



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.



DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

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

Date and Time of Meeting: January 30, 2023
10:00 AM

Meeting was held virtually at:

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer, mobile app or room device

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 259 216 275 566

Passcode: qczj3h

[Download Teams](#) | [Join on the web](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[+1 775-321-6111,,463478068#](#) United States, Reno

Phone Conference ID: 463 478 068#

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

Thank you for planning to attend this Teams meeting.

[Learn More](#) | [Meeting options](#)

Pursuant to NRS 241.020(3)(a) as amended by Assembly Bill 253 of the 81st Legislative Session, this meeting will be convened using a remote technology system and there will be no physical location for this meeting. The meeting can be listened to via telephone or viewed live over the Internet.

Public comments may be submitted by email at mgarrison@dhhs.nv.gov by 2:00 p.m. on Friday, January 27, 2023. Please include your name and the corresponding agenda item number, if applicable, with any comments submitted. Written comments should contain no more than 300 words. Public comments received by the deadline will be posted on the board's website before the start of the meeting and noted for the record as each action item is heard by council ([Meetings \(nv.gov\)](#)).

MINUTES

I. **Call to Order, welcome, and announcements.**

Interim chair, Lori Ann Malina-Lovell, welcomed all on the call. A quorum of members was present, and the meeting was called to order at 10:09 am.

Members Present: Dawn Brooks, Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Andre' Haynes, Sarah Horsman-Ploeger, Lisa Hunt, Rhonda Lawrence, Sandra LaPalm, Janice Lee, Catherine Nielsen, Kate Osti, Keana Sullivan

Members Absent: Valeria Gundersen, Kellie Hess, Kristin Hoxie, Crystal Johnson, Robin Kincaid, Karen Shaw, Brittany Toth, Jenna Weglarz-Ward

Public Attendees: Sherri Alexander, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD); Robert Burns, Therapy Management Group (TMG); Karen Frisk, Nevada Early Intervention Services (NEIS)-Northeast; Sheila Garner, NEIS-Las Vegas; Stephanie Gerow, Public Attendee; Daniel Guo, Yahasoft; Erin Hawley, Yahasoft; Randi Humes, ADSD; Devon Kawata, ADSD; Patricia Knight, ADSD; Jennifer Loiacano, TMG; Kelcy Meyer, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS); Elizabeth Newman, NEIS-Carson; Julie Ortiz, Advanced Pediatric Therapies (APT); Danielle Race, ADSD; Monique Robinson, MDDA; Jessica Roew, NEIS-Carson; Roy, Public Attendee; Debra Stewart, MDDA; Fatima Taylor, NEIS-Las Vegas; Lindsay Wood-Lopez, NEIS-Las Vegas

Part C Staff Present: Mary Garrison, Lori Ann Malina-Lovell, Jalin McSwyne, Melissa L. Slayden, Pam Silva

I. **Public Comment**

Ms. Malina-Lovell asked at this time, if anyone would like to provide public comment, please raise your hand.

Lori Ann stated, at this time, I would like to enter public comment on behalf of the Part C office. For the record, this is Lori Ann Malina-Lovell, Part C Coordinator with the IDEA Part C office. The public comment that I would like to share is to inform the ICC and the public of the challenges that have been facing the IDEA Part C office within these last four (4) months. We have experienced a critical staff shortage and that has been due to staff being on sick leave, hospitalization and on bereavement leave. We have also experienced flooding to our office, and that occurred on the day after Christmas, December 26, 2022, in the Carson City location. A parking lot drain was backed up and slush and heavy rains flooded into our office and into the entire building which we share with Medicaid. For that reason, our staff have not been able to work in the Carson City office and have had to work remotely. This has posed several problems, especially with obtaining data and the time that it takes to gather that through our current TRAC Data System, which is in process of being transitioned over to a new data system. That is expected to go live in September 2023, and will be a more current and modern up to date system. We have also had succession challenges, with two (2) of our staff retiring. Fortunately, we felt that we were able to send them off with honor. With new hires and onboarding, we filled those two (2) positions in December and January. We do have two (2) new staff and they are Lauren Roscoe, Development Specialist IV, and Pamela Silva, Development Specialist IV. You will be hearing from Pam and Lauren in the months ahead as we have our meetings. That is the good news that came out of these recent months. Nonetheless, we have been facing challenges, which we will continue to share throughout this meeting. Despite all of this, we were so grateful to be able to spend our time here with you this morning.

Are there any other public comments today? At that this time we'll close this section of the meeting hearing none, and we'll move forward to the next section, which is approval of the minutes from our most recent meeting on October 20, 2022. You are welcome to make any suggestions for any edits that you see are necessary. You can put that into the chat, or you may interject and turn on your mic.

II. **Approval of the Minutes from the October 20, 2022, Meeting (For Possible Action):**

This is Mary Garrison for the record, I wanted to let you know that I will be updating these minutes in addition to what you see today. With the flood damage that occurred in our Carson City office, which Lori

Ann shared, all my written notes from this meeting were locked in a storage container. I was unable to go back and check those notes, so in your April meeting, I will have an updated version of these minutes. Those updates will include the information that I could not gather from my written notes. If you have questions about that, please let me know. Ms. Garrison reviewed the minutes with the council and corrections were notated. Lori Ann Malina-Lovell stated, thank you very much, Mary, and to all our administrative team who assisted with the tedious minute taking. We appreciate you all very much. Thank you to everyone for your patience. At this time, we are seeking a motion to approve the minutes from the October 20, 2022, ICC meeting.

Corrections Noted: Note placed in the chat by Randi Humes to request that the spelling of her name be corrected throughout the report. Mary acknowledged that she had received the message and would be making that correction.

MOTION: Approve minutes with corrections as noted in the discussion

BY: Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May

SECOND: Janice Lee

ABSTAINED: Rhonda Lawrence, not in attendance for October 20, 2022, meeting

VOTE: PASSED

III. **Discuss, Nominate and Approve New Nevada Early Intervention Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) Parent Representative Co-Chair and Agency Co-Chair (For Possible Action)**

a. **Nominate ICC APR/SSIP Certification Signer if a co-chair/parent co-chair is not approved.**

Mary Garrison stated Andre', I know that you are on the call. I'm going to give a brief introduction regarding this topic. As a Council, we are looking to nominate two (2) new Co-chairs, one (1) being a parent representative and one (1) being a general member of the Council. We had two (2) individuals who showed interest in this position, one (1) being Mr. Andre Haynes and then one (1) being our parent representative from the northeast part of our state. Her name is Kelly Hess. I don't see Kelly on today's call. And Andre, we are looking to move you around into another position. I am going to hold off on nominating you until we get you transitioned over into that new position. I did create a survey where you guys can nominate those members who have shown interest. I did put Kelly on there. I did not include Andre. As I said, we're waiting to see about another position that he can fill in as well on the ICC so I can submit that survey to you in our chat right now. I don't know how the Council wants to move forward though, just because I don't see Kelly on today's call. Mary further clarified the bylaws for the ages of children whose parent is serving in the role of parent representative. The bylaw that requires us to have Andre moved into a new position specifically states that the child of a parent must be under the age of 12 to be on the ICC. Mary stated Andre, who is one of our current parent representatives on the ICC has a son who has qualified him as a member who has recently aged out and his membership is due to expire in June of 2023. Mary stated in that time, I have been working with the Governor's boards to see if we can have him assigned to another position because he does want to continue his work with the ICC as well as the ICC Equity Subcommittee, so we're looking at some other options of roles within our ICC that Andre can move to. So, we'll be picking up that discussion and seeing what our board members say we can do going forward. But I'm working on that with them for you so that we can get Andre reassigned. I don't see it being a problem. I'll tell you that it's just a matter of time as we transition into a new Governor and that group is reassembled within his office and ensuring that we get a response from them.

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell thanked Mary for her comments and then led a discussion on ways that the need for members could be addressed. Lori Ann stated at this time the ICC could brainstorm about ways to approach

this. One suggestion would be to see if there are any other parents here who would like to nominate themselves or nominate someone. And what we could do is take the names moving forward and have an election in the April meeting as Kelly is not present. Another way to approach this is to look at the other side that we need for the general members. If there's anyone who would like to nominate themselves or someone else on the Council.

And then yet another way to approach this is to have someone among yourselves that would be considered as the interim chair, so perhaps there is an individual who would not want to be that official lead or Co-lead going forward but is willing to assist in the interim. So myself, as the Part C coordinator am defaulted to being the interim. The aim of this role is for it to be with one of you, and so we're (remove this word) we'd like to open the floor to you, those of you on the ICC to see how you'd like to approach this. Does anyone have any suggestions?

There was a question regarding the responsibilities of this role. Lori Ann stated that this person would certify our annual performance report and what that entails is signing off on a form that goes to OSEP, saying that the ICC approves our annual performance report. We do that every January annually and other notable responsibilities for the co-chairs include facilitating our quarterly meetings, just as you've seen me doing that today and as you have seen Sherry Waugh facilitating meetings in the past. A group of early intervention programs needed some support, and the ICC wrote a letter of support that was made out to the legislature so those are some of the kinds of things you might be interested in hearing about that co-chairs fulfill. Mary clarified a question in the chat regarding whether the interim chair could be a state employee and stated that yes, it absolutely can.

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell again asked the ICC members if there was anyone that would like to nominate themselves or anyone else on the council? Or if there was anyone who's interested in being an interim who could assist us in certifying our annual performance report, which is required of our state.

Catherine Nielsen identified herself by her full name and stated I would not mind taking on the interim portion for you guys. Lori Ann thanked her stating Catherine is with the Governor's Council on Developmental disabilities, and she's so graciously and generously offered to be the interim lead for the ICC.

MOTION: For Catherine Nielsen to be interim Co-chair.

BY: Sarah Horsman-Ploeger

SECOND: Lisa Hunt, parent representative

VOTE: PASSED

IV. Aging and Disability Services Division Updates

i. Early Intervention Updates

Sarah Horsman-Ploeger shared that a lot of the EI programs continue to experience a lot of the effects of the pandemic, particularly labor shortages. This has increased wage demands in this labor market, so we try to help programs and come together as a system as much as we can to help each other out. And one thing that programs can request is a referral rotation hold. We currently have one program out of rotation that we evaluate on a weekly basis, and we will continue to update ICC as we evaluate those referral rotation holds requests. I know Randi is going to share some data, but our caseload is currently equal at the 50/50 split, meaning 50% of the caseload statewide is for state programs and 50% for community providers. That number did go up a little bit, particularly in the north when (removed space and comma) the Continuum, one of our community providers, did close their doors for business at the end of October beginning of November. A lot of those cases were dispersed among providers and the state took a large portion of those. We continue to have

COVID protocols in our home visits and in visits with families. However, we're moving away from calling it COVID protocols and moving towards long term universal health screenings and infection disease mitigation. So currently masks are still required by staff when they're interacting with families due to the medically fragile nature of infants and toddlers, and not a high vaccination rate there, and we have our physicians in both Las Vegas and in the North evaluating county and local infection disease spread, but as of right now, since we see ourselves as more of a healthcare provider, that masks are still required and we do require screenings prior to any visits and if families or staff have two or more symptoms, those are reasons that may be rescheduled or moved to telehealth. We do have a new Community provider in the southern region, and they will be entering rotation soon. And we continue to be working with Part C Office and with ADSD with Yahoo software developers who are moving for a new case management data system. That probably might be on the agenda, so I won't speak too much about that, but that's moving along. And then finally, just as a reminder to stakeholders that early intervention services both for the Community providers and the state are coming out of state general funds. We have a fixed budget and sometimes not money to do and purchase items that we may need. We are very grateful that the Part C Office does have excess federal funds that they get to share with ADSD so that all programs may be able to get training materials and all of that. We're working with them right now to order what programs need. Those are the main updates from ADSD. The developers are taking in information that is needed to make the Nevada specific system. They already have an off the shelf product but what things our state needs to be able to function efficiently and effectively, we have not got down to, we're not quite at the stage of the project to do any user testing or any data migration or storage. We're still in the preliminary stages there and I don't want to speak incorrectly. I will get the correct information to ICC, but I believe we do have a go live date.

Good morning, everybody, and to the Council this morning. For the record, Randi Humes, management analyst with early intervention services. Today I'm presenting our quarterly updates for the requested report that identified children who are receiving in home services versus telehealth services. We are providing an update today from our last reporting, which was back in September. The data that you see today in our report were generated at the end of December. At that time, the data indicated that there were 2967 children identified in the system with 8382 ongoing services. This is across all our programs in the EI system. So, it is a comprehensive number. If we look down at the bottom of the report there, we see tables one (1) and two (2). Tables one (1) and two (2) are a comparison showing our most current data compared to our last quarter as generated in September, we see in our December related data here that we have those 2967 children with those 8382 services. When we look at our split between in person and telehealth related services, we see 16.5% of those services identified as being provided in a telehealth related platform and 83.5% of those services being provided in person to the child and family. The Table two (2) there compares our data that we identified in September. We see those numbers as a slightly different variation being 23.7% telehealth in 76.2% in person. We do see that we have grown in terms of providing more in person services since returning to home related services and community-based services. When providing a comparison to our original data set, which was generated approximately a year ago, we do see we have an 85% increase from that original data set, showing that we are moving back towards providing those services in home. We've had a very nice increase compared to our data from approximately one (1) year ago. We have some data notes located on page two (2) as well for any possible questions and we will go ahead and open it up to the Council to see if you have any current questions about our report as provided today. Thank you. Question from Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May clarifying the age of children served by early intervention. Randi Humes answered, so, this report, specific to early intervention services under Part C, is for children ages 0 up to age three (3). They exit from our services once they turn three (3) and we collaborate with the school district for ongoing services thereafter.

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell thanked Randi for the report. Lori Ann stated we appreciate the updates and all the tedious work that goes into generating the data for us. It's wonderful hearing that in person (removed comma) services are on the rise, and we hope to continue seeing those trends.

- i. **Early Intervention Program Highlights (Information Only)**
- ii. **Programs Highlights**

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell stated the next part of the ADSD portion includes program highlights and that includes state and community partner programs. Mary has those on the screen there for you. And for those of you who may not be joining us via video, these highlights are also a part of your packet.

This is Mary Garrison for the record. We don't have every program represented with these highlights, but I did include the ones that we did receive. We always like to open this up in the event that there are any members of our community or state programs who would like to share any updates with the Council.

V. **Overview of timeline and comment period of Part C application (Information only)**

Posting and comment period starts March 1, 2023. Comment period ends March 31, 2023. Due Date is May 3, 2023.

Melissa Slayden stated, we have some set dates from OSEP for our application and comment period. This is different from our Annual Performance Report (APR), which is data. This is our grant application. So, we need to match a number that OSEP provides in our ask, and that includes the money that we spend for all of our activities for Part C salaries and for those Part C services that we transfer over to ADSD in our Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Our application is due May 3, 2023. It must be posted no later than 60 days before that. We're giving ourselves a little buffer this year. The first 30 days of that sixty-day viewing period for the application must be held for comment. From March 1st to March 31st, we will have the application on our website for you to view. We will also have a SurveyMonkey link. From March 1st to March 31st, you will have time to do that and then it will still be up in April. We must leave it up for that full 60 days and then we will have it off to OSEP by the due date May 3, 2023. We are preparing for budget spending for next fiscal year that starts on July 1, 2023. That is when we are given our NOGA (notice of grant award). So yes, those things will happen, and all at once. But that is not the link to the SurveyMonkey for the application. We will be sending out reminders to program staff and administrative staff within the system and to our ICC members as stakeholders. We'll make sure that you know when that application hits our website.

VI. **Overview of timeline and activities of Nevada IDEA Part C Family Survey 2023 (Information only)**

Melissa Slayden stated after the December one (1) count this year I feel like lots of our data has kind of hit the stone wall because of the changes that we've had for access to our network and that sort of thing. We will be sending out address corrections and contact information corrections and at the end of this week and the beginning of next week hoping that we can get those returned and corrected and for mailing addresses and for emails for families participating in our system so that we can send out beginning on February 13, 2023. We will look at preparing the list serve so that we can send out a be on the lookout notice. The survey will be sent to all families that have an e-mail and have received at least six (6) months of service in this fiscal year, because those are the rules from OSEP.

We will also be sending out postcards the third week of February to have families be on the lookout and to know that the survey will be coming. This also serves as a primary address check for our office. It does get quite costly to send out the surveys. With the flooding this year, we're putting all the printing and envelope

stuffing out to the mail services room. We don't know what kinds of delays may be associated with that, but our Xerox is in the pod with Mary's notes and all my stuff. We'll get those out through the letters and through postcards for those primary address checks and just so that families know that it's coming. Then we'll give it just a couple of weeks so that we can see any bad returns that we will get. And then the beginning of March, the survey will go out. It'll come back or close out by about April 21, 2023. Families will have about six (6) to seven (7) weeks to respond. We're hoping that during this time, our staff are sure to remind families. We will have a couple of e-mail blasts that go out through the list serve during that time. Last year, we found that we got a boost in responses after every reminder. We want to make sure that we're not overwhelming families. I know if I get too many reminders, I usually turn it all off. We're looking to increase our responses this year. We will be sending the reminders, and then of course, making sure that contact information is correct within the TRAC system so that we can get the surveys to families. This will allow us to receive hard copies through May 1st and then in May we will do our analysis for reporting and then we will share the preliminary data with you all in July at the ICC meeting then with a draft family survey report by October. Please be sure to remind your families to take that survey if they get the chance. Thank you.

Update on Part C office flooring repairs

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell requested that Melissa Slayden give an update on the status of the floor repairs in the Carson City office. Melissa stated the carpet has been pulled up. Most of the glue has been removed and we found a huge crack in the flooring in both units so concrete must be repoured. I think that Irma and Mary may be able to move into their suite before Dr. Pam Silva and I are able to join them at the office because it's on our side that the crack has happened. We've added a couple of weeks with that need for a concrete pour before the adhesive and carpeting process.

VII. ICC By-Laws, Roberts Rules of Order Cheat Sheet, and Open Meeting Law Manual (Information Only)

Mary Garrison stated we have had some discussions in the recent past about an ICC retreat. I am happy to report that the Part C office will be hosting an ICC retreat this year where we will have the opportunity to have an agency outside of the state of Nevada. We will have some technical assistance at that retreat to assist with the review of our bylaws, the Roberts Rules of Order, as well as Open Meeting Law. We're going to take the time during that retreat to review all of those things and make any update suggestions to our ICC by-laws. We will also do strategic and action planning for the future of the ICC, as well as review of our subcommittees and requests for additional subcommittees if that's what the Council finds is needed during that retreat. Because we are in legislative session this year, we had initially looked at April. We do know that that is not a good time, not for legislation, and not for our office as we work through program monitoring. So, we are going to look around July, but you will have further discussion regarding that later in today's meeting. I did include a copy of the current bylaws, a cheat sheet on Roberts Rules of Order, as well as the Open Meeting Law manual. This is for your information only. At this time, I would suggest over the next six (6) months that you look and notate anything that you may want to have changed on those bylaws or anything that you may have questions about when we do have that technical assistance facilitating the retreat. Mary called for any questions regarding the information that was shared in the information packet and there were none.

MOTION: ICC retreat on the July 20-21, 2023, or alternative dates of the 27-28th that would take place in Northern Nevada.

BY: Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May

SECOND: Catherine Nielson
VOTE: PASS

VIII. Review, Discuss, and Approve the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Indicators 1-11 (Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)) Due to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) February 1, 2023; ICC APR for Submission to Governor's Office (For Possible Action):

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell stated at this point in time, we will be moving into reviewing our State Performance Plan SPP, Annual Performance Report, APR. Going forward, we will simply call this the APR and we will also be covering the State Systemic Improvement Plan or SSIP for short, which really is indicator 11 as we go through this report.

I'm reading an executive summary for you at this time. In the interest of time, we'll be covering the results from indicators one (1) through 11 for you. As you may know, these indicators are required to be reported on by all States and territories receiving Part C funds.

Indicator one (1) is the number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received EI services or early intervention services in a timely manner. And for Nevada, during this past federal fiscal year, that result was 92.03%. We did not meet the target and slippage occurred.

For Indicator two (2), this is surrounding the percent of infant and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. This met the target and no slippage occurred.

For Indicator three (3), this is the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved positive social emotional skills, including social relationships.

This is the percent of families participating in Part C, who report that early intervention services have helped their family to a know their rights, (B) effectively communicate their children's needs, and (C) help their children develop and learn.

The results were:

A 97.49% did not meet target but no slippage occurred.

B 93.87% did not be target but no slippage occurred

C 96.37% met Target but no slippage.

Indicator five (5) is regarding the percent of infants and toddlers ages birth to one with IFSPs or Individualized Family Service Plans.

The result was 1.3% and we met the target for this, with no slippage occurring.

Indicator six (6) is regarding percent of infants and toddlers ages birth to three (3) years with an active IFSP
The result was 3.05%. Nevada met the target and no slippage occurred.

Indicator seven (7) is regarding the percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSP's for whom and initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. This did not meet the target and slippage occurred.

This data is in process of being updated.

Consistent with any opt out policy adopted by the state, the State Educational Agency (SEA) and the Local Educational Agency (LEA), where the toddler resides, at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services and conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine (9) months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

The results were for Indicator 8a 96.77%. This did not meet the target, and slippage occurred.

For indicator 8b, this is in the process of being updated.

Melissa Slayden stated sorry to interrupt for 8b. Last year it was at 72%. We had been at 100%, meeting our target every year but in our last fiscal reporting FY20, that dropped to 72%. This year we will not make 100%, which is always our target on indicator 8b. And I think that we're sitting between a 97 and a 98%, but that means that we still missed kids, so we did not meet target, but there will not be slippage. Thank you.

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell thanked Melissa for this information and resumed her presentation of the indicators.

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell stated as this data is in the process of being verified and updated, it appears that the result is approximately 97 to 98%. This does not meet the target, but no slippage will have occurred.

Indicator 8c the result was 90.7%. This did not meet the target and slippage occurred.

For indicators nine (9) and ten (10) as it has occurred in the past years for our APR, we have "not applicable" marked here for Indicator nine (9), resolution sessions, and Indicator ten (10), mediation. And that is because OSEP would like us to report on these indicators if we have ten (10) or more complaints that need resolution or instances needing mediation, and Nevada did not have those numbers. We did have approximately two (2) complaints during that fiscal year which were resolved.

And finally, we have Indicator 11 which is surrounding our State Systemic Improvement Plan, as I had mentioned earlier and that is our SSIP. It is required of all states to have this Systemic Improvement Plan. Ours began in 2013/ 2014 federal fiscal years. We have completed all stages of the first step, and we have started into this second round. Continuing with our State Identified Measurable Result, which is our SIMR. The SIMR statement that we have remains as, infants and toddlers exiting early intervention services will demonstrate a significant increased rate of growth in positive social emotional skills, including social relationships. And with the result being 68.96%, we met the target with no slippage.

As you continue to read on, you'll see additional information related to our data collection and reporting as well as the supports and systems that we have in place as we continue to provide general supervision to the early intervention services system in Nevada as the lead agency. And so that is a summary there for you within the executive summary. Lori Ann invited questions on the summary as presented.

Melissa Slayden stated when we look at our indicators each year, typically we break them up between our liaisons so that they are leads for each of those different pieces of data that come from different kinds of sources. For indicator one (1), that's a monitoring data piece and there's a very small, limited number of records that we can look at that include the information that's pertinent to indicator one (1). In indicators five (5) and six (6), that's the number of children that we have in the system. So, every fall I reach out to the demographer and gain a series of spreadsheets that shows the age range for each county in our state and the overall population of our state with projections. I have used these for the last few years. You know that Mary

Knight and Shari Fyfe used those before and Nevada went through such tremendous growth during the COVID-19 pandemic, that infectious disease period we recently survived or hopefully made it through. Well, OSEP didn't use our demographers population estimates, so the national outlook for population in Nevada, the numbers that they used do not reflect the population growth that we had. We were anticipating with these two (2) indicators; Child Find Indicators five (5) and six (6), that we would not have met the target and we would have had slippage. And really, we're talking estimates, it's one (1) demographer estimate that works nationally versus the Nevada demographer who works locally. When you look at populations, it's always going to be some sort of estimate. No one's out there actually head counting all the time.

The denominators were reduced by like 10,000 and 15,000. We were able to meet the 1.3% to meet our target with our original numbers, but from our state demographer we did not meet that target. We didn't meet either of these. We did bring this to OSEP earlier this month to explain to them that we thought that their numbers were wrong, and they said that we could choose to ignore it, or we could explain the way it reflects in our data. We chose that we don't get to change the numbers on five (5) and six (6). These are entered in different data reports throughout the year. These were prefilled for us. We cannot manipulate them, but we can explain how they don't match what we thought they were going to look like, which was much worse and not much worse. But there was slippage. I think that we graciously accepted the numbers from OSEP and told them that our numbers looked different, but I think that this will give us support in the next few years. I think we're going to see that national outlook for population in Nevada is going to catch up with where we actually are, and I don't want it to hurt us later. Let's keep up with the Child Find activities and find those kids that need services. For now, we've met targets and we have no slippage for this reporting year.

MOTION: For the APR moving forward for submittal to OSEP on or by February 1, 2023, with the certification by our interim Co-chair, Catherine Nielsen.

By Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May

SECOND: Dawn Brooks

VOTE: PASS

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell stated, thank you to everyone and thank you to the Part C office for all your hard work as well as to the entire Early Intervention System of programs, providers, families, and stakeholders who worked very hard to ensure that we have all the elements needed for this year's Annual Performance Report.

Mary Garrison added thanks to the Council members as well and let Catherine know that the Part C office would be in touch to talk a little bit more about what is needed for certification. Mary went on to clarify that this is not the final draft that gets submitted on February 1st. The next steps are after states and territories submit their Annual Performance Reports, OSEP will review those and sometimes they will make corrections or comments that we must acknowledge. And then we go through what is called a clarification period and that is held during April. At that time, we will make our edits according to OSEP and then we will submit the final report and that is the report that is sent to the Governor's office and approved here within the Director's office.

Melissa Slayden answered a question regarding when the report would be available. Melissa stated we did have to take about an hour to an hour and a half on Friday afternoon last week to be able to remediate the version that you're seeing after our submission on Wednesday. Then we also need to take the time to remediate that document before we can make it publicly available because we do want to make sure that all our documents are accessible by folks. Lori Ann Malina-Lovell added that as those are updated, we will provide those onto our website under the public publications page. Mary Garrison further added for the record,

I also will distribute that to our ICC members via e-mail so that they have it in easily accessible form that is remediated.

IX. IDEA Part C Information and Reports (Information Only):

- a. **Introduction of Lauren Roscoe and Pam Silva, New Part C Liaisons**
- b. **Complaint Log**

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell introduced the two (2) new Part C staff. We have Lauren Roscoe who is our new DS IV. I believe she may be out this morning. She needed to take some leave today. We'll have to take a moment during the next meeting to say hello to Lauren when she's able to join us, but we do have with us Doctor Pamela Silva who is our new Developmental Specialist IV, and she is there in our Northern region with our Carson City office.

Pam Silva stated good morning. I come from a long background in developmental services with NEIS, I worked there for 15 years and joined the Part C office three (3) weeks ago. I'm very happy to be here and meet everyone and looking forward to working with all of you.

Complaints:

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell stated regarding our complaint log, we want to share with you as we do at every quarterly meeting when there are any new complaints in the system. And I wanted to let you know that we did receive an employee complaint from Capability Health and Human services, and we did discuss at the last meeting in October and that was regarding Telehealth services were being utilized for most families and families were allegedly not being given a choice between telehealth and in person services, and so they weren't receiving their procedural safeguards and so that investigation has been completed, and the complaint report is in final draft awaiting Deputy Attorney General or DAG approval and prepared to go out to the program.

Then we had another complaint that came in from a family from NEIS Elko, which is in the northeastern part of our state. This was regarding physical therapy services that were previously being received in person, but then had to be moved to telehealth based on availability of physical therapists there in the Northeastern region. And so that complaint investigation is still underway, and we should have an update for you regarding that during our next April meeting.

X. Schedule Future 2023 Meetings (For Possible Action):

Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May stated I just wanted to go back to the conversation we had at the last meeting relative to some possible training with the Legislative Council Bureau during the session as part of the April meeting and scheduling that I didn't know if that was part of this conversation as well. I just didn't want to lose that.

Discussion was held to incorporate the Legislative training into the April meeting.

Sarah Horsman-Ploeger stated for the record, I agree with the Assemblywoman Brown-May. Many of you know Patrick from Legislative Council Bureau just gave a training to ADSD leadership, and it was extremely helpful and beneficial. If we could do it earlier and I think the virtual option would allow more accessibility for parents and families.

Catherine Nielsen stated Thank you, Assemblywoman Brown-May for bringing up Legislative Day on the 8th. We also have a training on the 7th on how to interact with the legislature and we're bringing in all that

information. It's all parents, family members, etc. I'm wondering if there's not a way that I can share some of that with you guys. We already have the day put together.

MOTION: To have the quarterly ICC meeting on April 5th with legislative training.

By Catherine Nielsen

SECOND: Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May

VOTE: PASS

XI. Public Comment *(No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action will be taken.)*

Sarah Horsman-Ploeger requested to make a comment. Sarah stated just to throw it out to stakeholders and anybody else, we have a long-standing difficulty with finding providers willing to travel to our rural and frontier areas as some of those require like hours on the road. We are constantly recruiting for all positions in our rural regions if anybody knows any providers.

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell thanked Sarah for her comment and stated we can't underscore enough how critical the shortage is in early intervention and how that's really occurring across the nation for this industry and for our field at large. We continue to make steps strategically as a system as we collaborate with our programs and with our stakeholders to perform recruitment and retention activities. As you know, we continue to work toward our Professional Development Center, our PD Center, which did receive funding back in October when we last met. And we look forward to having more updates for you in April, which is when we should be launching our first course for that PD retention initiative.

Catherine Nielsen stated I just want to follow up to the comment that Assemblywoman Brown-May made about legislative day. The registration for that is still open, and you can find that through our Nevada ddcouncil.org website. Again, it's a really great event for family members or people with disabilities, even professionals in the disability community are welcome to come and join us for that day. We're meeting with our representatives and learning how to be a part of the legislative process. So, there's a training on the 7th that's available for anybody and the actual day at the legislative grounds on the 8th, and it is free for anyone that would like to attend. So that's my only comment.

Rhonda Lawrence reported that due to a HRSA grant there has been an increase in the number of assessments that are done and on the timeliness of assessments and getting to adequate resources and services. The reunification rate within the safe Baby support team is much higher than it is for other for children who are just in regular child welfare and this grant is going to establish a statewide office of leadership that I'm the project director of. We're looking for a statewide community coordinator and we're going to ICC tomorrow, just to have the funds reviewed and approved but we're really looking forward to this huge effort. The Carson team had been working with zero to three (3) on establishing a Safe Babies Court team in Carson and so that's going to be hopefully getting off the ground in February. And then we're looking at establishing a new Safe Babies Court team in Clark County. I will have more to report on this. This is an amazing opportunity to implement an evidence-based program that really can lift children and their families who find themselves within child welfare.

XII. Adjournment

Lori Ann Malina-Lovell called the meeting adjourned at 12:17 PM.

