

**Nevada Developmental Delay Age-6 Transition Survey –
Round 2 Findings**

Building Upon Initial Community Input



**Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental
Disabilities**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Background	4
Survey History.....	4
Survey Methodology.....	5
Respondent Demographics	5
Key Findings.....	6
Service Interruptions	6
Family Understanding.....	7
Educator Perspectives	8
Language Access	10
Practices that Worked Well	11
Support for Extending Developmental Delay Beyond Age Six	12
Qualitative Findings.....	13
Theme 1: Loss of Services.....	13
Theme 2: Confusing Eligibility Process	13
Theme 3: Families Were not Prepared	13
Theme 4: Need for Consistency Across Districts.....	13
Theme 5: Support for Extending Beyond Age Six.....	13
Policy Considerations.....	14
Discussion.....	14
Considerations for Future Action	14
Evaluate Nevada's Developmental Delay Eligibility Timeline.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Develop Statewide Transition Guidance	15
Standardize Reevaluation Timelines and Procedures	15
Strengthen Family Communication and Transition Planning	15
Continue Improving Accessible Communication	15
Collect Statewide Transition Data	15
Expand Professional Development.....	16
Conclusion	16
Appendix A	17
Survey Questions	17
Appendix B. Statistical Tables	19
Appendix C. Representative Anonymous Comments by Theme	23
Appendix D: Comparison of Round 1 and Round 2 Findings	25

Executive Summary

The Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities (NGCDD) conducted a second statewide survey to better understand stakeholder experiences with Nevada's requirement that children receiving special education services under the Developmental Delay (DD) eligibility category transition out of that category at age six.

This second survey was conducted following an initial statewide survey in May 2026, which identified recurring concerns regarding service continuity, reevaluation practices, communication with families, and consistency in implementation across Nevada school districts. Round 2 expanded outreach to determine whether those concerns were shared across a broader group of stakeholders.

A total of 255 individuals participated in Round 2, representing educators, administrators, related service providers, family members, self-advocates, and other stakeholders from across Nevada. The survey included both quantitative and qualitative questions designed to examine experiences with the age-six transition process.

Overall, the findings reinforce the concerns identified during Round 1. Respondents frequently described:

- interruptions or delays in services during the reevaluation process;
- inconsistent implementation of eligibility determinations across schools and districts;
- confusion among families regarding eligibility requirements and procedural safeguards;
- concerns that children continue to demonstrate developmental needs despite no longer qualifying under the Developmental Delay category; and
- strong support for examining whether Nevada should extend Developmental Delay eligibility beyond age six.

While some respondents reported positive transition experiences, the overwhelming themes demonstrate a need to review current policies and practices to ensure that children continue receiving appropriate educational supports during this critical developmental period.

The findings presented in this report are intended to inform policymakers, the Nevada State Board of Education, school districts, educators, families, and other stakeholders as discussions continue regarding Nevada's Developmental Delay eligibility policies.

Background

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) permits states to use the Developmental Delay (DD) disability category for young children who demonstrate delays in one or more areas of development. While federal law authorizes states to determine the maximum age for this eligibility category, each state establishes its own policy regarding when students must transition to another disability category.

In Nevada, children receiving special education services under the Developmental Delay category generally transition from that eligibility at age six. At that time, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) team must determine whether the student continues to qualify for special education services under another disability category.

Families, educators, and related service providers have raised concerns that this transition may result in interruptions in services, inconsistent eligibility determinations, confusion regarding the reevaluation process, and unnecessary administrative burden.

To better understand these experiences, the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities initiated a statewide survey effort during 2026. An initial survey (Round 1) collected feedback from 67 stakeholders and identified recurring concerns regarding continuity of services, reevaluation practices, communication with families, and consistency across school districts. These findings prompted the Council to conduct a second, broader survey (Round 2) to determine whether those concerns were reflected across a larger statewide sample.

This report presents the findings from Round 2, which received 255 responses from educators, school administrators, related service providers, families, self-advocates, and other stakeholders. The purpose of this report is to summarize stakeholder experiences, identify common themes, and provide information to support ongoing discussions regarding Nevada's Developmental Delay eligibility policies and transition practices.

Survey History

Figure 1. Number of Responses per Survey:

	Round 1	Round 2
Total Responses	67	255
Families	17	38
Educators/School Professionals	44	215
Self-Advocates	Included	2
Purpose	Initial input	Statewide validation

Survey Methodology

The Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities developed and distributed a statewide survey to gather information regarding stakeholder experiences with Nevada's Developmental Delay age-six transition process.

The survey was disseminated through multiple channels, including school districts, educators, disability organizations, community partners, family networks, and social media platforms to encourage broad statewide participation. Participation was voluntary, and respondents could complete the survey anonymously.

The survey included both closed-ended questions to quantify stakeholder experiences and open-ended questions that allowed participants to describe their experiences in greater detail and provide recommendations for policymakers.

Responses were received from:

- Educators
- School administrators
- Related service providers
- Families
- Self-advocates
- Other community stakeholders

Because the survey was voluntary, findings should be interpreted as stakeholder experiences and perceptions rather than a statistically representative sample of all Nevada families or education professionals. Nevertheless, the large number of responses and consistency of themes across respondent groups provide valuable insight into the implementation of Nevada's current Developmental Delay transition process.

Respondent Demographics

A total of **255 individuals** participated in Round 2 of the Nevada Developmental Delay Age-6 Transition Survey. Respondents represented a diverse group of stakeholders with firsthand knowledge of the age-6 transition process.

As shown in **Figure 2**, the majority of respondents (**84.3%**) identified themselves as educators, administrators, or other school professionals who have worked with students receiving special education services under the Developmental Delay (DD) category. Family members represented **14.9%** of respondents, while **0.8%** identified themselves as self-advocates who had personally received special education services under the Developmental Delay category.

The large proportion of education professionals provides substantial insight into how the transition process is implemented across Nevada schools. At the same time, responses

from family members and self-advocates contribute important lived experiences that help illustrate the real-world impact of eligibility and service transitions.

Figure 2. Survey Respondent Roles (N = 255)

Respondent Role	Number	Percent
Educator, Administrator, or School Professional	215	84.3%
Family Member	38	14.9%
Self-Advocate	2	0.8%
Total	255	100%

Key Findings

- Round 2 received 255 responses, nearly four times the participation of Round 1.
- Recurring concerns identified in Round 1 were also reported by respondents in Round 2.
- Respondents frequently described service interruptions, inconsistent implementation, and challenges navigating the age-6 transition process.
- Many respondents expressed concern regarding continuity of services following reevaluation.
- Survey responses identified strong interest in evaluating Nevada's current Developmental Delay age-6 transition policies.

Service Interruptions

Figure 3. Frequency of Service Interruptions Reported by Educators (N=215)

Response	Count	Percent
Frequently or Sometimes	159	74.0%
Rarely	33	15.3%
Never	17	7.9%
Other/No Response	6	2.8%

Figure 4. Frequency of Service Interruptions Reported by Families (N=31)

Response	Count	Percent
Services delayed or stopped	14	45.2%
Services not interrupted	17	54.8%

Concerns regarding interruptions in services emerged as one of the most consistent findings in Round 2. Among educators and school professionals, **159 of 215 respondents (74.0%)**

reported that they **frequently** or **sometimes** observed students experiencing delays or interruptions in services during the age-6 transition process. An additional **33 respondents (15.3%)** reported that interruptions occurred **rarely**, while only **17 respondents (7.9%)** indicated they had **never** observed service interruptions.

Family responses reflected similar concerns. Among parents whose children had completed the transition, **nearly half reported experiencing interruptions or delays in services**, while just over half reported that services continued without interruption. These findings suggest that interruptions in services continue to be a recurring concern during the reevaluation process and may affect continuity of educational supports for some students.

Representative Comments:

"All services ended, and we struggled for two years."

"Students are often exited and immediately placed into MTSS. If they still need support, they should not be exited. It then takes several years for them to qualify again."

"Many students are denied continuation of services even though they are still in need."

"If students have had effective early intervention, they thrive with appropriate supports. Then they no longer qualify at age six, supports are removed, and they struggle."

Although service interruptions were one of the most frequently reported concerns, respondents also emphasized that understanding the transition process itself presented challenges for many families. The next section examines how well families understood the eligibility changes and the information they received throughout the reevaluation process.

Family Understanding

Figure 5. Family Understanding of Eligibility Changes (N = 29)

Response	Count	Percent
Understood	15	51.7%
Partly understood	9	31.0%
Did not understand	5	17.2%

Family understanding of the age-6 transition process varied. While many parents reported understanding why their child's eligibility changed, others indicated they only partly understood or did not understand the reevaluation process or resulting eligibility decision. These findings suggest opportunities to improve communication before and during the transition.

Several additional responses indicated that parents understood the explanation provided by the school but questioned or disagreed with the outcome of the reevaluation.

Figure 6. Family Understanding of the Right to Appeal (N = 36)

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	29	80.6%
No	4	11.1%
Unsure	3	8.3%

Most parents (**29 respondents**) reported they were informed of their right to disagree with or appeal eligibility decisions, while **4** reported they were not informed and **3** were unsure.

Although many families received information regarding the transition process, the responses suggest opportunities to improve communication regarding eligibility criteria, reevaluation outcomes, and available procedural safeguards.

Representative Comments:

"I don't think families are well informed about the transition and often just accept what they are told in the IEP."

"Parents do not know how to advocate for the needs of their child."

"It can be frustrating when families see their child struggling at home, but the evaluations say services are no longer needed."

"To have an arbitrary age where your child loses services when you're new to all of this and don't understand what is happening... the needs don't stop, but the help does."

Educator Perspectives

Figure 7. Educators Who Reported Seeing Students Lose Services After Exiting the DD Category (N = 215)

Response	Count	Percent
Reported seeing students lose services	192	89.3%
No/Other	23	10.7%

Nearly nine out of ten (89.3%) of educator respondents reported observing students lose services after exiting the Developmental Delay category. Respondents also described challenges identifying the most appropriate disability category at age six, administrative complexity, and inconsistencies in implementation across districts.

Education professionals comprised the largest respondent group and provided extensive firsthand observations regarding the implementation of Nevada's age-6 transition process. Because educators represented more than 84% of survey respondents, their perspectives provide valuable insight into how Nevada's Developmental Delay transition process is implemented across schools. Many respondents had years of experience working with students receiving special education services and described observing similar challenges regardless of district or professional role.

Among educator respondents:

- **192 of 215 (89.3%)** reported that they had seen students lose services because they no longer qualified under the Developmental Delay category.
- **74.0%** reported that they **frequently** or **sometimes** observed delays or interruptions in services during the transition.

Educators frequently described concerns regarding:

- inconsistent eligibility decisions,
- service interruptions,
- administrative complexity,
- and challenges identifying the most appropriate disability category at age six.

Many respondents emphasized that children's developmental needs often continue beyond age six and expressed concern that reevaluation timelines may not always align with child development.

Representative Comments:

"Age 6 is much too young to determine eligibility under a different disability category."

"Kindergarten is the foundation for a child's future, yet we exit many students who are still in need, creating additional obstacles."

"The standards, curriculum, and evaluation testing have not caught up to one another."

"These students do not qualify at age 6, but they are still well behind their peers. By the time they requalify, they are very far behind."

Language Access

Figure 8. Educators Reporting Language or Communication Barriers (N = 212)

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	150	70.8%
No	38	17.9%
Unsure	24	11.3%

Figure 9. Schools Provided Information in Preferred Language (N = 196)

Response	Count	Percent
Always	77	39.3%
Usually	78	39.8%
Sometimes	31	15.8%
Rarely	8	4.1%
Never	2	1.0%

Figure 10. Family Responses Regarding Language Barriers (N = 38)

Response	Count	Percent
Experienced language barrier	1	2.6%
Did not experience a language barrier	37	97.4%

Language access experiences differed between educators and families.

Most educators reported that schools generally provided transition information in families' preferred language or communication method. However, many also indicated that language and communication barriers continued to affect some families during the transition process, which could still affect families' ability to fully understand or navigate the transition process.

Among family respondents, only **one family** reported experiencing language or communication barriers during their child's transition. Most families indicated that information was generally provided in their preferred language or communication method.

Although language access was not identified as a universal concern, educator responses suggest that communication barriers continue to affect some families and warrant continued attention.

Representative Comment:

"Please ensure the process is clear for families and that information is provided in a way they can understand."

Practices that Worked Well

Although many respondents described challenges during the age-6 transition process, the survey also identified practices associated with more positive experiences. These responses suggest that transitions were more successful when families received clear information, remained involved in decision-making, and experienced continuity of services throughout reevaluation.

Among family respondents whose children had completed the transition, **17 reported that services were not delayed or interrupted**. In addition, **15 family respondents reported that they understood why their child's eligibility changed**, and **29 reported being informed of their right to disagree with or appeal the eligibility decision**. These responses indicate that some schools successfully communicated transition requirements and procedural safeguards to families.

Educator responses also identified areas of effective practice. A total of **155 educators reported that schools always or usually provided transition information in the family's preferred language or communication method**. Providing accessible information can help families participate meaningfully in reevaluation and eligibility discussions.

Based on both quantitative and written responses, practices associated with more successful transitions included:

- beginning transition discussions before the child's sixth birthday;
- clearly explaining the purpose, timeline, and possible outcomes of reevaluation;
- involving families throughout assessment and eligibility discussions;
- explaining procedural safeguards and options for disagreement or appeal;
- providing information in the family's preferred language or communication method;
- maintaining services while evaluations and eligibility determinations are completed; and
- making individualized decisions based on the student's educational and developmental needs.

These findings suggest that the age-6 transition process can be more manageable when schools communicate early, preserve continuity, and treat families as informed partners in decision-making.

Support for Extending Developmental Delay Beyond Age Six

*Figure 11. Support for Extending Developmental Delay Beyond Age Six from Educators:
(N=215)*

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Support	174	80.9%
Support	27	12.6%
Neutral	6	2.8%
Oppose	4	1.9%
Strongly Oppose	2	0.9%
Other/Unsure	2	0.9%

*Figure 12. Support for Extending Developmental Delay Beyond Age Six from Families:
(N=38)*

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Support	35	92.1%
Neutral	2	5.3%
Strongly Oppose	1	2.6%

Support for evaluating an extension of Developmental Delay eligibility beyond age six was consistently high among both educators and families. More than nine in ten educator respondents supported or strongly supported extending eligibility, and nearly all family respondents expressed strong support.

Representative Comments:

"Please move the age to 8. Kindergarten is too young to identify many of the other eligibility categories."

"Many of the concerns and challenges for these students don't simply disappear. Some disabilities cannot be accurately identified until ages 8 or 9."

"PLEASE MAKE THIS CHANGE."

"My child was fortunate to turn six in first grade. If she had turned six earlier in kindergarten, she might have been denied services because the gap wasn't wide enough at that time."

Qualitative Findings

Theme 1: Loss of Services

Families and educators consistently described interruptions in speech therapy, occupational therapy, behavioral supports, and specialized instruction during or following the age-6 reevaluation process. Many respondents expressed concern that students lost valuable instructional time while awaiting eligibility determinations.

"All services ended, and we struggled for two years."

"Many students are denied continuation of services even though they are still in need."

Theme 2: Confusing Eligibility Process

Respondents frequently described the reevaluation process as confusing and difficult to navigate. Families reported uncertainty regarding why eligibility changed, while educators noted variability in how eligibility criteria were interpreted and applied.

"Families are often frustrated that they must 'find a label' for their children or lose services."

"I don't think families are well informed about the transition."

Theme 3: Families Were not Prepared

Many families indicated they were not adequately prepared for the transition process or fully informed regarding possible outcomes, timelines, and procedural safeguards. Several respondents recommended earlier communication and structured transition planning.

"Parents do not know how to advocate for the needs of their child."

"The needs don't stop, but the help does."

Theme 4: Need for Consistency Across Districts

Educators and families reported differences in implementation among schools and districts. Respondents recommended greater statewide consistency in reevaluation procedures, eligibility determinations, and transition planning.

"The standards, curriculum, and evaluation testing have not caught up to one another."

"The qualifications to continue services do not match the needs of many students."

Theme 5: Support for Extending Beyond Age Six

A recurring theme throughout the survey was the belief that developmental needs often continue beyond age six. Respondents emphasized that disability characteristics evolve over time and suggested that extending Developmental Delay eligibility could provide greater continuity of services while allowing for more comprehensive evaluation.

"Age 6 is much too young."

"Please move the age to 8."

Policy Considerations

The survey findings identify several areas that may warrant additional review by policymakers, educational leaders, and other stakeholders as they evaluate Nevada's current age-6 transition process. While individual experiences varied, the consistency of concerns across respondent groups suggests opportunities to improve both the consistency and effectiveness of implementation.

Areas that may warrant further review include:

- continuity of services during the reevaluation and transition process;
- consistency of eligibility determinations across Nevada school districts;
- family communication, education, and transition planning;
- language accessibility and culturally responsive communication; and
- the appropriate age for Developmental Delay eligibility under Nevada policy.
- Addressing these areas may help reduce uncertainty for families, improve statewide consistency, and ensure that children continue to receive appropriate supports during critical stages of development.

Discussion

Round 2 of the Nevada Developmental Delay Age-6 Transition Survey substantially expanded upon the Council's initial survey, increasing participation from 67 respondents in Round 1 to 255 respondents in Round 2. The larger sample strengthened confidence that the findings reflect experiences from families, educators, administrators, related service providers, and other stakeholders across Nevada.

The consistency of results across both survey rounds suggests that concerns regarding the age-6 transition process are shared across stakeholder groups. While individual experiences varied, common themes included service interruptions during reevaluation, inconsistent implementation of eligibility requirements, communication challenges, and concerns about continuity of supports. Respondents also described positive experiences, demonstrating that successful transitions are occurring and highlighting opportunities to replicate effective practices while maintaining individualized decision-making.

Because Nevada has flexibility under IDEA regarding Developmental Delay eligibility, these findings provide valuable stakeholder input that may assist policymakers and educational leaders as they evaluate current practices and consider whether policy, guidance, or implementation changes could improve consistency, reduce service disruptions, and support smoother transitions for young children and their families. Collectively, these findings provide a stronger evidence base for future discussions regarding Nevada's Developmental Delay eligibility policies and implementation practices.

Considerations for Future Action

The survey findings identify several areas that may warrant additional consideration by policymakers and educational leaders:

Consider Evaluating Nevada's Developmental Delay Eligibility Timeline

Survey respondents consistently expressed concern that developmental needs often continue beyond age six. Nevada may wish to evaluate the educational, fiscal, and implementation implications of extending Developmental Delay eligibility beyond the current age limit, including reviewing approaches used in other states.

Consider Developing Statewide Transition Guidance

Respondents described differences in how the age-6 transition process is implemented across schools and districts. Developing statewide guidance could help promote greater consistency in transition planning, reevaluation practices, family communication, and eligibility determinations while preserving the individualized decision-making required by IDEA.

Consider Standardizing Reevaluation Timelines and Procedures

Many respondents reported interruptions in services while reevaluations were being completed. Establishing consistent timelines and best practices for reevaluations may help reduce delays, improve continuity of services, and ensure that eligibility decisions are completed in a timely manner.

Opportunities to Strengthen Family Communication and Transition Planning

Families indicated that understanding the transition process and available options can be challenging. Schools may wish to begin transition discussions well before a child's sixth birthday, clearly explain reevaluation timelines and possible outcomes, and ensure families understand their procedural safeguards, including the right to disagree with eligibility decisions.

Consider Continuing to Improve Accessible Communication

Although many respondents reported that schools generally provided information in families' preferred language or communication method, educators also identified ongoing language and communication barriers. Continued investment in translated materials, interpreter services, and accessible communication strategies may improve family engagement throughout the transition process.

Consider Collecting Statewide Transition Data

The survey demonstrates the value of collecting stakeholder feedback regarding the age-6 transition process. Nevada may benefit from establishing a process to collect

statewide data related to Developmental Delay reevaluations, service continuity, eligibility outcomes, and family experiences. Ongoing data collection could help identify trends, measure improvements over time, and inform future policy discussions.

Consider Expanding Professional Development

Educators identified challenges related to eligibility determinations, developmental assessment, and implementation of the transition process. Additional professional development focused on early childhood development, disability identification, family engagement, and transition planning may help promote greater consistency and support informed decision-making across Nevada school districts.

Conclusion

The transition from the Developmental Delay eligibility category represents an important milestone in a child's educational journey. Survey respondents consistently emphasized that while eligibility categories may change, children's developmental needs often continue. The findings presented in this report provide valuable stakeholder perspectives that may assist educators, policymakers, families, and community partners as Nevada continues working to ensure every child receives appropriate educational supports during the early elementary years. By combining stakeholder experiences with quantitative findings, this report contributes meaningful information to ongoing conversations about strengthening Nevada's special education system for young children.

Appendix A

Survey Questions

Screening Question (All Respondents)

1. I am filling this out as:

- Self-Advocate
 - Educator/School Professional
 - Parent/Guardian
-

Self-Advocate Questions

1. Which school district did you attend during your age-6 transition?
 2. At what age did you begin receiving disability services in school?
 3. What services did you receive?
 4. What happened at the age-6 transition? (*Check all that apply.*)
 5. Please tell us about your experience when you turned 6.
 6. If your special education services ended when you turned 6, did you later qualify for special education again under a different disability category?
 7. If you qualified for special education again, what disability category did you qualify under?
 8. How old were you when you qualified again?
 9. Did turning 6 cause any gaps or delays in your special education services or supports?
 10. Overall, how did the age-6 transition affect you?
 11. Did you face any language access challenges?
 12. Would you support extending the Developmental Delay (DD) eligibility category beyond age 6 if it meant students could continue receiving appropriate services without needing to qualify under a different disability category?
 13. If you could tell the State Board of Education anything about the Developmental Delay (DD) category or the changes that happened when you turned 6, what would you say?
 14. May NGCDD share your story (either publicly or anonymously) as part of its report?
 15. Would you be willing to be contacted for follow-up?
-

Educator/School Professional Questions

1. What is your role?
2. What county/school district(s) have you taught in?
3. How many years have you worked in education?

4. Have you worked with students who were eligible for special education under the Developmental Delay (DD) category?
 5. Approximately how many students with a DD eligibility have you worked with?
 6. In your experience, what usually happens when students reach age 6? (*Check all that apply.*)
 7. Have you seen students experience delays or interruptions in services during the age-6 transition?
 8. Have you seen students lose services because they no longer qualified under the DD category?
 9. In your experience, what challenges have students or families experienced during the age-6 transition?
 10. Do you believe the current age-6 transition supports students effectively?
 11. What changes would improve the age-6 transition?
 12. How confident are you that families understand the age-6 transition process?
 13. How often do you disagree with the eligibility decision made during the age-6 transition?
 14. Have you seen families experience language or communication barriers during the age-6 transition?
 15. If yes, what barriers have you seen?
 16. In your experience, are families provided transition information in their preferred language or communication method?
 17. Overall, how does the age-6 transition affect students?
 18. Overall, how does the age-6 transition affect families?
 19. What language or communication supports would improve the age-6 transition for families? (*Check all that apply.*)
 20. Would you support extending the Developmental Delay (DD) eligibility category beyond age 6 if it meant students could continue receiving appropriate services without needing to qualify under a different disability category?
 21. If you could tell the State Board of Education anything about the Developmental Delay (DD) category or the changes that happen during the age-6 transition, what would you say?
 22. Would you be willing to be contacted for follow-up?
-

Parent/Guardian Questions

1. Which school district did your child attend during the age-6 transition?
2. At what age did your child begin receiving disability services in school?
3. How old is your child now?
4. Was your child ever eligible for special education under the Developmental Delay (DD) category?

5. Which special education services did your child receive? (*Check all that apply.*)
6. What happened at the age-6 transition? (*Check all that apply.*)
7. If your child's special education services ended when they turned 6, did they later qualify for special education again under a different disability category?
8. If your child qualified for special education again, what disability category did they qualify under?
9. How old was your child when they qualified again?
10. When your child turned 6, were their special education services or supports delayed or stopped for a period of time?
11. Approximately how long were services delayed?
12. Did your child lose any of these services during the age-6 transition?
13. If your child lost any services during the age-6 transition, which services?
14. Did you understand why your child's eligibility changed?
15. Were you informed of your rights to disagree with or appeal the decision?
16. Overall, how did the age-6 transition affect your child?
17. Overall, how did the age-6 transition affect you?
18. Did you experience any language or communication barriers during your child's age-6 transition?
19. If yes, what barriers did you experience?
20. In your experience, did the school provide transition information in your preferred language or communication method?
21. What language or communication supports would have improved the age-6 transition for you and your family? (*Check all that apply.*)
22. Would you support extending the Developmental Delay (DD) eligibility category beyond age 6 if it meant students could continue receiving appropriate services without needing to qualify under a different disability category?
23. If you could tell the State Board of Education anything about the Developmental Delay (DD) category or the changes that happen during the age-6 transition, what would you say?
24. Is there anything else you would like to share about your family's experience?
25. May NGCDD share your story (either publicly or anonymously) as part of its report?
26. Would you be willing to be contacted for follow-up?

Appendix B. Statistical Tables

The following tables provide the complete numerical results corresponding to the figures presented throughout this report. Percentages are based on the number of respondents who answered each question and may not total 100 percent due to rounding or because some respondents did not answer every question.

Figure 1. Number of Responses per Survey:

	Round 1	Round 2
Total Responses	67	255
Families	17	38
Educators/School Professionals	44	215
Self-Advocates	Included	2
Purpose	Initial input	Statewide validation

Figure 2. Survey Respondent Roles (N = 255)

Respondent Role	Count	Percent
Educator, Administrator, or School Professional	215	84.3%
Family Member	38	14.9%
Self-Advocate	2	0.8%
Total	255	100.0%

Figure 3. Frequency of Service Interruptions Reported by Educators (N = 215)

Response	Count	Percent
Frequently or Sometimes	159	74.0%
Rarely	33	15.3%
Never	17	7.9%
Other/No Response	6	2.8%
Total	215	100.0%

Figure 4. Frequency of Service Interruptions Reported by Families (N = 31)

Response	Count	Percent
Services delayed or stopped	14	45.2%
Services not interrupted	17	54.8%
Total	31	100.0%

Figure 5. Family Understanding of Eligibility Changes (N = 29)

Response	Count	Percent
Understood	15	51.7%
Partly Understood	9	31.0%
Did Not Understand	5	17.2%
Total	29	100.0%

Figure 6. Family Understanding of the Right to Appeal (N = 36)

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	29	80.6%
No	4	11.1%
Unsure	3	8.3%
Total	36	100.0%

Figure 7. Educators Reporting Students Lost Services After Exiting the Developmental Delay Category (N = 215)

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	192	89.3%
No/Other	23	10.7%
Total	215	100.0%

Figure 8. Educators Reporting Language or Communication Barriers (N = 212)

Response	Count	Percent
Yes	150	70.8%
No	38	17.9%
Unsure	24	11.3%
Total	212	100.0%

Figure 9. Schools Provided Information in the Family's Preferred Language or Communication Method (N = 196)

Response	Count	Percent
Always	77	39.3%
Usually	78	39.8%
Sometimes	31	15.8%
Rarely	8	4.1%
Never	2	1.0%
Total	196	100.0%

Figure 10. Family Responses Regarding Language Barriers (N = 38)

Response	Count	Percent
Experienced a language barrier	1	2.6%
Did not experience a language barrier	37	97.4%
Total	38	100.0%

Figure 11. Support for Extending Developmental Delay Beyond Age Six from Educators: (N = 215)

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Support	174	80.9%
Support	27	12.6%
Neutral	6	2.8%
Oppose	4	1.9%
Strongly Oppose	2	0.9%
Other/Unsure	2	0.9%
Total	215	100.0%

**Figure 12. Support for Extending Developmental Delay Beyond Age Six from Families:
(N = 38)**

Response	Count	Percent
Strongly Support	35	92.1%
Neutral	2	5.3%
Strongly Oppose	1	2.6%
Total	38	100.0%

Appendix C. Representative Anonymous Comments by Theme

The following anonymous comments were submitted by survey respondents and are presented to provide additional context to the quantitative findings summarized throughout this report. Comments have been organized by common themes identified during analysis. Minor edits have been made only to correct spelling, punctuation, or grammar where necessary. No substantive changes have been made to respondent comments.

Service Continuity

Many respondents described disruptions in services while eligibility determinations were being completed.

"All services ended, and we struggled for two years."

"Students are often exited and immediately placed into MTSS. If they still need support, they should not be exited. It then takes several years for them to qualify again."

"Many students are denied continuation of services even though they are still in need."

"If students have had effective early intervention, they thrive with appropriate supports. Then they no longer qualify at age six, supports are removed, and they struggle."

"Students lose valuable instructional time while waiting for reevaluations and eligibility decisions."

Family Communication and Support

Respondents frequently indicated that families would benefit from earlier and clearer communication regarding the reevaluation process.

"I don't think families are well informed about the transition and often just accept what they are told in the IEP."

"Parents do not know how to advocate for the needs of their child."

"Families need more information before their child turns six."

"The process should be explained much earlier so parents know what to expect."

"Communication should be clearer and available in language families understand."

Eligibility Determinations

Many comments focused on concerns regarding how eligibility decisions are made and whether students continue to receive appropriate supports.

"It can be frustrating when families see their child struggling at home, but the evaluations say services are no longer needed."

"Families are often frustrated that they must 'find a label' for their children or lose services."

"The qualifications to continue services do not match the needs of many students."

"The standards, curriculum, and evaluation testing have not caught up to one another."

"There is too much inconsistency between schools and districts."

Student Impact

Many respondents emphasized that the age-6 transition can have lasting educational consequences when services are reduced or discontinued. Comments reflected concerns that interruptions in support may contribute to widening academic and developmental gaps during the early elementary years.

"Kindergarten is the foundation for a child's future, yet we exit many students who are still in need, creating additional obstacles."

"The needs don't stop, but the help does."

"These students do not qualify at age 6, but they are still well behind their peers. By the time they requalify, they are very far behind."

"Students should not lose services simply because they reach a birthday."

Developmental Delay Age Limit

A recurring theme throughout the survey was concerns that the current age limit for the Developmental Delay eligibility category may not align with children's developmental trajectories. Many respondents suggested that extending the eligibility age could provide

greater continuity of services while allowing additional time for accurate evaluation and identification of disabilities.

"Age 6 is much too young to determine eligibility under a different disability category."

"Many of the concerns and challenges for these students don't simply disappear. Some disabilities cannot be accurately identified until ages 8 or 9."

"Please move the age to 8."

"PLEASE MAKE THIS CHANGE."

"My child was fortunate to turn six in first grade. If she had turned six earlier in kindergarten, she might have been denied services because the gap wasn't wide enough at that time."

Additional Recommendations from Respondents

In addition to describing their experiences, respondents offered several suggestions for strengthening Nevada's age-6 transition process. Common recommendations focused on promoting consistency, improving communication, supporting families throughout reevaluation, and minimizing disruptions in services.

"Provide statewide consistency in how the transition is handled."

"Begin planning well before a child's sixth birthday."

"Improve communication with families throughout the reevaluation process."

"Maintain services until eligibility decisions are finalized."

"Provide additional training for educators regarding Developmental Delay eligibility."

Appendix D: Comparison of Round 1 and Round 2 Findings

The Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities conducted two rounds of community input regarding Nevada's Developmental Delay (DD) age-6 transition process. The first survey was designed to identify initial concerns and determine whether additional statewide data collection was warranted. Based on those findings, a second survey was developed to further explore recurring themes and collect more detailed information from educators, families, and self-advocates.

While the surveys differed in scope and respondent populations, the findings were highly consistent. Across both rounds, respondents identified similar concerns regarding service continuity, communication with families, eligibility determinations, and the impact of requiring students to transition from the Developmental Delay eligibility category at age six.

Figure 13. Comparison of Survey Rounds

Measure	Round 1	Round 2
Total Responses	67	255
Families	17	38
Educators/School Professionals	44	215
Self-Advocates	0	2
Purpose	Initial community input	Statewide validation of initial findings

Validation of Round 1 Findings

Round 2 substantially expanded participation while reinforcing the concerns identified during the initial survey. Responses from educators, families, and self-advocates continued to identify several recurring themes, including:

- Interruptions or delays in special education services during the age-6 transition.
- Inconsistent implementation of eligibility determinations across schools and districts.
- Challenges for families in understanding the reevaluation process and procedural safeguards.
- Concerns that students continue to demonstrate developmental needs despite no longer qualifying under the Developmental Delay eligibility category.
- Strong interest in reviewing Nevada's current Developmental Delay age-6 transition requirements.

The consistency of these findings across two independent rounds of statewide community input suggests that the experiences described by respondents reflect recurring patterns rather than isolated incidents.

Key Themes Consistent Across Both Surveys

Several themes emerged consistently across both rounds of community input:

- Concerns regarding interruptions in special education services during the age-6 transition.
- Difficulty for families in understanding eligibility decisions and the reevaluation process.
- Concerns that some students lose needed supports despite continuing educational needs.

- Interest in improving statewide consistency in transition practices.
 - Broad support for reviewing Nevada's Developmental Delay eligibility age.
-

Value of the Two-Round Survey Process

Conducting two rounds of statewide engagement strengthened the reliability of the findings. The second survey expanded participation and provided additional quantitative and qualitative evidence that reinforced concerns identified during the initial survey. The consistency of responses across both survey rounds suggests that the issues identified were not isolated experiences but reflected patterns observed by educators, families, and self-advocates across Nevada.