

Supplemental Material S1. Characteristics of dynamic assessments reported across 65 peer-reviewed papers studying children with communication disorders.

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Alony and Kozulin, 2007	2007	ASLP		MLE	BG	Non-diagnosis	2	30	47	96	Con: 75.5; Ex: 71.4	Additional info	Language	DS	N/S	Attention, Task Items	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Child's performance	Post-test	Flexible	No	No
Asad et al, 2013	2013	CLTT		MLE	CS	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	N/A (case studies)	3	88	147	N/A	Diagnosis or Screening	Language	H/I	Some	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Bain and Olswang, 1995	1995	AJSLP		ZPD	WG	Non-diagnosis	1	15	30	36	N/S	Predict change	Language		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction	Post-test	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Binger et al, 2017	2017	JSLHR		GP	WG	Non-diagnosis	1	10	39	59	50.7	Predict change	AAC, Language		Some	Prompting	Cake	N/S	60 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Boyer and Martin, 2012	2012	CLP		IR	WG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	1	29	37	70	53.9	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items	Sandwich	2	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Camilleri and Botting, 2013	2013	JLCD	DAWL	GP	WG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	1	15	42	51	N/S	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Some	Task Items, Prompting	Both	1	35-40 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction, Child's performance, Transfer	Post-test	Planned	Yes	Yes

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Camilleri and Law, 2007	2007	ASLP			WG, BG	Non-diagnosis	3	54	41	50	N/S	Additional info	Language		Some	Prompting, Task Items	Both	1	45 mins	Criterion	Child's performance, Amount of Instruction	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Camilleri and Law, 2014	2014	IJSLP			WG, BG	Non-diagnosis	2	40	41	60	N/S	Predict change	Language		Some	Task Items, Prompting	Both	1	45 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction, Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Camilleri, Hasson and Dodd, 2014	2014	ECP	DAPPLE	T-T-R, GP	CS	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	N/A (case studies)	12	42	59	N/A	Diagnosis or Screening	Language, Speech		Yes	Task Items, Prompting, Nature of task	Both	1	40 mins	Criterion	Child's performance, Amount of Instruction	Post-test, Gain score	Pre-scripted	No	No
Donaldson and Olswang, 2007	2007	ASLP			BG	Non-diagnosis	2	26	63	82	ASD: 73.6 TD: 68.7	Intervention Planning	Pragmatics	ASD	N/S	Prompting	Cake	3	N/S	Set Amount, Criterion	Child's performance, Amount of Instruction	Post-test	Planned	No	Yes
Gillam and Ford, 2012	2012	CLTT			WG	Non-diagnosis	1	10	60	129	84.9	Additional info	PA/Literacy		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	No
Glaspey and Macleod, 2010	2010	CLP	GDAP		CS	Broader Study	N/A (case studies)	1	41	41	N/A	Monitor change	Speech		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Glaspey and Stoel-Gammon, 2005	2005	TLD	SSS		CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	1	43	43	N/A	Monitor change, Intervention Planning	Speech		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	No
Glaspey and Stoel-Gammon, 2007	2007	ASLP	SSS	GP	CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	1	4yr	4yr	N/A	Monitor change	Speech		N/S	Prompting	Cake	N/S	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	No
Gutierrez-Clellen and Conboy, 1998	1998	JCCD		MLE	BG	Non-diagnosis	2	18	153	181	165	Additional info	Language	Dyslexia	Yes	Nature of task	Sandwich	1	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Transfer	Gain score	Planned	No	Yes
Gutierrez-Clellen and Pena, 2001	2001	LSHS		MLE	CS	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	N/A (case studies)	2	48	54	N/A	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Planned	No	No
Hasson and Botting, 2010	2010	CLTT		T-T-R, MLE	CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	3	11y	12y	N/A	Intervention Planning	Language		N/S	Prompting, Nature of task	Sandwich	3	40 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Hasson and Dodd, 2014	2014	CLTT	DASS		CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	1	109	109	N/A	Intervention Planning	Language		N/S	Prompting	Cake	N/S	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Planned	No	No

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Hasson et al, 2013	2013	CLIT	DAPPLE	T-T-R	BG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	2	26	3y	5y	Case: 50.3 Con: 50.4	Diagnosis or Screening	Language, Speech		Yes	Prompting, Task Items	Both	1	40 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction, Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	No
Hasson et al., 2012	2012	IJLCD	DASS	GP, MLE, Testing	WG	Non-diagnosis	1	24	98	129	111	Intervention Planning	Language		No	Prompting	Cake	1	25-40 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Planned	Yes	Yes
Hemsley et al., 2013	2013	SLH		T-T-R	CS	Broader Study	N/A (case studies)	1	8y	8y	N/A	Additional info	Language		Yes	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Flexible	No	No
Hemsley et al., 2014	2014	SLH		T-T-R	CS	Broader Study	N/A (case studies)	2	102	140	N/A	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	45 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Planned	No	No
Henderson et al., 2018	2018	JSLHR	PEARL		BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	90	48	71	54	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich	1	30-40 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Post-test	Planned	Yes	Yes
Jacobs 2001	2001	CDQ	KIDTALK		BG, WG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	2	60	84	107	96	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items	Sandwich	1	approximately 30 minutes per child.	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	No

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Kapantzoglou et al., 2012	2012	LSHSS		T-T-R, MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	28			TLD: 57 PLI: 54	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich	1	30–40 min	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Kelley and Goldstein, 2019	2019	SSL	EWLM		WG, BG	Non-diagnosis	2	16	45	62	54	Predict change	Language		N/S	Task Items, Prompting	Both	1	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance, Amount of Instruction	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Keske-Soares et al., 2018	2018	CoDAS	DEMSS-BP		BG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	3	18	53	68	TD: 59 PD: 60 CAS: 59	Diagnosis or Screening	Speech		N/S	Prompting	Cake	N/S	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Planned	No	No
King et al., 2015	2015	AAC		GP	WG	Non-diagnosis	1	4	60	70	65	Predict change, Intervention Planning	AAC, Language		No	Prompting	Cake	4 to 6	60 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Kramer et al., 2009	2009	CJSLPA	DAI	T-T-R	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	17			Grade 3	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	N/S	Set Amount	Clinician Rating, Child's performance	Gain score	Planned	No	Yes
Lederberg and Spencer, 2009	2009	JDSDE			WG, BG	Experimental task	1	98	27	82	55	Intervention Planning	Language	H/I	Some	Task Items	Cake	2	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	No

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Lidz and Peña, 1996	1996	LSHSS		MLE	CS	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	N/A (case studies)	2	47	49	N/A	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich	2	20 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Planned	No	No
Long and Olswang, 1996	1996	AJSLP			WG	Non-diagnosis	2	21	31	36	Not provided	Intervention Planning	Language		N/S	Prompting	Cake	N/S	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	No
Macleod and Glaspey, 2014	2014	CLP	GDAP		CS	Broader Study	N/A (case studies)	3	36	36	N/A	Monitor change	Speech		No	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Mann et al., 2014	2014	JCD		MLE	CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	2	88	102	N/A	Additional info	Language, AAC	H/I	Some	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich but no post test	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Time for task completion, Clinician Rating		Pre-scripted	Yes	No
Mann et al., 2015	2015	AJSLP		MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	37	75	135	102.8	Diagnosis or Screening	Language, AAC	H/I	Some	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich but no post test	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Clinician Rating		Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Maragkaki and Hessels, 2017	2017	JSE	DAPPLE	T-T-R, GP	BG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	2	12			Case: 58.7, TD: 43.7	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items, Prompting	Both	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction, Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	Yes	No

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Martin, 2015	2015	LT	DAI	MLE	CS	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	N/A (case studies)	3	N/S (6-7 yrs)	N/S (6-7 yrs)	N/A	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Some	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	20 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Planned	No	Yes
McLaughlin and Cascella 2008	2008	CDQ			CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	6	107	156	N/A	Intervention Planning	Pre-verbal	GDD/IDD	N/S	Prompting	Cake	3	30 to 45 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction, Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	Yes
McNaughton, 1991	1991	JSLPA			CS	Broader Study	N/A (case studies)	1	79	79	N/A	Intervention Planning	AAC	Acquired aphasia	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S		N/S	No	No
Olswang and Bain, 1996	1996	JSHR			WG	Non-diagnosis	1	21	31	36	32.6	Predict change	Language		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	No
Olswang et al., 1986	1986	CLTT			CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	2	28	34	N/A	Predict change	Language		No	Prompting	Cake	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Olswang et al., 2013	2013	AJSLP		MLE, GP	WG	Non-diagnosis	1	6	11	24	18.3	Predict change	Pre-verbal	Motor diff.	Some	Prompting	Cake	1	20-30 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Flexible	Yes	Yes

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Peña et al., 1992	1992	TJSE		MLE	BG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	2	50	43	57	Not provided	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	20 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Flexible	No	No
Peña et al., 2001	2001	AJSLP		MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	79	45	57	50	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Some	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Planned	Yes	Yes
Peña et al., 2006 - second experiment	2006	JSLHR		MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	3	71			N/S – 1 st and 2 nd grade	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		N/S	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Peña et al., 2007	2007	ASLP		MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	40	78	101	89	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		N/S	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich but no post test	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Clinician Rating		Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Peña et al., 2014	2014	JSLHR	DAI	MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	3	54			LD: 68.4, TD-M: 68.9, TD-C: 69.8	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Peña, 2000 - study 1	2000	CDQ		MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	Study 1: 50	44	58	50	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Some	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	20 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	N/S	Yes	No

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Peña, 2000 - study 2				MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	Study 2: 55	45	57	50	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Some	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Clinician Rating		N/S	Yes	Yes
Petersen and Gillam, 2015	2015	JLD			WG	Diagnostic Accuracy	1	63			65.3	Diagnosis or Screening	PA/Literacy		Yes	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich	1	3 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Petersen et al., 2017	2017	JSLHR			BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	42	76	114	91	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	25-30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score, Post-test	Planned	Yes	Yes
Petersen et al., 2020	2020	LSHS		T-T-R, MLE	BG	Diagnostic Accuracy	2	31	69	115	93	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items, Nature of task, Prompting	Sandwich	1	15 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Post-test	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Regalla and Peker, 2017	2017	FLA			BG, WG	Non-diagnosis	2	31			N/S - pre-kindergarten	Additional info	Language	ASD, H/I, GDD/I	N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Resendiz and Peña, 2015	2015	Dialog		MLE	CS	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	N/A (case studies)	2			N/A - Kindergarten age	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance, Clinician Rating	Gain score	Pre-scripted	No	No

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Roseberry and Connell, 1991	1991	JSHR		Invented Rule	BG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	2	26	53	76	TD: 68, LD: 65.6	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Yes	Task Items	Sandwich	2	15-20 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	Yes	Yes
Snell, 2002	2002	AAC		T-T-R	CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	3	6y	40y	N/A	Additional info, Intervention Planning	Pre-verbal	ASD, GDD/ID	N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	90-120 minutes + planning	Criterion	Child's performance		Planned	No	No
Spencer et al., 2015 - phase 1	2015	AJSLP		T-T-R	WG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	1	41			N/S - preschool	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		Some	Nature of task, Task Items	Sandwich	3	15-20 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance	Gain score	Planned	No	No
Steele, 2015	2015	IJSLP		GP	BG	Broader Study	3	39	81	141	LD: 127, AM: 126, VM: 103	Additional info	Language		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Steele et al., 2013	2013	IJSLP		GP	BG	Broader Study	2	23	9y	11y	LI: 123.8 TD: 128.2	Additional info	Language		No	Prompting	Cake	4-Jun	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Strand et al., 2013	2013	IJLHR	DEMSS		WG	Diagnostic Accuracy	1	81	36	79	54.7	Diagnosis or Screening	Speech		No	Prompting	Cake	1	7-25 mins	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Planned	Yes	Yes

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Thomas et al., 2018	2018	CACD	NDAPD	GP	BG	Non-diagnosis	2	60	76	100	SSD: 87, TD: 87	Additional info	PA/Literacy		No	Prompting	Cake	N/S	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Tyler, 1996	1996	JCD			BG	Non-diagnosis	2	20	22	40	TD: 24; LD: 33	Intervention Planning	Speech		N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	60 min	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Pre-scripted	No	No
Tzuriel and Groman, 2017 - CPUT	2017	JCEP	CPUT	GP	BG	Broader Study	2	64			TD: 112, ASD: 112	Additional info	Language	ASD	N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Tzuriel and Groman, 2017 - CMCT	2017	JCEP	CMCT	GP	BG	Broader Study	2	64			TD: 112, ASD: 112	Additional info	Language	ASD	N/S	Prompting	Cake	1	N/S	Criterion	Amount of Instruction		Pre-scripted	No	Yes
Ukrainetz et al., 2000	2000	LSHSS		MLE	BG	Diagnostic, non-accuracy	2	23			N/S - Kindergarten age	Diagnosis or Screening	Language		No	Task Items, Nature of task	Sandwich	2	30 mins	Set Amount	Clinician Rating, Child's performance	Gain score	Planned	No	Yes
Wade and Haynes, 1989	1989	CLTT			BG	Non-diagnosis	2	18	18	44	LD: 36, TD: 20.3	Additional info	Language		No	Prompting	Cake	1	120 mins	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Planned	No	Yes

Author	Year	Journal	Name of DA	Named approach	Study Design	Study Type	Number of Groups	Total participants	Age - min	Age - max	Age - mean	Purpose	Area of assessment	Population	Linguistically Diverse or Bilingual	Type of mediation	Format	Number of Instructional Sessions	Duration of Sessions	Amount of instruction provided	Measurement	Post-test/gain score	Level of Prescriptiveness	Validity described	Reliability described
Weismer et al., 1993	1993	JSHR			CS	Non-diagnosis	N/A (case studies)	4	25	26	N/A	Predict change	Language		No	Nature of task	Sandwich	2	N/S	Set Amount	Child's performance	Post-test	Planned	No	Yes

Abbreviations:

TD= typically developing; LD= language disorder; N/S= Not specified; N/A=Not appropriate; Con= control group; Ex= experimental group, Case= caseload group

Age: age is given in months unless paper only provides age range in years (e.g. 3-5 year olds)

Type of Instruction: Attention= Instruction about attention or behaviour; Task Items=Instruction about task items or skills; Nature of Task= Instruction about task or nature of task; Child's Performance= Child's performance following instruction; Clinician Rating= Clinician's rating of child's modifiability; Amount of Instruction= Quantitative measure of amount of instruction; Transfer= Measurement of transfer to another task

Amount of Instruction: Criterion= Until child reaches or fails to reach set criterion; Set Amount= Set Amount of Instruction

Study Design: BG= between groups; WG=within group; CS=case study or single subject design; Broader Study= DA used as one part of broader study

Co-occurring conditions: H/I= Hearing impairment; GDD= Global developmental delay; ID= Intellectual Disability; DS= Down Syndrome; ASD= Autism Spectrum Disorder

Named theoretical approach: MLE=Mediated Learning Experience; ZPD=Zone of Proximal Development; GP=Graduated Prompting; T-T-R=Test-Train-Retest; IR= Invented Rule

Journals: ASLP= Advances in Speech Language Pathology; CLTT= Child Language Teaching and Therapy; AJSLP= American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology; JSLHR= Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research; CLP= Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics; IJLCD= International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders; IUSLP= International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology; ECP= Educational & Child Psychology; TLD= Topics in Language Disorders; JCCD= Journal of Children's Communication Development; LSHSS= Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools; SLH= Speech, Language and Hearing; CDQ= Communication Disorders Quarterly; SSL= Seminars in Speech and Language; AAC= AAC: Augmentative & Alternative Communication; CJSIPA= Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology; JDSDE= Journal of Deaf Studies & Deaf Education; JCD= Journal of Communication Disorders; JSE= Journal of Studies in Education; LT= Language Teaching; JSLPA= Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology; JSHR= Journal of Speech and Hearing Research; TJSE= The Journal of Special Education; JLD= Journal of Learning Disabilities; FLA= Foreign Language Annals; Dialog= Dialog: Journal of the Texas Educational Diagnosticians Association; CACD= Clinical Archives of Communication Disorders; JCEP= Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology

Assessments: DAWL= Dynamic Assessment of Word Learning; DAPPLE= Dynamic Assessment of Preschoolers' Proficiency in Learning English; GDAP= Glaspey Dynamic Assessment of Phonology; SSS= Scaffolding Scale of Stimulability; DASS= Dynamic Assessment of Sentence Structure; PEARL= Predictive Early Assessment of Reading and Language; KIDTALK= Kidtalk Interactive Dynamic Test of Aptitude for Language Knowledge; EWLM= Explicit Word Learning Measure; DEMSS= Dynamic Evaluation of Motor Speech Skill; DEMSS-BP= Dynamic Evaluation of Motor Speech Skill (Brazilian Portuguese); DAI= Dynamic Assessment and Intervention; NDAPD= Nonverbal dynamic assessment of phoneme deletion; CPUT= Children's Proverbial Understanding Test; CMCT= The Children's Metaphorical Construction Test

References:

- Alony, S., & Kozulin, A. (2007). Dynamic assessment of receptive language in children with Down syndrome. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 9(4), 323-331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14417040701291415>
- Asad, A. N., Hand, L., Fairgray, L., & Purdy, S. C. (2013). The use of dynamic assessment to evaluate narrative language learning in children with hearing loss: Three case studies. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 29(3), 319-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265659012467994>
- Bain, B. A., & Olswang, L. B. (1995). Examining readiness for learning two-word utterances by children with specific expressive language impairment: Dynamic assessment validation. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 4(1), 81-91. <https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360.0401.81>
- Binger, C., Kent-Walsh, J., & King, M. (2017). Dynamic assessment for 3- and 4-year-old children who use augmentative and alternative communication: Evaluating expressive syntax. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 60(7), 1946-1958. https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_JSLHR-L-15-0269
- Boyer, V. E., & Martin, K. Y. (2012). Invented rule with English language learners. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 26(7), 613-627. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2012.682694>
- Camilleri, B., & Botting, N. (2013). Beyond static assessment of children's receptive vocabulary: The Dynamic Assessment of Word Learning (DAWL). *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 48(5), 565-581. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12033>
- Camilleri, B., Hasson, N., & Dodd, B. (2014). Dynamic assessment of bilingual children's language at the point of referral. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 31(2), 57-72.

- Camilleri, B., & Law, J. (2007). Assessing children referred to speech and language therapy: Static and dynamic assessment of receptive vocabulary. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 9(4), 312-322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14417040701624474>
- Camilleri, B., & Law, J. (2014). Dynamic assessment of word learning skills of pre-school children with primary language impairment. *International Journal of Speech Language Pathology*, 16(5), 507-516. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2013.847497>
- Donaldson, A. L., & Olswang, L. B. (2007). Investigating requests for information in children with autism spectrum disorders: Static versus dynamic assessment. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 9(4), 297-311. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14417040701413720>
- Gillam, S. L., & Ford, M. B. (2012). Dynamic assessment of phonological awareness for children with speech sound disorders. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 28(3), 297-308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265659012448087>
- Glaspey, A., & Stoel-Gammon, C. (2007). A dynamic approach to phonological assessment. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 9(4), 286-296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14417040701435418>
- Glaspey, A. M., & MacLeod, A. A. N. (2010). A multi-dimensional approach to gradient change in phonological acquisition: A case study of disordered speech development. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 24(4), 283-299. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/02699200903581091>
- Glaspey, A. M., & Stoel-Gammon, C. (2005). Dynamic assessment in phonological disorders: The scaffolding scale of stimulability. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 25(3), 220-230.
- Gutierrez-Clellen, V. F., Conboy, B., Brown, S., & Robinson-Zañartu, C. (1998). Modifiability: A dynamic approach to assessing immediate language change. *Journal of Children's Communication Development*, 19(2), 31-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/152574019801900204>
- Gutierrez-Clellen, V. F., & Pena, E. (2001). Dynamic assessment of diverse children: A tutorial. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 32(4), 212-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461%282001/019%29>
- Hasson, N., & Botting, N. (2010). Dynamic assessment of children with language impairments: A pilot study. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 26(3), 249-272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265659009349982>
- Hasson, N., Camilleri, B., Jones, C., Smith, J., & Dodd, B. (2013). Discriminating disorder from difference using dynamic assessment with bilingual children. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 29(1), 57-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265659012459526>
- Hasson, N., & Dodd, B. (2014). Planning intervention using dynamic assessments: A case study. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 30(3), 353-366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265659014521642>
- Hasson, N., Dodd, B., & Botting, N. (2012). Dynamic Assessment of Sentence Structure (DASS): Design and evaluation of a novel procedure for the assessment of syntax in children with language impairments. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 47(3), 285-299. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-6984.2011.00108.x>
- Hemsley, G., Holm, A., & Dodd, B. (2013). A bilingual child's language profile: Impaired English but intact Vietnamese. *Speech, Language and Hearing*, 16(3), 127-138. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/2050571X13Z.00000000013>
- Hemsley, G., Holm, A., & Dodd, B. (2014). Identifying language difference versus disorder in bilingual children. *Speech, Language and Hearing*, 17(2), 101-115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1179/2050572813Y.00000000027>
- Henderson, D. E., Restrepo, M. A., & Aiken, L. S. (2018). Dynamic assessment of narratives among Navajo preschoolers. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 61(10), 2547-2560. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-17-0313
- Jacobs, E. L., & Coufal, K. L. (2001). A computerized screening instrument of language learnability. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 22(2), 67-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152574010102200202>
- Kapantzoglou, M., Restrepo, M., & Thompson, M. S. (2012). Dynamic assessment of word learning skills: Identifying language impairment in bilingual children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 43(1), 81-96. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2011/10-0095\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2011/10-0095))
- Kelley, E. S., & Goldstein, H. (2019). Examining performance on a process-based assessment of word learning in relation to vocabulary knowledge and learning in vocabulary intervention. *Seminars in speech and language*, 40(05), 344-358. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1688447>

- Keske-Soares, M., Uberti, L. B., Gubiani, M. B., Gubiani, M. B., Ceron, M. I., & Pagliarin, K. C. (2018). Performance of children with speech sound disorders in the dynamic evaluation of motor speech skills. *CoDAS*, 30(2), e20170037. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2317-1782/20182017037>
- King, M. R., Binger, C., & Kent-Walsh, J. (2015). Using dynamic assessment to evaluate the expressive syntax of children who use augmentative and alternative communication. *AAC: Augmentative & Alternative Communication*, 31(1), 1-14. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3109/07434618.2014.995779>
- Kramer, K., Mallett, P., Schneider, P., & Hayward, D. (2009). Dynamic assessment of narratives with grade 3 children in a first nations community. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 33(3), 119-128.
- Lederberg, A. R., & Spencer, P. E. (2009). Word-learning abilities in deaf and hard-of-hearing preschoolers: effect of lexicon size and language modality. *Journal of Deaf Studies & Deaf Education*, 14(1), 44-62. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enn021>
- Lidz, C. S., & Pena, E. D. (1996). Dynamic assessment: The model, its relevance as a nonbiased approach, and its application to Latino American preschool children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 27(4), 367-372. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461.2704.367>
- Long, S. H., & Olswang, L. B. (1996). Readiness and patterns of growth in children with SELI. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 5(1), 79-85. <https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360.0501.79>
- MacLeod, A. A. N., & Glaspey, A. M. (2014). A multidimensional view of gradient change in velar acquisition in three-year-olds receiving phonological treatment. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 28(9), 664-681. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2013.878855>
- Mann, W., Pena, E. D., & Morgan, G. (2014). Exploring the use of dynamic language assessment with deaf children, who use American Sign Language: Two case studies. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 52, 16-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2014.05.002>
- Mann, W., Pena, E. D., & Morgan, G. (2015). Child modifiability as a predictor of language abilities in deaf children who use American Sign Language. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 24(3), 374-385. https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2015_AJSLP-14-0072
- Maragkaki, I., & Hessels, M. G. (2017). A pilot study of dynamic assessment of vocabulary in German for bilingual preschoolers in Switzerland. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 7(1), 32-49. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v7i1.10392>
- Martin, D. (2015). Dynamic assessment of language disabilities. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 51-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S026144481200016X>
- McLaughlin, K., & Cascella, P. W. (2008). Eliciting a distal gesture via dynamic assessment among students with moderate to severe intellectual disability. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 29(2), 75-81. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1525740107311821>
- McNaughton, D. (1991). Augmentative and alternative communication intervention for a child with acquired aphasia with convulsive disorder: A case study. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*, 15(2), 35-41.
- Olswang, L. B., & Bain, B. A. (1996). Assessment information for predicting upcoming change in language production. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 39(2), 414-423. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3902.414>
- Olswang, L. B., Bain, B. A., Rosendahl, P. D., Oblak, S. B., & Smith, A. E. (1986). Language learning: Moving performance from a context-dependent to -independent State. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 2(2), 180-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026565908600200205>
- Olswang, L. B., Feuerstein, J. L., Lloyd Pinder, G., & Dowden, P. (2013). Validating dynamic assessment of triadic gaze for young children with severe disabilities. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 22(3), 449-462. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2012/12-0013](https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2012/12-0013)
- Peña, E., & Iglesias, A. (1992). The application of dynamic methods to language assessment: A nonbiased procedure. *The Journal of Special Education*, 26(3), 269-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002246699202600304>
- Peña, E., Iglesias, A., & Lidz, C. S. (2001). Reducing test bias through dynamic assessment of children's word learning ability. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 10(2), 138-154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360%282001/014%29>
- Peña, E. D. (2000). Measurement of modifiability in children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, 21(2), 87-97. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/152574010002100203>

- Peña, E. D., Gillam, R. B., & Bedore, L. M. (2014). Dynamic assessment of narrative ability in English accurately identifies language impairment in English language learners. *Journal of Speech Language & Hearing Research, 57*(6), 2208-2220. https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0151
- Peña, E. D., Gillam, R. B., Malek, M., Ruiz-Felter, R., & et al. (2006). Dynamic assessment of school-age children's narrative ability: An experimental investigation of classification accuracy. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 49*(5), 1037-1057. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2006/074\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2006/074))
- Peña, E. D., Resendiz, M., & Gillam, R. B. (2007). The role of clinical judgments of modifiability in the diagnosis of language impairment. *Advances in Speech Language Pathology, 9*(4), 332-345. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14417040701413738>
- Petersen, D. B., Chanthongthip, H., Ukrainetz, T. A., Spencer, T. D., & Steeve, R. W. (2017). Dynamic assessment of narratives: Efficient, accurate identification of language impairment in bilingual students. *Journal of Speech Language & Hearing Research, 60*(4), 983-998. https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2016_JSLHR-L-15-0426
- Petersen, D. B., & Gillam, R. B. (2015). Predicting reading ability for bilingual Latino children using dynamic assessment. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 48*(1), 3-21. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022219413486930>
- Petersen, D. B., Tonn, P., Spencer, T. D., & Foster, M. E. (2020). The classification accuracy of a dynamic assessment of inferential word learning for bilingual English/Spanish-speaking school-age children. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in Schools, 51*(1), 144-164. http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2019_LSHSS-18-0129
- Regalla, M., & Peker, H. (2017). Prompting all students to learn: Examining dynamic assessment of special needs and typical students in a prekindergarten inclusive French program. *Foreign Language Annals, 50*(2), 323-338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/flan.12261>
- Resendiz, M., & Peña, E. (2015). Dynamic assessment with English language learners. *Dialog: Journal of the Texas Educational Diagnosticians Association, 44*(1).
- Roseberry, C. A., & Connell, P. J. (1991). The use of an invented language rule in the differentiation of normal and language-impaired Spanish-speaking children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 34*(3), 596-603. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3403.596>
- Snell, M. E. (2002). Using dynamic assessment with learners who communicate nonsymbolically. *AAC: Augmentative & Alternative Communication, 18*(3), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07434610212331281251>
- Spencer, T. D., Petersen, D. B., & Adams, J. L. (2015). Tier 2 language intervention for diverse preschoolers: An early-stage randomized control group study following an analysis of response to intervention. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 24*(4), 619-636. https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/2015_AJSLP-14-0101
- Steele, S. C. (2015). Does language learning disability in school-age children affect semantic word learning when reading? *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 17*(2), 172-184. <https://dx.doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2014.979872>
- Steele, S. C., Willoughby, L. M., & Mills, M. T. (2013). Learning word meanings during reading: Effects of phonological and semantic cues on children with language impairment. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 15*(2), 184-197. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2012.700322>
- Strand, E. A., McCauley, R. J., Weigand, S. D., Stoeckel, R. E., Baas, B. S., Kreiman, J., & Liss, J. (2013). A motor speech assessment for children with severe speech disorders: Reliability and validity evidence. *Journal of Speech, Language & Hearing Research, 56*(2), 505-520. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2012/12-0094\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2012/12-0094))
- Thomas, D., Lance, D. M., & Rainey, J. L. (2018). Phonemic awareness assessment of children with and without speech sound disorders: A comparison study. *Clinical Archives of Communication Disorders, 3*(2), 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.21849/cacd.2018.00346>
- Tyler, A. A. (1996). Assessing stimulability in toddlers. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 29*(4), 279-297. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9924\(96\)00018-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9924(96)00018-4)
- Tzuriel, D., & Groman, T. (2017). Dynamic assessment of figurative language of children in the autistic spectrum: The relation to some cognitive and language aspects. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology, 16*(1), 38-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1945-8959.16.1.38>
- Ukrainetz, T. A., Harpell, S., Walsh, C., & Coyle, C. (2000). A preliminary investigation of dynamic assessment with Native American kindergartners. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in the Schools, 31*(2), 142-154. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461.3102.142>
- Wade, K. M., & Haynes, W. O. (1989). Dynamic assessment of spontaneous language and cue responses in adult-directed and child-directed play: A statistical and descriptive analysis. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy, 5*(2), 157-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026565908900500204>
- Weismer, S. E., Murray-Branch, J., & Miller, J. F. (1993). Comparison of two methods for promoting productive vocabulary in late talkers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 36*(5), 1037-1050. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3605.1037>