MINUTES - Draft

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

Date of Meeting: November 9, 2017

Place of Meeting: Division of Public and Behavioral Health
4150 Technology Way, Ste 303
Carson City, Nevada

I. Call to Order, Roll Call and Introductions
Sherry Waugh called the meeting to order at 9:26 a.m. A quorum of the members was present; the meeting proceeded as scheduled.

Members Present: Jason Adams, Sherry Bingham, Dawn Brooks, Yasodara Carbrera, Lisa Cridland, Aimee Hadleigh, Robin Kincaid, Sandra LaPalm, Rhonda Lawrence, Sherry Manning, Yvonne Moore, Reesha Powell, Karen Shaw, Sherry Waugh

Members Absent: Janina Easley, Kimberly Everett, Dr. Ashley Greenwald, Ben Kieckhefer, Christine Riggi, Keana Sullivan, Claribel Zecena, Jack Zenteno

Special Guests: Perry Smith, Nevada Public and Behavioral Health Division (NPBH)

Public Attendees: Sarah Horsman, The Continuum; Kate Green, Nevada Early Intervention Services (NEIS)-Northwest (NW); Margot Chappel, Primary Care and Health Workforce Development; Rique Robb, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD); Janice Lee, Nevada Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children (TACSEI), University of Nevada Reno (UNR), Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED); Julie Ortiz, Advanced Pediatric Therapies (APT); Daina Loeffler, Nevada Department of Education (NDE); Lisa O’Malley, Easter Seals of Nevada – South (ESN-S); Wendy Nelson, Positively Kids; Fatima Taylor, NEIS-South (S); Barbara Stoll, NEIS-Northeast (NE)

Part C Staff Present: Brenda Bledsoe, Dan Dinnell, Shari Fyfe, Mary Garrison, Edie King, Iandia Morgan, Melissa Slayden

II. Public Comment
No public comments were given.
III. Approval of the Minutes from the August 31, 2017 Meeting

Ms. Waugh asked for any comments or corrections to the minutes. The following corrections were noted:

- Robin Kincaid asked for the spelling of her name be corrected on Page 4, Item VIII.
- Brenda Bledsoe asked for the word “council” to be capitalized in Section 1 of Page 1. She also requested the word “new” be added to line 1 on Page 3 when referring to Cara Paoli’s transition to a role in the Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD).
- Sandra LaPalm remarked the grant program offered by Dr. Ann Bingham mentioned on Page 2, Item II, should be listed as the Early Childhood Hybrid Online Special Educator Education or ECHOSEE.

MOTION: Accept the minutes as presented with the corrections as noted.

BY: Reesha Powell
SECOND: Sherry Bingham
VOTE: PASSED
ABSTENTION: Sherry Manning abstained as she was not present at the meeting.

IV. Review of Membership Status

Ms. Bledsoe indicated there were several changes to the membership of the ICC and indicated an updated list of members had been provided in the meeting packet. She pointed out there were three (3) State agency appointments awaiting approval from the Governor’s office. Ms. Bledsoe also advised the Council of a parent representative vacancy in the South and anyone who knew of a parent who might be interested in participating could direct them to the IDEA Part C Office for information about the application process. Sherry Bingham announced she had submitted her resignation from the ICC due to her retirement from State service effective December 29, 2017. Her replacement, Daina Loeffler has submitted her application and is awaiting news of the appointment. Iandia Morgan requested corrections be made to the membership list because it shows Dawn Brooks as a public provider rather than with Nevada Early Intervention Services South and did not list the Northwest region for Claribel Zecena.

V. Introduction of Rique Robb, Deputy Administrator for Children’s Services, ADSD

Rique Robb stated her appointment paperwork for the ICC had been submitted to the Governor’s Office and she is waiting on appointment. Ms. Bledsoe stated she is excited about Ms. Robb working with the IDEA Part C Office. Ms. Robb said, as the new Deputy Administrator for ADSD, she is excited to be a part of what she considers a positive movement for the agency and in early intervention. She stated she feels there is an opportunity to raise the bar to meet the needs of the children across communities. She noted the ICC and early intervention personnel are an intricate part of that movement.

VI. Featured Program

Nevada Early Hearing Detection and Intervention (EHDI) Program Update

Perry Smith from the Nevada Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Program (EHDI) provided an update on the program. Mr. Smith informed the Council the program is housed within the Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) and is funded by two Federal grants: one from the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the other from Health Resources and Services Administrative (HRSA). Each state and almost all territories have an EHDI program. Mr. Smith referred to a handout previously provided regarding the information he would be reviewing. He stated the purpose of the EHDI program is “To ensure all children in Nevada are screened for hearing loss at birth; and those identified with hearing loss receive timely and appropriate audiology, educational and medical intervention. We promote the
national EHDI goals and timelines developed by the Joint Committee on Infant Hearing (JHIC) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).” Mr. Smith indicated the program does not provide services, but oversees programs that provide the services.

Mr. Smith stated the EHDI program provides a yearly report to the CDC concerning the hearing screenings and follow up with the children who are zero (0) to three (3) years of age. The handout provided showed the national timeline goals for the program. Those goals are:
1. Before one (1) month of age, Hearing Screening for all babies;
2. Before three (3) months of age, Diagnostic Audiology by an audiologist if baby did not pass the hearing screening; and
3. Before six (6) months of age, Early Intervention if baby is diagnosed with hearing loss.

Mr. Smith indicated there is extensive research showing early hearing detection is imperative to positive outcomes, particularly around language acquisition and vocabulary. He also shared data showing, of the 35,945 reported births, 96% were screened for hearing loss. He stated more are screened, but the program may not have access to the data. Mr. Smith indicated approximately 1200 infants do not have records of screening; however, while the report indicates the result of the screening is “unknown”, there is data that explains some of the reasons why children did not receive the screening (ex. Infant died, Parent/Family declined, Homebirth, etc.). Mr. Smith noted many of the children show as having not been screened with a reason of Unknown or Loss to Follow Up are from Mike O’Callaghan Military Medical Center at Nellis Air Force Base. Nearly 100% of the children born at the facility are screened, but the documentation is not received by the EHDI program. These numbers should improve over time since the EHDI program is working directly with the program. Mr. Smith went on to discuss the pilot project of working with midwives, which help to show progress in the 2016 data. Mr. Smith clarified that the data being presented was for 2015, and anything after that is considered preliminary and will not be released until the annual report has been provided to the CDC.

Mr. Smith reported on the Diagnostic Audiology Data which showed 233 documented diagnoses of the 476 children who did not pass their initial screening, with 52 confirmed instances of hearing loss (22.3%). He added 243 children who did not pass their initial screening never received a diagnosis. This is the area of concern the EHDI Program is trying to improve but Nevada does have a lack of pediatric audiologists to complete diagnoses. However, 88.5% of children with a diagnosis are enrolled in early intervention services, which is significantly above the national average. Mr. Smith concluded with the contact information of the representatives from the EHDI program.

Jason Adams, Parent representative for the southern region, introduced himself and discussed the frustration he and his family felt when trying to get assistance for his seven (7) month old son diagnosed with severe to profound hearing loss. He stated, because of the lack of assistance in Nevada, he had reached out to an audiologist through Ohio State University. Mr. Adams questioned why the targeted timeline for audiology diagnosis is by three (3) months of age and stated he felt it should be within one month including the referral to early intervention because within that time the child can continue to lose hearing. He stated his family is still waiting for a speech pathologist to be assigned for his son.

Mr. Adams requested data regarding other states early intervention referral statistics. In response to Mr. Adams, Mr. Smith clarified the audiology diagnosis and Early Intervention referral timelines and noted it is the expectation that the services would be provided before the indicated age in the targeted timeline. This means that the audiology diagnosis and Early
Intervention referral can be within days of the initial screening. He added the joint committee on infant hearing who initially proposed the “1-3-6 EHDI Plan” timelines have a website outlining all the early hearing guidelines and will be coming out with a new set of guidelines in June or July of 2018. The data referred to in the presentation, including comparison of Nevada’s data to other states is located on the state website at http://dpbh.nv.gov/programs/EHDI/EHDI-Home/. Mr. Adams voiced concerns for families that may not have the money or resources to continue to follow up and search for assistance for their child. Mr. Smith requested Mr. Adams contact him directly so they could continue to work towards resolution for his family and others in similar situations.

VII. Reporting on Information and Resources Presented to Families Transferred to the Screening and Monitoring (SaM) System

Barbara Stoll explained the Screening and Monitoring System (SaM) was initially developed for children coming from hospital Neonatal Intensive Care Units (NICU). The program is used for children not found to have an auto eligible condition or risk factors. In Elko and Ely, when the program is administered, it is done through referral by the Interim Service Coordinator, Margaret Paoli. Ms. Paoli manages the SaM referrals, talks with families about any resources they may need, sends the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ), and informs the families they can request an additional evaluation if they were not considered eligible in the past.

Aimee Hadleigh asked for more information about the resources and information provided to families through this program. Ms. Stoll stated in the past families were asked if they needed resources and those would be provided accordingly. Ms. Hadleigh stated in her experience it would have been helpful to have a resource list with information about the purpose of the resource. She also voiced her concern about whether families even know what resources they need if they are not aware of what is available. Ms. Stoll replied she believes Ms. Paoli will ask the families what resources they need, but also will provide information verbally about what is available. Ms. Stoll stated they will be working on a resource list to provide as well.

Karen Shaw asked about what outreach is being done to the Native American Communities in the northeast region. Ms. Stoll stated they collaborate with the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada (ITCN) Head Start, and Indian Health Service (IHS), as well as providing a presentation for the provider meeting at the Owyhee Health clinic. Ms. Stoll also indicated they have a Tribal member who is contracted with their program and maintains a relationship with the tribes.

Ms. Bledsoe indicated the SaM policies are currently out of date but ADSD and the IDEA Part C Office are currently working on updating the information. Ms. Kincaid asked whether the SaM program is being implemented statewide, if there is data showing how long the children have been in the SaM program, what the outcome is for these children, and whether the private providers are implementing a similar program? Ms. Bledsoe stated the SaM program is implemented statewide but may look different due to the variation in population throughout the different regions. She indicated the program is only implemented within the state programs since they are the point of entry for all referrals. Ms. Bledsoe added some data is available but not compiled at this time.

VIII. Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016 Annual Performance Report (APR) Status Update

Ms. Bledsoe discussed the two handouts that were provided in the packet relative to the APR. Landia Morgan discussed Indicator Three (#), which reflects the child outcome data. Ms. Morgan stated there are three (3) outcomes within this indicator which are reported on each year. These include demonstrating improvements in children’s positive social emotional skills, the child’s
acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and the child’s ability to use appropriate actions to meet their needs. Ms. Morgan discussed the document that showed the comparison of the State’s performance between Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 and FFY 2016. Ms. Morgan stated six (6) of the six (6) targets were met in FFY 2016 and 2,174 of the 2,203 children (more than 98%) who exited with six months or more of services had progress data reported. Progress data was not available for twenty-nine children. Ms. Morgan stated several improvements have been made in tracking this data.

Ms. Kincaid stated the targets between FFY 2015 and FFY 2016 are very similar and inquired whether the numbers have increased for FFY 2017. Ms. Morgan reported the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center had developed a calculation process for identifying ‘Meaningful Difference’ and it was used to establish the targets for Outcome A1 as it became the State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR) for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). For the other two (2) Outcomes in Indicator 3, the numbers are increased by one-tenth of a percentage every other year. She also noted that the data is based on comparing the child’s performance to what is considered typical development for the child’s age.

Ms. Kincaid asked whether parent’s input is incorporated when collecting data. Ms. Morgan stated, in the beginning, when the team is gathering assessment data, it includes the parent’s input. Ms. Kincaid inquired if the form is completed during the meeting with the family, or after. Ms. Morgan replied the forms are completed after meeting with the family, and is completed with at least two members of the IFSP team so there is collaborative data. Ms. Kincaid voiced her concern about the parent input not being included. Mr. Adams stated that with his experience, his son’s service coordinator has been great and has asked for his input regarding his son’s progress, and was also given the opportunity to review his son’s paperwork. Ms. Morgan explained state procedures require the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) entry be completed within ten (10) working days of the initial Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP), and within ten (10) days after the child exits the program. Yvonne Moore shared the process from Positively Kids, and explained the same people that meet with the families are the ones completing the form. After meeting with the families, they compile all the data and then complete the form. Ms. Bledsoe stated the child outcomes data is more about measuring how the system is functioning and how the services are supporting families rather than a reflection of the individual child’s progress. Ms. Bingham pointed out a different subset of children are included each year so there is no comparison of the same children from year to year. Ms. Kincaid indicated her concern is more about the parents not being included since they have more interaction with the children. Ms. Waugh stated the information on the COSF is a small portion of the Federal Reporting. Ms. Bledsoe explained the standard for determining a child’s coding or rating is whether the child can complete the activities across all environments, not just with their parents or with the service provider, therefore it is imperative that we gather family input in this process. Ms. Morgan concluded that for a child that has been in Early Intervention from a very young age, there should be significant improvement seen throughout the course of their Early Intervention experience.

Ms. Bledsoe reported she hoped to have Indicator 4 completed, but it was not available as a separate item for this meeting. She added as in the past there has been an executive summary provided that includes all the indicators, distinguishes whether the Indicator is based on compliance or performance, and the targets against which the data is reported. A version of the document was initiated and included in the packet. Ms. Bledsoe stated Indicator 4 has preliminary data, but a broader set of information will be shared at the January ICC meeting. She also stated final data for Indicator 7 is not available; the IDEA Part C office is currently
finalizing information from the year-end report for this indicator. She pointed out this information is based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) and is from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. Indicators 9 and 10 will not have targets as the baseline is not set until ten (10) requests for due process hearings or ten (10) mediation sessions have been received within a year; therefore, the only thing that would be reported in these Indicators is performance for that year. In this reporting period, there have been no mediation sessions or due process hearings. Ms. Bledsoe requested the Council email her with any questions regarding this reporting.

Ms. Hadleigh requested a topic be added for the next ICC meeting around the transition process. She indicated she has heard there is confusion from parents about the transition to IDEA Part B. Ms. King asked Ms. Hadleigh if she was asking about transition information for only IDEA Part C, IDEA Part B, or both? Ms. Hadleigh clarified by stating the transition process is very confusing for parents prior to being in the process, and is looking for information on what should be expected for the families during transition from IDEA Part C to IDEA Part B.

IX. Report on Conferences Attended Since Last Meeting
   a. Division of Early Childhood (DEC) held in Portland, Oregon on October 4-6, 2017
   Dan Dinnell discussed the DEC conference, which is held annually. Mr. Dinnell shared that there were eight (8) to nine (9) pre-conference sessions, followed by 120 sessions, which did not include the approximately 300 poster sessions. Mr. Dinnell spoke about the key note speaker, Janice Fialka. Ms. Fialka, who spoke about the importance of communication between parents and professionals in programs. Mr. Dinnell said he enjoyed her talk because it was about how important word selection can be when approaching a family. The example that was given was a specialist approaching a family and saying, “We are going to evaluate your child to see what they can do”, and how changing the wording to “Let’s discover what your child can do” can come across as more acceptable to the parents. Mr. Dinnell also spoke about a session regarding the barriers fathers encounter when it comes to inclusion and participation with programs. During the discussion, the speaker was able to point out numerous barriers fathers encounter, but due to time restraints was unable to discuss the solutions.

Sandra LaPalm stated she also attend the DEC conference and felt it was amazing. She also spoke about Ms. Fialka’s speech and how professionals need to change the mindset from the families “being in denial”, to “being in hope”. Ms. LaPalm said she attended as an ECHOSEE scholar, and attended a presentation regarding a pilot for a family outcome/quality assessment tool.

Ms. LaPalm stated that she feels this tool will be beneficial to programs to assist in writing and evaluating high quality outcome statements. Ms. LaPalm also discussed a presentation regarding a longitudinal study of executive function for low birth weight that has good implications for eligibility, as well as identifying and helping this vulnerable population. Ms. LaPalm spoke about an assessment program planning for young children with significant disabilities and how many of the professionals were parents of children with disabilities. Ms. LaPalm also discussed a poster session she attended that should provide additional information over the next year.

   Mr. Dinnell reported he attended the United by Developmental Disabilities Advocacy Conference as a vendor and hosted an IDEA Part C resource table. He stated the presentations
were focused on the inclusion of the Hispanic community. Mr. Adams stated it was powerful for him to see the young adults who had gone through early intervention, and it was profound for them to present at the event. It was encouraging to him regarding his child’s future.

Edie King spoke regarding the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) Cross-Cohort Leadership Institute and the development of a program for teaching professionals that work with children with disabilities. Ms. King reported about the opportunity provided to discuss Early Intervention and Early Childhood Education and the discussions around combining Early Intervention, Early Childhood Education, and Early Childhood Special Education. She added they are working on competencies for Early Intervention Service Providers in collaboration with the Professional Development Subcommittee.

d. National Center for Systemic Improvements (NCSI) Part C Cross-State Learning Collaborative on Results-Based Accountability, Chicago, Illinois October 23-29, 2017
Ms. Bledsoe spoke about the National Center for Systemic Improvements (NCSI) Part C Cross-State Learning Collaborative on Results-Based Accountability meeting and how this provides an opportunity to hear what other states are doing. Ms. Robb stated she could see some of the struggles Nevada has had around IDEA Part C are also prevalent in other states. Ms. Robb said that Ms. Bledsoe, Ms. Morgan, and herself discussed how Nevada can better their collaborations as a state. Ms. Morgan agreed, and stated it was nice to brainstorm and hear what is working and what is not working for Nevada as a state, as well as issues that we do not face as a state. Ms. Bledsoe stated the discussions during this meeting led to plans to develop a stronger collaboration between the IDEA Part C Office and ADSD Quality Assurance.

X. Early Intervention Services Report
   a. Early Intervention Program Certification Update
      ADSD EI Staff
   b. Early Intervention Program Highlights/Updates – Informational Only

Ms. Robb stated due to restructuring the Early Intervention. Program Certification has been postponed and she is looking for additional information about what the Council has requested in the past to ensure at future meetings she can provide an adequate report.

Ms. Waugh advised the Council programs highlights were provided in the packet for review at their leisure.

XI. Update on the Nevada Parent Advocacy Initiative
Ms. Hadleigh reported the Parent Advocacy group recently attended an event at Sierra Nevada Chocolate hosted by Carol Reitz. Ms. Hadleigh stated the event was great and parents had the opportunity to discuss various initiatives. She also shared information regarding the Facebook group they have created, Special Needs Families of Northern Nevada, and indicated resources and conversations relevant to the Northern Nevada region are reflected. Ms. Hadleigh requested an invitation be extended to Dr. Nicole Welsh to provide a presentation to the ICC around pediatric psychology and mental health/behavior. She concluded her update by discussing the JUSTin HOPE foundation that sponsors a free sensory Autism hour at Fly High Trampoline in Reno. Ms. King inquired about events happening in Southern Nevada for Parent Advocacy. Ms. Hadleigh replied she is not aware of events happening in the Southern Region, but if there are parents who would like to collaborate getting it started, she would be happy to
work with them. Mr. Adams stated he would be interested in leading this activity if one did not already exist. Ms. Kincaid stated there are support groups in the Southern Region meeting on a regular basis and named several activities in the Las Vegas area. Ms. Kincaid also spoke about the University of Las Vegas, Ackerman Autism Center and the sensory activities offered there. Mr. Adams reiterated it would be nice to have a Facebook group in the Southern Region that has resources and activities for families. It was suggested he contact Mr. Dinnell for assistance. Ms. Kincaid reported the Nevada Parents Encouraging Parents (PEP) resource list was recently updated with information on state wide resources and can be provided on request. Lastly, Ms. Hadleigh stated a dad’s group has been formed and has met twice. They meet at a Bully’s Sports Bar and Grill in Reno.

XII. ICC Committees – Reports on Activities
   a. Family Support Resource Subcommittee
   Dan Dinnell stated the minutes from the August 24, 2017 meeting were provided in the packet. He reported the subcommittee had a discussion regarding sharing family perspectives. During the meeting, Ms. Kincaid expressed concerns for families who wanted an evaluation but were still having to wait for an evaluation for specific services as well as waiting for other services to be started. It was noted due to delays it can take a long time for families to receive services.

   Ms. Kincaid said she would like to hear from programs since there have been reports from families regarding the delay in obtaining additional services. She also asked for complaint updates be added to the agenda for the next ICC meeting. She then specifically asked about a complaint regarding the addition of services and a policy within the program that prevented the addition of services. Ms. Bledsoe replied there was a focused monitoring of that program scheduled for December 2017. Ms. Kincaid asked if the updated procedure can be shared in the next meeting. Ms. Morgan reported there were also plans to send a provider survey to ensure the provider staff are aware of the new procedure.

   b. Child Find Subcommittee
   Shari Fyfe reported the Child Find Subcommittee had met and there is a new Child Find Activities tracking spreadsheet for the programs to start using. This new report will be presented at the January 2018 ICC meeting. She stated a representative from the “Pink Project” is scheduled to present at the December 7, 2017 meeting and she is in talks with them about whether they need additional brochures for the packets that are given to families leaving the new born nursery and NICUs.

   c. Professional Development Subcommittee
   Ms. Bledsoe stated at the last meeting of the Professional Development Subcommittee they discussed the processes used by other states and their requirements around certifying Developmental Specialists (DS’s), or those providing special instruction. There was also discussion about having a specific license for early intervention. Ms. King spoke about the collaboration with Jason Dietrich from the Nevada Department of Education. She stated he had requested the number of Developmental Specialists throughout the state as well as the syllabus for the courses offered at the University of Nevada Reno and Las Vegas, which is being provided. Ms. Bledsoe discussed the course content being specific to Early Intervention and the next follow up meeting will be several months out.
d. Public Awareness Projects In Lieu of the Annual Calendar (For Possible Action)
The Council reviewed the handouts provided regarding the Public Awareness Subcommittee meeting. Ms. Hadleigh commented she would like to see an ICC brochure to provide the public and others of the work this Council and early intervention does. Yvonne Moore stated on behalf of the community providers they enjoy the calendar and provide them to their active families once received. She added significant costs could be saved by providing calendars to only active families. Ms. Moore asked that the ICC vote whether to proceed with the publication of the calendar for 2018 or not. Ms. Waugh agreed it is important to collect the data and send the number of calendars each program needs based on active cases. Mr. Dinnell asked if a motion was needed. Ms. Bledsoe asked if the ICC would give the IDEA Part C Office an opportunity to produce a mockup of an ICC brochure. Mr. Adams stated he liked the idea of providing an electronic version of the calendar. Mr. Dinnell confirmed he would have the ability to add a link to the calendar on the website. Ms. Waugh stated it appears based on the minutes from the last subcommittee meeting that the calendar for 2018 would be distributed as in the past and additional outreach options would be further discussed in 2018. Ms. Manning asked if no action were taken, would the calendars still be distributed? Mr. Dinnell replied the calendars would be distributed if no decision was made. It was concluded the 2018 calendar would be distributed as expected, and further discussion around outreach would proceed in 2018.

XIII. Part C Information Updates

a. Personnel Update
Ms. Bledsoe asked Margot Chappel to discuss the restructuring in the Directors Office. Ms. Chappel introduced herself as the Primary Care and Health Workforce Development Office Manager for the Directors Office. She explained as part of the reorganization, the IDEA Part C office will now be under the Primary Care and Health Workforce Development Office since the work of the Part C Office includes workforce development.

Ms. Bledsoe introduced Melissa Slayden as the newest member to the IDEA Part C office.

b. State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Update
Ms. Bledsoe reviewed the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). The handouts included the intended outcomes and activities, where the state is regarding their goals, evaluation questions on how the state is doing on improvements strategies, and evaluation questions on how the state is doing regarding outcomes. Ms. Bledsoe indicated surveys were being conducted to gather data to answer the evaluation questions. She added a stakeholder meeting is being planned for late January 2018 or early February 2018.

c. TACSEI-EI Project Report
Ms. Bledsoe asked Janice Lee to report on the activities around the Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children (TACSEI-EI) Project as it relates to the SSIP to improve social-emotional outcomes.

Ms. Lee gave a summary of the items provided in the handout included in the meeting packet. She stated the classes were broken into two (2) day training modules. The first module is regarding relationships and environment and was completed on October 12, 2017 in Reno with eleven participants and was completed in Las Vegas on October 19, 2017 with fourteen participants. The second module will cover social-emotional assessment and will be held in Reno on November 16, 2017, and in Las Vegas on December 14, 2017. Following these two training days, there will be bi-monthly coaching meetings. Ms. Lee stated she will be working with each group to ensure the practices are universal and how to maintain the training.
indicated data has been collected from the trainings and can be used for the social-emotional module being developed.

Ms. Hadleigh asked if Ms. Lee could explain what the training contains. Ms. Lee stated the information for module one was developed at the national level and is based on evidence based practices. The beginning of module one talks about what Part C services are, what the model is supposed to look like, and what information needs to be shared in the annual performance report (APR). The remaining portion of the module discusses how to support parents and caregivers of young children who have developmental delays or disabilities with strategies about building and maintaining high quality and supportive relationships. Ms. Bledsoe stated the agenda shows the outline for the trainings and it can be provided.

Ms. Robb asked about the capacity for participants and what is the incentive for the Early Intervention providers to attend. Ms. Lee stated the initial training was geared towards supervisors so the information could be disseminated to those who could not attend. The goal is to have providers make a commitment to not only complete the trainings, but participate in future meetings and planning on how to implement the training in their programs. It was noted many participants have already started sharing the information learned. Ms. Lee stated smaller groups are used in hopes any kinks can be overcome and to ensure more responsibilities are not be added to Early Intervention Providers. She added a meaningful and proactive approach is to be created as a base layer of knowledge and information. Ms. Robb asked if the participants are signing up with the understanding that they will be sharing the information with their programs. Ms. Lee stated they are, and part of the bi-monthly meetings, post training, will be to see how the information is being implemented and if they are applying the training within their program. She clarified the follow up will also be used to see what the providers, who are working directly with children and their families, are doing to implement what they learned, as well as how they will change their service delivery to support this moving forward. Ms. Robb asked how this information will be tracked going forward. Ms. Lee stated that through TACSEI-EI they will use forms and processes, as well as recording and self-evaluations for individuals providing direct services to children and families. These individuals will have a coach or mentor who will also evaluate their ability to implement strategies.

Ms. Bledsoe shared how this initiative stemmed from our SSIP and how the State’s data on social/emotional outcomes was not very good. Ms. Bledsoe stated providers shared their concern about how to approach social/emotional development with families, and the lack of resources. This is the reason the State committed to try and improve the resources in our system and particularly for Early Intervention Providers. Ms. Bledsoe reported questions arose as to how agencies can sustain having a resource in their program that can provide services, but also be a go-to for other staff. The question also arose as to how providers can help families understand the relationship with their baby and how it will impact their child’s social/emotional development. It was suggested when a child is behind in their social/emotional development, it affects their interaction with their family and can impact their ability to have success in other areas of development.

a. Workgroups to:
Develop Evidence-Based Practice Module on EI Practices to Evaluate and Support Infant-Toddler Social-Emotional Development
Ms. Fyfe discussed the Social/Emotional Evidence-Based Practices Module Workgroup and the three (3) meetings already held. She reported the workgroup has been gathering research, resources, and has developed a skeleton outline for the module with plans to complete the
module by April 1, 2017. The next meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2017, Ms. Bledsoe explained the module is being built off the effective practice modules already in place and the plan is to have the module available in other medias besides paper.

**Revise Part C Annual Family Survey Instrument and Process**

Ms. Bledsoe stated the Family Survey Workgroup is currently trying to implement recommendations from the September meeting. She reported based on feedback the IDEA Part C office will be working with Program Managers to identify families with an upcoming six-month review to provide the revised survey to and gather their feedback about the questions and approach of the survey. Ms. Bledsoe also stated feedback from the workgroup showed there was a preference to provide an option for an electronic version of the survey for families.

**Review and Revise Nevada Personnel Policies for Individuals Providing Services to Infants and Toddlers Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing**

Ms. Bledsoe announced workgroup has been formed regarding personnel standards for the service providers of children who are deaf or hard of hearing. The next meeting is scheduled for November 16, 2017. Ms. Bledsoe stated if policies need adjustments then those recommendations will need to be completed by the end of January 2017. Mr. Adams requested to be a part of the workgroup. Ms. Hadleigh stated she is excited about this workgroup and had questions regarding the qualifications in other states. Ms. Bledsoe stated she is in the process of researching this information and should have the information for the next workgroup meeting. She shared the qualifications for Nevada, which stated there is a certification for teachers of the hearing impaired, which starts at age three (3). Ms. Bledsoe also indicated there is a certification for interpreters as well, but what is being discussed is instruction, which was addressed for the visually impaired, but not the deaf and hard of hearing.

**b. Data Discussion and Reports**

**Update on Data System Project**

Ms. Bledsoe provided an update on the data system project and reported Ms. Chappel is assisting with a different approach in getting the project approved.

**State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2017 EIS Statistics – 4th Quarter Preliminary Report; Delayed Services Reports – September and October**

Ms. Bledsoe stated the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2017 Early Intervention Services Statistics report was provided as well as the Delayed Services Report. She reported the items marked as “no note” on the Delayed Services Report are referred to the program for correction.

**Child Outcomes Data Summary**

Deferred to APR Discussion

**c. Training and Technical Assistance Provided:**

**North East Transition Training/New Employee Orientation**

Ms. King stated Part B/Part C transition training conducted in Elko with Ms. Fyfe, Ms. Slayden, and Ms. Bingham went well. Ms. King also reported on the New Employee trainings that were conducted in the north and south noting training on functional outcomes are waiting to be completed.

**Upcoming:**

**Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) Functional Outcomes- TBD**
Ms. Bledsoe stated the Strategic Planning Meeting of the Early Childhood Advisory Council (ECAC) was conducted the previous week and a presentation will be given at the next ICC Meeting.

XIV. Consider Agenda Items for the Next Meeting
- Approve Minutes from November 2017 meeting
- Presentation on the results of the ECAC Strategic Planning meeting
- Review SaM Data and the Outcomes of children in programs
- Presentation by Psychologist Dr. Nicole Welsh
- Review of Indicator 4 Data
- Complaint Matrix
- Verify strategic planning for ICC will be done during April 2018 face to face
- Open Meeting Law Training
- Part B-Nursing care during transition
- Child Find representative presentation
- Washoe County representative-transitional information

XV. Schedule Future Meetings
- January 18, 2018 - Confirmed
- April 19, 2018 – Confirmed Annual Face-to-Face, Las Vegas

XVI. Public Comment
Kate Green requested the Council consider having a representative from NDE Part B or Child Find come to a future meeting to discuss transitioning. Ms. Kincaid stated the Clark County School district has created satellite locations for Child Find, which early intervention programs might want to consider. She added the contact person for Child Find in Clark County Julie Russo. It was also suggested the Washoe County School District representative be invited.

XVII. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 12:41 pm.