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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1990, the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) initiated the Family and Child Education (FACE) program, an integrated model for American Indian early childhood education/parental involvement. The FACE program primarily serves families with children prenatal to 5 years of age by providing early childhood education, adult education, and parenting services. The goals of the FACE program are to:

♦ Support parents/primary caregivers in their role as their child's first and most influential teacher.

♦ Strengthen family-school-community connections.

♦ Increase parent participation in their child's learning and expectations for academic achievement.

♦ Support and celebrate the unique cultural and linguistic diversity of each American Indian community served by the program.

♦ Promote lifelong learning.

Program Design and Implementation

The FACE program is implemented through a collaborative effort of the BIE, the Parents as Teachers National Center (PAT), and the National Center for Family Literacy (NCFL). Models from these programs have been adapted and integrated to achieve the FACE model. All FACE services integrate native language and culture.

PAT provides the training and technical assistance for home-based services, which are delivered by parent educators to families with children ranging from prenatal to 3 years of age. The primary goal of home-based services is to support parents in their role as their child’s first and most influential teacher. Language development is emphasized. Services are delivered through personal visits that are offered weekly or on alternating weeks, monthly FACE Family Circles (parent group meetings), periodic screening of overall health and development of the child, and referrals to school and community services.

NCFL provides training and technical assistance for center-based services, which are offered in school facilities to children aged 3 to 5 years and their parents. Services are offered four days a week through a four-component model. Adult education addresses the academic needs of the parents, enhances and supports parenting skills, and addresses employability skills of adults.

---
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Early education is provided for children in a developmentally appropriate preschool in which literacy development is emphasized. Parents and children are provided with daily opportunities to interact during Parent and Child Together Time (PACT Time). Parent Time offers daily opportunities to address critical parenting/family issues in a supportive environment and serves as an important venue for language and culture development for adults.

Using a 10-point rating scale, staffs self-rated the level of FACE implementation of various program components at their site.

- The highest ratings were assigned to implementation of Screening (an average rating of 9.4), Partnership and Community Resources (9.3), Early Childhood Education (9.2), Personal Visits (9.1), and Program Management and Teamwork (9.1).

- On average, implementation of Family Circles and Adult Education were rated 9.0.

- The lowest ratings (although still high) were assigned to Assurances (8.6); Recruitment, Enrollment, and Participation (8.6)—an area of focus in PY10; and Pact Time (8.5).

Early childhood staffs also rated their implementation of early childhood standards in Language and Literacy and in Mathematics. Although average ratings for all standards were high (over 3.0 on a 4-point scale), implementation of Mathematics standards were consistently lower than were ratings of Language and Literacy standards. This suggests a possible need for additional professional development on improving the implementation of Mathematics standards.

**Participation in FACE**

Beginning in 1991, FACE was implemented at six sites, serving almost 500 participants (see Figure 1). The program gradually expanded to 45 programs in Program Year 2010 (PY10, the period from July 1, 2009, to June 30, 2010).

![Figure 1. Number of FACE Participants in Home-Based, Center-Based, and Overall (Unduplicated) by Program Year (With Number of Sites)](image-url)
During the 20-year history of FACE, the program has served 33,896 American Indians, including about 15,927 adults and 17,969 children in approximately 13,500 families. Of these FACE participants, 18% participated in the full FACE model—receiving both center- and home-based services (20% of adults and 16% of children); 63% participated in only home-based services (61% of adults and 65% of children); and 19% of both adults and children received only center-based services.

In PY10, FACE services were provided to 2,647 adults and 2,587 children (aged birth to 5 years) from 2,092 families. Seventy-two percent of adults and children participated in home-based only services, 24% participated in center-based only services, and 4% participated in both home- and center-based services.

In the center-based component, adults participated in an average 136 hours of adult education (the highest level of participation over a 14-year period). They also participated in 42 hours of Parent Time. Children participated in an average 182 hours of FACE preschool (similar to the previous year but 18 hours less than PY08). Adults and children interacted in an average 42 hours of PACT Time.

Home-based families received an average 12 personal visits (among the highest average number of visits recorded). On average, home-based adults attended three FACE Family Circles.

Outcomes for FACE Children

The early detection of developmental delays is one of the critical components of the FACE program. The following are findings for PY10 FACE children:

Eighty-five percent of children—including 87% of home-based children and 78% of center-based children—received some type of screening service.

Of children who were screened, 18% were identified with developmental concerns, 11% were referred for services, 9% received services to address identified concerns, and 8% continued to display ongoing concerns at the end of the year. Concerns were most frequently identified in the area of language/communication.

A total of 139 children were identified with special needs or concerns—constituting 5% of FACE children, 27 fewer children than the previous year. Approximately 100 of these children had an IEP or IFSP.

Early childhood educators assess developmental progress of FACE preschoolers using Meisels’ Work Sampling System (WSS). Children are rated on performance indicators in each of seven domains. Most FACE preschool children demonstrate improvement in WSS ratings.

As would be expected, 4-year-olds demonstrated more proficiency in all of the domains than did 3-year-olds. Approximately one-half of indicators for the personal/social skills, language/literacy, social studies, scientific thinking, and arts domains were rated as partially proficient or proficient for 3-year-olds, compared with about three-fourths for 4-
year-olds. Less than one-half of indicators for the mathematical thinking domain were rated partially proficient or proficient for 3-year-olds, compared with approximately two-thirds for 4-year-olds. Two thirds of indicators for the physical development domain were rated as at least partially proficient for 3-year-olds compared with 86% of indicators rated similarly for 4-year-olds.

♦ FACE preschool children with two assessments during PY10 demonstrated statistically significant improvement in ratings on every domain. Forty-five percent of these children demonstrated gains in all seven domains.

♦ Four-year-olds who participated in more than one year of preschool scored significantly higher than four-year-olds with only one year of preschool on the domains of personal/social development, language and literacy, mathematical thinking, scientific thinking, social studies, and the arts.

Center-based staff members and parents are trained to implement the Dialogic Reading strategy, which is designed to increase the vocabulary and language comprehension of young children. The strategy involves children and their parents in a shared reading experience. FACE preschool children who participated in Dialogic Reading were assessed with the Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test, an instrument that measures expressive vocabulary—an important factor in emergent literacy. Results from matching pre- and post-administrations of the instrument indicated that average standard scores had increased by 9 points (from a standard score of 89 to 98), a significant and meaningful gain (see Figure 2). The pretest standard score is equivalent to a percentile rank of 23 and the posttest score is equivalent to a percentile of 45, near the national average.

![Figure 2. Average Matched Pre- and Post-Test Standardized Scores and National Percentile Equivalents from Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test in PY10](http://www.caselink.education.ucsb.edu/casetrainer/cladcontent/cladlanguage/node4/practice/dialogicreading.htm)

Research indicates that children who are socially and emotionally ready for school have better social and academic success in kindergarten and have a better chance for later school and vocational success. FACE parents believe that FACE is effective in preparing their child for school.

---
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6 For convenience, the scale of 0-100 is used to illustrate scores and percentiles; however, the scale for each differs. Standardized scores can range from approximately 55 to 145. Percentiles range from 1 to 99.
Approximately 80% of parents indicated that FACE participation had a large impact on increasing their child’s interest in learning.

Three-fourths of parents reported that FACE participation had a large impact on increasing their child’s interest in reading.

Approximately 70% of parents reported that FACE participation had a large impact on their child’s verbal/communication skills, preparing their child for school, and increasing their child’s self-confidence.

Approximately 60% of parents indicated that participation in FACE had a large impact on helping their child get along with other children.

One parent summarized the benefits of FACE participation for children:

I chose to join the FACE Program because I have seen the positive educational outcome on children first hand. … My nephew is the best example as being part of the first graduating class of … [our] FACE Program. Since kindergarten through 4th grade, which he’s in now, he has always been ahead of his classmates in reading and math. He also receives high academic achievement honors each semester since he became old enough to be on the honor roll, and shows great leadership skills as well. He often reads to his younger cousins and borrows books for them, which they read on his recommendation. I do credit the FACE Program for his jump start on reading, math, and socializing among other things that molded him into the intelligent boy he is today.

Outcomes for FACE Adults

FACE adults most frequently set goals for themselves as parents. FACE adults consistently identify their improved parenting skills and their increased understanding of their children to be the most important program outcomes for themselves and their families.

Seventy-seven percent of center-based adults set parenting goals, similar to PY07 (see Figure 3). The 56% goal achievement rate is comparable to the PY06 rate of 54%.

Figure 3. Percentage of Center-Based Adults Who Set and Completed Goals as Parents/Family Members in Program Years 2003 to 2010
Most parents (from 73% to 81%) indicated that FACE helped them *a lot* in increasing the amount of time they spend with their child, in becoming more involved in their child’s education, in more effectively interacting with their child, in increasing their understanding of child development, in becoming a better parent, and in encouraging their child to read. Almost 70% reported that FACE participation helped them *a lot* in increasing their ability to speak up for their child. Other parents generally reported that FACE participation was *somewhat* helpful in these areas.

One parent commented about the impact FACE had on her parenting skills:

*As a parent involved in the FACE program, since our first few visits, my parenting skills began to evolve and I started doubting myself less and less knowing I was incorporating all the educational aspects that were age appropriate for my son.*

The academic achievement of adults is an important focus for the center-based component of FACE. In FACE adult education in PY10, educators assessed academic achievement with the *Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System* (CASAS).

- Of adults with both pretest and posttest reading scores, 17% scored at beginning levels (*beginning literacy or beginning/intermediate basic skills*) at pretest; 51% scored at the highest levels (*adult secondary or advanced secondary*). At posttest, 14% scored at the beginning levels and 61% scored at the highest levels.

- Of adults with pretest and posttest mathematics scores, 39% of adults scored at beginning levels (*beginning or beginning/intermediate basic skills*) at pretest; 19% scored at the highest levels (*adult secondary or advanced secondary*). At posttest, 30% scored at beginning levels and 32% scored at the highest levels.

- Of adults with pretest and posttest scores, 28% advanced at least one level in reading and 30% advanced at least one level in math during the year.

- Of the 48% of center-based adults who reported a goal of obtaining a GED or high school diploma (198 adults), 60% reported that FACE participation helped them make progress toward achieving their goal.

- Sixty-nine adult participants completed requirements for their GED or high school diploma in PY10. Since the inception of the FACE program, approximately 1,170 FACE adults obtained their GED or high school diploma (approximately 20% of all center-based adults).

- Eighty-two percent of center-based adults improved their computer literacy skills through FACE participation.

A parent wrote in her essay about the impact of FACE on her academic development:

*When I first started, math was an area I felt I needed help with. Little did I know the math I was getting was helping me sort out and problem solve more than I realized.*
Other outcomes for PY10 FACE adults include the following:

- A total of 622 adults (23% of FACE adults) completed job applications or attended job interviews and 356 adults (13%) gained employment. Forty-eight percent of center-based adults who enrolled in FACE to improve their employability reported that FACE helped them obtain a job or a better job. Throughout the history of FACE, approximately 4,550 adults gained employment during their FACE participation.

- Some FACE participants earned the required credentials to become employed in FACE. Of 244 FACE staff members, 32% were former FACE participants.

- Almost 95% of FACE adults reported that FACE participation helped them feel better about themselves and improved their communication skills. Almost 90% reported increased frequency of their interactions with other adults, and more self-direction and self-discipline.

**Home Literacy Practices**

In all components of FACE, literacy is emphasized—not only as a focus during service delivery, but with special emphasis on carry-over into the home. Evidence of impacts on home literacy is provided through parent reports:

- Eighty percent of FACE parents read to their K-3 children on a daily basis. This is a considerably higher percentage than reported for parents nationwide, where only 36% of parents read to their K-3 children this frequently (see Figure 4). None of the FACE parents reported that they rarely or never read to their K-3 children, compared with 10% of parents nationally who do so.

**Figure 4. Percentage Distribution of the Frequency That FACE Parents With K-3 Children and K-3 Parents Nationwide Read to Their Child**

---

These results are supported by findings in the 2004-05 FACE Impact Study in which two thirds of K-3 FACE parents reported reading daily or almost daily to their child, significantly more than the one-half of non-FACE K-3 parents at the same schools who reported this same frequency.

FACE parents read to their child significantly more frequently at the end of PY10 than they did early in their FACE participation. At the end of PY10, 80% of parents read to their child daily or almost daily, compared with 72% of parents who did so early in their FACE participation (see Figure 5).

Figure 5. Percentage of Parents Reporting the Frequency That They Read to Their Child Early in FACE Participation and at the End of PY10

FACE parents significantly increased the frequency that they listen to their child read by year’s end. Eighty-seven percent of FACE parents reported listening to their child read on a daily basis at the end of FACE participation, compared with 71% who did so early in FACE participation.

The frequency that FACE parents tell stories to their child significantly increased during FACE participation. At the end of the year, 73% of parents compared with 64% of parents early in FACE reported that they tell stories to their child daily or almost daily.

FACE addresses the need to increase the number of books in homes by implementing special initiatives designed to distribute books to families. Evidence of success of these endeavors is provided below:

The BIE funds the Dollywood Foundation’s Imagination Library program to provide FACE children a new book each month. During the year, approximately 21,500 books were distributed to FACE children.

The RealeBooks Project is a special initiative that the BIE funds in support of family literacy. Materials and training are provided to assist FACE staffs and families in creating their own RealeBooks on computers and to distribute those books to all participating FACE families and to kindergarten students at FACE schools. During PY10, approximately 15,000 books were distributed to families.
Findings indicated that households had more books for children and adults at year’s end. The median number of children’s books at the beginning of FACE participation was 29 books, compared with a median of 49 at the end of PY10. With the FACE program’s emphasis on reading, 13% of home libraries consisted of more than 100 volumes of children’s books by the end of the year.

Parent Involvement in Children’s Education

The FACE program’s focus on increasing parent involvement in children’s education is supported by research. Recent parent involvement research indicates that increases in family involvement in the school predict increases in literacy achievement and that family involvement in school matters most for children at greatest risk.\(^8\)

The involvement of PY10 FACE parents in the education of their K-5 children is compared with nationally reported parent involvement data from the National Household Education Survey.\(^9\)

Almost all FACE parents who had K-5 children (92%) in PY10 attended classroom or school events, compared with 81% of parents nationally who did so (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6. Percentage of FACE and National Parents Reporting Involvement in Their K-5 Child’s Education**

![ Percentage of FACE and National Parents Reporting Involvement in Their K-5 Child’s Education](image)

Nationwide, only 60% of parents volunteered in the classroom or school or participated on school committees, compared with 74% of PY10 FACE parents who did so.

Integration of Native Language and Culture

One important focus within each FACE program is to support and celebrate the unique cultural and linguistic diversity. Native language and culture is integrated throughout FACE.

For each of the FACE program components, the staff in 89% to 100% of the programs reported that language and/or culture are integrated at least sometimes.

---


In 47% of the programs, the culture teacher assisted the staff in efforts to integrate native language and culture during PY10. The culture teacher provided classroom instruction for FACE children in 44% of the programs and for FACE adults in 42% of the programs.

The FACE program ensures the integration of native language and culture through the hiring of community members whenever possible. In PY10, three-fourths of all FACE staff members were American Indian. Most parent educators (95%) and early childhood co-teachers (80%) were American Indian. Almost half or more of early childhood teachers (62%), coordinators (58%), and adult educators (49%) were American Indian.

Approximately two-thirds of adults indicated that participation in FACE helped increase their usage of their native language.

Evaluator Recommendations

From the evaluator’s perspective, several recommendations for future evaluations are offered.

Continue to meet at least annually with the BIE, NCFL, and PAT staffs to review evaluation issues.

Continue emphasis on keeping FACE sites accountable for providing complete and timely data; and continue to require administrators to attend FACE training to help them understand and support the program.

Continue to collaborate with the BIE in sharing information in the development of a comprehensive database for school-aged children and integrating FACE reporting in the Native American Student Information System (NASIS). This database would include information about FACE participation and could provide data for evaluation studies on FACE outcomes (e.g., school readiness data, student achievement data, and information about special needs).

Focus on updating the RTA longitudinal database and ensuring accuracy of information. Convert to NASIS student identification number.

Continue to focus on the intensity and quality of services received by families and provide site level feedback reports that compares their data to FACE standards of implementation and to other FACE sites.

Continue to conduct trend analyses that connect types and quantity of FACE participation to outcomes.

Continue to share site-level analysis and findings with technical assistance providers.

Work with NCFL to improve the percentages of FACE preschool children with two administrations of WSS data at year-end.

Work with PAT to align Quality Indicators with the revised PAT curriculum.
FACE Sites by First Year of Implementation
(PY10 Sites are identified in Italics.)

Program Year 91 (Spring 1991)
Chief Leschi, Puyallup, WA
Conehatta Elementary School, Conehatta, MS
(Fond du Lac Ojibwe School, Cloquet, MN)
Na’eezhin J’Olta (Torreon Day School), Cuba, NM
Takini School, Howes, SD
To’Hajiilee-He Day School (Canoncito), Laguna, NM

Program Year 92 (1991-92)
Chi Chi’l Tah-Jones Ranch Community School,
Vanderwagen, NM
Chooshgai Community School (Chuska), Tohatchi,
NM
Hannahville Indian School, Wilson, MI
Little Singer Community School, Winslow, AZ
Wingate Elementary School, Fort Wingate, NM

Program Year 93 (1992-93)
Alamo Navajo Community School, Magdalena, NM
Atsa Biyaazh Alternative School (Shiprock), Shiprock,
NM
Blackwater Community School, Coolidge, AZ
Chinle Boarding School, Many Farms, AZ
Kickapoo Nation School, Powhattan, KS
Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwe School, Hayward, WI
Rough Rock Community School, Chinle, AZ
Meskwaki (Sac & Fox) Settlement School, Tama, IA
(Tiits’ooizi’Bi’Olta (Crownpoint), Crownpoint, NM
Tohaali Community School (Toadlena), Newcomb, NM

Program Year 94 (1993-94)
Ramah Navajo School Board, Inc., Pine Hill, NM
Tiis Nazbas Community School, Teec Nos Pos, AZ

Program Year 02 (2001-02)
Coeur d’Alene Tribal School, De Smet, ID
(Cottonwood Day School, Chine, AZ
Dunseith Indian Day School, Dunseith, ND
Enemy Swim Day School, Waubay, SD
Gila Crossing Community School, Laveen, AZ
Jeehdez’a Academy (Low Mountain), Chinle, AZ
(Little Wound School, Kyle, SD
Nenahnezad Community School, Fruitland, NM
Paschal Sherman Indian School, Omak, WA
(Salt River Elementary School, Scottsdale, AZ

Program Year 04 (2003-04)
Beclabito Day School, Shiprock, NM
Mescalero Apache School, Mescalero, NM
(Oneida Nation Elementary School, Oneida, WI
Santa Rosa Boarding School, Sells, AZ
Seba Dalkai Boarding School, Winslow, AZ
St. Francis Indian School, St. Francis, SD
Tiospa Zina Tribal School, Agency Village, SD

Program Year 05 (2004-05)
Pearl River Elementary School, Philadelphia, MS

Program Year 06 (2005-06)
John F. Kennedy Day School, White River, AZ
Tate Topa Tribal School, Fort Totten, ND

Program Year 07 (2006-07)
Dzith-Na-O-Dith-Hle, Bloomfield, NM
Santa Clara, Espanola, NM

Program Year 08 (2007-08)
Casa Blanca Community School, Bapchule, AZ
Kayenta Community School, Kayenta, AZ
Theodore Jamerson Elementary School, Bismark, ND

Program Year 09 (2008-09)
American Horse School, Allen, SD
Baca/Dlo’ay azhi Community School, Prewitt, NM
Chilchinbeto Community School, Kayenta, AZ
Lake Valley Navajo School, Crownpoint, NM
Leupp Community School, Winslow, AZ
Mariano Lake Community School, Crownpoint, NM

Program Year 10 (2009-2010)
Pine Ridge School, Pine Ridge, SD