Adolescent Literacy Implementation Indicators and Monitoring Tools

Annotated Bibliography

October 2026

Introduction

As state and local education leaders strive to improve adolescent literacy outcomes for all students, they look for ways to support effective literacy program implementation. These efforts include monitoring implementation to learn whether the initiative is implemented as intended, whether educators can adapt the program to meet student needs, and what support is needed to enhance effective implementation. This annotated bibliography focuses on practical indicators and tools that can help answer those questions during implementation.

We identified initial resources through a scan of 21 state adolescent literacy websites. This product narrows that larger inventory to three implementation domains: (1) leadership and implementation readiness; (2) assessment and data-use implementation; and (3) school-wide literacy culture, buy-in, and shared responsibility. Below, we present information about indicators in these three domains followed by a discussion of cross-domain considerations.

Many resources in the state scans are structured monitoring tools rather than psychometrically validated measures. These tools can be highly useful for identifying what should be observed or discussed and have value for implementation monitoring.

How to Use This Bibliography

This document is designed to be used by state education agency (SEA), local education agency (LEA), school leaders, curriculum specialists, professional development providers, and other educator leaders who support literacy implementation. SEA and LEA leaders will find these tools helpful as they implement strategic plans and goals related to literacy achievement. School leaders, curriculum specialists, and professional development providers can use the guide to assess school-wide readiness for literacy implementation, and monitor progress and data-informed adjustments.

This document includes annotated resources that are connected across domains. Each domain begins with a short overview and a table

of indicators that includes the possible data sources and frequency for monitoring. The indicators in each domain and their corresponding constructs represent a synthesis of the key factors that educators across states have found to be important when examining implementation of literacy programs and practices. Best practices in implementation monitoring involve using multiple sources of data; no single data source can fully capture implementation. Perception data can identify clarity, fit, and support needs, but should generally be triangulated with observed practice or administrative evidence. Likewise, completion of a plan or assessment does not demonstrate the quality of implementation. This bibliography is intended to be used as a resource to support technical assistance and formative evaluation for continuous improvement.

The appendix includes a description of the methodology used to develop this bibliography, a list of states that were selected to scan for resources, and limitations of the document.

Domain: Leadership and Implementation Readiness

Overview

Constructs in this domain focus on shared vision, leadership commitment, readiness, role clarity, protected time, scheduling, resource allocation, communication, goals, and implementation planning. One goal of these types of indicators is to identify technical assistance needs before classroom implementation problems emerge.

> This domain helps education leaders determine whether leadership structures, roles, time, and implementation plans are sufficient to support adolescent literacy efforts.

Readiness indicators are most useful when teams are required to point to concrete evidence rather than only rate themselves. A strong approach combines a periodic facilitated self-assessment with lighter-touch checks of schedules, plans, roles, and leadership follow-through.

Table 1. Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators

Construct	Potential indicator	Possible data sources	Monitoring frequency
Shared instructional vision	Staff can articulate how lesson planning and instruction connect to the shared high-quality instructional material (HQIM) vision.	Leader check / teacher survey	At launch; semester
Readiness plan completeness	Implementation plans specify goals, roles, timelines, data sources, professional learning, stakeholder engagement, and follow-up actions.	Needs assessment/ implementation plan	At implementation milestones; annual

Construct	Potential indicator	Possible data sources	Monitoring frequency
Protected time	School schedules protect core literacy/HQIM instructional blocks and common planning time.	Schedule records	Semester or when schedules change
Role clarity	Implementation team members and school staff know who is responsible for leadership, coaching, data review, materials, communication, and follow up.	Needs assessment / survey	At launch; annually
School-wide literacy leadership	A multidisciplinary school literacy leadership team maintains a shared vision, reviews multiple sources of evidence, distributes leadership, and protects time for collaborative disciplinary-literacy work.	Leadership-team self-assessment, plans, and meeting artifacts	Annual; quarterly evidence review

Annotated List of Tools and Resources

Beyond Curriculum Adoption: Implementation Guidance for HQCM

Rhode Island Department of Education. (2025). Beyond Curriculum Adoption: Implementation Guidance for High-Quality Curriculum Materials.

https://ride.ri.gov/sites/g/files/xkgbur806/files/2025-12/HQCM%20Implementation%20Guidance%20v2.1.pdf

Rhode Island's Beyond Curriculum Adoption guidance is a comprehensive implementation-monitoring resource. It organizes implementation around multiple systems and phases, with explicit attention to leadership, operations, curriculum-based professional learning, meaningful instruction, readiness, access, climate, fidelity, and continuous improvement. It could be useful for monitoring a shared instructional vision, implementation conditions, teacher clarity and confidence, and school climate around curriculum use. The framework also models how implementation data can be used to differentiate support rather than only document compliance and also includes an implementation framework and indicator bank that can strengthen existing approaches.

Construct connections: Shared instructional vision, readiness plan completeness, and school-wide literacy leadership (See Table 1: Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Implementing Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement

Ohio Department of Education and Workforce. (2025). Implementing Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement: A Guide for School Leaders, Grades 6–12.

https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Learning-in-Ohio/Literacy/Plan-to-Raise-Literacy-Achievement/Adolescent-Literacy/6-

12-Literacy-Implementation-Guide-Summer-25-Revision.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US

Implementing Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement, A Guide for School Leaders, Grades 6–12 is designed to help secondary administrators operationalize the state's literacy plan. The guide is organized around four key actions: shared leadership, effective literacy instruction, collaborative problem solving, and tiered systems of instructional support. It includes graphics, tools, templates, team structures, assessment/data supports, and self-reflection activities. Ohio materials use a traffic light scale (red, orange, yellow, and green) to help leaders evaluate the level of implementation. For each action, this provides a school-leader monitoring model that links leadership actions to schedules, coaching, data teams, and tiered supports.

Construct connections: Shared instructional vision, protected time, and role clarity (See Table 1: Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators)

South Dakota Literacy Framework: District Guide for Implementation

South Dakota Department of Education. (2025). South Dakota Literacy Framework: District Guide for Implementation.

https://doe.sd.gov/literacy/docu/DistrictGuide-0125.pdf

South Dakota's district implementation guide and related literacy-planning resources provide a guide for implementing a state literacy framework. The guide lays out implementation tasks, responsible parties, timelines, and resources, while the companion plan template is intended to be updated as districts identify concerns and set goals. The package also includes professional-learning quality criteria, providing value for readiness monitoring beyond a basic action plan. This resource could be used to examine whether leadership responsibilities are assigned, milestones are explicit, professional learning is aligned to implementation needs, and follow-up evidence is built into the plan. The package does not provide a validated readiness score, and plan completeness should not be interpreted as implementation quality.

Construct connections: Readiness plan completeness, role clarity (See Table 1: Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators), and growth-oriented implementation climate (See Table 3: School-Wide Literacy Culture and Shared Responsibility Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Michigan Department of Education Mult-Tiered System of Supports Practice Profile

Michigan Department of Education. (2020). MDE MTSS Practice Profile 5.0.

https://www.michigan.gov/mde/services/school-performance-supports/mtss/content/mde-mtss-practice-profile

Michigan's MTSS Practice Profile provides a structured description of what MTSS implementation should look like across essential system components. The state identifies the profile as guidance for districts and pairs the resource with research summaries and professional learning supports. In an adolescent literacy monitoring system, teams can use practice descriptors to examine leadership, implementation stages, data-based decisions, and fidelity-related conditions that support literacy instruction and intervention. Used in

that manner, the resource can complement a literacy-specific needs assessment by showing how broader MTSS infrastructure supports implementation without implying that a favorable profile rating demonstrates effective literacy instruction.

Construct connections: Readiness plan completeness and role clarity (See Table 1: Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators)

CLSD Local Literacy Plan Toolkit: Kindergarten–12th Grade

Colorado Department of Education. (2025). CLSD Local Literacy Plan Toolkit: Kindergarten–12th Grade.

https://ed.cde.state.co.us/fs/resource-manager/view/612dd55c-cde7-4ac9-9300-58c55dafa431

Colorado's K–12 Local Literacy Plan Toolkit is designed as a step-by-step guide for developing a comprehensive local literacy plan. This toolkit addresses vision, team structures, needs, goals, instruction, data use, leadership, professional learning, family/community partnership, and action planning. For implementation monitoring, this resource is useful as evidence of readiness and plan quality: reviewers can examine whether the local team has linked needs to goals, established responsibilities, identified evidence, and planned for stakeholder engagement and follow-up. A completed plan does not demonstrate implementation, and users should therefore use any adapted planning criteria alongside progress reports, observations, and participant feedback.

Construct connections: Readiness plan completeness and role clarity (See Table 1: Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Comprehensive Literacy Needs Assessment and Comprehensive Literacy Plan Template

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2025). Comprehensive Literacy Needs Assessment: Comprehensive Literacy Plan Template.

https://dese.mo.gov/media/pdf/comprehensive-literacy-needs-assessment-comprehensive-literacy-plan-template-step-2

Missouri's Comprehensive Literacy Needs Assessment and Comprehensive Literacy Plan Template is a planning resource designed to move local teams from evidence about current conditions to goals, actions, responsibilities, and monitoring. The resource includes multiple domains: leadership, standards-based curriculum, instruction, assessment, partnerships, and success-ready students. For leadership and implementation readiness, it provides an explicit linkage between identified needs and a written implementation plan. Missouri also provides completed or adaptable planning materials that can help teams understand how the process is intended to work.

Construct connections: Readiness plan completeness and role clarity (See Table 1: Leadership and Implementation Readiness Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Domain: Assessment and Data-Use Implementation

Overview

This domain focuses on literacy assessments, including screening, diagnostic follow-up, progress monitoring, technical adequacy, data review, decision rules, and instructional response A central measurement caution is not to treat accountability or college-readiness assessments as screeners or diagnostics. Decisions about which assessment tools to use should include a consideration of their technical adequacy.

> This domain helps educators determine if they are using the right assessments for the right purposes and using results to adjust instruction or intervention.

Progress monitoring, data-based instructional adjustment, assessment-purpose accuracy, and secondary decision process all matter when using assessment implementation as a decision process and not as assessment administration alone. The key distinction is between collecting data and using data: monitoring cadence without an explicit response process can produce data burden with little implementation value.

Table 2. Assessment and Data Use Implementation Constructs and Potential Indicators

Construct	Potential indicator	Possible data source	Monitoring frequency
Assessment-purpose accuracy	Educators correctly distinguish screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, formative, interim, and summative data and use each for its intended decision.	Survey/knowledge check, record review	Annual; pre/post assessment
Secondary decision process	School teams follow a documented flowchart or decision process from screening/concern to diagnostic follow-up, intervention, and monitoring.	Decision-tree checklist	Quarterly
Progress-monitoring cadence	Students receiving targeted literacy support are progress monitored at the frequency required by the intervention/plan.	Progress-monitoring records	Every 6–8 weeks or intervention-defined
Data-based instructional adjustment	Teams document an instructional/intervention change when progress data show inadequate response according to the selected decision rule.	Progress-monitoring record, decision log	Every 6–8 weeks

Annotated List of Tools and Resources

Literacy Comprehensive Needs Assessment

Nebraska Department of Education. (2025). Literacy Comprehensive Needs Assessment (L-CNA).

https://www.education.ne.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Appendix-F.-Literacy-Comprehensive-Needs-Assessment-L-CNA-Fillable.xlsx

The L-CNA is Nebraska's Comprehensive Literacy State Development (CLSD) system-wide reflection and planning tool. The 2025 CLSD materials organize around four essential elements of the Nebraska Multi-Tiered System of Support (NeMTSS). The L-CNA uses a four-point scoring guide ranging from no evidence to practices that are regularly and appropriately integrated across contexts. The Nebraska Department of Education (NDE) directs teams to make holistic ratings using multiple observations and evidence sources to examine vision, staff engagement, layered supports, data-based decision-making, communication, collaboration, and implementation evidence. Since ratings are team-generated and broad, the L-CNA should be treated as a facilitated self-assessment rather than a validated performance score.

Construct connections: Progress-monitoring cadence and data-based instructional adjustment (see Table 2: Assessment and Data Use Implementation Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Progress-Monitoring Guidance for Improving Student Outcomes

Oregon Department of Education. (2026). Progress Monitoring Guidance for Improving Student Outcomes.

https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Documents/Progress_Monitoring_Guidance_Final.pdf

Oregon's Progress Monitoring Guidance for Improving Student Outcomes focuses on what educators do with progress-monitoring evidence, beyond whether an assessment was administered. The guide addresses selection of appropriate measures, analyzing and interpreting data, implementation challenges, and potential solutions. The guidance describes progress monitoring as a way to determine whether instruction is working and how to make appropriate adjustments. It provides an example of connecting progress-monitoring data to explicit instructional response, directly addressing the difference between collecting data and using data.

Construct connections: Assessment-purpose accuracy, progress-monitoring cadence, and data-based instructional adjustment (See Table 2. Assessment and Data Use Implementation Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory Secondary-Level Edition

St. Martin, K., Harms, A., Walsh, M., & Nantais, M. (2023). Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory: Secondary-Level Edition (Version 2.2).

https://mimtsstac.org/sites/default/files/session-documents/MiMTSS%20R-TFI%20Sec%20Ver%202.2.pdf

The Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) Secondary-Level Edition provides fidelity measures focused on secondary reading systems, a facilitator system, an administration fidelity checklist, data-source guides, and aligned professional learning. The inventory uses team-based evidence and consensus scoring to judge whether specified reading-MTSS components are fully, partially, or not in place. Assessment and data-based decision-making are embedded within a broader fidelity model rather than treated as isolated activities. The resource can be used as a system-fidelity complement to more targeted data-use indicators.

Construct connections: Assessment-purpose accuracy (at the system-fidelity level), progress-monitoring cadence, and data-based instructional adjustment (See Table 2. Assessment and Data Use Implementation Constructs and Potential Indicators)

North Dakota Multi-Tier System of Supports Resource Library

North Dakota's Multi-Tier System of Supports Resource Library. (n.d.).

https://ndmtss.org/resource-library/

North Dakota's MTSS resource package includes a playbook, the Self-Assessment of NDMTSS Implementation (SAND), a roadmap, guiding questions, and other data-based decision-making resources. The SAND page describes a 39-item school-level instrument organized into six domains: leadership; capacity and infrastructure; multi-tiered instruction/intervention; communication and collaboration; data-based decision-making; and data/evaluation. North Dakota's data-use guidance addresses balanced assessment, student-level decisions, and continuous improvement systems for states. Together, these resources provide a structured example of how assessment and data use can be monitored as part of a larger implementation system.

Construct connections: Assessment-purpose accuracy and secondary decision process (See Table 2. Assessment and Data Use Implementation Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Domain: School-Wide Literacy Culture and Shared Responsibility

Overview

This domain focuses on school-wide literacy culture; collective responsibility, shared vision, organizational climate, safe learning environment, student agency/belonging, leadership support, adult beliefs, and cross-content priorities. This domain directly addresses the challenge of engaging the entire school system in the support of literacy learning for all students across all subject areas.

> This domain helps education leaders determine whether school-wide organizational conditions, shared beliefs, leadership actions, and the learning environment make disciplinary literacy a visible collective responsibility.

Shared responsibility, a growth-oriented and feedback-oriented climate,

leader visibility and support, and a school-wide literacy culture illustrates that school-wide literacy culture is broader than individual teacher attitudes. The strongest monitoring approach combines educator perceptions with leadership-team evidence and observable signs that disciplinary literacy is prioritized across content areas and improvement routines. A positive culture score without visible cross-content practice, protected collaboration, or leader follow-through should be interpreted cautiously.

Table 3. School-Wide Literacy Culture and Shared Responsibility Constructs and Potential Indicators

Construct	Potential indicator	Possible data source	Monitoring frequency
Belief in Shared responsibility	Educators agree that adolescent literacy is a shared responsibility across English language arts (ELA), content-area, intervention, special education, and leadership roles.	Teacher climate/belief survey	Annual or semester
Growth-oriented implementation climate	Staff report that implementation monitoring, walkthroughs, and coaching are used for learning rather than surveillance or punishment.	Teacher survey/focus group	Semester
Leader visibility/support	Educators report leaders communicate the purpose, protect implementation time, respond to barriers, and participate in learning.	Teacher/leader survey	Semester
Question/feedback climate	Teachers and teams regularly raise questions, implementation problems, and requests for support without fear of negative consequences.	Pulse survey + meeting artifacts	Quarterly
School-wide literacy culture	The school learning environment visibly prioritizes disciplinary literacy across content areas, and adults share responsibility for every student's literacy growth.	School-wide self-assessment + teacher survey + walkthrough	Annual; with semester pulse check

Annotated List of Tools and Resources

Essential School-Wide Practices in Disciplinary Literacy: Grades 6–12

Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators General Education Leadership Network Disciplinary Literacy Task Force. (2020). Essential School-Wide Practices in Disciplinary Literacy: Grades 6–12.

https://literacyessentials.org/downloads/gelndocs/school-wide_6-12_literacy_practices_final_with_notes.pdf

Michigan's Essential School-Wide Practices in Disciplinary Literacy: Grades 6–12 identifies eight organizational practices intended to support literacy development across secondary schools. The framework addresses literacy leadership, organizational climate, the learning environment, ongoing professional learning, academic supports and individual needs, instructional resources, community networking, and continuous improvement. The resource makes school-wide disciplinary-literacy leadership, culture, and shared

responsibility explicit while preserving important cautions about measurement. The framework is not a checklist, an implementation-science guide, or a team-development manual. The Michigan literacy site also provides a grade 6–12 school-wide screener to help schools identify their level of implementation.

Construct connections: Shared responsibility belief, leader visibility/support, and school-wide literacy culture (See Table 3. School-Wide Literacy Culture and Shared Responsibility Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Project for Adolescent Literacy Network and Local Action Accelerator

Wyoming Department of Education. (n.d.). Project for Adolescent Literacy.
https://edu.wyoming.gov/educators/language-literacy/project-adolescent-literacy/

Wyoming's Project for Adolescent Literacy (PAL) is a teacher-centered initiative for middle and high school educators across content areas, intervention roles, coaching, and school leadership. The state describes the network as a way to build awareness and solutions for older students who are not yet reading at grade level, identify effective materials and strategies, and create a community of practice. This resource treats school-wide literacy culture as something developed through educator ownership, stakeholder perspectives, and collaborative local action rather than only through a leadership checklist. This resource is a model for gathering perspectives and organizing local improvement work, not as a validated monitoring instrument.

Construct connections: Shared responsibility belief, leader visibility/support, question/feedback climate (See Table 3. School-Wide Literacy Culture and Shared Responsibility Constructs and Potential Indicators)

Cross-Domain Monitoring Considerations

This section presents several key considerations for monitoring implementation across the domains described above.

- ***Triangulate perception with implementation evidence.*** Teacher perceptions are essential for identifying clarity, fit, confidence, and implementation barriers, but the state resources consistently suggest that monitoring is stronger when perception data are interpreted alongside plans, observations, coaching records, data-team artifacts, or other implementation evidence.
- ***Treat leadership/readiness as dynamic.*** Readiness is not a one-time launch condition. Staffing, schedules, materials, coaching capacity, leadership attention, and professional learning change over time. Annual self-assessments can therefore be supplemented with shorter milestone checks tied to actual implementation decisions.
- ***Distinguish assessment administration from data use.*** A school may administer screeners or progress-monitoring measures on schedule and still have weak implementation if teams do not interpret the evidence accurately or respond to it. A comprehensive assessment system therefore requires both process indicators and evidence of documented instruction or intervention adjustment.

- ***Separate school-wide culture from individual attitudes.*** School-wide literacy culture involves organizational routines, leadership, cross-content priorities, collaboration, and the learning environment. Individual teacher agreement is one signal but should not be used as the sole evidence that literacy has become a shared school responsibility.
- ***Use implementation monitoring formatively.*** Several resources explicitly frame walkthroughs, self-assessments, and practice guides as improvement tools rather than personnel evaluation instruments. Turning formative monitoring into high-stakes evaluation can alter response behavior, reduce psychological safety, and undermine the quality of the evidence.
- ***Keep burden and small-system capacity visible*.** Rural and small districts may benefit from regional collaboration, shared coaches, common templates, and virtual review. A monitoring system should collect only information that can plausibly trigger a decision or support action; otherwise reporting burden can weaken implementation rather than improve it.

Appendix: Methods

Purpose and Source Universe

The purpose of the scan was to identify resources for technical assistance purposes. It was not designed to meet standards for evidence review (e.g., What Works Clearinghouse) and is not a systematic review of adolescent literacy implementation research. For this bibliography, we included resources that met the following criteria:

- Addressed one or more of the three selected domains as a primary domain or provided a distinct monitoring mechanism for one of those domains.
- Included a concrete monitoring instrument, structured process, explicit implementation practices/criteria, or material useful for developing implementation indicators.
- Was relevant to adolescent/secondary literacy or sufficiently transferable to grades 6–12 implementation.
- Provided information that could inform state, district, school, or technical-assistance monitoring decisions.
- Resources were collected from the following states: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Evidence and Resource Types

Materials included in this bibliography span formal implementation measures, structured monitoring tools, implementation-practice frameworks, state guidance, needs assessments, self-assessments, planning tools, decision protocols, and research-aligned practice resources. These types of materials are not interchangeable. In particular, a research-aligned practice framework is not described as a validated measure unless formal measurement evidence supports that claim.

In addition, for the purposes of this document, an indicator is a specific observable or measurable sign of implementation. A data source is where evidence about an indicator comes from, such as a survey, walkthrough, progress-monitoring record, plan, or team artifact. A monitoring tool is a structured way of collecting or interpreting implementation evidence. A formal measure goes further by specifying a measurement and scoring approach and, ideally, documenting evidence about reliability, validity, or administration fidelity.

Limitations

- The scan is descriptive and intended for technical assistance; inclusion does not imply effectiveness, validation, or endorsement.
- Many tools have limited or no published psychometric evidence, and implementation frameworks often were designed for reflection rather than scoring.

- Adaptation can change a tool's measurement properties; locally developed items or scoring systems require testing before high-stakes use.
- Several resources are broader than adolescent literacy and would require states to tailor the resources to the needs of their adolescent learners, including adapting , terminology, and evidence definitions.
- Direct-source access and version status can change. Users should verify the current version and permissions before reproducing or adapting source material.

Appendix: Resource Characteristics

This table consolidates the sources displayed with each annotation. Primary domains are limited to the three domains addressed in this bibliography.

Resource	Resource type	Developer	Grade span	Intended users	Primary domain	Administration/use	Scoring or interpretation
Beyond Curriculum Adoption: Implementation Guidance for HQCM	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	Rhode Island Department of Education	K–12; content- and course-team applications explicitly included	District and school leaders, implementation teams, curriculum leaders, coaches, teachers, EPPs, professional-learning providers	Leadership and Implementation Readiness	Team needs assessment / continuum review	Phase/indicator review; some explicit planning thresholds and checklists
Implementing Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	Ohio Department of Education and Workforce and State Literacy Team	6–12, with grades 4–9 decision-rules example	District/building leaders, literacy teams, content teachers, interventionists, coaches, families	Leadership and Implementation Readiness	School-leader implementation review	Traffic-light self-reflections and illustrative decision tools; not a validated score
South Dakota Literacy Framework: District Guide for	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	South Dakota Department of Education	K–12; intended for districtwide systems including	District/building leaders, literacy teams, coaches, curriculum and assessment leaders,	Leadership and Implementation Readiness	Facilitated planning/ review	Planning/action criteria; no validated summary score

Resource	Resource type	Developer	Grade span	Intended users	Primary domain	Administration/use	Scoring or interpretation
Implementation			secondary schools	special educators, families			
Michigan Department of Education Mult-Tiered System of Supports Practice Profile	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	Michigan Department of Education	K–12	District and school teams, leaders, educators, support staff	Leadership and Implementation Readiness	Practice-profile review	Implementation-level descriptors
CLSD Local Literacy Plan Toolkit: Kindergarten-12th Grade	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	Colorado Department of Education	K–12	District and school leaders; literacy teams; educators; coaches; families; community partners	Leadership and Implementation Readiness	Facilitated planning	Planning/reflecti on criteria
Comprehensive Literacy Needs Assessment and Comprehensive Literacy Plan Template	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	Birth–grade 12; adaptable to grades 6–12 planning	Local education agency and school leaders, literacy teams, content teachers, special educators, EL staff, coaches, families and community representatives	Leadership and Implementation Readiness	Facilitated planning	Planning prompts/rubric; no validated scale
Progress Monitoring Guidance for Improving Student Outcomes	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	Oregon Department of Education	K–12; explicitly aligned with the adolescent framework	Teachers, interventionists, special educators, coaches, leaders, assessment teams, families	Assessment and Data-Use Implementation	Instructional/team data review	Four-Point Rule, trend-line analysis, tool-selection criteria
Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory Secondary-Level	Formal implementation measure	Michigan Department of Education / Michigan	Secondary level	School leadership teams, multidisciplinary teams, R-TFI	Assessment and Data-Use Implementation	Certified facilitator plus team consensus scoring	2 = fully in place; 1 = partially in place; 0 = not in place;

Resource	Resource type	Developer	Grade span	Intended users	Primary domain	Administration/use	Scoring or interpretation
Edition		MTSS Technical Assistance Center		facilitators, district/ISD staff			reports/action planning
NDMTSS Playbook, SAND, and Data-Based Decision-Making Resource Package	Structured implementation -monitoring tool	NDMTSS and North Dakota Regional Education Association partners	K–12	District/school teams, educators, interventionists, coaches, administrators	Assessment and Data-Use Implementation	Self-assessment and facilitated data-based decision making (DBDM)	Self-assessment/ decision tools; no single validated score identified
Essential School-Wide Practices in Disciplinary Literacy: Grades 6–12	Implementation -practice framework	MAISA/GELN Disciplinary Literacy Task Force	6–12	Principals, school leadership teams, instructional leaders, teachers, specialists, families/community partners	School-Wide Literacy Culture, Buy-In, and Shared Responsibility	Framework review / locally developed self-assessment; not a checklist in source	No validated score specified; practices can be converted cautiously into local reflection/ rubric items
Project for Adolescent Literacy Network and Local Action Accelerator	Implementation support resource	Wyoming Department of Education and Seek Common Ground	Middle and high school	Any-content middle/high educators, interventionists, coaches, principals, and school teams	School-Wide Literacy Culture, Buy-In, and Shared Responsibility	Virtual network and coached accelerator	Qualitative/quantitative local tools; measurement properties not verified

Prepared by: Claudia Gentile, Matthew Finster, and Susan Vermeer Lopez

The contents of this annotated bibliography were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education (Department). The Department does not mandate or prescribe practices, models, or other activities described or discussed in this document. The contents of this document may contain examples of, adaptations of, and links to resources created and maintained by another public or private organization. The Department does not control or guarantee the accuracy, relevance, timeliness, or completeness of this outside information. The content of this document does not necessarily represent the policy of the Department. This publication is not intended to represent the views or policy of or be an endorsement of any views expressed, or materials provided by any Federal agency. [2026, NORC at the University of Chicago]