



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
IDEA Part C Office
4126 Technology Way, Suite 100
Carson City, Nevada 89706
Telephone (775) 687-0587 • Fax (775) 684-0599

MINUTES

Name of Organization: Nevada Early Intervention Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC)

Date of Meeting: October 16, 2014

Meeting was held via video conference at the following locations:

Department of Public and Behavior Health
4150 Technology Way, Room 153 and Room 301
Carson City, Nevada

Nevada Department of Education
9890 S. Maryland Parkway, Conference Room
Las Vegas, Nevada

Nevada Early Intervention Services, Northeastern Region
1020 Ruby Vista Drive, Conference Room
Elko, Nevada

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

Co-Chair Dr. Ann Bingham called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. A quorum of the members was present; the meeting proceeded as scheduled.

Members Present: Nicole Atwell, Dr. Ann Bingham, Michelle Canning, Lisa Cridland, Janina Easley, Kimberly Everett, Maynard Florence, Aimee Hadleigh, Sherry Halley, Jana Khoury, Robin Kincaid, Dr. Catherine Lyons, Sherry Manning, Lorraine O'Leary, Johnette Oman, Reesha Powell, Christine Rigg, Shannon Sprout, Sherry Waugh

Members Absent: Michele Ferrall, Joyce Larsen, Alisa Koot, Caroline Taylor, Karen Stephens, Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury, Jack Zenteno

Public Attendees:

Sally Cannon, Positively Kids; Margot Chappel, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD); Julie Coman, Easter Seals Nevada; Tina Jeeves, Easter Seals Nevada; Thomas Kapp, ADSD; Janelle Mulvenon, Nevada Early Intervention Services (NEIS)-Northwest(NW); Julie Ortiz, Advanced Pediatric Therapies; Martha Schott-Bernius, NEIS-Northeast (NE); Dana Symmes, NEIS-NE; Fatima Taylor, NEIS-South; Tammie Williams, Nevada Department of Education; Carrisa Tashiro, Nevada Disability Advocacy Law Center; Angela Tate, ISS Baby Steps

Part C Staff Present: Brenda Bledsoe, Susie DeVere, Dan Dinnell, Edie King, Iandia Morgan

II. Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

III. Approval of the Minutes from the July 10, 2014 Meeting

Dr. Bingham asked for any comments or corrections to the minutes. No corrections were noted.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes as presented.

BY: Christine Riggi

SECOND: Lorraine O’Leary

VOTE: PASSED

Abstentions: Sherry Manning

IV. New Member Biographies

- Shannon Sprout
- Nicole Atwell
- Reesha Powell
- Jana Houry
- Alisa Koot

Dr. Bingham announced many new members were appointed to the Council since the last meeting and asked them to introduce themselves. Each new member introduced themselves and provided a brief summary of their background. Alisa Koot was unable to attend the meeting but would be given the opportunity to introduce herself at the next meeting. Dr. Bingham welcomed them to the ICC and thanked the new members for their willingness to participate.

V. Review and Discuss Possible Changes to the ICC Bylaws Based on Information Recently Obtained from Attorney General’s Office Regarding Timelines included in the Bylaws

Edie King remarked this agenda item was sparked by a comment for the attorney general’s office upon review of the bylaws. She referred to page 5, section 5 and the second sentence of the bylaws which states “the agenda will be provided at least one week prior to the meeting and be in compliance with open meeting law requirements.” It was suggested the “at least one week” statement be removed because if for some reason the agenda could not be distributed in that one week timeframe the meeting

would need to be cancelled. It was agreed it would be best to remove the statement and requested the agenda item be forwarded to the January agenda as an action item.

VI. Review Outcomes of the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Visit in August

Ms. King stated Priscilla Irvine, our Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) representative, along with her associates Tracie Dickson and Ann Karasek as well as Anne Lucas from WRRRC, came to Nevada on a two day visit. The first day they met with stakeholders and related the reason for their visit was to support Nevada in the first phase of the State System Improvement Plan (SSIP). The rest of their visit was spent with the IDEA Part C Office going over the SSIP and providing guidance on the process. As a result, the IDEA Part C Office has a better understanding of what is required and is moving forward in a positive manner.

VII. Report on Improving Data, Improving Outcomes Conference held on September 6–10, 2014

Christine Riggi expressed her appreciation to the Council and stated attending the conference gave her a different perspective of her personal role as a member of the ICC as well the early intervention system. The sessions provided insight into the data and procedures emphasizing why these are important and how it will be used to improve services or the system. Ms. Riggi provided a handout for the packet regarding inclusion which she spoke about briefly. She remarked on how the sessions made her more aware of the need for more parents to participate and taken an active role in the early intervention of their children. She also suggested for the next ICC agenda the Council discuss activities to get more parents involved such as a brochure regarding the ICC and its role be created, participating in new employee orientations for early intervention staff, and providing outreach to new families in the system. She concluded by saying her new goal is to try to get more parents involved. Ms. Bledsoe suggested looking at brochures directed towards families from other states and present those at the next meeting. Dr. Bingham suggested this might be an activity for the Family Support Resource Subcommittee to be able to work on.

landia Morgan stated the session that stood out most for her was the session on the evaluation tool for the first phase of the SSIP. She believes it will be very helpful in moving forward with this new process.

Ms. Bledsoe stated she attended the pre-session meeting hosted by ITCA and indicated it was rich in content. One of the discussions was around systems of funding for early intervention. This was an open forum where state representatives spoke freely about what issues or successes their particular state were having. Another discussion was regarding getting legislation passed so private insurance would pay for early intervention services. A letter was provided that was issued by CMS regarding Medicaid payments for services for children with autism. It was felt this was very positive step towards getting support for funding services for that population. Ms. Bledsoe reported the new system for submitting the APR called the GRADS360 was rolled on October 1 and an introductory session was held. She also briefly explained how each state with

this new SSIP will have to report child outcomes and how determinations by OSEP will be made regarding these. Overall, she was pleased with the informative sessions that were provided and would be willing to share any information she received if you would send her an email.

Sherry Halley stated she too attended the conference and found the presentation by Sharon Walsh, who provided legislative updates and current happening on Capitol Hill in regards to IDEA, very informative. She noted her presentation or the information she shared can be found on the DaSy website for those who are interested.

VIII. Report on the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) Conference held on October 7-9, 2014

Janina Easley reported attending the conference was a trip of a lifetime for her. She related the keynote address by Ann Turnbull was about Group Action Planning (GAP) which she thought was a very good. She attended many sessions but the ones that stood out the most for her were the sessions on Alternative Technology which is where she and her daughter are at for communication; the session called Preparing School Administration For Involving Parents Of Children With Disabilities is where she received a handout called The Welcoming Atmosphere Walk Through that provided questions and tips for families transitioning into the school system. Another session called Babies Count spoke to the national registry for infants and toddlers with visual impairments. Currently, Nevada does not participate in this informational registry. Ms. Easley indicated she was going to provide the registry information to visual therapists in an effort to implement the registry and encourage the State to participate as a way to collect data to help with research.

Ms. King related she found the conference to be informative and attended sessions that were concentrated around the Comprehensive Personnel Development since our State is going through the process of looking at the requirements for developmental specialist and DEC recommended practices for quality standards and personnel development. It was evident in these sessions that many states are looking at how they are providing comprehensive training to all of the early intervention staff and therapists. Additional, she attended a couple of Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children (TACSEI) presentations. Nevada is fortunate to be a TACSEI state and the IDEA Part C Office will be using TACSEI data for our SSIP to help improve our comprehensive services to children who may have social emotional delays. She indicated she spoke with several people who are currently using their TACSEI data in this way and looks forward to sharing her notes with Nevada's TACSEI group.

Daniel Dinnell reported he also enjoyed the keynote speaker as Ms. Easley did. Mr. Dinnell also related that part of the keynote included the story, as told by her family, of a young girl who participated in a GAP program from the age of 18 months until currently as a freshman at Washburn University taking seven credit hours per semester. He indicated he thought the whole process was the epitome of the parent/professional relationship and partnering.

Dr. Catherine Lyons remarked she attended as a presenter along with a team from UNLV and they spoke on the IFSP and looking a cultural linguistics.

Dr. Bingham noted there had been several comments about the opening session and the GAP measures. She indicated Nevada presently has a project through the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED) where three students with intellectual disabilities are attending as students at the university. For more information about Nevada's strides in this area, you may contact Mary Bryant who is the project director.

IX. Presentation on How Early Intervention Programs are Connecting with Families within Hospitals.

Ms. King stated programs were requested to provide the IDEA Part C office with a description on how their early intervention program connects with families in a hospital setting. The compilation of responses was provided in the meeting packet. Ms. King introduced Tina Jeeves from Easter Seals Nevada who read their response because it was not received in time for the meeting packet.

Robin Kincaid remarked she was excited to see all the outreach being done but still had questions on whether these families were getting their options explained to them so they could make their own choices. It appears that families are receiving some support and help but in a very loose unstructured way and it appears they are not being introduced to the fact that they have procedural safeguards or the right to an IFSP while their children are in the hospital. She added it feels like this might be circumventing an opportunity to make sure services have begun so there is a continuity and flow without the interruption of services. Fatima Taylor interjected she believes there has been a misunderstanding with the hospitals regarding the early intervention system and its waitlist. She explained that due to the number of hospitals in the Las Vegas area, the turnover of staff in those hospitals and the staff shortage in the Nevada Early Intervention Services South (NEIS-S) it is difficult to keep everyone updated with what is happening in the system. During in-services with the hospitals, the forum team puts emphasis on the whole early intervention system and family choice not just an individual program.

Margot Chappel spoke to the NEIS NW program and their relationship with the hospitals in the north. She related the team for NEIS NW does primarily act as feeding specialists because that is what is needed most but they are capable of stepping in when other issues arise if it is appropriate for them to do so. She indicated the big challenge is that the hospitals have their own organizations. Because NEIS staff are not hospital employees, it is difficult for them to participate as part of that team but they facilitate the transition to developmental specialist service coordinator who will continue to follow them as they are discharged from the hospital. Ms. Chappel indicated their staff, who work with the local hospitals, report that most parents are not in a place to talk about procedure safeguards as they are more concerned with the survival of their child. She added this is another reason why the feeding specialty has been such a focus and then to get them into services once they are out of the hospital.

Dr. Bingham stated her concern is that if a child is automatically eligible for services while in the NICU those families, at a minimum, should be connected with a service coordinator. Johnette Oman explained the NEIS NW staff has 20 plus years combined experienced in child development and are well trained. They inform families about early intervention and when those babies are discharged from the hospital the family leaves with a follow up appointment usually a week after the discharge but they stay in constant contact with the family.

Julie Ortiz from APT noted the first call to the families after they leave the NICU is sometimes hard because they have no idea what to expect. She stated she feels it would be easier if we know these children are automatically eligible to at the very minimum get their IFSP done with the hospital service coordinator. They could then be transitioned from the hospital to their program which would give them their time to settle in at home.

Ms. Bledsoe stated she has a procedural concern which has been voiced before. These types of decisions being discussed are individual family decisions not decisions that are made on behalf of the family. Per federal regulations as a provider in the state when any child may be suspected to be eligible for Part C services that child must be referred to the system within seven days. The family has the right to refuse the referral or to move forward in the process. The first two rights the family has under IDEA is the right to timely determination of eligibility and service coordination which must be provided by the state's Part C system. This does not mean that anybody from the early intervention system has to be in direct contact with the child; service coordination could fulfil this requirement. It is up to the family to decide how to proceed. If the family is denied this right, they can file a complaint or due process up to three years after that time. She indicated programs should be carefully documenting whether the family declines or accepts services at this point.

Martha Schott-Bernius inquired how to deal with the babies in the NICUs that are out of state because currently those born in Utah and referred to the Nevada system do not come with an IFSP. Ms. Bledsoe replied she would pose the question to OSEP to get their guidance. Ms. King offered to do research on how other states handle this type of situation and bring it back to the next meeting.

Dr. Lyons asked if there is an agreement to be made to make sure this process is in place from here forward and is there funding available to the services or trained specialists in the NICUs in the south. Ms. Taylor related NEIS-S does have an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sunrise hospital to do IFSPs with families who have children in the NICU that meet medical eligibility. She added they are in the process of rewriting the MOU because it currently states the referral will take place two weeks prior to discharge from the hospital. Ms. Taylor reiterated that at this time they do not have the work force to expand into all NICUs and not all NICUs care to work with them. Ms. King remarked the IDEA Part C office is looking at a training component that would be the

best use of resources to provide the specialized training the developmental specialists need to work in the NICUs.

Several of the parents on the ICC, provided their points of view on the experience of having a child in the NICU and how they were informed of the available early intervention services in their region. Ms. King thanked them for their input and emphasized how critical it is to parents participating in making policy and procedural decisions for the system.

Dr. Bingham stated that due to the discussion and the concerns noted she requested that the IDEA Part C Office staff look into whether or not state policy and procedures need to be updated or written so they can be reviewed at the next meeting.

X. Update on OSEP State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase I Strategic Planning Meetings

Ms. Morgan reported the strategic planning meeting held in August went very well. The attendees represented a wide variety of areas and points of view. During the meeting, a broader look was taken at the data which had previously shown the child outcomes areas with the lowest performance were in the social emotion skills and acquiring and using knowledge and skills. The attendees looked at reports provided by ECTA that compared Nevada to others with similar restrictive eligibility criteria which again showed the same two areas as low performing. With the assistance of national technical assistance providers, in-depth analysis of the data for a few subgroups was completed. Those areas included the primary language of families which would get the impact of language on the children's or family's ability to access services or resources in the community as well as whether or not an interpreter was needed and the insurance/Medicaid status of families to see if there appeared to be any impact on the children's social/emotional outcomes based on family income. This approach was used because family income is not always reported. The analysis also looked at whether or not a child was in a biological home or foster care and how each of those impacted the child's outcomes. Small groups of stakeholders were formed and each group was asked to respond to questions, look at patterns in the data, and then suggested why they thought the data looks the way it does.

An analysis of seven components of state infrastructure (governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance and accountability) were reviewed during the meeting to identify the strengths, the opportunities, and the weaknesses in them. Ms. Morgan remarked this was an "eye opening" part of the meeting for some attendees and sparked deep conversations on how to make the system better as we move forward.

After these discussions, attendees indicated a consensus the data presented had steered them to focusing on one child outcome area which was the goal of the meeting.

A follow-up SSIP meeting was held on October 2nd to review the feedback received from the August meeting and to do further data analysis focused on the length of time the children were in services, their age at entry, the eligibility criteria, the diagnosis at

referral, their age at exit, reasons for exiting, and what their exit data looked like. Small groups were formed as in the August meeting to study the data. At this meeting, there were a number of attendees who did not participate in the August meeting. This resulted in additional perspectives and input and the infrastructure analysis plan was revised to include this new input. Within the infrastructure analysis, the group looked at various leverage points or supports that are in place which could potentially hinder or impede the ability to make progress in the social emotional area and identified current state initiatives that might have an impact on moving forward with implementation of the SSIP. Ms. Morgan related many, including herself, were surprised at how many related initiatives are currently on-going in our state.

Ms. Halley interjected that the Expanding Opportunities committee worked on a document known as the Petal Poster which at the time of its creation listed most if not all the initiatives and supports in the state. She noted this document has recently been mentioned at several meetings she has attended and believes it would be beneficial to update it rather than start from scratch. She indicated she would take the lead on this and would forward the document to Ms. King for distribution. If anyone has changes or additions they would like to make, they may send them to her.

Ms. Morgan stated the next steps for the SSIP would include the IDEA Part C Office developing potential hypotheses based on what was discussed related to the data, and the infrastructure analysis. From the hypotheses, questions will be developed which the IDEA Part Office will use to conduct interviews with program managers, administrators and direct service providers to determine whether or not the hypotheses can be confirmed. At that point, identifying the root causes of why the data looks the way it does will be done and then improvement strategies will need to be put into place.

The next SSIP meeting is tentatively scheduled for January 7, 2015 and will be in conjunction with national technical assistance providers.

XI. Early Intervention Services Report

a. Early Intervention Program Certification Update

Ms. Chappel stated the Standards of Services document included in the meeting packet has had additional updates made to it and she is in the middle of piloting with the NEIS-Carson site now. At the conclusion of the pilot, she would provide an update to the ICC. Thomas Kapp stated he would like to add to the Standards of Services a specific section for Part C standards. He explained when there are certifying a program they are looking for quality not compliance. The compliance side would be addressed in this additional Part C section. Mr. Kapp indicated he needed a Part C representative on the team since he is now in a different role and they need Part C input.

Dr. Bingham voiced her appreciation regarding the inclusion of the IDEA Part C Office in this process as they are the monitoring body as per IDEA. She also asked for this to be on future agendas of the ICC so they can stay updated.

Ms. King asked Mr. Kapp if the suggestions provided by the national technical assistance personnel had been incorporated into the updated Standards of Service. Ms. Chappel

indicated she had not seen them so they were not incorporated. Ms. King stated she would resend them to her following the meeting.

The following topics of concern or questions were posed to Ms. Chappel regarding the Standards of Service document:

- Did community providers have input into these standards
- Is there anything included in these that NEIS programs do not do
- Are there processes or statements that could be construed as contradictory to Part C regulations
- References to HIPAA and not FERPA was concerning in regards to confidentiality
- Concern regarding reference to programs having their own complaint processes
- Reference to programs having their own process for developing an IFSP

Ms. Chappel responded to each by saying:

- The community providers, through the survey process were able to have their input included;
- All programs including NEIS would be certified and she indicated during the piloting process a few things were discovered that needed to be implemented or changed.
- She had reviewed the regulations before starting this document and made sure there were very few references to compliance in it. She explained she was directed to make sure there was no duplicating of what the IDEA Part C Office does and believes the Part C Office has reviewed it.
- The most current version reflects those updates.
- Language was removed in the section.
- This is not referring to them having their own but to ensure the process is in place. She reiterated this is a quality document not a compliance one because it is assumed Part C will be checking for compliance.

After this question and answer session, Ms. Bledsoe commented she felt the process was unclear because quality and compliance go hand-in-hand. A program providing services to Part C eligible children and families is going to have to have processes that are in accordance with Part C law and regulations; quality alone does not meet requirements for certification to be a Part C provider. Ms. Chappel stated that is exactly why Mr. Kapp wants to include a page specific to Part C. Ms. Halley suggested including a broad statement such as any program delivering early intervention services to young children with disabilities is in compliance with Part C of IDEA laws. Mr. Kapp agreed such a statement could be added. A discussion over the definition of natural environments included in the document took place. Ms. Chappel indicated they were trying to make the language very understandable. Dr. Bingham stated as far as natural environment the legal definition is pretty straightforward and understandable.

Ms. King stated in the past when new program came into the system the Part C Office has a readiness checklist they went through with the new program to ensure they had in

place those items needed to be compliant. She asked Ms. Chappel if there was any process in place on how this would work going forward and would the Part C Office be a part of that process. Ms. Chappel replied it is her understanding that is still the role of the Part C Office. Ms. King indicated she would like to meet with Ms. Chappel to work out the process collaboratively.

Through the discussions on the Standards of Service document there remained some confusion as to the purpose of the document, particularly around what was quality and what was compliance. Ms. Halley suggested making the purpose of the document clearer and maybe note which parts refer to compliance by using a “C” next to them and “Q” for quality. Ms. Chappel provided some background on how this document came about. She briefly explained the merge with Developmental Services and how ASD took the quality and quantitative standards from the adult side in order to have a more quality measure beyond compliance. She added this is where she believes some of the confusion lies. This document contains some things that you will not find in Part C documents and this is also an attachment to the provider agreement that ASD holds with providers. She also explained the programs will be rated like a school grade system. This means a program will receive an “A” if they receive a 92% or above and will have a three year certification period; programs who receive 81% to 91% will get a “B” and a two year certification; programs with a 80% to 74% will receive a “C” and a one year certification with the requirement to make improvements within a year. These programs will have the opportunity to improve their rating with a 30 to 60 period after the original certification is done. Programs who are struggling will receive a quality improvement plan and this is where the program development piece comes in. It was noted by several members that knowing the rating system was very helpful in understanding the process.

XII. Report on Information Obtained Through the Early Intervention Family Alliance (EIFA) Membership and Possibly Approve Renewal of Annual Membership

Daniel Dinnell reported the EIFA is going to drop its nonprofit status. He explained they are endeavoring to meet or ally themselves with Division of Early Childhood (DEC) and/or the Infants and Toddlers Coordinators Association (ITCA) both of which have a focus on young children with disabilities and who are listened to and known nationally. Therefore, there will no longer be a fee for membership requirement. They will continue to develop the website and encourage parent leadership. They will continue with their Facebook and twitter accounts as well as using their listserv capabilities for sharing and networking. Since there is no longer a need for membership, this item requires no action.

XIII. Updates and Highlights from Early Intervention Programs

Dr. Bingham referred members to their handouts provided in the packets. No further discussion was held.

XIV. ICC Committees – Reports on Activities

a. Family Support Resource Subcommittee (FSRS)

Ms. Dinnell reported a handout was provided covering what was discussed at the meeting and if after review there were questions, to please email him.

b. Child Find Subcommittee

Ms. Bledsoe reported the last meeting was cancelled and has yet to be rescheduled. She did state the committee is working on a document listing the specific requirements of each early childhood initiative. They have become aware of multiple committees working on similar areas. The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 4 at 1:30pm.

c. Developmental Specialist Certification/Endorsement Subcommittee

Dr. Catherine Lyons reported the last meeting of the subcommittee was in August and was facilitated by Lois Pribble and Jane Squires from the Early Childhood Personnel Center. The subcommittee during this meeting looked at vision, mission, and barriers. A couple of the barrier topics were involving class availability, release time for taking classes and funding. Dr. Pribble will be providing reciprocity processes for other states for us to review before our next meeting. Dr. Lyons noted a certificate program is being put in place at UNLV in effort to make registering for classes easier for early intervention employees and will help keep employees on track to receive their endorsement. The approval process is moving forward and she hopes it will be in place by January 2015. She noted Dr. Pribble has agreed to continue to meet with the subcommittee once those meetings have been scheduled

Ms. King provided an update on the progress of the conditional/provisional license. She reported she and Ms. Morgan had briefly met with Dena Durish who is in charge of licensure for the Nevada Department of Education. An additional meeting has been scheduled for November 10.

d. Finance Subcommittee

Ms. Bledsoe reported the reconvening of this subcommittee had not yet taken place.

XV. Part C Information Reports

- a. Complaint Matrix Review**
- b. Service Provider Position Report**
- c. Family Outcomes Survey**
- d. Review and Discuss Data Reports**
 - **Wait List for September**
 - **Compensatory Services Report**
 - **SFY14 4th Quarter Data Report**

Ms. King stated no formal complaints have been filed within a year. She elaborated the last two complaints that were filed are in the process of being closed.

Ms. King reported the personnel position report requested at the last meeting was provided in the packet. The information was solicited from providers and combined in this document to show staff levels for each discipline within the individual programs.

Ms. King reported the family survey has been distributed and a PDF copy has been posted to the IDEA Part C Office website.

Susie DeVere reported the wait list has gone up but only slightly. Ms. King added that there are two wait list reports provided; one is compiled by pulling services that are in needed status which is how the data is regularly reported and the second reflects services that are marked current but no actual start date has been entered into the data system. The reason for pulling this alternative way was because the IDEA Part C Office was doing program verification of timely services and found in TRAC that services were marked as current but the actual child record had no documentation of the service being provided. Ms. King remarked programs were contacted and found some of them were unaware they needed to put the start date in TRAC. At that point, programs began cleaning up their data. Because the report was compiled with point in time data not all of the records which have been corrected since are reflected in this report. The data cleanup and verification by the IDEA Part C office continues. Ms. Bledsoe explained the wait list presented here and that which is reported in the APR in terms of timely initiation of service are two different things. The data for the APR is gathered through file reviews of individual child records and the wait shows what TRAC/the system is doing.

Ms. DeVere related the compensatory services report was created by pulling by services that were in needed status and in current status. The problem with using those in current status is that TRAC has no way of identifying which ones have been completed. After doing a test pull to see what could be cleaned, it was determined there is no way for TRAC to pull what actual hours are owed so what is provided in this report is an estimation.

Ms. DeVere presented the fourth quarter data and added she made the corrections noted at the last ICC meeting.

XVI. Consider Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- New member biography from Alisa Koot
- Action Item to change the bylaws regarding timelines for the agenda
- Discussion on activities to promote and inform public especially parents on the ICC and the early intervention system
- Revisit the NICU policy
- Update on the standards of services document and how the visits are going
- Provide data on when children are screened and how many are being screened based on Nevada regulations
- Information on why CAPTA exits have increased over the last few months

XVII. Schedule Future Meetings

a. Update on the April 2015 Strategic Planning Meeting

Ms. King asked the ICC to consider moving their January 15th meeting to a later date in order to accommodate the time needed for the IDEA Part C Office to compile the

information they will collect at the January 7, 2015 SSIP meeting which will need to be presented to the ICC at their January meeting. She also requested the April meeting be moved into March due to the SSIP/Indicator 11 information needing ICC review prior to the April 1 submittal deadline. The following dates were agreed upon:

- January 22, 2015
- March 26-27, 2015 which will be the annual face-to-face strategic planning meeting and held in Reno
- July 16

XVIII. Public Comment

Lisa Cridland commented she found a website called Get Puzzle Piece where they are offering an android tablet with case and autism apps for only \$29. There is a reoccurring fee for the apps each month.

Ms. Kincaid commented that NV PEP continues to offer to families of early intervention training on-line with the next training taking place on Thursday, November 20, 2014 at noon. She encouraged families to register as these trainings are free. These are designed so families can learn more about early intervention services.

XIX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.