

DRAFT
Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC)
Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2022
July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2022

*Prepared by the Nevada Department of Education
for Submission to the Nevada State Board of Education*

INTRODUCTION

The Nevada Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) has played an active role in the state's continuous improvement and focused monitoring efforts. In order to help the state with these ongoing efforts to increase results for children and youth with disabilities, carryout the activities in the State Performance Plan (SPP), and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) this important stakeholder Committee serves as:

1. An advisory group to the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and the State Board of Education (SBE) relative to decisions that may affect special education.
2. A vehicle for disseminating information about federal and State regulations to the constituencies represented by the Committee.
3. An entity to provide support for policies and procedures that are initiated and/or implemented by the NDE and the SBE.

In order to serve these functions, the SEAC operates within the duties that are delineated at 34 CFR §300.169 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA):

The advisory panel must--

- (i) Advise the State educational agency of unmet needs within the State in the education of children with disabilities;*
- (ii) Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities;*
- (iii) Advise the State educational agency in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618;*
- (iv) Advise the State educational agency in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in Federal monitoring reports under Part B of the act; and;*
- (v) Advise the State educational agency in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.*

The SEAC is comprised of a broad representation of individuals with knowledge and expertise in meeting the needs of children and youth with disabilities. The SBE makes appointments to the Committee, with each member serving a three-year term. At their first meeting of the 2021-2022 fiscal year, the SEAC elected MaryAnn Demchak to serve as Chair for this term, and Mathew Montgomery to serve as Vice-chair. Additional members for this fiscal year and the roles they represent are listed on the next page.

REGULAR MEMBERS

<i>Anna Marie Binder</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Ivy Burns</i>	<i>Special Education Administrators - South</i>
<i>Diana Cannon</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Marva Cleven</i>	<i>Special Education Administrators – Rural</i>
<i>MaryAnn Demchak</i>	<i>Universities - North</i>
<i>Jessica Dunn</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Penni Echols</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Leah Edge</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Candace Emerson</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Connor Fogal</i>	<i>Individuals with Disabilities</i>
<i>Danielle Fredenburg</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Shirley Gaw</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Roy Harvey</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Lisa Hunt</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Sara Jorgensen</i>	<i>Charter Schools</i>
<i>Kati Layosa</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Ellen Marquez</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Travis Mills</i>	<i>Individuals with Disabilities</i>
<i>Mathew Montgomery</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Joseph Morgan</i>	<i>Universities - South</i>
<i>Melina Proffitt</i>	<i>Special Education Teachers- South</i>
<i>Jodee Prudente</i>	<i>Special Education Teachers - North</i>
<i>Lisa Rosas</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Jackie Sheppard</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Karen Taycher</i>	<i>OSEP Funded State Parent Training Center</i>
<i>Aliceandrea Untalan</i>	<i>Parents of Children with Disabilities</i>
<i>Jennifer Van Tress</i>	<i>Special Education Administrators- North</i>

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION STAFF TO THE SEAC

<i>Julie Bowers</i>	<i>Director, Office of Inclusive Education</i>
<i>Jessica Boles</i>	<i>Secretary to the Advisory Committee</i>

2021-2022 MEETINGS

During the 2021-2022 fiscal year, the SEAC met on September 22, 2021 (meeting #1); December 8, 2021 (meeting #2); and February 16, 2022 (meeting #3). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meetings were conducted via Zoom.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In keeping with their prescribed duties, the SEAC discussed many issues and generated a number of actions during the 2021-2022 fiscal year. Following is a summary of the activities of the Committee relative to each of these federally conferred duties:

1. ADVISE THE STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY OF UNMET NEEDS WITHIN THE STATE IN THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Activity

A. Special Education Advisory Committee (SEAC) (Meeting #1)

- NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS – OVERVIEW OF ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION ADVISORY MEMBERS

The Interim Director of the Office of Inclusive Education from the Nevada Department of Education provided information about the roles and responsibilities of the SEAC members. Discussion ensued:

- SEAC consists of members appointed by the Governor or any other official authorized under State law to make appointments.
- Majority of the members must be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities.
- Members must serve 3 years.
- Members are Representatives:
 - Parents of Children with disabilities ages birth through 26
 - Individuals with Disabilities
 - Teachers
 - Representatives of institutions of higher education
 - Administrators of programs from children with disabilities
 - State Representatives from Child Welfare responsible for foster care
 - Parent Training Information Center
 - Office of Protection & Advocacy
 - Representatives of other State agencies
 - Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
 - At least one representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provisions of transition services to children with disabilities
 - Representatives from the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
 - State and local officials that represent homeless children
- Purpose of SEAC- an advisory committee that provides guidance on policies, procedures, regulations. For Special education and related services for children and youth with disabilities. Ages 3-21.
- Advocacy is to: take sides, support a position, plead a case or a cause, sometimes argue.
- To advise is to: give advice, inform, recommend, suggest, and guide.
- SEAC Function:
 - 1. Advise the SEA of unmet needs within the State in the education of

children with disabilities

- 2. Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the State regarding the education of children with disabilities. Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) Special Education & Teacher Licensure.
- 3. Advise the State in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under Section 618 of the Act.
 - State Performance Plan (SPP)
 - Annual Performance Report (APR)
 - SEAC members need to:
 - Understand the relationship between APR & SPP
 - Provide guidance to the State in developing measurable and rigorous targets for indicators
 - Participate in discussions on SPP, SSIP, and APR at least annually
 - Use the SPP/APR data to help understand needs and work with the partners to improve outcomes
 - Know what Levels of Determination are about
 - Made for each State by OSEP. Made for each district by the State.
- 4. Advise the State in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of the Act.
- 5. Advise the State in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities.
- 6. The SEA, after deleting personally identifiable information must provide the SEAC with the Due Process Hearing decisions and make decisions available to the public.
- Meeting Process:
 - One chair and one vice chair-
 - Elected annually from the membership
 - Chair runs meeting in collaboration with NDE
 - Agenda developed by NDE and Chair
 - Follow Robert's Rule of Order
 - Conduct of meetings (motions, turn-taking, etc.)
 - Adhere to Open Meeting Law
 - Agenda posted, visitors welcome
 - Standing agenda items for committee and visitor input

B. Due Process, Complaint and Mediation Report (Meeting #1)

Report of data regarding state complaints filed in the 2020-2021 school year including information of due process, complains, and mediations. Possible action may include advisement to the NDE. Discussion ensued:

- Due Process/ Complaint/Mediation Report- reporting period of July 1, 2019- June 30, 2020.
- Summary of Due Process Activity:
- Total numbers of Students enrolled in Nevada Schools- 496,938
- October 1, 2019, Special Education Child Count- 63,828

- Requests for Due Process Received- 97
- Hearings Conducted- 3
- Reviews- 2
- Summary of Complaint/Mediation Activity:
- Complaint requests received- 8
- Mediation requests received - 6
- Facilitation requests received - 9
- Trends to date for Reporting Period FY20:
 - State Complaints:
 - IEP Implementation
 - Manifestation Determination
 - Placement
 - Due Process:
 - Identification
 - Eligibility
 - Placement
 - Manifestation Determination
 - Mediation:
 - IEP Implementation
 - Parent Participation
- Due Process/ Complaint/Mediation Report- reporting period of July 1, 2020- June 30, 2021 (Reporting Period FY22- July 1, 2021-September 16, 2021)
- Summary of Due Process Activity:
- Total numbers of Students enrolled in Nevada Schools- 481,345
- October 1, 2020, Special Education Child Count- 62,000
- Requests for Due Process Received- 63
- Hearings Conducted- 3
- Reviews- 1
- Reporting Period FY22- 11 requests for due process received
- Summary of Complaint/Mediation Activity FY21:
- Complaint requests received- 10
- Mediation requests received - 13
- Facilitation requests received – 8
- Summary of Complaint/Mediation Activity FY22:
- Complaint requests received- 0
- Mediation requests received - 3
- Facilitation requests received - 1
- Trends to date for Reporting Period FY21
 - State Complaints:
 - IEP Implementation
 - Placement
 - Eligibility
 - Due Process:
 - IEP Implementation
 - Placement

- Evaluation
 - Mediation:
 - IEP Implementation
 - Parent Participation
- Historical Data for the last 10 years to see the variation of the numbers for each resolution process.
- Link takes you to the state webpage that has the findings from the last 5 years.

C. Initiatives and Programs

Office of Inclusive Education Staff Changes (Meeting #1)

- Julie Bowers- Interim Director
- Jennifer Kane- EPP: Secondary Transition
- Andrew Morgan- EPP: Monitoring, Parent Engagement, GATE
- Katherine Fusilier- EPP: Part B Data Manager
- Austin Olson- EPP: Behavior, AB56
- Cathleen (Cat) Rexing- EPP: Early Childhood, 619 Data Coordinator
- Fredina Romero- EPP: Indian Education
- Jessica Boles- Administrative Support: Professional Development
- Connie Torres- Administrative Support: Dispute Resolution
- New EPP selected- Low Incidence Disabilities, Project Achieve
- Vacant- Fiscal Support

- 2021 National Teacher of the year Juliana Urtubey- Representing Nevada, Clark County School District, and Special Education.

Nevada Department of Education Monitoring (Meeting #1)

- State of Nevada Monitoring our School Districts
- During the pandemic, monitoring process wasn't halted, wanted to keep it moving forward.
- School districts provided digital records
- Information is reported in the district annual reports
- School Year 2020-2021- Virtual
 - Clark County School District
 - Lyon County School District
 - Pershing County School District
 - State Public Charter School Authority
 - Storey County School District
- School Year 2021-2022- In Person
 - Churchill County School District
 - Lander County School District
 - Lincoln County School District

Office of Inclusive Education Monitoring (Meeting #1)

- Office Special Education Programs (OSEP) Monitoring
- Started the process pre-pandemic, put on hold, and now starting to pick it back up.
- DMS 2.0 Roadmap 2021-2022
- October 2021- onsite/virtual visit scheduled for Cohort 1 States
- Phase 1 : Pre-Site : Document Request
- Phase 2: Visit: Onsite/Virtual State Engagement
- October 2022- onsite/virtual visit scheduled for Cohort 2 States. Issue letter for June onsite/virtual visits.
- Areas of Review:
- Subrecipient Monitoring- Done
- Integrated Monitoring
- Sustaining Compliance and Improvement
- Data and SPP/APR
- Dispute Resolution
- Technical Assistance and Professional Development
- Don't have protocols yet for the onsite monitoring
- No specific trigger for monitoring. It is OSEPs on monitoring cycle
- There is a report provided of the findings after the monitoring

COVID Guidance (Meeting #1)

- No interruptions or changes.
- Guidance from OSEP regarding the fact that nothing under IDEA has changed during this time.
- Still continue to meet FAPE and
- Communicated any guidance out to districts
- No interruptions of services
- New Guidance Reaffirms Importance of Full Implementation of IDEA Amidst COVID-19 Pandemic
- ARP/ESSER Funds: On Thursday, March 11, 2021, President Biden signed into law the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act, which will deliver critical aid to States, as the country continues to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic. Nevada received 18 million dollars in Special Education Part B IDEA funds that were allocated to the districts.
- All ARP/ESSER Funds are IDEA Funds
- All requirements for the use of IDEA Funds apply
- Considerations for Spending:
 - Consider sustainability
 - Consider focus on challenges from the pandemic
 - School re-entry
 - Disruption in the education of children with disabilities
 - Mental health services

- Consider focus on issue of equity in Special Education and Early Intervention Services

NDE Projects (Meeting # 3)

The committee received information on projects at the Nevada Department of Education. Discussion ensued:

- SPP/APR report- submitted on February 1, 2022. Submitted to OSEP for review. They can come back and ask for clarification or changes before it is finalized. If there are no questions or changes then it will be finalized and then posted to the NDE website. Found that groups want to continue to meet and be involved in that indicator work.
- ARP/ESSER Funds- The state receives 18 million in Part B money to distribute to districts. 75% have put in applications for those funds, others are still researching what their districts need. Some spending of funds towards additional staffing needs, starting some teacher leader programs for special education, IEP facilitation trainings, tutoring and enhancement programs during the school day or after school, adding after school programs, purchasing of curriculum and enhancements to curriculum especially around social emotional learning, equipment, and devices to support students, training and professional development around inclusive practices and accelerated learning, mental health services to meet the needs of the kids coming back.
- State Personal Development Grant (SPDG)- finishing up the reports on these projects now. Project Achieve in Carson City and our Assess Plan Teach (APT) in Las Vegas. More information to come regarding SPDG at our Spring meeting. Will also be providing more information on OSEP monitoring at the NDE.

SB203 Update (Meeting #3)

The committee received an update on current happenings with SB203. Discussion ensued:

- SB203 signed into law in 2019, following the 80th session of the Nevada State Legislature
- Intended to improve services for the Language development for children who are deaf, hard of hearing blind, and visually impaired
- SB203 Advisory Committee
 - Established the committee, appointed a chair and committee members
 - Met Eight Times
 - Adopted final report, December 7, 2020
- Final report provided to SEAC
 - SEAC approved the document, December 9, 2020, to send to the state board of education

- The State Board adopted the criteria
 - Evaluation of the development of language and literacy skills and recommendations, January 29, 2021.
- In progress:
 - Resource document for parents
 - The criteria for use by school employees and providers pursuant to NRS 388.519 shall be prescribed in regulations, to be adopted by the State Board
 - Distribute a summary and provide training regarding criteria to be provided by NDE
 - To be completed upon adoption of regulations by State Board
 - In collaboration with Disability Services Division of HHS, compile, and post, on NDE website, aggregate and comparative data concerning language and literacy developmental skills of children under the law vs. non-disabled peers

2. COMMENT PUBLICLY ON ANY RULES OR REGULATIONS PROPOSED BY THE STATE REGARDING THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Activity

A. Legislative Update (Meeting #1)

The committee received an update on information of Special Education bills that were brought forward with the Legislative Session. Discussion ensued:

- Eligibility for Adult Education Programs
- Discipline-Related Statutes
- AB-215 Age for Admission to Adult Education Programs
 - Purpose- intended to help students who have attended 4 years of high school, but who are 17 (not yet 18), are credit deficient, and want to earn adult diploma (vs GED)
 - What the law says- Now a student may be admitted to an adult education program if the student has not received a high school diploma and:
 - Is at least 18 years old or eligible for participation in the statewide program for education or incarcerated persons; or
 - Is at least 17 years old and has attended at least 4 years of high school. (New law)
 - Note- The age for admission to adult education programs has been in regulation, not statute. Statute requires change to regulation.
- AB-67
 - Purpose- intended to clarify some inconsistencies in AB-168 from 2019
 - What the law says- nearly every School Board responsibility may now be assigned to a “designee,” except when a school requests School Board approval to permanently expel a student under age 11
 - For suspension, expulsion, permanent expulsion, a designee may review the circumstances and approve the action in accordance with the procedural policy adopted by the School Board
 - For suspension, expulsion, and permanent expulsion of a special education student, a designee may review the circumstances and determine that the action is in compliance with the IDEA
 - Any student (special education or general education) at any age (including under age 11) is subject to mandatory discipline under state law for possession of firearm/dangerous weapon
 - The IDEA continues to protect students with disabilities from removal from school if the removal would result in a change of placement AND the student’s conduct is a manifestation of disability
 - That is why all proposed removals must be reviewed to ensure that the district’s proposed action is in compliance with the IDEA
- Summary of State Law Discipline Rules General Education and Special Education Students

- Age Limits- state law prohibits the suspension or expulsion of general education and special education students who are not at least 11 years old, except as follows:
 - **Exception:** Any students at any wage may be suspended or expelled for possession of a firearm or dangerous weapon
 - **School Board Exception:** In extraordinary circumstances, a school official may request an exception from the School Board to permanently expel a student from school who is 10 years old or younger
- Summary of Special Education Removal Limits
 - Special education students may be suspended for up to 5 days per occurrence of misconduct, expelled, or permanently expelled.
 - Procedural Requirements:
 - Before imposing any suspension, expulsion, or permanent expulsion of a special education student, the School Board or a designee must review the circumstances and ensure compliance with IDEA. The IDEA compliance review requires:
 - Determining if the proposed removal will constitute a change of placement
 - If so, ensuring that a manifestation determination is conducted prior to the removal
 - If the misconduct is NOT a manifestation of the student's disability, then a removal may be proceeded, but services must be provided on the 11th and any subsequent day of disciplinary removal during the school year
- AB-194 Student Discipline
 - Purpose: intended to provide an appeal process for suspensions, expulsions, and permanent expulsions
 - What the law says:
 - School districts must have a policy for appealing suspensions and expulsions
 - The policy must be posted on the district website and each school website
 - If an appeal is filed, a hearing must be scheduled (so far, what that "hearing" entails is up to school districts)
 - NDE will develop regulations (which may affect district options)

B. NAC Update (Meeting #3)

The committee received information on NAC updates. Discussion ensued:

- Process and timelines- NAC revision process began in winter 2013-2014.
- Task force included representatives from NV PEP, school districts, SPCSA, UNR and NDE
- Regulations were finalized by Legislative Commission, effective January 30, 2019.

- Codified July 2022
- Technical Changes
 - Throughout the NAC, since 1988, the phrase “special services and programs of instruction” was used in many sections. This phrase has been replaced with “special education and related services” to align with state and federal law. This change alone resulted in 21 revised sections in the NAC.
 - NAC revised to add definitions that already existed in the IDEA, were used in the NAC, but were not defined in the NAC
 - e.g., “business day” (NAC 388.0285), “school day” (NAC 388.1025)
 - NAC revised to change “autism” to “autism spectrum disorder” throughout. This change had already been made in NRS, so Statement of Eligibility for Autism Spectrum Disorder and IEP have already been revised to reflect this change.
 - NAC revised to change “mental retardation” to “intellectual disability” throughout. This change had already been made in NRS, so Statement of Eligibility for Intellectual Disabilities and IEP have already been revised to reflect this change.
 - Need to revise other forms (e.g., Statement of Eligibility for Specific Learning Disabilities) to make conforming changes
 - NAC revised to change “serious emotional disturbance” to “emotional disturbance” throughout. IEP already uses the term “emotional disturbance.”
 - Need to revise Statement of Eligibility for Emotional Disturbance and make conforming changes elsewhere
 - NAC revised to ensure that a “due process complaint” is consistently referred to as a “due process complaint”; and a “state complaint” is consistently referred to as a “state complaint.”
- Changes that Incorporate, Reference, or Clarify Federal Law (IDEA)
 - Expedited Hearings: NAC revised to clarify that under certain circumstances a due process hearing “must be expedited” (vs “may” be expedited) (NAC 388.306.1)
 - Accessible Formats: NAC revised to add new sections incorporating the federal requirements under 34 CFR 300.172 to ensure that instructional materials are timely provided in an accessible format (NAC 388.217).
 - Scientifically Based Research: The ESSA nearly eliminated the term “scientifically based research” in favor of “evidence based”; IDEA regulations were amended to conform. NAC revised to eliminate term “scientifically based” (NAC 388.103.2) and to repeal previous definition contained in NAC 388.104.
 - However, NAC has a state regulation about “targeted scientific, research-based intervention” (NAC 388.325). Because this is state law (not federal law), we kept our definition of “scientific, research-based intervention” (NAC 388.103) because the term exists within NAC 388.325.

- Highly Qualified: The ESSA eliminated the requirement for “highly qualified” personnel; IDEA regulations were amended to conform. NAC revised to conform (NAC 388.171).
- Placement Options for Early Childhood: NAC revised to align with OSEP memorandum describing early childhood placements, as well as IDEA regulations regarding least restrictive environments (NAC 388.245.3). Previously, NAC included a list of placements that included a combination of locations and service delivery methods.
- Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA): NAC revised to clarify that informed written consent is required if an FBA is conducted as part of making an eligibility decision, or to determine the nature and extent of the student’s need for services (NAC 388.386). This language aligns with long-standing OSEP interpretation and practice in Nevada.
- Specific Learning Disabilities Observation Requirement: The 2006 IDEA regulations contain a provision that allows the “observation” requirement in SLD evaluations to be accomplished in one of two ways:
 - Use a routine classroom observation that was done before the child was referred for an evaluation, or
 - Have a member of the group conduct an observation after the child has been referred for an evaluation
- When the NAC was revised in 2008, the task force intended to permit either kind of observation. A mistake in the NAC limited the observation to only the classroom observation after the referral. NAC revised to clarify that either option satisfies the observation requirement (NAC 388.420.5(b) and (6)).
- Changes that incorporate/reference/ clarify state law (NRS)
 - Dyslexia: NAC revised to add definition of dyslexia (NAC 388.0415). NAC revised to add state-law dyslexia-related considerations to IEP content (NAC 388.284.2(g)). NAC revised to add state-law dyslexia-related assessment component to the evaluation under the SLD category when applicable (NAC 388.420.5(c)):
 - A norm-referenced assessment of whether the pupil has dyslexia, if the public agency has: (1) confirmed the pupil has indicators for dyslexia, (2) provided scientific- research-based intervention and the early literacy assessment, and (3) determined that the pupil needs additional screening to determine whether the pupil has a specific learning disability
 - Parent Application to Represent Educational Interests: NAC revised to clarify that upon approved application, parent may continue to represent IDEA educational interests of student until the student earns a “standard high school diploma” (NAC 388.197.4(a)). This revision corrected an error in previous regulations that stated the parent may continue to represent IDEA educational interests until the student earns an “adjusted diploma.” Receipt of an adjusted diploma does not terminate a student’s right to FAPE.
 - Placement Determinations: NAC revised to clarify that placement is based on the student’s IEP (NAC 388.245.6), which aligns with other

language in the NAC stating that IEP committee provides for the student's placement in the LRE (NAC 388.245.4). Previous language mirrored federal regulations stating that a placement would be made by a "group of persons..... knowledgeable about the pupil..." In Nevada, placements are made by IEP committees.

- NDE Approval to Exceed Caseload: NAC revised to clarify that the NDE may approve exceeding the maximum "number of cases per teacher" (i.e., caseload, not class size) (NAC 388.150.7). The previous term was "enrollments" which led to confusion and frequent need for NDE to provide clarification that it could approve an increase in caseload, but not class size.
- Hearing Officer Qualifications and Request for Recusal: NAC revised to incorporate state law requirements for hearing officer qualifications (NAC 388.310.16) and method to request recusal of hearing officer (NAC 388.310.18).
- Deaf-Blindness: NAC revised to add section for eligibility of pupil with deaf-blindness (NAC 388.427). Previously, deaf-blindness was established if a student met the criteria for hearing impairment and the criteria for visual impairment.
 - The Statements of Eligibility for Visual Impairment and for Hearing Impairment contained a section at the bottom where the Eligibility Team would conclude the student had "Deaf-Blindness" if the student satisfied the eligibility criteria for both of those separate impairments. There was no separate Statement of Eligibility for Deaf-Blindness.
 - NAC revision recognized that less extensive impairments in hearing and vision than those established in the separate eligibility categories, when combined, create a unique disability.
 - Hearing Impairment component in Deaf-Blindness has been lowered to 26 from 92 decibels, and states "the pupil has an average hearing threshold level, at 500, 1,000 and 2,000 Hz of 26 decibels or more" (in the Hearing Impairment category, the decibel level is 92)
 - Added progressive deterioration as a possible criterion ("or the pupil suffers from a progressive deterioration of the pupil's hearing, the probable result of which will be the condition described above")
 - Visual Impairment criteria adds a similar "progressive deterioration" as a possible criterion
 - Deaf-blindness cannot be combined with intellectual disabilities to create eligibility under multiple impairment category
 - It is important to be able to identify students with deaf blindness, rather than having those students subsumed within the multiple impairment category
- Next Steps
 - 1. Each of the following documents must be reviewed and necessary action take, including posting to NDE website in 508 accessible formats:

- Special Education Rights of Parents and Children (September 2018) (Review and revise, including to reflect applicable NAC changes and applicable NRS changes)
- Statements of Eligibility:
 - Visual Impairment (remove reference to deaf-blindness as combination of visual impairment and hearing impairment; draft was prepared but need to finalize)
 - Hearing Impairment (remove reference to deaf-blindness as combination of visual impairment and hearing impairment; draft was prepared but need to finalize)
 - Deaf-Blindness (create new Statement of Eligibility; draft was prepared but need to finalize)
 - Intellectual Disabilities (remove reference to deaf-blindness as a possible concomitant disability, which when combined with intellectual disabilities can result in multiple impairment; draft was prepared but need to finalize)
 - Specific Learning Disabilities (replace reference to “mental retardation” with “an intellectual disability”; replace reference to “emotional disturbance” with “an emotional disturbance”)
 - Emotional Disturbance (replace title of form to state “EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE”; make conforming changes elsewhere, e.g., SLD)
 - ALL STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY will be reviewed to ensure accuracy and consistency.
- 2. All links to NAC on the NDE website direct users to the current version of the NAC.
- 3. Other proposed NAC revisions are in development.

C. Nevada Eligibility: Visual Impairment (Meeting #3)

The committee received information on Nevada Eligibility: Visual Impairment. Discussion ensued:

- Memo from Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) went out to State Directors of Special Education regarding the Eligibility Determinations for Children Suspected of Having a Visual Impairment Including Blindness under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).
- Three key purposes to the memo:
 - To ensure broad dissemination of the key points made in a previous letter that went out November 12, 2014.
 - Provide the additional guidance requested on the issues.
 - Share information about outside resources that may be helpful in examining what our state current procedures look like that related to the identification and evaluation of children suspected of having a visual impairment including blindness.

- Further, under 34 CFR §300.8(c)(13), “visual impairment including blindness” means an impairment in vision that, even with correction, adversely affects a child’s educational performance. The term includes both partial sight and blindness.
- State and Local Eligibility Criteria:
 - While States are permitted to establish standards for eligibility for special education and related services and are not required to use the precise definition of a disability term in the IDEA, these State-established standards must not narrow the definitions in the IDEA.
 - In contract, in the definition of “visual impairment including blindness,” the regulations do not contain a modifier; therefore, any impairment in vision, regardless of significance or severity, must be included in a state’s definition, provided that such impairment, even with correction, adversely affects a child’s educational performance. States may not use criteria or other definitions for “visual impairment including blindness” that result in the exclusion of children who otherwise meet the definition in 34 CFR §300.8(c)(13).
 - Some States implement a two-step process when addressing whether a child suspected of having a visual impairment may be eligible for special education and related services under the IDEA.
 - First step, the eligibility team is required to reach a decision as to whether the child has one or more of the conditions that the State has identified and believes could affect a child’s vision functioning.
 - Second step, the eligibility team determines the extent that it should proceed further and examine whether the condition adversely affects the child’s educational performance.
 - However, if the eligibility team were to conclude the child’s vision difficulties do not fall within one of the State’s listed criteria or conditions, the eligibility team would not consider whether the child’s visual functioning adversely affects his or her educational performance. Such a practice is inconsistent with the IDEA.
- Based on the guidance set forth in the memo and OSEP’s Letter to Kotler, a State may need to review its criteria and revise those criteria, as appropriate, and make sure that its LEAs are informed of the changes.
- As an example of how a State could revise its criteria, a State could comply with the IDEA requirements by adding a general criterion stating that the definition of “visual impairment including blindness” includes, in addition to other specific State-established criteria, any other impairment in vision that, even with correction, adversely affects a child’s educational performance.
- First draft of the regulation changes for Nevada. NDE is trying to change our current Nevada regulations for visual impairment to match what OSEP has asked us to do. Draft Regs are trying to broaden the criteria, so it isn’t too narrow.
- SEAC third group of stakeholders for consideration. First two groups were SEDA and Nevada Vision Services Team. Robust group for representation for

current expertise in the field. Did a lot of recommendations for what they want to see included in the regs, they would also be the group to create a guidance document and provide training once the regs are changed. Clear guidance to everyone in the system on changes moving forward. Timeline isn't in our control once in Legislative Council Bureau. What really needs to go into the regs, so they do what OSEP tells us what to do. What goes in the training to support what goes into the regs.

- By the old definition, children who may have fallen through the cracks before will no longer fall between the cracks. Impact numbers by widening the definition and not keeping it so narrow

Motion: Joseph Morgan moved to recommend approval of the presented changes to the NAC related to the visual impairment definition. Jodee Prudente seconded the motion. The vote was called, and the motion carried without objection.

3. ADVISE THE STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY IN DEVELOPING EVALUATIONS AND REPORTING ON DATA TO THE SECRETARY UNDER SECTION 618.

Activity

A. SPP/APR Target Setting (Meeting #3)

- OSEP Requirements. What is required:
 - Each indicator will be reviewed to determine whether new baseline data should be set and establish six-year targets.
 - OSEP will set some of the targets (Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13).
 - The method for measuring some indicators WILL NOT change (Indicators 7,9,10,11,12,15,16,17). Any changes to baseline data will have to be justified.
 - The method for measuring some indicators WILL change (Indicators 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,13,14). It is expected that baseline data will be updated when the new targets are set.
- Indicator Target Setting
- Stakeholder Involvement: Parent Involvement- The number of parent members and a description of how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.
- Description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.
- Public Input and Documentation: The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for target setting, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress; and
- The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the Improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.
- Indicator groups
 - Equity
 - #4: Suspension/Expulsion Rates
 - #9: Disproportionate Race/Ethnic Representation
 - #10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Dispute Resolution
 - #15: Resolution Sessions
 - #16: Mediation
 - College and Career Ready
 - #1: Graduation Rates
 - #2: Drop Out Rate
 - #13: Secondary Transition
 - #14: Post School Outcomes

- Strong Start
 - #5: School Age Education Environments
 - #6: Preschool Environments
 - #7: Preschool Outcomes
 - #11: Child Find
 - #12: Early Childhood Transition
- Continuous Growth
 - #3: Assessment
 - #8: Parent Involvement
 - #17: SSIP

B. State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) Update (Meeting #2)

Update of information regarding the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report. Possible action may include advisement to the NDE. Discussion ensued:

- Part B FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR
 - Graduation
 - Drop Out
 - Assessment
 - Suspension/Expulsion
 - Education Environments (School Age)
 - Preschool Environments
 - Preschool Outcomes
 - Parent Involvement
 - Disproportionate Representation
 - Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Child Find
 - Early Childhood Transition
 - Secondary Transition
 - Post-School Outcomes
 - Resolution Sessions
 - Mediation
 - State Systemic Improvement Plan
- Project Timeline: May 2021-January 2022 and beyond
 - Stakeholder Meetings- May-November 2021
 - Feedback Survey- December-January
 - FFY 2020 SPP/APR Submitted- February 1, 2022
 - OSEP Feedback on NV SPP- Spring 2022
 - LEA APR Published- June 2022
 - Revisit, Revise, Renew- Summer-Fall 2022
- Indicator Groups- Summer and Fall 2021: 2-3 Virtual Meetings to discuss and Explore Indicators, Review Data Sets and Set Targets
 - Equity
 - #4: Suspension/Expulsion Rates
 - #9: Disproportionate Representation

- #10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - College and Career Ready
 - #1: Graduation Rate
 - #2: Drop Out Rate
 - #13: Secondary Transition
 - #14: Post School Outcomes
 - Strong Start
 - #6: Preschool Environments
 - #7: Preschool Outcomes
 - #11: Child Find
 - #12: Early Childhood Transition
 - Continuous Growth
 - #3: Assessment
 - #5: School Age Education Environments
 - #8: Parent Involvement
 - #17: SSIP
- Equity-workgroup lead: Austin, support staff: Fredina
- Equity work group indicators: 4A, 4B, 9, 10
- Equity Group Indicators Workgroup Members represent parents, local education agencies, Nevada Department of Education
- Equity Workgroup Indicators
 - Indicator 4A
 - Topic- Suspension/Expulsion Rates: % of LEAs with significant discrepancy
 - Target/Baseline- NV Sets Target: 0%; Baseline Updated
 - Changes- Must report minimum “n” and cell size requirements (NV already does this)
 - Indicator 4B
 - Topic- Suspension/Expulsion Rates: % of LEAs with significant discrepancy by race/ethnicity
 - Target/Baseline- OSE Sets Target: 0%; Baseline Updated
 - Changes- Must report minimum “n” and cell size requirements (NV already does this)
 - Indicator 9
 - Topic- Disproportionate Race/Ethnicity Representation
 - Target/Baseline- OSEP Sets Target: 0%; Baseline not Updated
 - Changes- The method for measuring indicator will not change
 - Indicator 10
 - Topic- Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
 - Target/Baseline: OSEP Sets Target: 0%; Baseline not Updated
 - Changes- The method for measuring indicator will not change
- What is Indicator 4?
 - Indicator 4 requires States to examine rates of suspension and expulsion as they relate to:

- Indicator 4A: The percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs.
 - Indicator 4B: The percentage of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs and policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
- Indicator 9 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indicator 9 compares the enrollment of all students to those students with IEPs by Race/Ethnicity at a school, district, and state level [20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)].
- Indicator 10 is a compliance indicator measuring the percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in 6 disability categories (intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism) that is the result of inappropriate identification [20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)].
- Equity Group Next Steps:
 - Consensus of the group was to keep Indicators 4A and 4B targets at 0%
 - The Equity Group remains an ongoing process
 - Input is being collected from all Indicator Stakeholders
 - Equity Group will reconvene to discuss potential implementation strategies after all Indicator baselines are approved and submitted
- College and Career Ready
- Welcome and Introductions CCR Workgroup members representing parents, local education agencies, state agencies, and state education agency
- Discussion Highlights from June/July Meeting:
- Stakeholder recommendations for Indicator 1:
 - Do NOT set Indicator 1 targets at 100.00% as was previously done
 - Follow OSEP requirements and set targets that are rigorous yet achievable
 - Baseline: Set baseline at FFY2019 72.72%
 - Rationale: Based on historical data, do NOT increase targets by more than 1.0% year to year during COVID-19 impacted years and do NOT increase targets by more than 2.0% year to year after that
 - Improvement strategies: Statewide training for registrars to ensure consistency
 - Progress evaluation plans: Leave the option for a target review/correction open as we move beyond the COVID-19 impact, understand that some data are so affected, we may have to change baseline multiple times in future years when data stabilizes

- Stakeholder Recommended Baseline and Targets for Indicator 1: Graduation
 - Baseline: FFY2019 72.72%
 - Targets TBD: There was a 3-way tie between options A, B, & C on the Indicator 1: SPP/APR Target Setting stakeholder Consensus Survey, so options A, B, & C will be moved forward for additional stakeholder feedback.
- Stakeholder recommendations for Indicator 2:
 - Follow OSEP requirements and set targets that are rigorous yet achievable
 - Baseline: Set baseline at FFY2019 15.85%
 - Rationale: Bases on historical data, dropout rates were increasing with the new measurement, so consider this trend along with COVID-19 impact on FFY2021 and beyond when setting targets
 - Improvement strategies: Statewide training for registrars to ensure consistency
 - Progress Evaluation plans: Leave the option for a target review/correction open as we move beyond the COVID-19 impact
 - Stakeholder Recommended Baseline and Targets for Indicator 2: Drop Out
 - Baseline: FFY2019 15.85%
 - Targets: 15%, 15%, 14%, 13%, 12%, 11%
- Discussion Highlights from August Meeting
- Stakeholder recommendations for indicator 14 Measure A:
 - Follow OSEP requirements and set targets that are rigorous yet achievable
 - Baseline: Set baseline at FFY2018 22.20%
 - Rational: FFY2018 baseline is more reflective of the steady upward 4-year trend and may be more reflective of Measure A in COVID impacted years
 - Improvement strategies: New survey vendor, new data collection system, expanded access to Virtual Job Shadow (ages 14-exit)
 - Progress evaluation plans: Leave the option for a target review/correction open as we move beyond the COVID-19 impact
 - Stakeholder Recommended Baseline and Targets for Indicator 14A: Post School Outcomes Enrolled in Higher Education
 - Baseline: FFY2018 22.20%
 - Targets: 27%, 27%, 30%, 30%, 33%, 33%
- Stakeholder recommendations for indicator 14 Measure B:
 - Follow OSEP requirements and set targets that are rigorous yet achievable
 - Baseline: Set baseline at FFY2018 57.84%
 - Rational: FFY2018 baseline is more reflective of the steady 5-year trend and may be more reflective of Measure B in COVID impacted years.
 - Improvement strategies: Continue/grow Nevada Vocational Rehabilitation provided Pre-employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) and training including hands-on practice of Pre-ETS, new survey vendor,

- new data collection system, expanded access to Virtual Job Shadow (ages 14-exit)
 - Progress evaluation plans: Leave the option for a target review/correction open as we move beyond the COVID-19 impact
 - Stakeholder Recommended Baseline and Targets for Indicator 14B: Post-School Outcomes Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed
 - Baseline: FFY2018 57.84%
 - Targets: 63%, 63%, 66%, 68%, 70%, 72%
- Stakeholder recommendations for indicator 14 Measure C:
 - Follow OSEP requirements and set targets that are rigorous yet achievable
 - Baseline: Set baseline at FFY2018 71.76%
 - Rational: FFY2018 baseline is more reflective of the overall trend and may be more reflective of Measure C in COVID impacted years.
 - Improvement strategies: New survey vendor, new data collection system, expanded access to Virtual Job Shadow (ages 14-exit)
 - Progress evaluation plans: Leave the option for a target review/correction open as we move beyond the COVID-19 impact
 - Stakeholder Recommended Baseline and Targets for Indicator 14C: Post- School Outcomes Enrolled in Higher Education, or Competitively Employed, or in some other Postsecondary Education or Training Program
 - Baseline: FFY2018 71.76%
 - Targets: 74%, 76%, 78%, 78%, 80%, 80%
- Strong Start:
 - #6: Preschool Environments
 - #7: Preschool Outcomes
 - #11: Child Find
 - #12: Early Childhood Transition
- Strong Start Indicator Workgroup Members representing parents, stakeholders, local education agencies, and state education agency
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 6A- Percent of children with IEPs aged 3,4 and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a: A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 39.13%
 - Target: 44.13%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Continue to build teacher ECSE pipeline
 - Professional development to Special Education teachers regarding inclusion
 - Rationale:
 - Rigorous yet achievable
 - 19/20 Baseline because that is most likely the most accurate data as it was collected before COVID-19 pandemic

- Increase steady amount each year
 - Expectation is to serve students with individual needs rather than “place them in a room”
 - We can review targets to adjust if necessary
 - Aligns with OSEP expectations
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 6B- Percent of children with IEPs aged 3,4 and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a: B. Separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 47.03%
 - Target: 42.03%
 - Improve Strategies:
 - Clark County will be increasing opportunity for inclusion and decreasing number of self-contained programs. Not reducing overall opportunities but providing more opportunities
 - Child Find data recommends more children attending inclusion programs
 - Need more preschool general education programs to increase inclusion in more districts
 - Rationale:
 - 19/20 baseline data because that year reflects most accurate data before pandemic
 - Reasonable to give Nevada’s time to recover
 - Rigorous yet achievable, decrease 1% each year
 - Many families have chosen not to enroll their general education children in preschool which lessens the opportunity for inclusion
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 6C- Percent of children with IEPs aged 3,4 and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a: C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline. The final target for Indicator B6C should decrease from the baseline established in FFY2020
 - Baseline: .65%
 - Target: .60%
 - Improvement Strategies
 - IEP teams must understand the terms, this is not homeschooling
 - More training to understand the LRE option
 - Rational
 - Reasonable yet achievable
 - Provide the opportunity for services in the home for a student enrolled in a preschool program
 - Home is an appropriate place for a child who is not yet school age or may be the best environment for a family
 - 0% is not reasonable
 - Consider number of students as opposed to percentage
 - Nevada is significantly lower than the national average

- OSEP expectation is to decrease
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 7A1-A1: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.
 - Only rule: baseline is set at 78.55%, target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: 78.55%
 - Target: 80.3%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Professional Development on Data collection
 - Upgrade data collection systems to ensure accurate data and not allow impossible scores and other validation safeguards
 - Rationale:
 - Larger increase in the end, to give Nevada's time to recover
 - 1.4% every year
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 7A2- A2: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships). The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program
 - Only rule: baseline is set at 57.13%, target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 57.13%
 - Target: 57.23%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Professional Development on Data collection
 - Upgrade Data collection systems to ensure accurate data and not allow impossible scores and other validation safeguards
 - Rationale:
 - Concerns regarding validity of data during pandemic
 - Larger increase in the end, to give Nevada's time to recover
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 7B1- B1: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy). Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.
 - Only rule: baseline is set at 77.06%, target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 77.06%
 - Target: 77.07%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Professional Development on Data collection
 - Upgrade data collection systems to ensure accurate data and not allow impossible scores and other validation safeguards
 - Rationale:

- A steady trajectory to give Nevada more time to meet the goal because historically this target has been decreasing
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 7B2- B2: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy). The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program
 - Only rule: baseline is set at 54.14%, target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 54.14%
 - Target: 56%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Professional Development on Data collection
 - Upgrade Data collection systems to ensure accurate data and not allow impossible scores and other validation safeguards
 - Rationale:
 - Meet targets slowly over time
 - Aggressive yet reasonable
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 7C1-C1: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. OF those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.
 - Only rule: baseline is set at 72.21%, target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 72.21%
 - Target: 74.71%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Professional Development on Data collection
 - Upgrade Data collection systems to ensure accurate data and not allow impossible scores and other validation safeguards
 - Professional Development on understanding outcomes and what this piece measures
 - Rationale:
 - Concerns with validity of data due to methodology of TSG
 - Aggressive target
 - Aim high yet prevent slippage
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 7C2-C2: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.
 - Only rule: baseline is set at 62.82%, target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: 60.32%
 - Target: 62.82%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Professional development on data collection

- Upgrade data collection systems to ensure accurate data and not allow impossible scores and other validation safeguards
 - Professional development on understanding outcomes and what this piece measures.
 - Rationale:
 - Concerns with validity of data due to methodology of TSG
 - Aggressive target
 - Aim high yet prevent slippage
- Continuous Growth
- Workgroup Members Representing, parents, local education agencies, state agencies, and state education agency
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 3A- Participation and Performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4,8, and high school.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: School Year 18-19
 - Target: 95%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - To mitigate slippage, school districts can remove the opt-out provision
 - School districts to communicate to parents “why” participation is important, how the data is utilized
 - Provide Make-Up Windows
 - Rationale:
 - Should the targets for participation in statewide assessment remain aligned with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) at 95 percent in both reading/language arts and mathematics across all reported grade levels
 - Rigorous yet achievable
 - Aligns with OSEP expectations of 95%
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 3B- Statewide Assessment Proficiency (Grade Level Standards): Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards: B. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4,8, and 11.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: School Year 17-18 (15.21%)
 - Target: 33%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - The group did not define specific improvement strategies for increasing proficiency rates across 4,8,11 grades for subject areas of reading and math
 - Rational:
 - Rigorous expectations are appropriate to start, the group would like to review data after the first 2 years then reconvene to adjust the targets as necessary.

- Given the circumstances of the pandemic, the group was optimistic that students will be able to make more significant gains in their first two years, while tapering off beginning in 2023.
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 3B- Statewide Assessment Proficiency (Grade Level Standards): Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards: B. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4,8, and 11
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 3C- Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards (NAA): C. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and 11.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: School Year 17-18 (1.85%)
 - Target: %
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - The group did not define specific improvement strategies for increasing proficiency rates across 4,8,11 grades for subject areas of reading and math
 - Rationale:
 - Baseline because that is most likely the most accurate data as it was collected before Covid-19 pandemic
 - Increase steady amount each year
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 3D- Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards: D. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4,8, and 11.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: 17-18 (22.73%)
 - Target: %
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - The group did not define specific improvement strategies for increasing proficiency rates across 4,8,11 grades for subject areas of reading and math
 - Rationale:
 - Baseline because that is most likely the most accurate data as it was collected before Covid-19 pandemic
 - Increase steady amount each year
 - Suggested Targets Starting Point 5A- Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served: A. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: School Year 18-19 (61.15%)
 - Target: 73%
 - Improvement Strategies-
 - Hold school districts accountable for meeting targets
 - Publish inclusion rate data and make it easily accessible and understandable

- Provide training to IEP team members for understanding and evaluating LRE Reporting and tracking
 - Rationale:
 - Baseline because that is most accurate data as it was collected before COVID-19 pandemic
 - Increase steady amount each year
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 5B- Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served: B. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: School Year 18-19 *15.89%)
 - Target: 10%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Hold school districts accountable for meeting targets
 - Publish inclusion rate data and make it easily accessible and understandable
 - Provide training to IEP team members for understanding and evaluating LRE Reporting and tracking
 - Rationale:
 - Baseline because that is most likely the most accurate data as it was collected before Covid-19 pandemic
 - Decrease steady amount each year
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 5C- Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served: C. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline
 - Baseline: School Year 18-19 (1.46%)
 - Target: 1.4%
 - Improvement Strategies:
 - Hold school districts accountable for meeting targets
 - Publish inclusion rate data and make it easily accessible and understandable
 - Provide training to IEP team members for understanding and evaluating LRE Reporting and tracking
 - Rationale:
 - Baseline because that is most likely the most accurate data as it was collected before Covid-19 pandemic
 - Maintain 1.4% each year
- Suggested Targets Starting Point 8- Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities:
 - Target at the end of the package must show improvement over baseline.
 - Baseline: School Year 18-19 (75.31%)
 - Target: 79%

- Improvement Strategies:
 - Districts can play a larger role in increasing the response rate to the parent survey by helping NDE get the word out.
 - A team can assemble to look at the survey question and overall process to make suggestions for improvement.
 - Nevada PEP would like to play a role in increasing the response rate and making improvements to the survey.
- Rationale:
 - Baseline because that is most likely the most accurate data as it was collected before COVID-19 pandemic
- A survey will come out. It is available in two formats, a fillable form and a google form.
- Your input and discussion are greatly appreciated.

C. ADVISE THE STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY IN DEVELOPING CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS TO ADDRESS FINDINGS IDENTIFIED IN FEDERAL MONITORING REPORTS UNDER PART B OF THE ACT.

There were no activities in this area.

D. ADVISE THE STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY IN DEVELOPING AND IMPLEMENTING POLICIES RELATING TO THE COORDINATION OF SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

Activity

A. Nevada PEP (Meeting #2)

The committee will receive information on Nevada PEP, a nonprofit organization, offering Education Empowerment, and Encouragement to families of children with disabilities. Discussion ensued:

- Website- nvpep.org
- Started in 1991 with a few parents trying to get services for their children and has bloomed from there. A homegrown statewide nonprofit organization, offering Education, Empowerment, and Encouragement of families of children with disabilities.
- Services are about empowering families to be life-long advocates for their children through education and skill building.
- Designated as the state training and information center.
- SAMSHA as the statewide family network for parents with children with mental health care needs.
- Training from funders, staff are well trained on trends and expectations
- NDE and NVPEP are usually at same PD opportunities
- Peer to Peer approach to serving families. Families can share and talk to one another, in a way that is sometimes hard with professionals.
- Support family's birth through 26. Provide information referral, individual assistance. Not representing the family, there to support the family. Training workshops for families and professionals. Offering a variety of training workshops on special education and disability related topics
- Volunteer opportunities, community outreach, systems engagement, and advocacy.
- During the pandemic, pivoted quickly, closed the office, and became virtual. Continued to serve families provide services virtually, through various platforms. Benefit of doing that will continue to meet with more families, especially rural. Rural numbers have doubled since the pandemic.
- In the last fiscal year 22,786 individual contacts with families, 1071 new families for support, support at 573 school related meetings, 288 wrap around and family teen meetings.
- Newest program is #SafeAllies, a collaboration of Nevada PEP and Youth M.O.V.E. Nevada. Reaching children and youth with digital resources and youth designed activities. Offers training workshops on the laws and processes for reporting a bullying incident and navigating the education system.
- Youth M.O.V.E- youth inspired and led organization that encourages and empowers youth to unite to engage with youth serving systems. Help youth

develop self-advocacy skills, create systems change and remove the stigma placed on mental health.

- System of Care Project- Given Nevada funds to transform the system of meeting the mental health needs of children. 51 in the nation and the 4th year running. Changes aren't showing improvement.
- Beginning a project of podcasts and short topic webinars. Would like to know what topics need to be covered in these?
 - IEP Material
 - Parental Rights
 - Transition Services
 - Child Find Process
 - Everything CTE
 - State facilitated IEP process and Mediation
 - Early literacy and literacy
 - Parent and Student self-advocacy
 - Preparing child for transition

B. Nevada Dual Sensory Impairment Project (Meeting #3)

The committee received information on The Nevada Dual Sensory Impairment Project. This presentation will highlight project eligibility and technical assistance services provided to parents, educators, and other service agencies in meeting the educational needs of children who are deafblind. Discussion ensued:

- To enhance the educational services provided to all children and youth, birth through 21 years of age, who have dual sensory impairments by providing technical assistance to families and service providers.
- Who is eligible for each project?
 - Vision and hearing impairments
 - Can also have other disabilities:
 - Intellectual/cognitive disabilities
 - Orthopedic/ physical impairments
 - Other health impairments/ complex health care needs
 - Communication/ speech / language impairments
 - Emotional/ behavioral disorders
 - Most of the time do have other disabilities in addition to impairments in both vision and hearing
 - How severe do vision and hearing impairments need to be?
- Why do families and professionals want to refer to the project?
 - At no cost:
 - Project newsletter & other TA documents (e.g., tips sheets, posters)
 - Email MaryAnn to request materials or to be added to the newsletter list
 - Print or video resources
 - Informal parent-to-parent network
 - Project sponsored trainings

- Parent conference
 - Summer Institute
 - School district, EI agencies, and others
- Home and school visits (upcoming video clips)
- Help in finding resources
- The project follows children into school districts when they age out of early intervention
- What might we focus on during TA visits?
 - There is often a focus on using touch cues to enhance receptive understanding (touch cue for suctioning)
 - There is often a focus on using cues to enhance expressive communication (requesting “more”- continuation)
 - There is often a focus on enhancing expressive communication (choices)
 - Literacy:
 - Choice of book
 - Shared reading
- What happens after TA visits?
 - Summary of TA Visit:
 - Interactions with child regarding strategies and recommendations
 - Written recommendations
 - Follow up regarding implementation of suggestions
 - Possible additional TA visit(s) or resources
- How many children have been served by the project since 1990 (when the project started)?
 - Over 500 children from birth to 22 years old over the last 32 years have been involved
- Where have we been in Nevada?
 - The map below represents where we have been in Nevada-all over the state, except for four counties/school districts.
 - Also, nearly all EI agencies (at some point)
 - We have never had children from the following school districts: Esmeralda, Mineral, Eureka, or Storey Counties.
 - Green represents locations of children currently involved in the project
 - Red represents locations of children who were formerly involved in the project
- Funding from the U.S. Department of Education and Nevada Department of Education