**MEETING MINUTES**

**Name of Organization:** Nevada Early Intervention Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), Child Find Subcommittee

**Date and Time of Meeting:** August 24, 2021

11:33 a.m.

**Meeting was held through teleconference and at the following location:**

1000 East William St, Ste 101

Carson City, NV 89701

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call:**

Sherry Waugh called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m. A quorum of members was present; the meeting proceeded as scheduled.

**Members Present:** Marty Elquist, Karen Frisk, Sarah Horsman-Ploeger, Robin Kincaid, Marnie Lancz, Janice Lee, Yvonne Moore, Sarah Sills, Dr. Debra Vigil, Sherry Waugh, Jenna Weglarz-Ward

**Members Absent:** Patrice Gardner, Cherish King

**Part C Staff Present:** Mary Garrison, Shari Fyfe

1. **Public Comment**

No public comment was made.

1. **Review and Approve Minutes from the January 21, 2021** **Meeting (For Possible Action)**

Mary Garrison mentioned that she will scroll through the minutes slowly but if anyone wants to review them at their own pace there is an attachment for the minutes in the invite. Ms. Garrison also mentioned that the meeting on January 21, 2021, ended due to loss of quorum so the minutes end at item five (5). Ms. Waugh asked if anyone had any corrections for the notes? If not, she would entertain the motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Kincaid asked for clarity regarding the name Lisa, and she doesn’t recall anyone with the last name Lisa. Ms. Fyfe mentioned that she made the comment and Dr. Vigil was talking about getting a contact who professionalized in making advertisements. Ms. Waugh also asked to have Dr. Vigil’s name updated from Ms. Vigil to Dr. Vigil.

**MOTION:** Approve the January 21, 2021 meeting minutes with edits noted

**BY:** Dr. Debra Vigil

**SECOND:** Marnie Lancz

**VOTE: PASSED**

1. **Child Find Self-Assessment Workgroup Update (For Possible Action)**
   * + - 1. State Fiscal Year 21 (SFY21) Annual Report and Future Quarterly Child Find Reporting
         2. Longevity of Indicator 6
         3. County, Population, Child Find Activities, and Referral Numbers

Ms. Fyfe presented the group with the Child Find summary page for each quarter and Ms. Garrison will inform the group on this report. Ms. Garrison mentioned that most of the Early Intervention (EI) programs have been sending quarterly reports and within the reports we can get raw data on a spreadsheet and create an activity report for each quarter. The report displaying now is for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2021 which ended June 31, 2021, and it gives cumulative information for the year under each activity sheet as you go through the quarters. Ms. Garrison presented the report as it currently stands. The fourth (4) quarter data was shown. The information is somewhat convoluted, but it is a lot of information being filled out by programs and there is a tab for each quarter that they input each child find activities they have completed. The report asks for the date of the activity, if it is an ongoing partnership, the frequency, the setting, the county, any specific population group, the method, number of attendees. There’s a section that asks if it’s specific to birth to one (1) or if it is all-inclusive for birth to three (3), and the type of activities (what was the outreach information). Ms. Garrison mentioned that she will scroll down because each section columns L through O have a key that was provided when the report was created, and they indicate the type of outreach with a number. For example, under the Public Awareness Code section a one (1) is for sib shop, two (2) is for fairs etc. The reports are submitted on a quarterly basis, and because of COVID there was a drop in Child Find activities. For some of the entries the programs put no activities due to COVID. Ms. Fyfe asked if the group had any questions about the report? She mentioned that Ms. Garrison and herself have been holding discussions on how to improve the report because IDEA Part C wants to do what is required by the law. One of the issues Ms. Garrison ran into is when she receives the report it is not consistent and there are twelve programs that are completing the spreadsheet with each person completing it differently. People will put different names for the counties, or all counties, or statewide. Under the ongoing partnership/collaborations section people will put wording instead of answering yes or no. The dating format is never consistent, and Ms. Garrison presented another section where it is difficult to get consistency. Under the types of materials distributed if someone is doing outreach activities, they could be providing brochures and fact sheets. When people are putting that in, they are putting multiple numbers because they are providing different types of materials, and when you go to the cumulative activity sheet it is difficult to have excel calculate that information and give accurate data. Ms. Garrison explained that she must go back and change the fields that are already created and updated by the programs. Ms. Garrison looked at what is being requested, Ms. Fyfe and Ms. Garrison looked at what is required by federal law and came up with a spreadsheet to provide to programs going forward. The spreadsheet does have a lot of the same information that is presented on the old report. Ms. Garrison highlighted sections in yellow that might be options to eliminate. The information highlighted is not on the activity sheets, and typically it is inconsistent depending on who is filling out the form. Ms. Garrison asked the group if they would agree to removing setting, specific population group, and method/s from the spreadsheet? If not, why should they remain, and would the group want to see that information in the reporting? Ms. Garrison created drop down menus and check boxes for the fields so no matter who fills out the report, the information would remain consistent. Some of the fields have a drop-down menu in which you can select more than one option and excel will combine them so both options will show in the field. Ms. Garrison mentioned if the group agreed to the new format, then the report could move forward for this quarter going forward which would be at the end of September 2021 in which Part C would be requiring the programs to submit their quarterly child find report.

Ms. Kincaid commented that she loves the drop-down menus and that is an excellent way to ensure consistency. Ms. Kincaid mentioned that she needs more information on the area of setting to understand what Ms. Garrison was trying to accomplish by have that in there? And how does that (the highlighted fields) influence the decisions that the group has discussions about? Ms. Garrison responded that she’s sharing the information under setting and the group can keep it but what Part C is trying to figure out is if the information is truly needed. Ms. Garrison presented the information was shown under the highlighted sections to the group so they can see if it is needed. Ms. Kincaid mentioned that she thinks setting is essential for the purposes of discussion and the group would lose valuable information if setting was removed, and the report would not have a lot of meaningful information without setting. Ms. Garrison stated that she would not create options for the settings field and that it would remain a freehand option for individuals to enter information. Ms. Kincaid suggested that Ms. Garrison could give people some guidance by showing that the information came from a flyer for example, so people aren’t creating a setting based off what they remember. For example, instead of someone just putting Head Start, they are putting Head Start of Northeastern Nevada since it tells the location of the activity, which the group needs for covering the State in any way, shape, or form. Ms. Garrison told the group that she could show them the old report which has instructions in comparison to the new one. Ms. Garrison suggested that she could have a message populate that explains what information should go in that field if the group believes that would be helpful. Ms. Kincaid responded by agreeing with Ms. Garrison’s suggestion and that it would reduce a lot of difficulties that Ms. Garrison had in the past.

Dr. Vigil had a few questions the first one being that each program fills out a spreadsheet, correct? Then programs send it to Ms. Garrison who has to go through it all? Ms. Garrison answered yes and that is where the issues come from with so many programs filling out the form differently. Dr Vigil mentioned that she doesn’t know if this is the appropriate venue for this discussion since there are early intervention providers present so she would be interested in their feedback. It almost seems like for efficiency’s sake that it would be nice to have a fillable form so programs can select an option and then it automatically populates into a spreadsheet. Dr. Vigil stated that she doesn’t know if this discussion is an offline conversation so she can show Ms. Garrison what she has done with some other venues to collect information from various programs. Ms. Garrison responded that she thought about that and for example all the programs have the TRAC user form and anytime that someone needs to be deactivated from the TRAC system or added, or if their roles need to change there is very specific fields on them and somebody goes and selects what is needed with all the information that is required and then they send it to Part C. The problem that Ms. Garrison ran into is that the programs would have to complete a form every time an activity is done. Ms. Garrison mentioned to the group to correct her if she is wrong, but she believes when the report is due the programs collect information from staff to complete. The concern is if the programs did the reports as the activities happened it would be fine, but the programs might grow weary if all the activities could not go on one (1) report that everything is entered onto. This might require feedback from individuals who fill out this form that are on this call.

Ms. Lancz mentioned that she has done the form for twelve years and her staff does activities and sends her their reports monthly and she compiles it all together to complete the report. Ms. Lancz likes the new report since it is simpler, and she agrees with Ms. Kincaid that the setting column should be kept but she would get rid of the other two highlighted fields. Ms. Garrison responded with a suggestion that she could come up with a reference guide for any turnover with contact information for people to reach out to if they need additional training and an explanation of what each field is and what is expected in them. Another suggestion would be to schedule some trainings with whomever would be filling out the reports. Ms. Fyfe asked if it would be helpful to see what activities are being done instead of just having where they are being done. Ms. Kincaid mentioned that specific population and method/s should stay on the report since she looked at the report that Part C sent out in December 2020, and she believes that it is helpful information. Some of that information told the group if the population was parents, whether it was a health fair, whether it was a combination of general education and children with disability, etc. Ms. Kincaid realizes that there could be inconsistency and there could be somewhat of a drop down for the fields. Ms. Moore agreed with Ms. Lancz, that she pulls all the information together as a calendar item at the last second sometimes. Ms. Moore agrees that participating in a meeting with all programs is needed. Ms. Garrison mentioned that she is showing the report with the instructions for specific populations and method/s as the form is done today and a drop-down menu can be added to those fields as well and the group can provide Ms. Garrison with feedback on what the options can be. Ms. Garrison mentioned that it doesn’t have to be a drop-down menu unless the group wants the information automatically transferred to the activity report that is created with all the data. Ms. Garrison asked the group if they would like for her to add drop-down menus to the highlighted fields and keep the unhighlighted sections with the updated menu options?

Ms. Frischmann asked what if there was a random community event? Ms. Garrison responded that she added a “once” option in the drop-down menu for frequency. Ms. Lee asked if the title ‘Settings’ should be changed to ‘Events’ or ‘Venue’ to make it more specific and more informative to other programs? Ms. Garrison asked the group if she could get some suggestions on what the column should be named? Ms. Lancz responded with the settings her team uses, which is pediatrician’s office, or childcare center, or family services so she doesn’t know if it should be named targeted population or something like that. Ms. Lancz also mentioned that the columns seem to be too small, and she had to readjust them when she needed to add text to the fields. Ms. Garrison responded that she formatted the columns so people could expand the fields and wrap text that is entered. Also, she mentioned removing population and method so specific population could be added to the setting with different wording depending on the opinion of the group. Ms. Frisk mentioned that she completes this report for the northeast, she compiles the information, but it is difficult since employees may list the same event, but the information is different. Also, Ms. Frisk thinks the distribution of materials need to be updated with a different list because social media is the main source of information, not brochures. Ms. Frisk does not know how the group is coming up with different materials, but she mentioned that she put together an internal workgroup and hopes to provide that statewide to all the early intervention providers and get their feedback on it. Ms. Frisk hopes to present the workgroup to the ICC once she gets feedback. Ms. Garrison responded that she understood because doctor’s offices are moving more to telehealth, which patients are preferring. They are also pulling brochures in favor of social media. Ms. Garrison mentioned that she would like to make that field more inclusive to the different types of materials of distribution. Ms. Lee asked does it make sense to specify the type of information shared versus the type of material that is distributed? Ms. Lee said instead of brochures and fact sheets, it could be developmental milestones and typical development, or information on how to access services. Ms. Garrison agreed with Ms. Lee that the specifics of the information being distributed is important as well, and she will make updates to the drop-down based on feedback.

Ms. Fyfe mentioned that the Child Find numbers are not from these reports, the report is just to let the group know what they are missing. Ms. Fyfe mentioned that Child Find is a requirement in the contract with all programs, and the group is trying to get back to what is required and where the holes are in reaching people. Ms. Fyfe mentioned that there are more documents from the December one (1) count 2020 compared to 2019 to share. Ms. Fyfe suggested that the programs should share what materials should be distributed during Child Find, and the group can look at that to make sure it has consistency. Ms. Fyfe mentioned that the group is looking to see if materials have the single point of entry number or are people just putting their business number. Ms. Fyfe asked the group if they wanted to add her suggestion of having programs provide samples of what they are distributing to the next Child Find agenda? Ms. Waugh shared her concern about the amount of time spent on this topic and most of the meeting time is gone. Ms. Waugh asked the group if they want to go forward with Ms. Garrison’s revision and see what the providers feel about it? Ms. Lee asked if it made sense to have a survey to send to the providers about what materials and information to use for distribution not to descend from the group vote that Ms. Fyfe asked for? Ms. Garrison mentioned that the group can move forward with the revisions for the report except for the names of the materials for distribution in which she can gather through trainings and then update the report if the group approves.

Ms. Moore asked Ms. Garrison to clarify the agenda in the notes for this meeting the purpose of the report, on whether it’s required and if people are using it. Ms. Garrison replied that this will be included in the minutes.

There was a quorum check and Dr. Vigil had to leave due to another meeting taking place, but the group still had quorum.

Ms. Fyfe presented a document from the Child Find Self-Assessment Workgroup with Ms. Waugh, Ms. Lee, Ms. Garrison, Ms. Fyfe, and Dr. Vigil unable to attend the last meeting. Ms. Fyfe showed the group what Part C reports to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). Ms. Fyfe shared if Child Find does not meet the targets, then there will be a corrective action plan. As of 2006, the State of Nevada was rated 40th out of 50 states in early intervention, so OSEP required a corrective action plan, which required early intervention to show these reports to OSEP. Ms. Fyfe informed the group that the required reports continued for the next three (3) years in which NV rated 45th out of 50 until 2008. Then NV went to 49th out of 50 in 2009, however all the activities for Child Find were supposed to end in 2012, which they have not. There have not been any more corrective action plans required by OSEP, and NV then ranked 30th for 2012, 32nd for 2013, and 38th for 2014 out of 50 for the next few years since the target was met. OSEP raised the target last year to 2.46% based on birth (0) to three (3), with NV at 3.1% of the population.

Ms. Kincaid commented that in NV EI history the state has suffered with waiting lists during those years. Ms. Fyfe presented a graph that showed the Child Find activities broken down by county, population, and referrals for the first three (3) quarters of 2021. Ms. Fyfe thought it was useful to show the group this new breakdown graph instead of four (4) different spreadsheets, and then presented the group with a graph showing where the referrals came from. The IDEA Part C Child Find policy was then presented to the group which shows the purpose of the group in accordance with the law.

1. **Update on IDEA Part C Differentiated Monitoring Services and Supports (DMS)**

Ms. Fyfe shared what OSEP is monitoring through DMS, specifically Nevada for this protocol. Nevada is one of the first cohorts to be monitored and OSEP is looking at Nevada’s Part C office, how Part C monitors programs, and how Part C follows up on non-compliance. There will be feedback from OSEP and there might be a corrective action plan based on their findings. Ms. Fyfe presented the entire layout of IDEA Part C monitoring for the programs to show that OSEP monitors Part C just like Part C monitors the programs. Ms. Kincaid asked if any of the monitoring is in person, or is it sent electronically to OSEP? Ms. Fyfe responded that the information is sent through the mail and email, also Team’s meetings have taken place. Ms. Fyfe believes it will be in person at some point once travel becomes safe.

1. **Consider Agenda Items for the Next Meeting** **(For Possible Action)**

Ms. Waugh concluded that we have our standard list of agenda items and asked the group for additional agenda items. Ms. Kincaid wanted the project assist numbers pre-COVID and through COVID to see how families are reaching out. Also, Ms. Kincaid wanted to know if hospital contacts have dissipated through COVID, and if early intervention needs to develop relationships with hospitals again. Ms. Fyfe mentioned that EI is in phase III (3) of the re-entry plan, with information on how to deal with COVID and hybrid options being available to families. Ms. Waugh wants Child Find materials added to the agenda for the next meeting. Ms. Frisk informed the group that she wants to make posters for doctors’ offices and hospitals that have EI information and the QR code, she wants to present that at the next meeting for feedback.

1. **Schedule Future Meetings** **(For Possible Action)**

Tuesday, November 16, 2021, 11:30 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

1. **Public Comment**

No public comment was made.

1. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:01 p.m.