**Comprehensive Early Literacy Self-Assessment Tool for Birth to Age 5 Organizations**

**Instructions**

This tool is an optional self-assessment that may be used by early care and education programs and local education agencies (LEAs) serving children birth through age 5 to investigate the current state of early literacy practices in your early care and education program(s). The early care and education program/LEA early literacy planning team is encouraged to use this tool to identify strengths and gaps in building a comprehensive early literacy program. After completing this self-assessment with your early literacy planning team, you are encouraged to discuss your findings and establish a consensus on the areas of strength and areas of need. These findings will provide you with the information needed to identify priority areas of growth and intervention in your local literacy plan.

**Needs Assessment Domains**

* Teaching and Instructional Support
  + Selecting and Implementing Research-Based Early Literacy Curriculum
  + Continuously Improving through Program-wide Professional Learning Plans
* Learner Supports
  + Providing Supports using Data, Differentiated Teaching Approaches and Teamwork and Collaboration
  + Integrating Supports for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners
  + Prioritizing Supports for Children with Speech, Fine Motor and Cognitive Developmental Delays and Disabilities
* Family and Community Partnerships
  + Creating Opportunities for Family Engagement
  + Leveraging Community Partnerships

**Indicators**

* Exemplary – serving as a successful model that achieves desirable outcomes as intended.
* Operational – in use or functioning but may be missing viable components or data to show effectiveness.
* Emergent – in the process of becoming operational but not in use.
* Not Yet Evident – there are no observable indicators.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN: Teaching and Instructional Support** | | | | | |
| Selecting and Implementing a Research-Based Early Literacy Curriculum | | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Implementing Research-Based Early Literacy Curriculum with Fidelity | Uses a curriculum that is approved by OSSE or has independent research/evidence of effectiveness and has been implemented with fidelity in accordance to standards set forth by curriculum developers (e.g., Head Start Curriculum Fidelity, Creative Curriculum Fidelity Tool, High Scope Curriculum Implementation, etc.) but does not preclude the program from modifications or use of supplemental resources to meet the needs of population served. | Uses a curriculum that is approved by OSSE or has independent research/evidence of effectiveness but implementation is not in accordance to standards set forth by curriculum developers (e.g., Head Start Curriculum Fidelity, Creative Curriculum Fidelity Tool, High Scope Curriculum Implementation, etc.) | Uses a curriculum that is approved by OSSE or has independent research/evidence of effectiveness and has not been implemented with fidelity in accordance to standards set forth by curriculum developers (e.g., Head Start Curriculum Fidelity, Creative Curriculum Fidelity Tool, High Scope Curriculum Implementation, etc.) | Uses a curriculum that is not approved by OSSE or does not have independent research/evidence of effectiveness or does not have a clearly identified curricula. |  |
| Adapting Curriculum to Meet the Needs of Diverse Learners (e.g., English learners (ELs), children with disabilities, etc.) | Uses a research-based curriculum that has materials for cultural responsiveness and EL scaffolds built-in; or has enacted a plan that addresses the addition of supplementary materials that attend to cultural responsiveness and provide scaffolded supports for ELs and diverse learners. | Uses a research-based curriculum and has a plan developed to address the addition of supplementary materials that attend to cultural responsiveness and provide scaffolded supports for ELs and diverse learners. | Uses a research-based curriculum but does not have a plan to address the addition of supplementary materials that attend to cultural responsiveness and provide scaffolded supports for ELs and diverse learners. | Is not using a research-based curriculum and does not yet have a plan to address the addition of supplementary materials that attend to cultural responsiveness or provide scaffolded supports for ELs and diverse learners. |  |
| Continuously Improving through Program-wide Professional Learning Plans | | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Comprehensive Professional Learning Calendar | Enacted a professional learning plan to include a professional learning calendar with opportunities for all educators, administrators, and program personnel to engage in professional learning to effectively implement the high-quality literacy curriculum with fidelity including strategies and accommodations for students who are EL and/or have disabilities; and to continue to develop knowledge, skills, and competency to implement or lead implementation of effective, evidence-based strategies for supporting children’s early literacy and language development. | Early care and education professionals within the program participate in initial training and support to implement the high-quality literacy curriculum; however, it is not comprehensive; on-going training is not consistently offered and may not include all educators. | A limited number of early care and education professionals within the program engage in professional learning that is limited to a one-day training or not specific to implementing the high-quality literacy curriculum and evidence-based practices. | No evidence of professional learning provided for early care and education professionals on the high-quality literacy curriculum and evidence-based practices. |  |
| Explicit Professional Learning Plan for New Hires | Enacted a professional learning plan for new hires that is ongoing and sustainable at all points of the year which includes allocated time and opportunities for support such as feedback and informal evaluation. | There is an informal plan outlined for professional learning for new hires or the present plan is limited in scope and sequence and does not include on-going support. | A scope and sequence and materials for the high-quality literacy curriculum have been provided to support implementation but there is no time/support allocated for new hires to engage in professional learning around implementation. | There is no plan to support implementation of the high-quality literacy curriculum for new hires. |  |
| Job-embedded Professional Learning Opportunities and Community Building | Collaborative professional learning for early care and education professionals, coaches/specialists, special educators, English learner specialists, etc. is ongoing, support is sustained, and progress is systematically evaluated. | Collaborative professional learning for early care and education professionals, coaches/specialists, special educators, English learner specialists, etc. is present but inconsistent in the infrastructure for implementation and support. Opportunities may not be connected and/or progress not evaluated in a systematic way. | There is seldom opportunity for collaborative professional learning for early care and education professionals, coaches/specialists, special educators, English learner specialists, etc. and opportunities are not connected and/or progress not evaluated in a systematic way. | There is no opportunity for collaborative professional learning for early care and education professionals, coaches/specialists, special educators, English learner specialists, etc. |  |
| Bias Training | Established understanding of the impact of unconscious bias by all staff and enacted a plan to raise awareness of the impact of unconscious bias in relation to the English language acquisition (ELA)/ high-quality literacy curriculum and the creation of high-quality early learning experiences and environments for diverse populations. | Enacted plan to raise awareness of the impact of unconscious bias in relation to the ELA/high-quality literacy curriculum and the instruction of diverse populations. | Drafted a plan to develop the understanding of the impact of unconscious bias in relation to the ELA/ high-quality literacy curriculum and the instruction of diverse populations. | No evidence of understanding that the impact of unconscious bias is a need for staff to understand in relation to ELA/high-quality literacy curriculum or instruction. |  |
| Reflections, Supporting Evidence or Comments: | 1. For any domain you rated “Exemplary,” what data supports this claim? 2. For any domain you rated less than “Exemplary,” what action steps need to be taken to push the practice to the next level? How long might this take and what factors and barriers might you encounter? 3. What patterns do you observe on how you rated your program’s early literacy practices? | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN: Learner Supports** | | | | | |
| Providing Supports using Data, Differentiated Teaching Approaches and Teamwork and Collaboration | | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Data-driven | Data from assessments is gathered and analyzed regularly to ensure that all children are receiving appropriate learning experiences that are evidence-based and implemented with fidelity using a continuous improvement cycle. Early educators are provided support on how to effectively use data. | Assessments are administered regularly to children, but data needs to be more consistent and effectively analyzed. Support on how to effectively use data is not available to all early educators. | Assessments are administered inconsistently and a plan for professional learning on the effective use of data has not been enacted. | Assessments are not completed and there is no plan for professional learning on the effective use of data. |  |
| Differentiated Teaching Approach in Providing Early Care and Education Experiences | Intentionally adjusts content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and group sizes consistently to meet learners needs. | Intentionally adjusts content, process, products, or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and group sizes to meet learners needs but differentiation is done consistently. | Evidence of differentiated teaching approach is minimal and content, process, products or the learning environment, the use of ongoing assessment and group sizes is only done occasionally. | There is no evidence of a differentiated teaching approach while providing early care and education experiences among children. |  |
| Collaboration and Planning | Early care and education professionals, coaches and family support specialists meet regularly for collaboration and planning to ensure that the goals of evidence-based intervention are being achieved using a continuous improvement cycle. | Early care and education professionals, coaches and family support specialists meet for collaboration and planning to ensure that the goals of evidence-based intervention are being achieved but may not be meeting regularly | Collaboration and planning between early care and education professionals, coaches and family support specialists is very limited (e.g., only happens upon director/supervisor’s request, etc.). | There is no evidence of collaboration and planning between early care and education professionals, coaches and family support specialists. |  |
| Teaming | There is an established system and process requiring the team to meet regularly to review and analyze data regarding children’s development (e.g., ensure that children’s lack of progress is not due to a preventable cause like lack of differentiated instruction, curriculum being implemented without fidelity, etc.). | There is an established system and process requiring the team to meet regularly regarding children’s progress but is not followed consistently. | There is a plan or system in place requiring the team to meet, but it is not executed regularly for early care and education staff and supports are not available to all students. | There is no plan or system in place requiring the school’s/program’s team to meet. |  |
| Integrating Supports for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners | | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Staff Training | Provides ongoing training and professional development for all staff on how to effectively embed support for literacy development for all children including English learners (EL). | Some training for staff on how to support all children including ELs’ literacy development has been provided, but not necessarily to all staff or in an ongoing manner. | Provide training for some staff on how to support all children including ELs’ literacy development but it is occasional and superficial. | No training has been provided on how to support all children including ELs’ literacy development and strategies for support are not embedded in early learning practices. |  |
| Embedded Supports | Supports for all children including ELs’ and dual language learner’s (DLLs) home language and literacy development are integrated and visible within all components of the curriculum, instructional practices and assessments (e.g., wrap-around services, intervention, etc.). | Supports for all children including ELs’ and dual language learner’s (DLLs) home language and literacy development are sometimes present in the curriculum and sometimes used in early learning and assessment practices, but are inconsistent. | Supports for all children including ELs’ and dual language learner’s (DLLs) home language and literacy development is seldom present within the curriculum and early learning practices. | There is no evidence of supports for all children including ELs’ and dual language learner’s (DLLs) home language and literacy development in the curriculum, early learning practices or assessments. |  |
| **Prioritizing Supports for Children with Speech, Fine Motor and Cognitive Developmental Delays and Disabilities** | | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Developmental Screening | Implemented developmental screening tools for children in the program including speech and fine motor delays and children are receiving interventions from certified professionals to support early literacy and overall development. | Enacted plan to implement developmental screening tools for children in the program including speech and fine motor delays and children are receiving interventions from certified professionals to support early literacy and overall development. | Drafted plan to implement developmental screening tools for children in the program including speech and fine motor delays and for children to receive interventions from certified professionals to support early literacy and overall development. | No evidence of plan to implement developmental screening tools for children in the program including speech and fine motor delays . |  |
| On-going Professional Learning | Enacted plan for research- and/or evidence-based ongoing professional learning that develops an awareness of dyslexia and knowledge of appropriate inclusive approaches for dyslexic learners for all early care and education staff and families. | Enacted plan for research- and/or evidence-based ongoing professional learning that develops an awareness of dyslexia and knowledge of appropriate inclusive approaches for dyslexic learners for all early care and education staff. | Drafted plan for research- and/or evidence-based ongoing professional learning that develops an awareness of dyslexia and knowledge of appropriate inclusive approaches for dyslexic learners for all early care and education staff. | No evidence of plan for research- and/or evidence-based ongoing professional learning that develops an awareness of dyslexia and knowledge of appropriate inclusive approaches for dyslexic learners for all early care and education staff. |  |
| Reflections, Supporting Evidence or Comments: | 1. For any domain you rated “Exemplary,” what data supports this claim? 2. For any domain you rated less than “Exemplary,” what action steps need to be taken to push the practice to the next level? How long might this take and what factors and barriers might you encounter? 3. What patterns do you observe on how you rated your program’s early literacy practices? | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DOMAIN: Family and Community Partnerships** | | | | |  |
| Creating Opportunities for Family Engagement | | | | |  |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Engagement | Early care and education programs consistently engage families by proactively sharing resources that promote at-home accessibility to the early literacy curriculum, providing parent literacy training and regularly sharing interactive family-friendly age-appropriate and culturally diverse literacy activities that support the curriculum. | Early care and education programs engage families by planning early literacy events, however these events do not directly support the early literacy curriculum in place or are in response to expressed family needs. | Early care and education programs inconsistently engage families or the engagement is limited to certain program activities (e.g., field trips, bring supplies, etc.). | Early care and education programs rarely engage families. There has been no plan constructed to include families. |  |
| Program-wide Systems | Implemented a consistent program-wide system of protocols to engage families with early literacy plans by providing trainings to support parent understanding of the goals, outcomes and tools (e.g., individualized education plan (IEP), individualized family service plan (IFSP), etc.). | There is a program-wide system of protocols to engage families with early literacy plans by providing trainings to support parent understanding of the goals, outcomes and tools (e.g., IEP, IFSP, etc.), however, these protocols are not followed consistently. | Program staff attempt to engage families with early literacy plans however it is inconsistent from staff to staff and is not a program-wide initiative. | There is no plan for tools and protocols to engage families with early literacy plans. |  |
| Cultural and Linguistic Supports | Respect for cultural and linguistic differences clearly evident by having learning environments sensitive to family’s culture(s) and language(s) and information are disseminated in a variety of ways and languages and alignment with the ideals of the culturally responsive practices. | Cultural and linguistic differences are accommodated by having learning environments sensitive to family’s culture(s) and language(s) and information are disseminated in a variety of ways; however, this sometimes excludes information about learning and classroom practices. | Cultural and linguistic differences are seldom accommodated; learning environments do not reflect family’s culture(s) and language(s). | There is no evidence that cultural and linguistic differences are respected or included. |  |
| Leveraging Community Partnerships | | | | | |
|  | Exemplary | Operational | Emerging | Not Yet Evident | Reflections + Evidence |
| Community Partnerships | Established district- and community-level partnerships (e.g., libraries, afterschool programs, cultural institutions, health care providers, businesses, philanthropy, faith-based community, etc.) to regularly and consistently support evidence-based early literacy practices. | Established some district- and community-level partnerships (e.g., libraries, afterschool programs, cultural institutions, health care providers, businesses, philanthropy, faith-based community, etc.) to support evidence-based early literacy practices. | Developed a plan to establish district- and community-level partnerships (e.g., libraries, afterschool programs, cultural institutions, health care providers, businesses, philanthropy, faith-based community, etc.) to support evidence-based early literacy practices. | No evidence of plan for district- and community-level partnerships (e.g., libraries, afterschool programs, cultural institutions, health care providers, businesses, philanthropy, faith-based community, etc.) to support evidence-based early literacy practices. |  |
| Literacy Focus | Partnerships ensure family early literacy practices support and accommodate families’ availability (e.g., evenings and weekends) and there is open communication with parents and families of children’s learning and development. | There are established partnerships; however, there are no consistent opportunities for family early literacy practices and supports that accommodate families’ availability (e.g., evenings and weekends) and there is no system for communication with parents and families on children’s learning and development. | Some partnerships have been established to provide family early literacy practices and supports, but these opportunities are mostly offered in times that are not within the families’ availability (e.g., evenings and weekends). | No partnerships have been established or finalized. |  |
| Seamless Support | Early literacy practices and supports between the early care and education program and district- and community-level organizations are seamless and there is collaboration between program staff and families. | Early literacy practices and supports between the early care and education program and district- and community-level organizations and collaboration between program staff and families are not consistently enacted. | Early literacy practices and supports between the early care and education program and district- and community-level organizations are not seamless and occur without collaboration with program staff or families. | No evidence of plan for partnerships between district- and community-level organizations, program staff and families to provide early literacy practices and supports. |  |
| Reflections, Supporting Evidence or Comments: | 1. For any domain you rated “Exemplary,” what data supports this claim? 2. For any domain you rated less than “Exemplary,” what action steps need to be taken to push the practice to the next level? How long might this take and what factors and barriers might you encounter? 3. What patterns do you observe on how you rated your program’s early literacy practices? | | | | |