**Abstract**

**Engaging Clinicians to Develop a Meaningful Digital Outcome Measurement Tool**

**Background and objectives (75-word limit):** The Focus on the Outcomes of Communication Under Six (FOCUS-34) is a measure that assesses participation-focused change during speech-language therapy.1 It is used widely in practice and research,2 but its paper format is an implementation barrier preventing the use of data clinically and for evaluation.3-4 C A digital solution has been identified as the best way to address this barrier.3-4 This study engaged clinicians to identify the important features and formats of a digital solution.

**Approach (100):** Twenty-three speech-language pathologists (SLPs) from a large health system that routinely used the FOCUS-34  participated in 1-hour virtual synchronous focus groups on Zoom.5-6 Prior to focus groups, SLPs completed an online survey to report demographic and diversity data. During focus groups, SLPs were led through discussions about their r perceived benefits of a digital solution, and their preferred features and functions for a digital solution. Probes were used to elicit responses to topics that were not spontaneously addressed.7 Focus groups were recorded and transcribed.  Qualitative data were coded and assessed using thematic analysis.8

**Results (125):** Two major themes were identified, each with associated sub-themes: (1) SLPs believed a digital solution would improve clinical efficiencies, utility of data, and delivery of family-centred care, and (2) SLPs’ suggested features and considerations for a smooth implementation. SLPs believed a digital solution would support conversations with families, save time and resources, improve their use of FOCUS-34 data, and improve buy-in for outcome measurement. Recommended considerations for developers included: accessibility, offering various formats to accommodate individual preferences, ensuring accessible data and storage, and ensuring current administrative requirements were reduced. Preferred features for a digital solution included: reporting and granting immediate access to change scores with visual display of results, flagging significant change, generating summary reports, incorporating goal recommendations, and reminder systems to support data accuracy.

**Conclusion (50):** Engaging clinicians early in the development of new tools can help make them more clinically meaningful and easier to implement.9-10 This study contributes new knowledge about clinician engagement in tool development. In practice, the developing digital FOCUS-34 is expected to improve the collection, interpretation, and use of participation-focused outcome data.
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