The conversation concerning the importance of high-quality early childhood education has grown more complex – encompassing not only defining the determinants of program quality but also linking these determinants to child outcomes. Research has linked high-quality early childhood education to "better cognitive function and language development" for young children - and in later years higher rates of attendance at a four-year college, and higher rates of employment (Ramey et al. 1999, 2; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development 2006, 1).

An important piece of the quality conversation continues to be not only what determines program quality but how to increase the supply of high-quality early childhood programs. After observing settings for children 3 and under, the National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development Early Childhood Research Network found that the majority of the programs were only of fair quality and that only 9 percent of programs were of excellent quality (Vandell & Pierce 2003). Another study rates the majority of care for older preschoolers of only medium quality (Vandell & Pierce 2003).

If demographics are considered, the link between the need for high-quality early childhood programs and efforts to increase the supply becomes clearer. In 2001, approximately 12 million children between birth and age 6, who were not yet in kindergarten, were receiving care and education services from someone other than their parents. This number represents roughly 61 percent of the children in this age group – 23.4 million children (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics 2005, Capps, et. al. 2004, 5). Over the past decade, the United States has seen not only an increase in the number of children served in early childhood programs but an increase in the cultural and linguistic diversity of the staff who work in and the children and families served by these programs. The variations within this diversity span race, ethnicity, home language, and family structure, but it should be noted that children of immigrants make up 22 percent of the 12 million children between birth and age 6 who were not yet in kindergarten and were receiving care and education services from someone other than their parents (Capps, et. al. 2004, 5).

One approach to improving and maintaining early childhood program quality is quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS) – currently being implemented statewide in 19 states (including the District of Columbia), as well as piloted in various counties and localities across the country. QRIS evaluate, observe, recognize, reward, and support early childhood program quality improvement – with a strong emphasis on continuous quality improvement. They can serve as a framework for the

various efforts to build and sustain early childhood program quality in a state and use state child care licensing regulations as a foundation for a pathway to higher program quality (McDonald, 2009).

The defining components of QRIS are accountability, standards, incentives (both financial and otherwise) linked to compliance, program and provider outreach and support, and consumer education and support. The focus on the "quality" piece of quality rating and improvement systems rests on the accountability and standards developed for the QRIS. QRIS standards typically address the areas of professional development, staff qualifications, family involvement, learning environment, curriculum, health and safety, and leadership and management. As those who develop, implement and administer QRIS track the growing diversity of the children and families served by early childhood programs, some have looked for additional ways to ensure that programs are truly responsive to and inclusive of their needs. For example, an early childhood program may rate at a higher level of a QRIS but not necessarily provide what the field determines is culturally-competent and –appropriate care and education.

Chang states that culturally competent early childhood programs are those that have skilled and effective teachers, low teacher-child ratios and appropriate group sizes, age-appropriate curriculum, engaged families, well-designed facilities, linkages to comprehensive services, culturally and linguistically appropriate assessment, and available and accessible bilingual education and services (Chang 2006, 10). Taking into account the demographics of children under six in this country, and using the opportunity that QRIS present to improve program quality, it is clear that this is an opportune time to ensure that concepts of cultural competence are woven into these quality standards and their criteria in a meaningful way.

To this end, the A.L. Mailman Family Foundation has provided funding for the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) to initiate the Quality Benchmark for Cultural Competence Project (QBCCP). The original purpose of the Project was to determine the feasibility of developing a tool, as well as a measure, to assess the level of cultural competence within programs participating in a QRIS. Regardless of the level at which programs are participating in a quality improvement process, NAEYC states that "[f]or optimal development and learning of all children, educators must **accept** the legitimacy of children's home language, **respect** (hold in high regard) the home culture, and **promote** and **encourage** the active involvement and support of all families, including extended and nontraditional family units" (NAEYC 1995, 2). A key point that is highlighted in this statement

is the importance of a child's home language and home culture. Since all children are rooted in their families, it may make sense to elevate a child's family structure and all that it entails as the core of their family's culture. This structure encompasses family socioeconomic status, family composition, parent's level of educational attainment, abilities of children and family members, family's immigration status, family's religion, family's home and preferred languages, parent's sexual orientation, and the way that a family classifies its race and ethnicity.

Additionally, the National Center for Cultural Competence states that "[c]ulture is an integrated pattern of human behavior, which includes but is not limited to – thought, communication, languages, beliefs, values, practices, customs, courtesies, rituals, manners of interacting, roles, relationships and expected behaviors of a racial, ethnic, religious, social or political group; the ability to transmit the above to succeeding generations; dynamic in nature" (National Center for Cultural Competence 2004, 4).

The QBCCP Collaborators, as well as various interested members of the early childhood field, created an initial list of eight concepts that define cultural competence. For the early childhood field, this translates into a commitment to engage in an ongoing process of learning and developing multiple and various solutions that yield effective practices. Seven of the culturally-competent approaches in early childhood programs survived broader scrutiny beyond the QBCCP Collaborators:

1. Acknowledge that children are nested in families and communities with unique strengths. Recognize and mitigate the tension between the early childhood profession's perceptions of the child as the center of the work versus the family as the center of the work.

2. Build on and identify the strengths and shared goals between the profession and families and recognize commonalities in order to meet these goals.

3. Understand and authentically incorporate the traditions and history of the program participants and their impacts on child-rearing practices.

4. Actively support each child's development within the family as complex and culturally-driven ongoing experiences.

5. Recognize and demonstrate awareness that individuals' and institutions' practices are embedded in culture.

6. Ensure that decisions and policies regarding all aspects of a program embrace and respect participants' language, values, attitudes, beliefs and approaches to learning.

7. Ensure that policies and practices build upon the home languages and dialects of the children, families and staff in programs and support the preservation of home languages.

The work of the QBCCP involved convening a group of Collaborators to develop the definition of cultural competence for early childhood. The definition, along with possible criteria relating to each concept within the definition, was discussed with a group of representatives from across the states who are actively involved in QRIS planning, development, and implementation, as well as with participants in a session on QBCCP at the 2008 NAEYC Annual Conference in Dallas, TX. The document was then distributed to interested parties in the early childhood field for an open comment period. After comments were integrated into the document, it was sent to researchers in the field to offer guidance on measuring the concepts and criteria. QBCCP was also part of a presentation and dialogue at the 2009 Smart Start conference in Greensboro, NC.

People were very responsive to the work that NAEYC was undertaking and provided invaluable input in the area of ideas for implementing the suggested criteria, suggestions on how to group and possibly combine the concepts of cultural competence, suggestions on how to measure concepts of cultural competence, and on expanding the view of culture beyond race and ethnicity to family structure. There was a significant amount of input concerning one of the concepts of cultural competence. As mentioned previously, the QBCCP Collaborators developed an initial list of eight concepts of cultural competence for the early childhood field. The eighth concept: "Examine and confront privilege and power and help to transform existing unequal balances of power" provoked an intense amount of feeling and discussion, primarily around how this could be implemented in a meaningful way in early childhood settings. The feedback was that respondents understood the underlying importance of the concept and recognized that imbalances in power do exist within programs. However, respondents felt that implementing this concept was not only a significant challenge to those in the field, but could be a potential hindrance to the respondents' work since the force behind the wording of this concept came across as off-putting.

The resulting Quality Benchmarks for Cultural Competence tool – a guide for identifying and weaving culturally-competent practices into

QRIS criteria – is included at the end of this document. It is arranged in matrix form, by each concept in the definition of cultural competence for early childhood stated above. The tool includes ideas for implementing the criteria – since early childhood programs are in different places and may not be ready to implement these practices but are committed to building their capacity to do so. The tool also includes guidance on how programs (and assessors or evaluators) can determine the level of cultural competence within a program by evaluating how well an early childhood program is performing culturally-competent practices and meeting the suggested criteria. To this end, some of the original concepts of cultural competence have been combined to streamline their measurement. In addition, the bibliography at the end of the document includes resources that may be useful to programs undertaking this work.

Also during our discussions with the field, we found that the topic of cultural competence was one that resonated with a broad range of people working on a broad range of issues. Some wanted this document to address the wide array of social issues that can intersect with cultural competence work. And to some readers, it may seem that this document does not go far enough to push the importance of providing culturally- and linguistically-appropriate early care and education. However, quality rating and improvement systems and their criteria are but one key piece of the much larger early care and education system. It is important to note that the focus of the QBCC tool is not about broad systemic change to the infrastructure of an early care and education system. The tool is a framework for moving the field forward and embedding and integrating the concepts of cultural competence into one existing policy (in this case, QRIS) in a meaningful way.

Measurement Tips

Several of the concepts and practices may seem overwhelming to some – but it is imperative to address the issue of cultural competence at all levels, from whatever the program, community, or state's starting point. Key to effective use of the criteria and assessing levels of cultural competence for each is the actual focus of the measurement. Is it the child, family, staff, or program? Across the seven concepts, all four are addressed. At least two questions must be answered regardless of the measurement focus (child, family, staff, or program): What are the most effective measurement tools to use? And, which tools are the most culturally-appropriate and sensitive?

As programs begin the process of using this tool to assess their level of cultural competence, it is imperative to pay attention to the following caveats about choosing measures:

- Investigate whether the assessment measures have been tested with diverse populations and whether they have internal validity. Measures that are chosen should have high internal validity across cultural groups, should have been developed and normed on the cultural groups represented in the classroom, and should be appropriately translated into the languages represented in the classroom.

- Whenever possible, choose people to administer the measures from the same diverse cultural background as the child or family being evaluated. Randomly select classrooms to observe for cultural sensitivity and competence.

- Whenever possible, hold a focus group of parents and ask colleagues to review measures for cultural competence before administering them to children and families.

- Administer pre-post, self-report questionnaires (in appropriate languages) to families from diverse backgrounds on communication preferences, children's goals, language preferences, and feelings of staff cultural competence. Use these questionnaires to determine staff progress in cultural competence and communication, goals for children that both teachers and families should work toward, and ideas for enhancing family-staff communication. In writing questionnaires, be cognizant of the language used and its meaning to families. For instance, questionnaires should use the terms "child and caregiver" as opposed to "son/daughter and parent."

Learning and Leading Together

The tool is a living document, meaning that it can grow beyond what is on the page to encompass additional practices that an individual program, community, state, or the early childhood field may recognize as culturally-competent as each learns and experiences more. In the end, leadership and responsibility for ensuring that early childhood programs are working toward this goal rest on families, communities, teachers, directors, and policymakers.

Families can actively work with early childhood programs to ensure that they are given meaningful opportunities to participate in the program –

from organizing family activities to being active board members (Halgunseth, et al, 2009). Communities can partner with early childhood programs to ensure that necessary resources are shared – from support services to translation services to possible funding opportunities to enhance program quality.

Teachers can work "to make the most of children's potential, strengthening and building upon the skills they bring when they enter programs" (NAEYC 1995, 3). As Copple and Bredekamp state: "When young children are in a group setting outside the home, what makes sense to them, how they use language to interact, and how they experience this new world depend on the social and cultural contexts to which they are accustomed. A skilled teacher takes such contextual factors into account, along with the children's ages and their individual differences, in shaping all aspects of the learning environment" (NAEYC 2009, 10).

Program directors can:
- recruit and retain a diverse teaching staff
- provide leadership and professional development opportunities for themselves and staff that support culturally competent practices
- ensure that they and their staff access the proper training to provide guidance and strategies for working toward a higher level of cultural competence beyond what QRIS criteria may dictate
- create a culture of intentionality around increasing their program's level of cultural competence so that it is understood that cultural competence is an integral part of providing a high-quality program
- take the lead in creating an environment that promotes equity, learning, growth and development for children, families, and teaching staff

It is hoped that program directors who desire to undertake this work will look to their state's early learning guidelines to see how they have embedded concepts of cultural competence within them to provide a contextual link to other state initiatives beyond QRIS. However, program directors can use information from the implementation of these QRIS criteria to inform their advocacy around the issue of cultural competence – and work with staff, families, and other interested parties to embed cultural competence further within early childhood policies.

Policymakers can listen to the needs of their constituents and ensure that the initiatives they create and fund take into account current and future demographics and respond to the true needs of those most impacted by them. Adequate allocation of resources to support early childhood systems so that programs are supported in their work to build

higher levels of cultural competence is also the responsibility of policymakers.

The QBCC matrix that follows is meant to be used as a guide to spark not only discussion within programs, but action through implementation of the ideas presented and measurement of how the criteria or program goals are being met. It is arranged to flow from the specific concept of cultural competence, to an example of criteria related to the concept, to the ideas for implementing the criteria, and finally to suggestions for ways to measure how well a program is meeting the selected criteria. The criteria are not listed in any particular order – or order of importance – so programs can choose where to start this process. The individual criteria are numbered so that it will be easier to discern their corresponding implementation and measurement suggestions.

The criteria, as previously noted were derived from several sources. In addition to those from the various reviewers, others include notations recognizing the following sources:

- Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)
- Harvard Family Research Project
- Keystone Stars
- NAEYC Early Childhood Program Accreditation Family and Community standards and criteria

It is hoped that programs can use this not only as a guide to implementing strategies to move toward a higher level of cultural competence, but to spark dialogue and action in the realm of policymaking to ensure that early childhood programs not only respond to the needs of diverse children and families but impact them in a positive way.

Lastly, we would like to thank the A.L. Mailman Family Foundation for their support of the Quality Benchmark for Cultural Competence Project. We would also like to thank the QBCCP Collaborators, the participants in our conference call and presentations at the 2008 NAEYC Annual Conference and the 2009 Smart Start conference, the participants in NAEYC's QRIS Meeting, and all of those who provided their comments and suggestions during the open comment period for this document. In addition, we would like to thank Mon Cochran, Leigh Kale D'Amico, Linda Espinosa, Linda Halgunseth, and Mariajose Romero for their input on the measurement suggestions provided in the tool, as well as Christina Wysong for her assistance in reviewing the document.

Acknowledge that children are nested in families and communities with unique strengths. Build on and identify the strengths and shared goals between the profession and families and recognize commonalities in order to meet these goals. Recognize and mitigate the tension between the early childhood profession's perceptions of the child as the center of the work versus the family as the center of the work.   Actively support each child's development within the family as complex and culturally-driven ongoing experiences. (Original concepts 1, 2, and 4)

Criteria	Ideas for Implementation	Measurement Suggestion
Programs have policies and practices in place that encourage family involvement in the administration of the program and that reflect the traditions of the children enrolled in the program. **[1]** Classrooms, materials, curriculum, and interactions reflect value for children's home languages and culture (CLASP) **[2]** Program has ongoing opportunities for communication with families regarding the child's progress and behavioral, social and physical needs. The staff participating in the parent conference should have bilingual or multilingual capacity. (Keystone Stars, Star 3 Partnerships with Family & Community Performance standard). **[3]** Program has policies and practices that demonstrate meaningful engagement and partnership with parents in program planning and decision making. Policies should represent the multilingual capacity of the program. (Keystone Stars, Star 4	Program directors work with staff and families to build their understanding of the dynamics of culture and its meaning for children and families' lives, development, and ways of learning. This includes nurturing families' pride in their home culture and helping staff and families understand how culture is intrinsic to organizations and unfolds in relation to race, ethnicity, skin color, social class, gender, age, nation and region of origin, immigration experience, and power and status relations. **(1,5)** Program directors provide ongoing professional development on furthering staff's understanding of	**What to document:** Evidence of policies that encourage family involvement OR Evidence that programs have at least (x) policies in place that encourage family involvement. **(1,2,3,4)** Evidence of staff awareness of policies that encourage family involvement. **(1,4)** Evidence that families are active and engaged in their childrens' education. **(3,4,6)** Evidence that program directors and staff are knowledgeable regarding the communities of program participants. **(1,2)** Evidence that the program and its multi-facets reflect value for children's home languages and culture. **(1,2)** Evidence that parent involvement policies and practices are visible in

Partnerships with Family & Community Performance standard). **[4]**

Professional development plans for staff must include trainings on communication with diverse families (translation, interpretation, use of cultural mediators, and other cultural and family practices) and understanding of the cultural practices relative to children served (CLASP). **[5]**

Program staff work to ensure that communication with families about their child's assessment findings is sensitive to family values, culture, identity, and home language (NAEYC). **[6]**

Teachers and directors gain a working knowledge of instructional strategies proven effective with learners of the standard dialect of English and second language learners. Teachers use these strategies on a daily basis during classroom instruction. **[7]**

culture and diversity and ways to engage families in this conversation. **(1,5)**

Program staff use individual child assessment that takes into account home culture and language as well as input from families for the purpose of improving instruction and classroom practice. **(3,6)**

Program staff work toward the understanding that they are experts on early education and pedagogy whereas the family is the expert on the child and their culture. Program policies and practices can exist to:
- educate parents on educational theory and pedagogy
- educate providers on parents' local culture and their culturally-based definitions of early development and education
- critique and further advance early

program resources and materials and board membership. **(1,2)**

Evidence that the cultures and ethnicities of all families in the program are reflected in reading books and other educational materials. **(1,2)**

Evidence that all children and families in the program are visible on the walls and by a family presence in program activities. **(1,2,4)**

Evidence that the program director is able to describe the use of child assessments and the sharing of assessment information in culturally sensitive ways. **(3,6)**

Evidence of a plan incorporating shared goals between families and program staff that is integrated into daily practices. **(3,4,7)**

Evidence of ongoing communication with families in their preferred language regarding goals and classroom practices. **(3,5,6)**

Evidence of the content of new staff orientation. **(1,4,5)**

Evidence of resources available to

education and pedagogical theory as used in actual practice in light of the more complex understanding of cultures and cultural dynamics. **(3,4)**

Program staff can invite families to share their goals for their children's progress in face-to-face meetings and be respectful of the time it may take to create trust for these conversations. Meetings should be used to discuss program staff and parents' culturally- based understandings of children's progress, needs, and goals, and establishing a shared framework. Program staff should use input from families in setting learning goals for children. This means collaborating with families to identify common ground and develop effective strategies for integrating family and program goals.

support culturally- and linguistically-appropriate teaching practices. **(2,5,7)**

Evidence of practices that support culturally and linguistically appropriate teaching. **(5,7)**

How to document:
Ask families to fill out a questionnaire identifying their goals for children. Teachers and families should discuss these top goals and determine an agreed upon set of goals that both teachers and families will agree to work on. At the end of the year, families and teachers should refer back to document to see if those goals have been met. **(3,4,6)**

Administer pre-post, self-report questionnaires (in appropriate languages) to families on communication and language preferences. Ask them how satisfied they were with school-family communication. **(3,4,6)**

Administer quarterly, pre-post, self-report questionnaires to teachers asking them to identify effective practices they have used with children and families and areas that they need resources on to improve. Address questionnaires in meetings, provide resources in areas of weaknesses, and recognize areas of

	(1,3,4)	strength. **(1,2,3,4,5,6,7)**
	Program should implement a family involvement awareness, orientation, and training program to ensure that all families know how to participate in the program and all program staff know how to involve families in culturally sensitive ways. (Harvard Family Research Project) **(1,3,4)**	Consider pre-post surveys to caregivers to track teacher knowledge building and improvement. Program director should also ensure that professional development and cultural sensitivity orientations are ongoing. **(5,7)**
	New staff orientation includes resources on working with diverse children and their families as well as an introduction to culturally-relevant and dual language education. **(1,4,5,7)**	**Specific Outcome:** Program director and 75% of teachers can cite and implement at least three instructional strategies that have been proven effective with learners of the standard dialect of English and dual language learners. **(5,7)**
	Resources that support cultural and linguistic appropriate teaching with children and families from diverse backgrounds are available to new and ongoing staff. **(2)**	90% of staff professional development plans include strategies for enhancing communication with families and understanding of cultural practices. **(5)**
	Program staff should have	

	access to culturally- and linguistically- appropriate comprehensive services, as well as provide families with access to such services (CLASP). **(1,4)** Staff meetings provide opportunities for cross-cultural learning among staff and families (CLASP). **(1,4)**	

Understand and authentically incorporate the traditions and history of the program participants and their impacts on child-rearing practices. Recognize and demonstrate awareness that individuals' and institutions' practices are embedded in culture. (Original concepts 3 and 5)

Criteria	Ideas for Implementation	Measurement Suggestion
Program staff must use a variety of formal and informal strategies (including conversations) to become acquainted with and learn from families about their family structure; their preferred child-rearing practices; and information families wish to share about their socioeconomic, linguistic, racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds (NAEYC). **[8]** Families are invited to develop and share material that is meaningful to their history and traditions. **[9]** Program staff members are aware of culture's influence on their own beliefs and practices. **[10]**	Programs should have policies that clearly articulate developmentally appropriate practices and place these policies in the context of the child-rearing beliefs and practices of the families served. **(8)** Teachers should serve as the bridge between developmentally appropriate practices in the mainstream culture of the United States and families' cultural history and traditions and child-rearing practices (including toileting, eating and communication since developmental milestones may be different). **(8,9,10)** Program directors and staff should work to ensure that the program creates a welcoming learning community that continually	**What to document**: Evidence that program staff are able to articulate the traditions and history of program participants. **(8,9)** Evidence of representation of traditions and history of program participants in the classroom and in daily activities. **(8)** Evidence that staff has been taught such traditions and histories, and can discuss them openly with family members. **(8,9,10)** Evidence that staff actively integrate environmental and culturally-appropriate curriculum and teaching methods. **(8,10)** **How to document:** Caregiver self-report questionnaire can be given asking caregivers to specify special cultural traditions and holidays they and the families in the program celebrate, as well as ways that these are incorporated into classroom practices. **(8,9,10)**

	seeks knowledge and is reflective of myriad cultures (as addressed in program philosophy, curricula and instructional resources, human resources policies, and the ways in which family and staff interact). Staff should be open to adapting their practices as their knowledge about home cultures grows and as families change. **(8,9,10)** Programs should have policies that reflect respect for and incorporate culturally-relevant traditions and histories that are reflected in child-rearing practices for guidance, discipline, encouragement, communication in the family's preferred language and toilet training. **(8)** Programs should offer a spectrum of meaningful opportunities for families to be involved and share their histories and traditions and their impact on child-	**Specific Outcome:** 75% of staff demonstrate awareness of culture's influence on their own beliefs and practices based on (assessment, observation, or other measure). **(10)**

	rearing practices, regardless of the language spoken by the family. **(9)**	
	Programs should offer a spectrum of meaningful, culturally-sensitive opportunities for families to participate in the program. Families are encouraged to make or share artifacts, music, stories, or other appropriate information within the classroom. **(9)**	
	Program staff should encourage and provide opportunities for children and their families to share experiences through storytelling, puppets, marionettes or other props to support the "oral tradition" common among many cultures (Goode, 2005, p.1). **(8,9)**	
	Program staff should plan trips and community outings to places where children and their families can learn about their own cultural or ethnic history as	

	well as the history of others (Goode, 2005, p.2). **(8,9)**	
	Programs should provide an opportunity for members of the community to serve as role models and share their cultural and ethnic history, and should create linkages with a diverse set of community representatives, regardless of whether their culture and ethnicity is represented by the families served by the program (Chang, 2006). **(8,9)**	
	Program staff should use videos, films, or other media resources reflective of diverse cultures to share with children and families served by the program (Goode, 2005, p.2). **(8)**	
	Program should have utensils, objects and music commonly used by the various ethnic groups served by the program (Chang, 2006). **(8)**	

	Program staff should ensure that curricula includes traditional holidays celebrated by the majority culture, as well as those holidays that are unique to the culturally diverse children and families served by the program (Goode, 2005, p.2). **(8)** Program staff should design literacy activities and materials in which children and their families harvest cultural traditions and funds of knowledge at home (e.g., gathering life histories, songs, rhymes, games) to be used in the classroom and at home. **(8)**	

Ensure that decisions and policies regarding all aspects of a program embrace and respect participants' language, values, attitudes, beliefs and approaches to learning. Ensure that these policies and practices build upon the home languages and dialects of the children, families and staff in programs and support the preservation of home languages. (Original concepts 6 and 7)

Criteria	Ideas for Implementation	Measurement Suggestion
All staff must attend professional development training on cultural competence and Inclusive Practices. The Inclusive Practices requirement refers to STARS approved professional development related to serving children with special needs or disabilities, as well as teaching diverse children and supporting diverse children and their families. (Keystone STARS, STARS Worksheet, Star 3 – Centers) http://www.pakeys.org/docs/WS3-02%20Ctr%20STAR%203%20WS%20(2008-07-01).doc) **[11]** Required hours of professional development must also include training in second language acquisition strategies appropriate to children's ages (CLASP). **[12]** Required hours of professional development must include training on culturally-competent practices and approaches to learning and how to create bilingual programs that support children's home language while also supporting second language acquisition. (CLASP) **[13]**	Program director should support staff in learning home languages (as well as ASL) and the dialects of families of children enrolled in the program. All domains of the program's curriculum should be made accessible to dual language learners through the use of their home language in the classroom, as well as exposure to English. **(12,13)** Program director should work within the program and the larger community to seek out financial supports for program staff to undertake professional development opportunities. **(11)** Program directors should develop multiple strategies for meeting the written and	**What to document:** Evidence that policies and practices build on home languages and dialects and support the preservation of home languages. **(12,13)** Evidence that appropriate materials are translated in languages spoken by families of children enrolled in the program. **(15)** Evidence that the program director is able to describe how the program addresses these needs, what community- and state-level resources are available to support such efforts, and the extent to which the program has been successful in accessing in them. **(13)** **How to document:** Administer quarterly, pre-post, self-report questionnaires to teachers asking them to identify effective practices they have used with children and families and areas that they need resources on to improve. Address questionnaires in meetings, provide resources in areas of

When at least 20% of children enrolled in a program speak a language other than English, at least one staff person must be fluent in that language. **[14]** Communication methods to family and staff (parent handbook, policy manual, newsletters, etc.) must be translated into the preferred language of families of children enrolled in the program. **[15]**	spoken translation needs of the program. Responsibility for translation of materials should not fall solely to program staff. **(14,15)** When possible, program staff should develop proficiency in families' native and preferred languages and communicate with the family in the language with which families feel most comfortable. **(14,15)**	weaknesses, and recognize areas of strength. **(11,12,13)** **Specific Outcome:** 90% of staff have attended professional development training on cultural competence and inclusive practices. **(11,12,13)** 75% of staff are able to cite at least two current approaches to learning that are based on current research in second language acquisition. **(11,12,13)** 90% of caregivers report that the program's policies and decisions respect the diversity of language, values, attitudes, and beliefs of program participants. **(13,14,15)** 90% of staff have completed required hours of professional development related to culturally competent practices. **(11,12,13)**

Quality Benchmark for Cultural Competence Project Collaborators

Camille Catlett – Investigator
Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute

Carol Brunson Day - President
National Black Child Development Institute

Linda Espinosa - Professor of Early Childhood Education
University of Missouri, Columbia

Antonia Lopez – Director, Early Care and Education
National Council of La Raza

Hannah Matthews – Senior Policy Analyst, Child Care and Early Education
Center for Law and Social Policy

Aisha Ray – Associate Professor
Erikson Institute

NAEYC Staff:
Jerlean Daniel, Deputy Executive Director

Davida McDonald, Director of State Policy

Linda Halgunseth, Office of Applied Research Coordinator

Peter Pizzolongo, Director of Training and Associate Director of Professional Development

References

Anderson, M. Parker. 1998. *Families Matter: Parent-Provider Partnerships.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project. Online: http://www.hfrp.org/family-involvement/publications-resources/parent-provider-partnerships.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2005. *Employment characteristics of families in 2004.* Washington, DC. U.S. Department of Labor. Online: http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/famee_06092005.pdf.

Capps, R., M. Fix, J. Ost, J. Reardon-Anderson, J. Passel. *The Health and Well-Being of Young Children of Immigrants.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Online: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311139_ChildrenImmigrants.pdf.

Chang, H. 2006. *Getting Ready for Quality: The Critical Importance of Developing and Supporting a Skilled, Ethnically and Linguistically Diverse Early Childhood Workforce.* Oakland, CA: California Tomorrow. Online: http://www.californiatomorrow.org/media/gettingready.pdf.

Chang, H. 1999, 2006 revised. Adapted from "Are We Supporting Diversity? A Tool for Reflection and Dialogue". Oakland, CA: Work/Family Directions, Inc. and California Tomorrow.

Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8. Third Edition. 2009. eds. C. Copple & S. Bredekamp. Washington, DC: NAEYC. Online: http://www.naeyc.org/store/node/162.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. 2005. *America's children: Key national indicators of well-being 2005.* Online: http://www.childstats.gov/amchildren05/index.asp.

Goode TD. 2005. *Promoting Cultural & Linguistic Competency: Self-Assessment Checklist for Personnel Providing Services and Supports in Early Intervention and Early Childhood Settings.* Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development. Online: http://www11.georgetown.edu/research/gucchd/nccc/documents/Checklist.EIEC.doc.pdf.

Halgunseth, L.C., A. Peterson, D.R. Stark, S. Moodie. 2009. *Family Engagement, Diverse Families, and Early Childhood Education Programs: An Integrated Review of the Literature.* Washington, DC: NAEYC. Online: http://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/ecprofessional/EDF_Literature%20Review.pdf.

Matthews, H., D. Jang. 2007. *The Challenges of Change: Learning from the Child Care and Early Education Experiences of Immigrant Families.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy. Online: http://www.clasp.org/publications/challenges_change.htm.

McDonald, D. 2009. *Elevating the Field: Using NAEYC Early Childhood*

Program Accreditation to Support and Reach Higher Quality in Early Childhood Programs. Washington, DC: NAEYC. Online: http://208.118.177.216/policy/state/pdf/NAEYCpubpolReport.pdf.

NAEYC. 1995. *Responding to Linguistic and Cultural Diversity Recommendations for Effective Early Childhood Education.* Washington, DC: NAEYC. Online: http://www.naeyc.org/positionstatements/linguistic.

National Center for Cultural Competence. 2004. *Planning for Cultural and Linguistic Competence in Systems of Care…for children & youth with social-emotional and behavioral disorders and their families.* Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development. Online: http://www11.georgetown.edu/research/gucchd/NCCC/documents/SOC_Checklist.pdf.

NICHD (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development), Department of Health and Human Services. 2006. *The NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development: Findings for children up to age 4½ years* (05-4318). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Online: http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/pubs/upload/seccyd_051206.pdf.

Ramey, C.T., F.A. Campbell, M.R. Burchinal, D.M. Bryant, B.H. Wasik, M.L. Skinner, & D.M. Gardner. *Early learning, later success: The Abecedarian Study.* 1999. Chapel Hill, NC: Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina. Online: http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~ABC/ells-04.pdf.

Vandell, D.L., & & K.M. Pierce. 2003. Child care quality and children's success at school. In *Early childhood programs for a new century,* eds. A.J. Reynolds, M.C. Wang, & H.J. Walberg, 115–39. Washington DC: Child Welfare League of America.

For further reading

Alvarado, C. 2004. Authentic Leadership: Lessons Learned on the Journey to Equity. *Zero to Three* 25 (2): 32-39.

Ballantyne, K., A. Sanderman, T. D'Emilio, N. McLaughlin. 2008. *Dual Language Learners in the Early Years: Getting Ready to Succeed in School.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Online: http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/resabout/ecell/earlyyears.pdf.

Bronheim, S., T. Goode, W. Jones. 2006. *Cultural and Linguistic Competence in Family Supports.* Washington, DC: National Center for Cultural Competence, Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development. Online:

http://www11.georgetown.edu/research/gucchd/nccc/documents/FamilySupports.pdf.

Bruner, C., M. Stover Wright, A. Copeman, A. Ray, D. Schaack. 2008. Preliminary *Report Highlights: State QRIS Systems and Cultural and Linguistic Diversity.*

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2006. *Race Matters: Users Guide.* Baltimore, MD: The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Online: http://www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/Publications.aspx?pubguid={8D2422A2-4ACB-461D-8CA5-60A660D4B4EC}.

Child Trends. 2009. *What We Know and Don't Know about Measuring Quality in Early Childhood and School-Age Care and Education Settings.* Washington, DC: Child Trends. Online: http://www.childtrends.org/Files//Child_Trends-2009_5_20_RB_WhatWeKnow.pdf.

Enochty, M., M. Farris, L. Sockabasin, N. St. Victor. 2005. *Essential to Quality: Supporting Cultural Competence in the Department of Early Education and Care Regulated Workforce.* Cambridge, MA: The Schott Fellowship in Early Care and Education.

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. 2008. *America's children: Key national indicators of well-being 2008.* Online: http://www.childstats.gov/pdf/ac2008/ac_08.pdf.

Gonzalez-Mena, J. 1998. *The Child in the Family and Community. Second Edition.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hernandez, D., N. Denton, S. Macartney. 2008. Children in Immigrant Families: Looking to America's Future. *Social Policy Report* 22(3): 1-23. Online: www.srcd.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=152.

Hernandez, D., N. Denton, S. Macartney. 2007. *Children in Immigrant Families: The U.S. and 50 States: National Origins, Language, and Early Education.* Albany, NY: Child Trends & The Center for Social and Demographic Analysis, University at Albany, SUNY. Online: http://mumford.albany.edu/children/img/Research_brief_1.pdf.

Keyser, J. 2006. *From Parents to Partners: Building a Family-Centered Early Childhood Program.* Saint Paul, MN: Redleaf Press and NAEYC. Online: http://www.redleafpress.org/productdetails.cfm?PC=949.

Maschinot, B. 2008. *The Changing Face of the United States: The Influence of Culture on Early Child Development.* Washington, DC: Zero to Three. Online: http://www.zerotothree.org/site/DocServer/Culture_book.pdf?docID=6921.

Matthews, H. 2008. *Supporting a Diverse and Culturally Competent Workforce: Charting Progress for Babies in Child Care Research-Based Rationale.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy. Online: http://www.clasp.org/publications/cp_rationale5.pdf.

Office of Child Development and Early Learning, Pennsylvania Departments of Education and Public Welfare. 2008. *Program Reach and County Risk Assessment State Fiscal Year 2007 – 2008.* Harrisburg, PA: Office of Child Development and Early Learning, Pennsylvania Departments of Education and Public Welfare. Online: http://www.pakeys.org/Reach_Rpt.aspx.

Romero, M. 2008. *Promoting Tolerance and Respect for Diversity in Early Childhood. Toward a Research and Practice Agenda: A View from the Field.* New York, NY: National Center for Children in Poverty. Online: http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_814.html.

Seitzinger, K.H. 2005. *Building Culturally and Linguistically Competent Services to Support Young Children, Their Families, and School Readiness.* Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Online: https://folio.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/10244/93/HS3622H325.pdf?sequence=1

Thomas, W., V. Collier. 2002. *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long Term Academic Achievement.* Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California – Santa Cruz. Online: http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/llaa/1.1_final.html.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Minority Health. 2001. *National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health Care. Executive Summary.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Minority Health. Online: http://www.omhrc.gov/assets/pdf/checked/executive.pdf.

Westmoreland, H., S. Bouffard, K. O'Carroll, H. Rosenberg. 2009. Data Collection Instruments for Evaluating Family Involvement. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project. Online: http://www.hfrp.org/family-involvement/publications-resources/data-collection-instruments-for-evaluating-family-involvement.