## North Dakota Case Review Tool-Revised (CRT-R)

The North Dakota Case Review Tool was designed to be used by the North Dakota Part C Early Intervention program for training, accountability, and monitoring purposes.

	Section 1: Chart Information	
A. Therap ID #:		
B. Age at Time of IFSP:		
C. Age at CRT-R Review:		
D. Initial Referral Date:		
E. Eligibility Date:		
F. IFSP Start Date:		
<b>G. IFSP End Date:</b> (Initial IFSP date is 1 year minus 1 day from date of eligibility)		
H. Initial Evaluation or Assessment attached in Therap:	No	Yes
I. Initial developed in 45 days:  If delayed, indicate reason for Date: Delay: Family Agency Weather		
J. IFSP Participants:     *Required     *Parent     *Service Coordinator     PEIP     Evaluators/Assessors     Other	No List Participants:	Yes

K. Evaluator/Assessor #1		
Name/Title:		
L. Evaluator/Assessor #2 Name/Title:		
M. Evaluator/Assessor #3 (optional):		
N. Prior Notice/Invite for IFSP:	☐ No	Yes
O. Prior Notice/Consent for evaluation/assessment:	☐ No	Yes
P. Assessment Tools/Objective Tools (criterion or norm referenced):	<ul> <li>Early Learning Accomplishment         Profile Preschool Language         Scale (ELAP)</li> <li>Developmental Assessment of         Young Children (DAYC)</li> <li>Hawaii Early Learning Profile         (HELP)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Vision Screening Tool</li> <li>Receptive Expressive Emergent Language Scale (REEL-3)</li> <li>AEPS</li> <li>Other</li> <li>Other</li> <li>Other</li> <li>Other</li> <li>Other</li> </ul>
Section 1 Reviewer Notes:		



Sec	ction 2: Pre	esent revers of r	evelopilient in De	illy Routines and Activ	VILIES		
A. Present level of Developm	ent	<b>Completed with</b>	strengths and	PLD based or	n criterion-referenced tool		
(PLD):		nallenges discus	sed functionally				
*Accommodations discussed as what	is	No	Yes	No	Yes		
currently occurring  B. Physical							
Gross Motor							
Fine Motor							
Vision							
Hearing							
C. Cognitive							
D. Self-Help/Adaptive							
E. Social-Emotional							
F. Communication							
Receptive							
Expressive							
G. Early Literacy							
H. Health (general health				Review of pertinent health re			
described)							
400011004)							
,				No	Yes		
I. All developmental a	ireas		<u> </u>	No			
,	areas	Ye	s		No		
I. All developmental a are included:		1	s	2	No		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area	U	1 Inacceptable		2 Accep	No stable		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels	U Present Le	1 Inacceptable evels are summar	ized Present Lev	2 Accep rels in each required da	No  table  illy routine and activity are		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development	Present Le	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of	ized Present Lev	Accep vels in each required da unctionally, including wh	No  table  illy routine and activity are		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is	Present Le in terms of following:	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of	rized Present Level the described for (challenges)	Accep vels in each required da unctionally, including wh	No  table  illy routine and activity are		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is	Present Le in terms of following:  • Tes	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of et scores/protocols	rized Present Lev the described for (challenges s AND	Accep vels in each required da unctionally, including wh ).	No  Itable  Italy routine and activity are nat's not working well		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of t scores/protocols ld's deficits	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND Are written	Accep vels in each required da unctionally, including wh	No  Itable  Italy routine and activity are nat's not working well		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the context of daily	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of st scores/protocols ld's deficits gue child strength	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND Are written and AND)	Accep vels in each required da unctionally, including wh ). in family friendly langua	No  Itable  It		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil Vag	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of t scores/protocols ld's deficits gue child strength nout describing	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND Are written and AND There is a left to the control of the	Acceptivels in each required data unctionally, including which in family friendly languated by the connection between the connection betw	No  Itable  It		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the context of daily routines and activities.	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil Vag	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of st scores/protocols ld's deficits gue child strength	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND Are written and AND There is a legal routine and	Accep vels in each required da unctionally, including wh ). in family friendly langua	No  Itable  It		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the context of daily	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil Vag	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of t scores/protocols ld's deficits gue child strength nout describing	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND) Are written and and AND	Accepteds in each required data unctionally, including when the family friendly languated area of developments.	No  Itable  It		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the context of daily routines and activities.  Acceptable	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil Vag	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of t scores/protocols ld's deficits gue child strength nout describing	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND) Are written and and AND	Accepteds in each required data unctionally, including when the family friendly languated area of developments.	No  Itable  It		
I. All developmental a are included:  Quality Review Area  J. Child's Present Levels of Development (including what is working well) is described in the context of daily routines and activities.	Present Le in terms of following:  Tes Chil Vag	1 Inacceptable evels are summar f one or more of t scores/protocols ld's deficits gue child strength nout describing	rized Present Level described for (challenges and AND) Are written AND There is a level routine and AND Are individu	Accepteds in each required data unctionally, including when the family friendly languated area of developments.	No  Itable  It		



Section 3: Family Assessment and Priorities								
Review Questions								
<ul><li>A. Family assessment interview documented:</li></ul>	No	Yes	N/A					
B. Priorities are ranked in numerical order by the family:	No	Yes	N/A					
C. Completed within 45 days of initial IFSP or prior to annual IFSP:	No	Yes	N/A					
Quality Review Area	1 Unacceptable	Acce	2 otable					
D. Information is included on the people who are important to the child and family and the family's concerns and resources with the concurrence of the family. This information is	No information is provided OR Information is provided and additional clarification is needed OR There is no documentation that the family declined to provide this information.	Acceptable  All of the following information is described:  • Family concerns and the information is connected to what is working well along with the challenges within typical routines and activities.  • Important people to the family  • Family assessment focuses on family functioning, child engagement, social relationships, and independence in the families routines throughout the day.  • General Resources (family resources)						



connected to the family's everyday routines and activities.  Acceptable  Unacceptable		childcare, friends/relatives employment  Community groups  Specific Resources (developmental resources) related to the family's capacity to enhance the child's development (i.e., specific strategies the family uses to enhance their child's development) including any family activities that are helpful or challenging for the family  OR  The family declined to provide information and documentation is present.
E. There is clear information linking family priorities to family concerns, strengths, and interests.  Acceptable	No priorities are listed OR Priorities are provided and additional clarification is needed OR There is no documentation that the family declined to prioritize	<ul> <li>Family priorities are clearly linked to family concerns, strengths, and interests of the child and family.</li> <li>Family priorities are described within family routines</li> <li>OR</li> <li>There is documentation that the family declined priorities</li> </ul>
Unacceptable Comments:		



Section 3 Reviewer Notes:



Section 4: Functional, Measurable Outcomes and Activities								
Review Questions								
<ul> <li>A. Outcomes are based on family's priorities and concerns</li> </ul>	☐ No	Yes						
B. Outcomes are developmentally appropriate (consistent with PLD).	□ No	Yes N/A if family outcome						
Quality Review Area	1 Unacceptable	2 Acceptable						
C. Child and/or family outcomes are functional (related to participation in daily routines and activities).  Acceptable  Unacceptable	Outcome statements are written:	Outcome statements are functional in that they: <ul> <li>Are useful and meaningful to the family</li> </ul> <li>AND         <ul> <li>Target a skill necessary for full participation in daily routines and activities</li> <li>Reflects the family's unique real-life situations that are addressed during daily routines and activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The following criteria should be met when the outcome is functional. The outcome:         <ul> <li>Based on routines</li> <li>Uses everyday language</li> <li>Emphasizes the positive</li> <li>Uses active rather than passive words</li> <li>Uses integrated domains</li> </ul> </li>						
D. Outcomes are measureable	Outcome criteria statements:  • Do not include criteria, procedures, or timelines	Outcome criteria statements are meaningful to the family and contain the following:  • A level of measurability,						
Acceptable	OR • Include percentages	<ul> <li>Procedures, and</li> <li>Timelines.</li> </ul>						
Unacceptable	and/or trials in criteria.	AND The outcome must be written so that all members of the team will understand when the outcome has been met.						



E. Early inter	suppo	ort the	Activitie profess	ional	will do	with		O A C	real R Fluit ND The districtivities are family	e amount played.  eneralizations). reflect that	period), erion (perion to time ion criteres ers to imp	erform to over when the over when the over when the over	he skill some time to the skill seems to the skill	emoothly behavior es, peopl personne	and rap needs t e, place el are su	oidly) to be es, upporting
child's and everyday build fami	routir	nes and	child, and only include specialized places and equipment.					A A	take place in the home and community settings.  AND  Activities are connected to the outcome and reflect the child's							
Acceptable			OR Activities are disjointed and not connected to the outcomes					t S	functional skills.  Strategies and activities reflect that the family and/or caregiver(s) implement activities of interest with professionals providing							
Unacceptal	ble		(e.g., the implem achievi	ney co	ould be	e plation		ut pi	onsultati roblem-s <b>ND</b> ctivities	on and/o	r coachii ected to	ng for fa	amily/car come ar	egiver le	arning a	and
Review each ou	ıtcon	ne and ra	ate:							,						
Outcome #1	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E;	1	2
Outcome #2	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #3	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #4	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #5	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #6	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2



Outcome #7	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #8	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #9	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Outcome #10	A:	Yes	No	B:	Yes	No	N/A	C:	1	2	D:	1	2	E:	1	2
Comments:																

Section 4 Reviewer Notes:			_



Section 5: Services and Natural Environment									
Review Questions									
A. Services are based on meeting the outcomes.	A menu of services are offered we to the needs in the outcome. No		Services are clear	ly based on the outcomes.  Yes					
B. Location of services identified.	□ No			Yes					
<ul><li>C. Type of service (individual or group) identified.</li></ul>	□ No			Yes					
D. Funding source of services identified.	□ No			Yes					
<ul><li>E. Duration of services identified (stop/start dates).</li></ul>	□ No			Yes					
<ul><li>F. Frequency of services identified (number of days service provided).</li></ul>	□ No			Yes					
<ul><li>G. Length of services identified (length of time service provided during each session).</li></ul>	□ No			Yes					
H. Method of services identified (how a service is provided).	□ No			Yes					
Quality Review Area	1 Unacceptable		2 Acceptab						
I. Adequate information and evidence is provided to support the rationale that a child's needs and outcomes cannot be achieved in natural settings.	The IFSP identifies one or more services that are not in a natural environment for the child and family.  AND  There is no justification or the justification is not based on the needs of the child but appears to be for one of the following reasons:	OR The child is rec AND When a service environment, a	e child, justifying that the	natural environments					



Acceptable	Administrative convenience	For each service justified, there is a plan to transition interventions into natural settings.
Unacceptable	<ul><li>Fiscal reasons</li><li>Personnel limitations</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>Parent/therapist preferences</li> </ul>	
Comments:	protection of	
Section 5 Reviewer Notes:		
		,



	Section 6: Adap	otations and Supports	
Review Questions			
A. Assistive technology (low and high tech supports and/or modifications to the environment i.e., sign language, visual schedules, adapted utensils, etc.) supports are provided when needed to achieve an outcome and documented in the activities.	☐ No	Yes	□ N/A
B. Assistive technology discussed in the activity is appropriate to meet the needs of the child.	☐ No	Yes	□ N/A
Comments:			
Section 6 Reviewer Notes:			



Section 7: Transition				
Review Questions				
A. Opt-out form was completed by 2.5 or later if child entered after 2.5. (optional based on family decision)	☐ No Opt-out form should have been completed and was not	☐ Yes Family chose opt-out, and form was completed	☐ N/A Family chose referral to Part B	
B. If no opt-out, LEA notification completed by 2.6 or later if child entered after 2.6.	□ No	☐ Yes	□ N/A	
C. Prior notice completed for transition meeting(s)	□ No	□ Yes	□ N/A	
D. DD eligibility determination made by 2.9	□ No	☐ Yes	☐ N/A if parent withdraws	
E. By the time the child is 2.6, the IFSP includes a transition outcome.	$\square$ No	Yes	N/A	
F. 2.7 meeting held	No	Yes	N/A if late referral	
G. 2.9 meeting held	No	Yes		
Quality Review Area	1 Unacceptable	2 Acceptable		
H. The transition outcome/activities includes documentation that transition issues are identified and discussed, and steps are included.	No transition is noted in the IFSP  OR  The information shared is inadequate to inform parents about the transition process.	Transition activities include information on all of the following: Individual needs of the child, family, and receiving agency for a successful transition.  AND The transition outcome clearly relates to the needs of the child and family.  AND Information about the following:  • Specific places		
Acceptable Unacceptable		<ul> <li>Specific places</li> <li>Programs</li> <li>Dates</li> <li>People who will need to be involved in the transition process</li> </ul>		



documentation that transition issues are identified and discussed during a transition meeting.	No transition meeting information is noted in the IFSP.  OR  The information shared is inadequate to inform parents about the transition process.	Transition meeting notes include documentation that transition issues are identified and discussed and steps are included to prepare the family for choices/options at different transition points. <i>AND</i> The transition outcome clearly relates to the needs of the child and family.
Acceptable	about the transition process.	Tarriny.
•		
Unacceptable omments:		
ction 7 Reviewer Notes		
ction 7 Reviewer Notes:		



Section 8: IFSP Review Check if N/A (IFSP Review not due at this time)				
Review Questions	Office if MA (ii of Review flot due at	uns une)		
A. Prior notice documented in Therap.	□ No	☐ Yes		
B. IFSP Participants	□ No	☐ Yes		
C. An IFSP review needs to be completed at least every 6 months, and a review is applicable to this IFSP.	□ No	☐ Yes		
D. Progress toward achieving outcomes is included in the documentation.	□ No	☐ Yes		
E. Present level of development, including child behavior is updated.	□ No	☐ Yes		
F. Priorities are updated.	□ No	☐ Yes		
G. Outcomes in the IFSP are updated.	□ No	☐ Yes		
H. Services are updated and based on the need of the updated outcomes.	□ No	☐ Yes		
Family assessment updated.	□ No	☐ Yes		
Comments:				



Section 8 Reviewer Notes:	

