore consisted of 12 individuals with varying backgrounds and experiences in clinical practice and research.

Methods

Team Meetings

While conducting virtual assessments, the 10 group members met weekly, or bi-weekly, to discuss issues relating to test administration and to provide feedback to one another. Topics discussed were varied and included themes like behaviour management, communication with caregivers, online scheduling, connectivity and technology troubleshooting, and test administration rules. A team member took notes and minutes for each meeting, which served as a starting point for the development of the recommendations grouped into key themes.

Development of key themes

The themes were developed from two sources. First, themes were incorporated based on information from papers identified in an informal literature search. For this informal review, two search concepts were used on MEDLINE and Embase databases: 1. Telemedicine (telepractice, telehealth, telemedicine, virtual care) and 2. Speech-Language Pathology (speech therapy, speech disorder). This search yielded a total of 176 articles. 129 of these were deemed irrelevant and removed, along with 12 duplicates, leaving a total of 35 unique articles. Of these 35, only five specifically addressed virtual language or literacy assessment and screening (Raman et al., 2019, Sutherland et al., 2019, Waite et al., 2010, Ciccia et al., 2011, Hodge et al., 2018,), and three addressed guidelines for virtual practice (Richmond et al., 2017, Brennan et al., 2011 Mashima and Doarn, 2008). Review of the articles identified common themes which were used to guide the development of the recommendations. Specifically *administrative, technical, and*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ethical issues (Richmond et al., 2017), *clinical considerations* (Brennan et al., 2011), *client candidacy* (Mashima and Doarn, 2008). Importantly, this informal review also revealed a lack of evidence to inform clinical practice regarding virtual assessment. Due to the paucity of research in this area, these recommendations are primarily based on the second source of information, which is the experience of the group members conducting assessments virtually. Common discussion points that emerged from team meetings with these group members yielded two additional themes to address in the recommendations, *communication and collaboration with caregivers* and special *considerations for bilingual children*.

Individual Interviews

Subsequent to the identification of the six themes, an interview script was developed and administered by the first author with each group member (see Appendix A). The six themes are: *Candidacy for Participation in Virtual Assessment, Communication and Collaboration with Caregivers, Technology and Equipment Considerations, Virtual Administration of Standardized Assessments, Ethics, Consent and Confidentiality, and Special Considerations for Bilingual Populations*.

The interviews were conducted virtually, and typically lasted 30-40 minutes. The first author acquired verbal consent to record the sessions and used the interview script to guide the conversation. Group members were asked to frame their responses in terms of challenges and advantages associated with each theme and were given as much time as they needed. Upon completion of the interviews, it was determined that additional clinical input from S-LPs working virtually outside the lab would help strengthen the recommendations and render them more clinically significant. The first author recruited two additional clinical S-LPs from a school board for participation in individual interviews. These clinicians were selected because they had

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

extensive in-person clinical experience working with school-aged children, and they were both currently working virtually for a school board in the 2020-21 school year. They participated in the same interview process as the other group members.

Analyzing the Interviews

The first author listened to and evaluated all 12 interview audio files. Observations were recorded and noted in a table with a challenges and advantages for each of the six themes. Subsequently, the two S-LP student clinicians each independently listened to and evaluated 6 recordings each and noted their observations.

Compiling the Recommendations Draft

The first author then integrated all noted observations into one document, and drafted the first set of the recommendations, which were grouped into the previously identified six themes for ease of use and readability.

Decision-making Process for Rating

This initial draft of the recommendations was then disseminated to all 12 group members via a survey to allow for rating of their importance. Members were instructed to rate each guideline, by choosing either “must,” “should,” or “consider.” They were informed that the “must” rating referred to recommendations that are required/mandatory to be followed in order to comply with regulations from their regulatory governing bodies such as those from CASLPO (College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists Standards for Virtual Care in Ontario, 2020). The “should” rating referred to recommendations that should be followed whenever possible or feasible, and that the “consider” rating referred to recommendations that are merely valuable pieces of additional information for consideration.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Recommendations were approved and adopted in instances where a minimum of 70% of group members agreed on their rating. Review of the first round of ratings indicated that the group members reached 70% consensus on 22/45 recommendations. Subsequently, a second version of the survey was shared with group members. In this second version, members were asked to rate the remaining unresolved recommendations again. In this version, only the top two choices chosen in the first survey were provided as options. Review of the second survey ratings indicated the group had reached consensus on an additional 10 recommendations. In order to decide on a final rating for the remaining recommendations, the first and second author, along with the primary investigator met to discuss and determine the final rating for the remaining 13/45 recommendations. The final rating was determined when the three group members unanimously agreed. A breakdown of the rating of votes for survey 1 and survey 2 can be found in the Appendix. After finalizing the ratings, the recommendations were complete, and are listed below.

Results

Recommendations for Virtual Administration of Standardized Assessments

1. CANDIDACY FOR PARTICIPATION IN VIRTUAL ASSESSMENTS

Participants and/or Clinicians ***Must:***
• Participants must have access to a device connected to the internet; • Participants must have a reliable and strong internet connection; • Special accommodation must be made for participants who have significant behavioural or attentional difficulties. Clinicians must consider how to adapt the virtual testing process to support the participant. This could include:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Having a caregiver present
- Scheduling frequent breaks
- Providing reinforcement
- Completing the session over several time periods

- Special accommodation must be made for participants who are hard of hearing or who have vision impairment. This could include:
  - Specialized headphones that function with assessment equipment.
  - The presence of a caregiver or adult who can troubleshoot audiology equipment like cochlear implants or hearing aids.
  - Software that allows for enlarged images or coloured overlays.

Participants and/or Clinicians ***Should*:**

- Participants should have previous exposure to computers and have basic computer literacy skills;
- Participants should have desk readiness and the ability to sit and attend to a computer session;
- Consideration should be given for how different age groups may be more or less suitable for virtual standardized assessment;
  - Preschool-aged children can be more challenging to engage virtually, specifically those who have limited computer or desk experience.

2. COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION WITH CAREGIVERS

Clinicians ***Must:***

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Obtain informed consent prior to the assessment and thoroughly explain all aspects included in standardized assessments. Provide the opportunity for caregivers to ask questions**.** This must also include informed consent to communicate via email and to audio record the assessment session;
- Obtain a completed background information form and questionnaire prior to starting the virtual assessment. Consider written or oral formats based on individual caregiver preference and ability.

Clinicians ***Should*:**

- Be flexible and provide caregivers choices. This may include completing assessment in chunks or staggered over multiple meetings to accommodate the participant;
- Consider meeting virtually or by phone with caregivers prior to the assessment to discuss the following:
    - Determine what device the child will be using to complete the assessment. The clinician may recommend that a desktop or laptop computer is preferred to ensure the participant is seated in front of it at a table rather than lying on a couch or walking about the room.
    - Remind caregivers about charging or plugging in portable devices to avoid loss of connection mid-assessment.
    - Determine the location that the child will complete the assessment. Clinicians should emphasize that a quiet, private space, with adequate lighting and minimal distractions is preferred.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Identify the interests of the participant to determine reinforcement and rewards if deemed necessary.
- Determine whether the caregiver will be present during the virtual assessment.
- If the caregiver attends the session, further directions should be provided regarding their positioning, ideally behind the participant in view of the camera.
- Outline rules for standardized assessments for caregivers. This should include information such as no repetition of instructions, no providing the participants with hints and no additional encouragement from the caregivers.

Additional Considerations:

- Consider reminding parents of upcoming assessments one week ahead of time, via email or phone call;
- Consider how caregiver presence during the assessment can be helpful for the management of behaviours, manipulation of testing materials on screen and provision of reinforcement, providing the caregiver is clear on standardized assessment rules;
- Consider how interpreting body language and nonverbal communication can be difficult through virtual assessment. Clinicians should strive to be clear and explicit in their communication with caregivers and participants.

3. TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT

Clinicians ***Must:***

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Have an appropriate device, that is fully charged and equipped with a functional microphone and camera;
- Have a secure and stable internet connection;
- Have access to a software platform that allows for synchronous video and audio (i.e., Zoom, Skype, Google Meet, Microsoft Teams);
- Have proficiency using the necessary hardware and software;
- Check with individual test makers that versions of standardized assessments are valid for virtual use, and are able to be used through public-facing screen sharing;
    - Many test makers of common S-LP assessment tools (Pearson and Pro-Ed) do not allow for public-facing screen sharing of their tests;
    - Clinicians therefore must use screen-mirroring with a document camera to remotely share visuals of tests with clients;
    - This requires clinicians to have at least two devices, one for the video conference platform and another (tablet or phone) to use as a document camera to capture images to be mirrored and shared from their device;
    - If the clinician is using two Apple devices, screen mirroring can occur automatically, if the two devices are not Apple, additional software must be downloaded on each device to allow for this;
    - When clinicians are using screen mirroring of these standardized testing measures, recording on the part of the client or clinician is not permitted;
    - New clinicians or agencies who are purchasing new standardized assessments may wish to consider purchasing online versions that can be used virtually and in person.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Clinicians ***Should*:**
• Have and use a headset with microphone for increased speech clarity; • Review the variety of software options available and test each version to see which best suits their needs (Zoom, Google Meet, Microsoft Teams, Skype); • Consider if the software allows for screen sharing, shared mouse control, annotation, stamping or screen drawing, and continuous video feed of client when sharing a screen; • Ensure caregivers and participants have familiarity with and access to the chosen software; • Ensure that images on shared or mirrored screens are as close to 9 inches in size as possible, to maintain test standardization; as per test maker recommendations (*Administering the Expressive Vocabulary Test, Third Edition (EVT-3) via telepractice*, 2021).
Additional Considerations
• Consider using two devices, one for the manipulation of testing materials and one for video feed from the participant.

4. ADMINISTRATION OF STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS

Clinicians ***Must:***
• Follow standardized assessment rules and instructions to the best of their ability; • Report and document any changes made to the standardization procedure, when following standardized assessment rules is not possible;   ○ For example, if a clinician must repeat a test item due to poor connection, this must be documented as a change in administration in their report.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Ensure an appropriate testing environment setup for both the clinician and the participant;
    - Ensure the participant is seated at a desk or table in a back-supported chair, facing the screen directly head-on.
    - When possible, ensure the participant is using either a laptop or desktop rather than a tablet or phone screen.
    - Ensure both clinician and participant are in a quiet, private space (ideally room with closed door), with minimal distractions (no toys or busy backgrounds), adequate lighting (front-lit, natural light) and minimal background noise, with strong internet connection (use WIFI booster as needed).
    - Ensure their technological set-up allows them to see their materials and the participant.
- Coordinate with caregivers ahead of time if tests require manipulatives to ensure appropriate replacements are available at the time of the test;
    - If manipulatives are not available in the home, then pictorial stimuli can be provided as an alternative, this must be documented in the reporting.
- Request caregiver permission to audio record components of the session.
    - Recorded sessions can allow for verification of responses to questions later and to allow clinician to focus on administering test rather than scoring in the moment. (This can only be done when testing visuals are not being shared on mirrored);
- Determine how to modify tests of receptive language that require touching or point to an item. Clinicians can consider the following ideas:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- When screen sharing or mirroring, if the software allows for shared mouse control, allow the participant to hover their mouse over their answer. Alternatively, have them circle or stamp using the annotation feature. This requires pre-teaching of these skills and may affect test standardization.
- If screen sharing is not possible, consider modifying how participants provide their responses, by having them identify the number associated with their answer (e.g., 1, 2, 3 or 4 on the PPVT), or using a colour overlay on the test easel to have them name the colour of their chosen picture.

Clinicians ***Should*:**

- Complete regular comprehension checks and listening checks with the participant. Clinicians can consider the following strategies:
  - "Teach-Back" technique: after explaining an activity or providing instructions to the client, ask them to repeat what you just said or explain the activity instructions in their own words.
  - "Repeat-after-me": say a silly phrase/sentence and ask the participant to repeat to ensure they are paying attention.
  - "Cueing" technique: Touching the eye to cue to look, touching the ear to cue to listen as required to prevent speaking out of turn or over one another.
- Complete regular checks to ensure screen sharing or mirroring is working;
  - Ask the participant to describe what they see on their screen (e.g., "Tell me what kind of animal you see on the screen," "Tell me what you see in the scene," etc.)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Prepare for implementation of reinforcement and breaks effectively. Clinicians should determine what types of reinforcement would be preferred and how frequently they might be required. Considerations include:
    - Virtual Games
        - https://www.thecolor.com/
        - https://www.happyclicks.net/click-tap-games/index.php
        - http://mrpotatohead.play.scriptmania.com
        - https://www.silvergames.com/en/connect-4
    - Movement Activities
        - Jumping jacks, toe touches, belly breathing.
        - Following along to a dance.
    - Tangible Reinforcements
        - Coordinate with caregivers to provide tangibles like food or stickers.
        - Small stickers and bite-sized or single piece food items are preferable.
    - Bathroom breaks
        - Pre-arrange with the caregiver depending on age
    - Visual Schedules
        - Some participants may benefit from a schedule, visual or written, so they know what to expect in the testing session. This can be prepared as a slide show to share with participants ahead of time. Reinforcement and breaks can be built into this schedule.
- Clinicians should determine how to modify instructions where test items cannot be repeated if a participant missed instructions due to poor connectivity;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- For example, if connectivity interferes with the ability to hear the test item in a number repetition task, the clinician could elect to skip that item, or repeat the item. Any such modifications must be documented and reported.

- Clinicians should attempt to establish rapport with participants in a virtual assessment just as they would in an in-person assessment. Clinicians can consider the following ideas;
  - Engage in a brief conversation about a preferred topic.
  - Do a quick "full-body warmup" to get focused for the session (e.g., big stretch up, left, right, touch your toes, 3 deep breaths).
  - Clinicians may wish to set up an initial meeting with caregivers and participants prior to assessment to get to know each other.

5. ETHICS, CONSENT, AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Clinicians ***Must:***

- Inform caregivers of additional risks associated with sharing information virtually and conducting assessments on virtual platforms;
- Obtain informed caregiver consent for all components of virtual session, just as they would for in person assessment. Ensure that caregivers have the opportunity to ask questions. Some additional consent considerations include:
  - Risk and benefits.
  - Communication via email.
  - Use of virtual platforms.
  - Confidentiality.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Storage of information.
- Virtual dissemination of reports and documents.

- Consult their provincial, state-wide, or regional regulatory body's position papers or practice guidelines and ensure they meet privacy law requirements and keeps all personal health information as confidential and secure as possible;
  - Review available virtual platforms, data transmission and data storage options to select the option that meets your regulatory body requirements.
  - Use password protection, data encryption, two-factor authentication and a secure internet network when required.
- Ensure that they contact and consult with the provincial, state-wide, or regional body prior to providing services across regional boundaries and outside of their area of certification or licensure;
- Complete detailed documentation of all interactions in the same way they would for in person practice.
- Have clear rules about where and how long they will store and keep personal health information and inform caregivers of these rules;

6. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR BILINGUAL PARTICIPANTS

Clinicians ***Should***:

- Match bilingual clinicians with bilingual participants who speak the same language;
- Encourage caregivers of bilingual children to be present to translate if directions are unclear;
- When available, and with caregivers' consent, use an interpreter to:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- Review information about assessment with caregiver and ensure comprehension and consent to proceed. If the caregiver is going to be present during the session, it is also imperative that they understand standardized testing rules (e.g., no prompting) prior to the start of the session.
- Translate any communication between a caregiver and participant, to ensure standardized assessment protocols are still being followed.

Recommendations Expiration and Updating

As previously stated, we consider these recommendations as a starting point for future guidelines development and research into online assessment by clinicians and researchers. These recommendations will be updated, as new themes emerge in future research investigating the in-the-field use of these recommendations by clinicians and researchers with typically and non-typically developing clinical populations.

Peer Review and Stakeholder Consultations

In order to obtain feedback on the quality of the recommendations, a draft was shared with four stakeholders, three additional school board SLPs working in a virtual care setting and one additional researcher who reported using standardized assessments tools virtually in their work. These external stakeholders were asked to evaluate the quality of the recommendations using an adapted version of the Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation Instrument (AGREE II; Brouwers et al., 2010). We adapted the AGREE-II checklist, developed for intervention-based clinical guidelines, as there are no checklists specific to assessment guidelines development (regardless of assessment medium, whether online or in-person). The AGREE II is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

comprised of 23 items sorted into 6 categories: Scope and Purpose, Stakeholder Involvement, Rigour of Development, Clarity of Presentation, Applicability, Editorial Independence. Individual items are rated on a scale of 1-10 and the checklist is scored within each category using a percentage, with a score of 70% indicating a high-quality guideline. In our modified version of the AGREE II, we retained the 6 categories, but adapted select items within each to better reflect the practice to evidence based approach used in the development of these recommendations. We also opted to emulate the International Centre for Allied Health Evidence Guideline Quality Checklist (iCAHE; Grimmer et al., 2014), and use a yes/no rating system for each item, rather than a ten-point rating. This was done for ease of stakeholder use, and for ease of interpretation and scoring. Please see the Appendix for the adapted and scored stakeholder checklist.

Given that the tool was modified, the results of the checklist were analyzed qualitatively rather than quantitatively. All four stakeholders provided positive feedback across the 23 items. In addition, subjective feedback from the stakeholders indicated that the recommendations were "very readable" and a "wonderful resource for clinicians and researchers alike." Regarding next steps, one clinical stakeholder indicated that the process for updating the recommendations should be better outlined and more robust. However, given that this recommendations paper is one of the first of its kind in the field of educational speech-language pathology, there is limited consensus or documented procedure for how to update recommendations in a practice guideline of this type. In order to provide researchers and clinicians with up-to-date recommendations, these guidelines will be continuously updated as the body of literature progresses. These updates will be published to following link: https://dataverse.scholarsportal.info/dataverse/virtualcare/ on the University of Toronto's open access Dataverse.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We are cognizant that feedback from four stakeholders on an adapted checklist cannot be generalized to indicate that these recommendations would be rated positively by all clinicians and researchers working with standardized assessments in a virtual setting. Future iterations of these recommendations, and other more formalized Clinical Practice Guidelines, should be reviewed and rated by clinicians and researchers working in a variety of settings and with diverse experiences to ensure their usefulness, readability and to determine their quality. Reviewer and stakeholder groups should ideally include clinicians and researchers with ample virtual care experience, as well as those who are new to this service delivery model. This would provide the opportunity to explore whether a) the recommendations are aligned with what experienced clinicians and researchers already do in their practice, and b) if the recommendations are useful for new clinicians and researchers in establishing good practices for virtual standardized assessment of oral language and literacy tests. Furthermore, as additional research in the field of virtual language and literacy assessment becomes available, more formalized Clinical Practice Guidelines should be developed, that systematically evaluate and incorporate these studies into their recommendations.

Beyond virtual care, there is also more generally a lack of Clinical Practice Guidelines available in the field of developmental speech-language pathology. Currently, those working in the medical sector, have access to select Clinical Practice Guidelines to inform certain aspects of their practice. Specifically, there are formal guidelines available for instrumental assessment of voice (Patel et al., 2018) and acquired velopharyngeal dysfunction (Guyton et al., 2018). However, those seeking guidelines pertaining to intervention in the areas of speech, language, and literacy development, either in person or in a virtual model, may have to rely on general position papers from regulatory bodies, which often do not provide concrete practice

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

recommendations, or individual research studies, which are often based on specific populations, limiting practice generalizability. Those working as clinicians and as researchers in the field of Speech-Language Pathology would benefit from the development and dissemination of additional Clinical Practice Guidelines addressing topics from developmental and medical sectors of the field.

Discussion

In recent years, virtual care has become more widespread (Canada Health Infoway, 2011). Previously, the incorporation of virtual care was primarily driven by the desire to save time and better allocate resources and reach those in rural communities who lived without access to valuable medical and health services. However, widespread use of virtual care became necessary for clinicians and researchers alike with the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic and work-from-home orders, while guidelines to support virtual clinical and/or research decision-making are scarce. The current paper offers practical recommendations for virtual administration of oral language and literacy assessments to be used by clinicians and researchers.

Through the virtual administration of standardized tests, and in the development of these recommendations, group members in this study identified benefits and challenges associated with virtual assessment. Regarding the challenges, several group members referred to poor internet quality and its effect on their ability to administer certain tests. In particular, tests that include a timing component, like the digit, letter, colour and object rapid automatic naming subtests in the CTOPP-2, or tests that require careful attention to specific sounds, like the repetition of non-words in the CTOPP-2 were most affected by poor internet quality. Tests that require pictorial or word stimuli like the word and non-word reading tests and the EVT-2 were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

impacted by the size of device that the participant was using to view the stimuli. In our experience, some families did not have access to computers, tablets, or monitors, and attempted to participate in the assessment using their phone. Group members also reported that some families struggled to access assessment meeting links, particularly those who did not have experience navigating and using virtual communication software.

These issues are of particular concern for lower socio-economic status (SES) families who may lack the necessary internet access, software, or hardware (Caroll et al., 2005; Frenette et al., 2020). Even in developed countries, such as the United States, 17% of children have no access to a laptop or desktop computer (National Centre for Educational Statistical [NCES], 2018; USAFacts, 2020). Furthermore, children belonging to lower SES households and marginalized Black, Indigenous and People of Colour communities are more likely to have limited or no access to a computer and/or internet connection (NCES, 2018). In Canada, children from lower income households are less likely to have access to their own internet-enabled device as compared to higher income households; further, as compared to higher income households children from lower income households are also more likely to *only* access the internet through mobile devices rather than personal computers, which may influence assessment quality (Frenette et al., 2020). These studies suggest that the very populations who may have the greatest need to for oral language and literacy assessment, those who are marginalized, living in low SES or remote and rural communities, are often those who do not have access to the necessary tools to participate in such assessments. Prior research has demonstrated the negative influence of low SES on early oral language skills, such as vocabulary knowledge, and subsequent literacy development (Gardner-Neblett & Iruka, 2015; Howard et al., 2014). It is therefore important to continue providing in-person oral language assessments and intervention for children belonging

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to marginalized and low SES communities. Clinicians and researchers should keep in mind that virtual assessment might be not suitable to all segments of the populations, due to limitations associated with internet and computer access.

This paper has identified that further research is needed to validate virtual administration of standardized oral language and literacy assessments commonly used by clinicians and researchers, such as the CTOPP-2, EVT-3, and PPVT-5, among others. In addition, due to the limited-permission nature of these No Objection orders, it is uncertain whether publishers will indefinitely allow clinicians to conduct virtual assessments using these tests, that were developed for in-person administration. These restrictions, along with a lack of standardized assessments validated for virtual use, limit the scope and type of assessments clinicians and researchers are able to conduct. For example, a commonly used tool for assessing phonological processing, the CTOPP-2, has not been validated for virtual use. As a result, clinicians and researchers may be required to administer non-standardized assessments, or components of validated standardized measures, such as the Kaufman Test of Educational Assessment-3, which require additional training and may not be as readily available in their place of practice. This paper has identified that further research is needed to validate virtual administration of standardized oral language and literacy assessments commonly used by clinicians and researchers, such as the CTOPP-2, EVT-3, and PPVT-5, among others. Virtual assessments can also pose additional challenges specific to researchers. Virtual experiments may facilitate a larger sample size by limiting potential geographical location or transportation-related participation barriers. However, heterogeneity in terms of the type and quality of internet-enabled devices accessible to the child, such as whether the child completes the assessment via a limited-function and smaller mobile device as compared to a personal computer, may limit generalizability of research findings to

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

children across diverse SES groups. Despite potential research-related challenges, virtual assessments can facilitate global cross-cultural speech-language research collaborations, while limiting potential cost and location- related assessment or research participation barriers.

Key Takeaways and Future Research

An unexpected finding from this study and the development of these recommendations is that caregivers played a larger-than-expected role in the administration of the assessment tasks. Caregiver participation was critical in the management of behaviours, provision of reinforcement if required, translation of child responses from other languages, provision of interpretive feedback for the clinician or researcher as needed, as well as trouble-shooting any technical difficulties that arose during administration, particularly for younger participants. The caregiver was also required to assist if manipulatives were needed to complete tasks. Consequently, it may be valuable for future studies to consider whether there is an effect of caregiver participation on assessment results, as their involvement during the assessment may have unintended but significant effects on clients' outcome. This notion should be further explored using a systematic approach.

Secondly, the establishment of these recommendations has also illustrated that virtual assessment is a new skill to be learned by clinicians and researchers, similar to how standardized assessment is a new skill to be learned when clinicians are beginning their practice. Consistent, deliberate practice should be prioritized by those administering the tests to learn the nuances pertinent to administering the assessment virtually, as opposed to in-person. In anticipation of these challenges, academic institutions providing instruction to clinical and research graduate students in the field of speech-language pathology may consider providing instruction in best practices for all aspects of virtual care, including virtual assessment, to ensure that their

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

graduates are qualified to practice or conduct research in the post- Covid era where virtual care has become ubiquitous.

Furthermore, additional recommendations addressing other aspects of virtual care, should be developed, and subsequently updated as more research becomes available. As we move into an increasingly virtual medium for assessment administration, it is important for clinicians to continue providing feedback to guideline creators and policy-makers; as such, informative documents and guidelines from governing organizations can stay current and continue to effectively support clinicians in a timely manner (College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists Pandemic Practice Advice 6: Additional and Continued Use of Virtual Care, 2020; CASLPO Further Guidance Related to Telepractice, 2020).

The current recommendations are merely an initial step toward the development of evidence-based virtual assessment guidelines. These recommendations were developed based on the experience of 12 individuals using three standardized measures with a select population. Consequently, future research should endeavour to evaluate the virtual administration of these types of assessments with children and adolescents with mild-to-severe speech and language difficulties and should expand the areas of oral language and literacy that are evaluated beyond expressive vocabulary, phonological awareness and word and non-word reading. Additionally, further research should consider the effect of child attention, caregiver involvement and access to necessary technology as a factor of SES on the virtual administration of such tests. As the body of research on virtual care continues to grow, researchers and clinicians must continue to collaborate on such studies to ensure that future guidelines are useful, realistic, and helpful for all.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

Administering the CELF-5 via telepractice. (2021). Pearson Assessments. https://www.pearsonassessments.com/professional-assessments/digital-solutions/telepractice/telepractice-and-the-celf-5.html

Administering the Expressive Vocabulary Test, Third Edition (EVT-3) via telepractice. (2021). Pearson Assessments. http://www.pearsonassessments.com/professional- a assessments/digital-solutions/telepractice/telepractice-and-the-evt-3.html

American Speech-Language Hearing Association. (2004). *Preferred practice patterns for the profession of speech-language pathology.* https://www.asha.org/policy/pp2004-00191/#sec1.3.10

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2005). *Speech-language pathologists providing clinical services via telepractice [Position statement].* https://www.asha.org/telepractice.htm

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (2011). *2011 membership survey: CCC-SLP survey summary report: Number and type of responses.* https://www.asha.org/uploadedFiles/2011- Membership-Survey-CCC-SLP-Summary-Report.pdf

Brandel, J., & Loeb, D. (2011). Program intensity and service delivery models in the schools: SLP survey results. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 42*(4)*,* 461–490. https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2011/10-0019

Brennan, D., Tindall, L., Theodoros, D., Brown, J., Campbell, M., Christiana, D., Smith, D. Cason, J., & Lee, A. (2010). A blueprint for telerehabilitation guidelines. *International Journal of Telerehabilitation*, *2*(2), 31–34. https://doi.org/10.5195/ijt.2010.6063

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Brouwers, M., Kho, M.E., Browman, G.P., Burgers, J.S., Cluzea, F., Feder, G., Fervers, B., Graham, I.D., Grimshaw, J., Hanna, S.E., Littlejohns, P., Makarski, J., & Zitzelsberger, L. (2010). AGREE II: Advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in healthcare. *The Canadian Medical Association Journal, 182(18).* https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.090449

Caesar, L. G., & Kohler, P. D. (2000). The state of school-based bilingual assessment: Actual practice versus recommended guidelines. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 38*(3)*,* 190–200. https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2007/020)

Canada Health Infoway. (2011). *Telehealth benefits and adoption. Connecting people and providers across Canada.* https://www.infoway-inforoute.ca/en/component/edocman/334-telehealth-benefits-and-adoption-connecting-people-and-providers-summary/view-document?Itemid=101

Carroll, A. E., Rivara, F. P., Ebel, B., Zimmerman, F. J., & Christakis, D. A. (2005). Household computer and internet access: The digital divide in a pediatric clinic population. *Proceedings of the American Medical Informatics Association Annual Symposium, 2005*, 111–115. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1560660/

Ciccia, A. H., Whitford, B., Krumm, M., & McNeal, K. (2011). Improving the access of young urban children to speech, language and hearing screening via telehealth. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *17*(5), 240–244. https://doi.org/10.1258/jtt.2011.100810

College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario. (2014). *Use of telepractice approaches in providing services to patients/ clients [Position statement].* https://www.caslpo.com/sites/default/uploads/files/PS_EN _Use_of_Telepractice_Approaches_in_Providing_Services_to_Patients_or_Clients.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario. (2020). *Further guidance related to telepractice [Information document].* https://caslpo.com/sites/default/uploads/files/INFO_EN_COVID19_Further_Telepractice_Guidance_Group_Email_Sent_Mar_26_2020.pdf

College of Audiologists and Speech-Language Pathologists of Ontario. (2020). *Pandemic practice advice 6: Additional and continued use of virtual care [Information document].* https://caslpo.com/sites/default/uploads/files/INFO_EN_COVID19_PPA_6_Additional_Continued_Virtual_Care.pdf

Cooper, D. H., Roth, F. P., Speece, D. L., & Schatschneider, C. (2002). The contribution of oral language skills to the development of phonological awareness. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *23*(3), 399–416. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716402003053

D'Souza, C., Kay-Raining Bird, E., & Deacon, H. (2012). Survey of Canadian speech-language pathology service to linguistically diverse clients. *Canadian Journal of Speech Language Pathology and Audiology, 36*(1), 18–39. https://www-proquest-com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/docview/609475795?pq-origsite=primo

Dunn, D. M. (2019). *Peabody picture vocabulary test.* NCS Pearson.

Edwards-Gaither, L. (2018). Cultural Considerations for Telepractice: An Introduction for Speech-Language Pathologists. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, *3*(18), 13-20. https://doi.org/10.1044/persp3.SIG18.13

Frenette, M., Frank, K., & Deng, Z. (2020). *School closures and the online preparedness of children during the COVID-19 pandemic.* Statistics Canada: Social analysis and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

modelling division. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/11-626-x/11-626-x2020001-eng.htm

Gardner-Neblett, N., & Iruka, I. U. (2015). Oral narrative skills: Explaining the language-emergent literacy link by race/ethnicity and SES. *Developmental Psychology, 51*(7), 889–904. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039274

Grimmer, K., Dizon, J. M., Milanese, S., King, E., Beaton, K., Thorpe, O., Lizarondo, L., Luker, J., Machotka, Z., & Kumar, S. (2014). Efficient clinical evaluation of guideline quality: development and testing of a new tool. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *14*(1), 1-10. https://bmcmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2288-14-63

Global Workplace Analytics. (2020). *Latest work-at-home / telecommuting / mobile work / remote work statistics.* https://globalworkplaceanalytics.com/telecommuting-statistics

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality.* Harvard University Press.

Guyton, K. B., Sandage, M. J., Bailey, D., Haak, N., Molt, L., & Plumb, A. (2018). Acquired velopharyngeal dysfunction: Survey, literature review, and clinical recommendations. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *27*(4), 1572- 1597. https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2018_AJSLP-17-0222

Hodge, M. A., Sutherland, R., Jeng, K., Bale, G., Batta, P., Cambridge, A., Detheridge, J., Drevensek, S., Edwards, L., Everett, M., Ganesalingam, C., Geier, P., Kass, C., Mathieson, S., McCabe, M., Micallef, K., Molomby, K., Pfeiffer, S., Pope, S., Tait, F., Willaimsz, M., Young-Dwarte, L., & Silove, N. (2019). Literacy Assessment Via Telepractice Is Comparable to Face-to-Face Assessment in Children with Reading Difficulties Living in Rural Australia. *Telemedicine Journal and E-Health: The Official*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Journal of the American Telemedicine Association, *25*(4), 279–287. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2018.0049

Houn, B., & Trottier, K. (2006). Meeting the challenge of rural service delivery. *The ASHA Leader Online.* https://www.asha.org/practice/telepractice/TelepracticeReferences.htm

Howard, E. R., Páez, M. M., August, D. L., Barr, C. D., Kenyon, D., & Malabonga, V. (2014). The importance of SES, home and school language and literacy practices, and oral vocabulary in bilingual children's English reading development. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *37*(2), 120–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2014.934485

Hsu, L. S., Ip, K. I., Arredondo, M. M., Tardif, T., & Kovelman, I. (2019). Simultaneous acquisition of English and Chinese impacts children's reliance on vocabulary, morphological and phonological awareness for reading in English. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(2), 207–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1246515

Kim, A. E., Oines, L. D., & Sikos, L. (2016). Prediction during sentence comprehension is more than a sum of lexical associations: The role of event knowledge. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 31*(5)*,* 597–601. https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1102950.

Koonin, L.M., Hoots, B., Tsang, C.A., Leroy, Z., Farris, K., Jolly, B., Antall, P., McCabe, B., Zelis, C.B., Tong, I., & Harris, A.M. (2020). Trends in the use of telehealth during the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic — United States, January - March 2020 [Report]. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *69*(43), 1595–1599. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/69/wr/pdfs/mm6943a3-H.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Lervåg, A., Hulme, C., & Melby-Lervåg, M. (2017). Unpicking the developmental relationships between oral language skills and reading comprehension: It is simple, but complex. *Child Development, 89*(5), 1821–1838. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12861

Mashima, P. A., & Doarn, C. R. (2008). Overview of telehealth activities in speech-language pathology. *Telemedicine Journal and E-Health: The Official Journal of the American Telemedicine Association*, *14*(10), 1101–1117. https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2008.0080

Mohan, H., Anjum, A., & Rao, P. (2017). A survey of telepractice in speech-language pathology and audiology in India. *International Journal of Telerehabilitation, 9*(2), 69–80. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5716619/

National Centre for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2018). *Digest of educational statistics.* https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_702.40.asp

Palsbo, S. E. (2007). Equivalence of functional communication assessment in speech pathology using videoconferencing. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare, 13*(1), 40–43. https://doi.org/10.1258%2F135763307779701121

Patel, R. R., Awan, S. N., Barkmeier-Kraemer, J., Courey, M., Deliyski, D., Eadie, T., Paul, D., Svec, J. G., & Hillman, R. (2018). Recommended protocols for instrumental assessment of voice: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association expert panel to develop a protocol for instrumental assessment of vocal function. A*merican Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *27*(3), 887-905. https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2018_AJSLP-17-0009

Pearson. (2020). *Pearson clinical assessment no objection letter for tele-health delivery*. https://www.pearsonassessments.com/content/dam/school/global/clinical/us/assets/telepractice/Letter-of-no-objection.pdf

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Prevoo, M. J., Malda, M., Mesman, J., & van IJzendoorn, M. H. (2016). Within-and cross-language relations between oral language proficiency and school outcomes in bilingual children with an immigrant background: A meta-analytical study. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(1), 237–276. https://doi.org/10.3102%2F0034654315584685

Pro-Ed. (2020). *Pro-Ed's statement on tele-assessment.* https://www.proedinc.com/Downloads/PRO-ED_Tele-Assessment.pdf

Provincial Health Services Authority (PHSA). (N.D.). *Zoom for healthcare.* https://www.phsa.ca/health-professionals/professional-resources/office-of-virtual-health/covid19 virtual-health-toolkit/zoom-for healthcare#:~:text=The%20Zoom%20for%20Healthcare%20platform, Electronic%20Documents%20Act%20(PIPEDA).

Qaseem, A., Forland, F., Macbeth, F., Ollenschläger, G., Phillips, S., & van der Wees, P. (2012). Guidelines International Network: toward international standards for clinical practice guidelines. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *156*(7), 525-531. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-156-7-201204030-00009

Raman, N., Nagarajan, R., Venkatesh, L., Monica, D. S., Ramkumar, V., & Krumm, M. (2019). School-based language screening among primary school children using telepractice: A feasibility study from India. *International Journal of Speech Language Pathology*, *21*(4), 425–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2018.1493142

Richmond, T., Peterson, C., Cason, J., Billings, M., Terrell, E. A., Lee, A. C. W., Towey, M., Parmanto, B., Cohn, E. R., & Brennan, D. (2017). American Telemedicine Association's principles for delivering telerehabilitation services. *International Journal of Telerehabilitation, 9*(2), 63–68. https://doi.org/10.5195/ijt.2017.6232

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists. (2020). *Telehealth guidance.* https://www.rcslt.org/members/delivering-quality-services/telehealth/telehealth-guidance

Ryan, C. (2013). Language use in the United States: 2011. *American community survey reports, ACS-22.* U.S. census bureau, Washington, DC. https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2013/acs/acs-22/acs-22.pdf

Shaw, J., Jamieson, T., Agarwal, P., Griffin, B., Wong, I., & Bhatia, R. S. (2018). Virtual care policy recommendations for patient-centred primary care: findings of a consensus policy dialogue using a nominal group technique. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *24*(9), 608–615. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1357633X17730444

Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Canada. (2006). *The use of telepractice for SAC SLPs and audiologists.* https://www.sacoac.ca/sites/default/files/resources/sac_ telepractice_position_ paper_english.pdf

Speech Pathology Australia. (2014). *Telepractice in speech pathology [Position statement].* https://www.speechpathologyaustralia.org.au/SPAweb/Members/Position_Statements/SPAweb/Members/Position_Statements/Position_Statements.aspx?hkey=b1a46941-246c-4609-bacc-1c1b5c52d19d

Statistics Canada. (2020). *Canadian perspectives survey series 1: Impacts of COVID-19 on job security and personal finances, 2020.* The daily. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/200420/dq200420b-eng.htm

Sutherland, R., Trembath, D., Hodge, A., Drevensek, S., Lee, S., Silove, N., & Roberts, J. (2017). Telehealth language assessments using consumer grade equipment in rural and urban settings: Feasible, reliable and well tolerated. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *23*(1), 106–115. https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633X15623921

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Torgesen, J. K., & Burgess, S. R. (1998). Consistency of reading-related phonological processes throughout early childhood: Evidence from longitudinal-correlational and instructional studies. In J. L. Metsala & L. C. Ehri (Eds.), *Word recognition in beginning literacy* (pp. 161–188). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2020). *COVID-19 impact on education: Global monitoring of school closures caused by COVID-19*. https://en.unesco.org/covid19/educationresponse

USAFacts. (2020). *4.4 million households with children don't have consistent access to computers for online learning during the pandemic.* https://usafacts.org/articles/internet-access-students-at-home/#:~:text=Overall%2C%204.4%20million%20households%20with,devices%20to%20access%20the%20internet.

van den Bosch, L. J., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2020). First and second language vocabulary affect early second language reading comprehension development. *Journal of Research in Reading, 43*(3), 290–08. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9817.12304

Wagner, R. K., Torgesen, J. K., Rashotte, C. A., & Pearson, N. A. (2013). *Comprehensive test of phonological processing.* Pro-Ed.

Waite, M. C., Cahill, L. M., Theodoras, D. G., Busuttin, S., & Russell, T. G. (2006). A pilot study of online assessment of childhood speech disorders. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *12*(3), 92–94. https://doi.org/10.1258%2F135763306779380048

Waite, M. C., Theodoros, D. G., Russell, T. G., & Cahill, L. M. (2010). Internet-based telehealth assessment of language using the CELF–4. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2009/08-0131)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Ward, L., White. J., Russell. T., Theodoros. D., Kuhl. M., Nelson. K., & Peters., I. (2007). Assessment of communication and swallowing function post laryngectomy: A telerehabilitation trial. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, *13*(3), 88–91. https://doi.org/10.1258%2F135763307783247293

Williams, K. T. (2007). *Expressive vocabulary test.* Pearson Assessments.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

APPENDICES

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Appendix A

Guidelines for Virtual Assessment Lab Members Interview Script

A) Obtain participant consent for recording

Hello _____, thank you for agreeing to meet via Zoom to discuss advantages and challenges of virtual administration of standardized assessment protocols. This interview will focus on your online literacy assessment experience and it will be recorded. Only I will have access to this recording, it will be not shared with a third party. Are you OK with me recording this interview?

B) Proceed with following explanation and interview questions

This interview will last approximately 30 minutes and will be semi-structured. I will ask for your perspective on various aspects of virtual assessment. We will cover 6 different topics and there will be an opportunity to share 'other' insights at the end of this interview. Do you have any questions for me before we begin?

1. **Sample / Candidacy for Participation**
   *First, we will discuss candidacy for participation in virtual assessment. *Consider who is able to participate in virtual assessment and who is not and the reasons why this might be, e.g. SES, cognitive ability, access to technology etc.*
   What are the advantages?
   What are the challenges?

2. **Collaboration / Caregiver Communication**
   *Next, we will discuss collaboration and communication with caregivers. * Consider communication with the guardian before, during and after the assessment in terms of setting up the assessment, the assessment itself, and the follow up on the assessment.*
   What are the advantages?
   What are the challenges?

3. **Technology / Equipment**
   *Next, we will discuss the technological / equipment requirements. *Consider what software and hardware and testing materials the tester needs, what the child / guardian requires etc.*
   What are the advantages?
   What are the challenges?

4. **Clinical / Administration**
   *Next, we will discuss the clinical administration of the standardized tests. *Consider the following: Test environment, Child interaction, Test administration, Test scoring.*
   What are the advantages?
   What are the challenges?

5. **Bilingual Children**
   Next, we will discuss special considerations for assessment of bilingual children.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

What are the advantages?
What are the challenges?

6. Ethics and Confidentiality

Last, we will discuss ethics and confidentiality issues.
What are the advantages?
What are the challenges?

***7.* Other**

Do you have any other advantages or challenges regarding virtual standardized assessment?

C) End Interview

Thank you for your participation in this interview. Please feel free to email me with other advantages or challenges should you have any.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Recommendations for Virtual Assessment Stakeholder Review	Yes	No
Scope and Purpose		
Is the overall objective specifically described?	100%	
The population for whom the guidelines apply is described	100%	
The guideline development group includes individuals from all relevant professional groups	100%	
The target users of the guidelines are clearly defined	100%	
Is the target setting adequately described so that context for the guideline development is clearly understood?	100%	
Rigour of Development		
The criteria for selecting the evidence is clearly described	100%	
The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described	100%	
The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described	100%	
Could this intervention be replicated by other educators, researchers, or practitioners?	100%	
A procedure for updating the guideline is provided	75%	25%
The guideline has been externally reviewed by stakeholders prior to publication	100%	
Is any essential information missing?	100%	
Are potential limitations reported and addressed?	100%	
Clarity of Presentation		
The recommendations are specific and unambiguous	100%	
How would you describe the quality of the writing [high quality / low quality]	100%	
Are the guidelines user friendly and easy to access?	100%	
Applicability		
The guideline provides advice and / or examples of how the recommendations can be put into practice	100%	
The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered	100%	
Is the generalizability of guidelines addressed?	100%	
Do the guidelines contribute concrete recommendations for future research (directed toward educators, researchers, or practitioners, as appropriate)?	100%	
Editorial Independence		
The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.	100%	
Overall Assessment		
How would you rate the quality of these guidelines? [high quality / low quality]	100%	
Would you recommend these guidelines for use?	100%	

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.07.21258378; this version posted June 11, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .