



## DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES DIVISION  
*Helping people. It's who we are and what we do.*



### Nevada Early Intervention Interagency Coordinating Council Family Support Resource Subcommittee Meeting Agenda

Thursday, November 20, 2025

**This meeting was held virtually via Microsoft Teams**

**1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Announcements:** *Janice Lee, Family Support Resource Subcommittee Chair*

Janice Lee welcomed all on the call and did roll call while opening with an ice breaker question for everyone present on the call. A quorum of members was present, and the meeting called to order at 4:02 p.m.

**Members Present:** Laurie Henderson, Amy Hendrickson, Robin Kincaid, Janice Lee, Anita Kelly, Cate Guzy

**Public Attendees:** None

**Support Staff:** Melissa L. Slayde; Part C Office, Pamela Silva; Part C Office, Mary Garrison; Part C Office,

**2. Public Comment:**

No public comment was made.

**3. For Review, Discussion, and Possible Action:** Discussion, review and possible vote to approve minutes from the meeting held on October 22, 2025 — *Janice Lee, Family Support Resource Subcommittee Chair*

Janice Lee entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the October meeting.

MOTION: Anita Kelly motioned to approve the October meeting minutes with the suggested edits.

SECOND: Amy Hendrickson

VOTE: Passed unanimously

**4. For Review, Discussion, and Possible Action:** Presentation of nationally utilized family survey tool and discussion, review and possible vote to approve State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2025 Family Survey draft report, SFY 2026 Family Survey tool, materials, and timeline — *Melissa Slayden, IDEA Part C Office*

Melissa L. Slayden along with Pamela Silva and Mary Garrison, presented information to the subcommittee of nationally utilized family survey tools and discussion, review and possible vote to approve State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2025 Family Survey draft report, SFY 2026 Family Survey tool, materials, and timeline from minute [00:16:16] to [01:09:15] of the recording, the discussion and information focused on:

**a. For Information and Discussion:** Presentation of nationally utilized family survey tool

- The Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) use this product in our state to help produce the survey that we have and use.
- On the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) website you can see the original, revised, state-developed, and NCSEAM surveys.

- The state of Nevada is one of a dozen other states that has developed their own tool, our state developed our tool through a series of work groups.
- Need to consider our family centeredness when we look at the language that we use in the survey as well as what root information we are trying to get.
- If we change the collection tool that will be used as part of the Annual Performance Report (APR) that will be turned in before the end of January or for the federal submission, we are required to upload that tool. Anytime that the content of the collection is changed, we are required to as the Part C Office to submit that with our APR data for Indicator four (4).

**b. For Possible Action:** Discussion, review, and possible vote to approve SFY 2025 Family Survey draft report prior to submission to Legislature and the Governor's Office.

- The Family Survey Report draft is currently 18 pages.
- Main reason for this report is because we are required to report to OSEP, but there are also other people who can utilize this information. Specifically answer the three questions that OSEP requires of "do parents know their rights under IDEA?", "are they able to effectively communicate their child's needs?", and "can they help their child develop and learn?"
- In addition to those three questions that are required, we have supporting questions that help us understand what the answers to those mean.
- There are three (3) state agencies and seven (7) community providers that are currently providing services for children with developmental delays and needing Early Intervention which are broken down by the three regions.
- Historically the instrument itself has been worked on since 2006, it's gone through various revisions. The last revision was in 2017, it went from twenty (20) questions to seventeen (17) questions.
- Survey has always been in English and Spanish, last year we added nineteen (19) additional languages.
- Mailed out two thousand one hundred and twenty-eight (2,128) surveys, fifty-three addresses were invalid and thus were not included in the count because they did not receive a survey. Of those one hundred and sixty-two (162) came back completed, one hundred and sixteen (116) by mail, and forty-six (46) on SurveyMonkey.
- White and Asian categories were representative, the rest were not.
- Had pretty good results for the three (3) questions we report on, question one (1) had 95.65% but did not meet our target of 98.75% but did increase from last year, questions two (2) had 94.96% which did not meet our target of 97.75% but was up 5.14% over last year, and the last question had 98.77% which exceeded the state target of 95.75%.

Robin Kincaid stated she saw the comment with Fallon and then question marks and ask if we know what that individual was trying to convey.

Pamela Silva responded stating she wonders if they means do we serve Fallon, she is not sure and unless the family gives us information to contact them back which she does not believe that was the case for this comment, they are unable to know who they are to contact them.

Amy Hendrickson commented stating that the Carson Nevada Early Intervention Services (NEIS) office, covers Fallon so she doesn't know if that's where the confusion may be coming from because we don't have an office in Fallon that provides services.

Robin Kincaid responded stating she understood that part she just wonders why that would be written like that and found it odd.

Melissa L. Slayden stated the Part C Office does sit and try to decipher and this one really was just that single word. Could possibly send an image of it to the NEIS office but it was probably just difficult trying to decipher this handwritten comment.

- Parts of the narratives from this report will go into the APR that the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) will be approving in January.

Janice Lee asked for clarification of what is looking to be approved to come up with a timeline as to when to approve the report.

Melissa L. Slayden clarified that we are looking to get approval for this report to send to the legislative body and the governor's office.

**c. For Possible Action:** Discussion, review, and possible vote to approve SFY 2026 Family Survey tool, materials, and timeline.

- Anyone who received the family survey, typically received a cover letter. Last year we changed our cover letter to give a little bit more information regarding why we're sending the survey, what information we're needing to know, how families can help by completing the survey, and a QR code to the electronic version so families have two options.
- Would like to see the survey evolve for 2026 with this subcommittee involved.
- Brief review of each section on the cover letter.

Laurie Henderson pointed out missing word in results section.

Mary Garrison thanked Laurie for catching the error and stated she would make sure to get that updated along with updating the QR code to reflect the correct one for this year.

Robin Kincaid asked if there was any trend data related to the numbers for question eleven (11) regarding children receiving all services on their IFSP that could easily be looked at.

Melissa L. Slayden responded stating that data does exist, but she has only looked at the three (3) primary questions for indicator four (4) and the first two for indicator eleven (11) but can easily build that historical data to show at the next meeting. She then asked for any comments or extra things the subcommittee would like to see included on the family cover sheet, as any alterations must be submitted by the seventeenth of December.

Robin Kincaid stated she would like to see the cover sheet be simplified as she feels there are too many words.

Mary Garrison stated the word count can be brought down and will work on that.

- There are three (3) sections of Likert scale questions that we include on the Nevada survey
- Shared OSEP's response to the APR data that was turned in last year.
- The Federal Fiscal year 24 data is due in calendar year 2026.
- Shared the demographic data that is reported.
- Shared which indicator data each question corresponds to.

- Expectation is that by February seventeenth (17) all surveys will be mailed. Surveys will close March thirty-first (31).
- Between February and April, we will do data entry and analysis, and then within July and August, we will have the final draft reporting.

**5. For Review, Discussion, and Possible Action:** Discussion, review, and possible vote to approve State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicator 4: Family Outcomes Data review and Federal Fiscal Year 2025 Target setting — *Melissa Slayden, IDEA Part C Office*

Melissa L. Slayden presented information to the subcommittee for discussion, review, and possible vote to approve State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Indicator four (4): Family Outcomes Data review and Federal Fiscal Year 2025 Target setting from minute [01:09:23] to [01:16:26] of the recording, the discussion and information focused on:

**a. Presentation and review of historical APR data and targets**

- If someone marks undecided, that is a decision. If someone marks prefer not to answer, that's not an answer and does not go into the denominator.
- The orange line in the C4A data which is the knowing their rights questions is the responses received data, the blue line which is of concern to us as it continues to grow is our target. Would be in our best interest to look at capping that target for knowing their rights as it is getting toward 100% compliance.
- Baseline for C4B in 2006 was 91.32% and it is for effectively communicating the needs of their children, is the one that came up over 5% and the target continues to grow which is a good goal but should also be capped.
- Baseline for C4C in 2006 was 91.00% for Part C helped my child develop and learn. Did have a nice growth up from federal year 2023 to federal year 2024, this target seems appropriate but should be looked at along with the other targets as well.

Robin Kincaid stated the target setting needs to be a full discussion as there is a lot that goes into target setting. She then asked if there was a recommended timeline of how frequently to be revisiting or revising targets by OSEP or anyone else.

Melissa L. Slayden stated she agrees it should be a longer discussion but needed to make sure the subcommittee received as much information as possible. She then stated that she believes it was a bout three (3) years ago that they told them that if they hadn't risen above baseline that they had to do that and will likely have to reset all the targets over 2026.

Mary Garrison shared responses to Laurie Henderson's questions via the chat stating that they have talked a lot about incentivizing families to complete the survey and they have some very big restrictions in their ability to purchase things like gift cards and stuff with the federal grant, they must go through the Finance Committee to get approval for things like that.

**b. For Possible Action:** Discussion, review, and possible vote to approve Federal Fiscal Year 2025 Targets for Indicator 4

Discussion for this will be moved toward the next meeting when scheduled.

- 6. For Discussion and Possible Action:** Discussion and possible vote for selection of meeting dates for 2026 and agenda items — Janice Lee, *Family Support Resource Subcommittee Chair*

Due to running out of time, this item was not discussed with the subcommittee, but Janice Lee did state she will work with the Part C Office to put out some ideas for the next meeting because the subcommittee does not have that scheduled which may probably be looking into early January at the earliest.

- 7. Public Comment:**

No public comment was made.

- 8. Adjournment** — Janice Lee, *Family Support Resource Subcommittee Chair*

Janice Lee thanked everyone for attending the meeting and thanked those who were able to stay passed the scheduled time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.