

**JURISDICTIONAL/REGIONAL SELF ASSESSMENT OF HOME  
VISITING PROGRAMS AND UNMET NEEDS**

**NAME OF JURISDICTION:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE COMPLETED:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PERSONS ASSISTING IN THE COMPLETION OF THIS ASSESSMENT:**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION/ADDRESS</b>	<b>PHONE NUMBER</b>	<b>E-MAIL</b>

**Please mark with a “\*” the person to be contacted if there are questions regarding this assessment.**

# **JURISDICTIONAL/REGIONAL SELF ASSESSMENT OF HOME VISITING PROGRAMS AND UNMET NEEDS**

## **A. NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM PLANNING**

*Vision: A system is in place to identify service gaps and plan for program expansion and growth.*

1. Does your jurisdiction identify areas in need? If yes, how is this done?
2. If your jurisdiction has multiple home visiting models, does it have centralized intake and assessment mechanisms in place or established criteria that determine how families are assigned to particular program models? If yes, what are they? If no, how are intake criteria established in each program model?
3. Do centralized data systems collect information on key home visiting indicators and statistics? If no, how are data systems currently collected? Who gets the data?
4. Has the jurisdiction completed an assessment of gaps in service delivery? If yes, please provide a copy.
5. Is there a jurisdictional plan to determine a process for program expansion? If yes, please describe.
6. Is there a mechanism in place to provide funding, technical assistance, and support to new program sites? If yes, please describe?
7. Has the LMB in your jurisdiction identified Early Childhood as one of its priority areas?

## **B. EVALUATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE**

*Vision: The system collects, analyzes, and monitors data about home visiting to identify program strengths and weaknesses and improve programs.*

1. Is there a quality assurance plan for home visiting in your jurisdiction?
2. Are program-specific quality assurance efforts integrated with jurisdiction- or federal-level regulations and monitoring?
3. Has the jurisdiction identified common outcome or evaluation indicators across multiple program models? If no, what would help this process?
4. Do the jurisdiction and individual programs allocate resources to enable rigorous, independent evaluation efforts?
5. Does your home visiting system have an established method to disseminate evaluation results and determine implications for program implementation?

### **C. PROGRAM STANDARDS**

*Vision: The system promotes adherence to a common set of program standards that ensure model fidelity and a high-quality system of services for young children and their families.*

1. Is there a system to track what standards monitor program fidelity in the jurisdiction?
2. Has the jurisdiction made an effort to “cross-walk” program standards or create a common set of standards to assist local programs that may integrate multiple models?
3. Do program standards address key program implementation areas, such as professional development, technical assistance, supervision, and cultural relevance?

### **D. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

*Vision: The jurisdiction system maintains a highly skilled and competent home visiting workforce and provides useful technical assistance to program sites.*

1. Has the jurisdiction determined core competencies for home visiting providers?
2. Are training systems in place that meet home visiting model requirements but also allow for appropriate training across models?
3. Does the system provide adequate resources and support to home visiting supervisors?
4. Are incentives in place to link professional development with course credit and higher compensation?
5. Does the home visiting system identify and address the technical assistance needs of individual program sites?

### **E. EARLY CHILDHOOD PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION**

*Vision: The home visiting system formally partners and collaborates with other early childhood services to create a comprehensive system of care for young children and their families.*

1. Does jurisdiction leadership bring together key stakeholders from an array of early childhood and related services to inform home visiting system development efforts?
2. Are transition policies or MOUs in place to create a seamless continuity of services for families enrolled in multiple early childhood programs?
3. Are funding streams coordinated to streamline administrative requirements and minimize competition?
4. Does the jurisdiction think holistically and consider home visiting to be a strategy connected to and dependent upon an array of early childhood services?

5. Does the jurisdiction integrate home visitation planning with other early childhood planning efforts? If yes, what other efforts are linked?

#### **F. PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

*Vision: The jurisdiction system engages a broad range of champions to create the public and political will for home visiting services to be part of a continuum of support for young children and their families.*

1. Are efforts underway to educate the public and cultivate champions to support home visitation?
2. Are marketing and outreach efforts underway to craft and frame a message to promote home visiting? If yes, please provide an example.
3. Does the jurisdiction proactively engage the media to highlight the benefits of home visiting?
4. Are jurisdiction-level government, state legislative hearings, national conferences, and other venues used to engage your community?

#### **G. ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE**

*Vision: The entity or entities that administer and fund the home visitation system are inclusive, responsive, and adaptable to the needs of the programs.*

1. Does a jurisdiction-level entity coordinate home visiting efforts in your county? If yes, who?
2. Do coalitions exist at the local level to address key home visiting issues? If yes, which ones?
3. Are key stakeholders engaged in home visiting planning and implementation efforts? If yes, what agencies, organizations?
4. Does a strategic plan or financial plan exist and guide home visiting planning efforts? If yes, please share your strategic plan or financial plan.

#### **H. FINANCING AND SUSTAINABILITY**

*Vision: The home visiting jurisdiction system is supported by a diverse and stable funding base that ensures the viability and sustainability of both local programs and systems-level support.*

1. Does the jurisdiction collect all available information about sources of home visiting funding?
2. Is adequate funding available to support the existing program sites? If no, what is needed?
3. Is funding available for program expansion?
4. Is funding designated for technical assistance and systems-level support to programs?

## JURISDICTION- SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

*Use this page for each additional component that is specific to your jurisdiction.*

<b>Component</b>				
<i>Vision:</i>				
Questions to Consider	Yes	If Yes, Is It Sufficient?	No	If No, Where Is a Place to Start?
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
<b>Jurisdiction Status and Notes</b>				
<b>Next Steps</b>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>				
<b>Priority Ranking</b> (on a scale of 1–10)	<b>Why:</b>			

**This self assessment tool for jurisdictions was adapted [by permission] from the Zero to Three Self Assessment Tool for States. [www.Zerothreethree.org](http://www.Zerothreethree.org)**

<b>Component</b>				
<i>Vision:</i>				
<b>Questions to Consider</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes, Is It Sufficient?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If No, Where Is a Place to Start?</b>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
<b>Jurisdiction Status and Notes</b>				
<b>Next Steps</b>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>				
<b>Priority Ranking</b> (on a scale of 1–10)		<b>Why:</b>		

<b>Component</b>				
<i>Vision:</i>				
<b>Questions to Consider</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>If Yes, Is It Sufficient?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>If No, Where Is a Place to Start?</b>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
<b>Jurisdiction Status and Notes</b>				
<b>Next Steps</b>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.</li> <li>2.</li> <li>3.</li> <li>4.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>				
<b>Priority Ranking</b> (on a scale of 1–10)		<b>Why:</b>		