

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Okay, well I've got 2:02, and we have a quorum, so I think we can start whenever everybody is ready.

>> KATY MYERS: I'm actually going to text someone and see if they're going to make it. So just give me one second and we can get started.

>> One, time is up.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay. We might have someone coming a little later and might not, we'll have to see. But as Mike pointed out, we have a good number, so let's go ahead and get started. Ann.

>> ANN BARNHART: Welcome to the SPIL meeting for September 21st, 2026. It is 2:03:00 p.m. and I am Ann Barnhardt, the SPIL committee vice chair, and we'll get started by calling roll. Ann Barnhardt, that's me. Halie Brown.

>> Here.

>> Jeanine Coleman-Miller, Abigail Fleenor, Linda Greeno,

>> KATY MYERS: I texted Linda to see if she would be attending today. And I'm not sure if she will or not.

>> ANN BARNHART: Ann Barnhardt.

>> Here. Jared Quarles.

>> Here. Luis Roman.

>> Thank you, I am present.

>> Julie Scher.

>> Here. Chris Spinks. I see her, are you here, Chris?

>> Yes, pushed the wrong button, thank you.

>> And Thomas Williams.

>> Yes, here.

>> Do you want me to read your whole entire name?

>> No, Cierra, or Cierra Thomas-Williams is okay. Thank you for asking. Appreciate that. Mike, do you want to do the statement of accessibility?

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Yes, so we have accessibility provisions in place for this meeting. We have ASL interpret being as well as CART services are available. They should all be accessible for everybody watching on line. If you are having any issues with that, you can either put something in the Q&A portion for today, or you

can email us at info@indianaINSILC.org or text me at (317)514-6145.

>> KATY MYERS: Sorry, you can go ahead and start. Apparently Linda is having trouble getting in. So she's trying to be here today.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, the next thing we need to do is approve the minutes from 8/17/26. Do we have a motion to approve the minutes? Or first of all, does anybody have any issues that need to be corrected? Hearing none, will somebody make a motion that we accept the minutes as read?

>> This is Anna, and I make a motion to accept the minutes.

>> We need a second, please.

>> This is Luis, and I motion to accept it.

>> ANN BARNHART: All righty, we will take roll now. And my Zoom just went off my screen. All right. I'm back. Ann Barnhardt, yes, Halie Brown.

>> Yes.

>> Linda Greeno is still not in. Anna Thompson Jones.

>> Yes Jared Quarles.

>> Yes.

>> Luis Roman.

>> Accept.

>> Julie Scher.

>> Yes.

>> Chris Spinks.

>> Yes.

>> And Cierra Thomas-Williams.

>> ANN BARNHART: Yes. The goal for today is to approve the first draft of the goals and objectives of the 2027 through 2030 state plan for Independent Living. The goal and independent framework approved today are not final. We will submit the framework to the CIL directors, the network partners and others for comment and feedback. And CIL directors are the Center for Independent Living. We will share the framework with the public for comment and feedback. And the committee will consider all feedback in future meetings. Today we are only focused on goals and objectives. We have not drafted any activities, performance measures. The four proposed goals are based on everything we

have learned so far with public comment being the leading data input. Statewide data, public input, feedback, benchmark plans and federal priorities. We analyze the data sources and look for recurrent themes in areas of need much we did not start with goals and look for data to support. So we got the data first and then we built the goals. Committee members reviewed the data and goals, but did not vote to approve. The proposed goals are goal number one, community living and inclusion. Increase opportunities for individuals with disabilities to live independently and participate fully in their communities. Goal number two. Independent Living core services and consumer access. Expand access to core Independent Living services that support community living, self determination and consumer choice. Goal number 3, systems advocacy and public policy. Systems change will you advocacy, leadership and disability representation. And goal 4, network capacity and sustainability. Strengthen the capacity sustainability effectiveness and leadership of Indiana's Independent Living network. Are there any questions or comments on these goals?

Do we have a motion to approve the four draft goals as presented?

>> This is Luis, and I motion to accept.

>> This is Chris and I second the motion.

>> ANN BARNHART: Yeah, take a vote. Ann Barnhardt, yes. Halie Brown.

>> Accept.

>> Linda Greeno is still not here. Anna Thompson Jones.

>> Accept.

>> Jared Quarles.

>> Luis Roman.

>> Accept.

>> Julie Scher.

>> Accept.

>> Chris Spinks.

>> Accept.

>> Cierra Thomas-Williams.

>> Accept, yes.

>> ANN BARNHART: Okay, there have been proposed objective combination. the proposals to combine some of the objectives we

have discussed. The draft objectives are based on data analysis with public comment being the leading input. Committee members reviewed the data and draft slate. Gave input but did not vote to approve them. During the review, the members suggested five businesses. After the vote, a detailed discussion on all objectives come next. Has everyone reviewed the proposed combinations that were sent out by email?

>> Yes.

>> Yes.

>> ANN BARNHART: Did anybody not see those? Great, you did your homework. Does anyone have questions or should it be separate? Is there anyone who would like to delay a decision on any particular combination?

>> Ann, this is Chris, what was your last question?

>> ANN BARNHART: Oh, sorry. Any questions or if any of the sets should remain separate? Any of the combinations we put together, should they be taken apart again?

>> The only one that I think should remain separate is 5. And that one is already listed as being separate on the sheet. It has committee discussion, and are we voting on that? It talks about community partnerships.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, I can interject here. So yes, the -- let me pull it up here real quickly.

>> Which one are we talking about specifically?

>> KATY MYERS: I will share that. So the original objective -- so the combination we're talking about is the fifth combination, and.

>> Of which goal?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, I'm telling you. So the first one is 4.4, which is about strategic partnerships, and the second one is 3.2, which is about representation and decision making. And so the proposed combined objective would read like this:

Strengthen partnerships and increase disability representation in community leadership and decision making. And the new objective number would be 3.1 under the advocacy and public policy goal. So the reasoning behind combining these is because creating partnerships like strategic partnerships, partnerships with other organizations, whether that's government, nonprofit, business, what

have you, those partnerships are oftentimes a really great entryway to be able to make sure there is more representation in decision making. So you could think of strategic partnerships in representation as being completely separate ideas, but you could also think about it as representation in decision making as being an outcome of having strategic partnerships. And so that's kind of the idea behind why we would combine those specific objectives. So what we do is, you guys, in just a moment, you guys can discuss everything that I just said, and if you all agree with Chris that we should keep them separate, then we will vote to approve only the first four combinations, and we'll leave those separate. But if all of you come to a consensus that we should combine them, if Chris has been persuaded or changes her mind, we can vote to approve all five combinations. So I'll hand it back to you. Ann.

>> ANN BARNHART: All righty. Let's discuss what you guys think.

>> This is Chris, let me explain. Strategic partnerships a lot of times, in my thoughts, are developed to strengthen, you know, disability efforts for the entire community. I can see the representation of getting of encouraging these organizations to reach out and have individuals with disabilities on their boards. But I don't know when you push them together, is it going to be can I make the partnership? Do I have to partnership and this? That's where I'm kind of wonder being if it should be two separate things. You focus on making partnerships, and you focus on developing the individual leaders to be represented on the boards, or in those partnerships. So I see where they can go together. And I'm just overthinking it as usual

>> KATY MYERS: I do the same.

>> ANN BARNHART: I actually, turning it to you, Katy?

>> KATY MYERS: Please, no.

>> ANN BARNHART: I do agree with Chris that I think it needs to be separate. Because I think if it could be -- with it together, it strengthens partnerships and increased disability representation. We could, if we put them together, we could do one and not the other. We can say, okay, we did X, but we can leave out Y, because we did X. If that makes sense. We can work -- if under this goal now, we can work on the street thing partnerships,

and then since we did that, we don't have to increase the disability representation, because we covered the first part. Because it's put together. So I think it would be better to separate them.

>> This is Luis, and can I say something?

>> ANN BARNHART: I think Jared had his hand up first.

>> Go ahead, Jared.

>> Can we add strategic into the proposed objective?

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Jared, this is Mike, do you mean in a potential new objective?

>> Yes.

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Where would you put it? Like strengthen strategic partnerships?

>> Or maybe strategically strengthen partnerships and disability representation. Because again, if you put strategically in there, we're saying like, that takes thought in where the partnerships need to be.

>> KATY MYERS: I see your point, Jared. So basically with your suggestion, the combined objective would read, strengthen strategic partnerships and increase disability representation in community leadership and decision making?

>> Correct.

>> Because I also think that can also read or be perceived as saying, we also need to increase the disability representation in our partnerships. So I think again, we kind of play around with some word play, we can get a couple of different objectives out of that.

>> ANN BARNHART: There is a question in the comments that Linda made it in, and she said, I missed what is separate. We are talking about whether to separate the combination number 5 that was sent out, the strategic partnerships, 4.4 and the 3.2 that were put together to make up strengthen partnerships and increase disability representation in community leadership and decision making. We are discussing whether those should be put together or separated like they were before we put them together. Luis?

>> Yes.

>> KATY MYERS: I think Halie had her hand up. I'm sorry, Luis.

>> No, Halie can go first for sure.

>> ANN BARNHART: I think you said something first, Luis.

>> For me, I have to agree with Jared. Historically speaking in the state of Indiana, we get so caught up with one class versus another class. I guess for the lack of a better word, we are so sensitive in the sense of one disability versus another disability. But I think we come to a point where I have to agree with Jared in the sense of, the partnerships, because that's what we're working towards, is, you know, the partnerships, and if we don't start at some point, you know, trying to become a unified state, we're just going to continue fighting. My disability is more important than yours is, and on and on. And historically, I've already been there and done that, and it's just time to -- let's come together and let's recognize the partnerships, because we should not have to fight each other where my disability is more important than yours. You know what I mean? So I have to agree with Jared in this particular instance.

>> ANN BARNHART: Thank you, Luis. Halie?

>> Yes, so I do agree with Jared that we need to put in strengthen strategic partnerships. Because there has to be a strategy. And there has to be an end goal. So for me, if you just say strengthen partnerships, what kind of partnerships are we looking for? And definitely, working with the league and our inclusion and advocate development specialist and leading the nine-month leadership program, working with individuals with disabilities to get them in those decision making spaces, that absolutely needs to stay in there. Because that's one of the reasons I'm in the position I'm in the league because I don't feel there's enough representation in leadership for individuals with disabilities, not to give an opportunity. But not to be encouraged to get in those types of roles and to get on councils and commissions and their voice can change. I definitely think that 3.1 just needs to be -- sorry, my words are not coming to me right now. Needs to add the strengthen strategic partnerships and keep the rest as is.

>> KATY MYERS: You go ahead, Ann. Okay, I'm going to -- this is not like an official vote, but of the SPIL committee members, if you think we should keep the two objectives separate, please raise your hand using the button, not like physically.

>> ANN BARNHART: I'm sorry, can I ask a question beforehand?

>> KATY MYERS: Please, yeah.

>> ANN BARNHART: As written, can we do one and leave out the other? Or do we have to, the way we write our activities and stuff, make sure that both are covered?

>> KATY MYERS: I'm not quite following your question, can you say more?

>> ANN BARNHART: It says the strengthen strategic partnerships and increase disability representation in community leadership and decision making.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes.

>> Can we write our activities and what goes under these objectives to make sure that both of those things, that the one before the end and after the end get accomplished?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, absolutely. And this will be something we touch on again. Which is that just another reminder that today we're only talking goals and objectives. We have not yet started drafting the activities, which is arguably the most important part of the SPIL. And the evaluation methods, how are we going to know whether we accomplished it. So the reason we want to approve these drafts of the goals and the objectives is so that first of all we can get them out to the public and to the rest of the IL network so we can get feedback, and so we can start drafting those activities so we can get feedback on the activities as well. So to answer your question, Ann, yes. If we were to combine these two objectives, the activities that we would write would be much more specific in how we would create those strategic partnerships, and how we would make sure that there's more representation.

>> ANN BARNHART: Okay. Thank you. Now, if you all would answer the question, Katy -- would you restate your question that you have about --

>> KATY MYERS: Yes. So I just want to see if you think that we should keep the objective separate, please raise your hand using the button. Linda, I know that the button is not working for you, so you can put in the chat whether or not you want to keep the objectives separate or not.

Sierra wants to keep them combined did the language on 3.2 change to strategic partnerships?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, I made that note.

>> So is that what we're -- are we looking at that with this new addition?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, that's correct.

>> Thank you.

>> KATY MYERS: Julie, did you have another question?

>> Sorry, I thought we were voting.

>> KATY MYERS: Just give me a second, let me chat with Linda really quick.

>> I don't know as much about this subject. But if they are not combined, can they still -- are there things about both of these things that are shared and can be used for both of these? To save time and effort and things? Or are they at their, with the intent that we want them to be, do they need separate items to be successful? Or are there --

>> KATY MYERS: Julie, hold on, I need to make sure, okay, never mind. Linda has access. I needed to make sure that she had access to her interpreter. Okay, sorry. Can you rephrase your question, please?

>> Yes, when we discuss combining these two things, do they share similarities in resources and other ways that would make it more efficient to combine them to save time and effort? Or are they so distinct in the resources they need --

>> KATY MYERS: I see your question.

>> Yeah, I'm not familiar with how these two things work, so someone please let me know. Thanks.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay, first of all, to the both interpreters, did you see Linda's note to you about notifying her when you switch?

>> Yes, I did see that. Is she able to pin both of us so that when we do switch, it should just swap us out?

>> KATY MYERS: Let me confirm that she can do that.

>> She can't.

>> KATY MYERS: Let me see. Okay, Linda, you should be able to pin now. I would like to ask Linda directly, Linda, do you have an opinion on whether or not we should combine these -- she said she can't pin. It said replace pin.

>> This is Jennifer, the other interpreter. Is it possible to spotlight both interpreters?

>> KATY MYERS: Sure.

>> That option, and then it will be staying on the screen for everyone.

>> KATY MYERS: That's fine with me. Okay, so right now, Heather is spotlighted, is that okay?

>> If you go and spotlight me as well. And I'll just turn my camera off when I'm not interpreting. Perfect. Thank you.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay. I wonder now if other speakers, if other panelist videos will show when they speak.

>> If you go up to the pop and change your view to gallery view

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you so much, I appreciate that, great. I would like to ask Linda directly, Linda, do you think that we should keep these two objectives, one is about strategic partnerships, one is about representation and decision making. Do you think we should keep them separate or combine them?

>> This is the interpreter, I'm not sure, does she have a camera on, or is she responding? She says, I'm not sure where to find the objective.

>> The objection was just verbal.

>> KATY MYERS: Linda, I think you missed the beginning of this discussion, so I'm going to put something in the chat.

>> She says that it's easier for her to get it through the sign language interpreter, and says please do. And Linda says --

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, I see. Did someone else -- while Linda is considering that, Chris, did I see your hand up?

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Yes, her hand is up.

>> Yes, I don't think you injured Julie's question.

>> that's what I was going to -- the things that Julie is asking about can be handled under the activities that go under this objective.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, I think if I understood Julie, if I understood your question correctly, you are asking if creating strategic partnerships and increasing representation and decision making require a lot of the same resources, or if they don't?

>> Yes.

>> KATY MYERS: And I think I would imagine, I'm not the only brain that would be working on this, but I would imagine that a lot of

the resources would overlap.

>> MIKE FODDRILL: And I think -- this is Mike, and I think that probably gets to the heart of this question. Do we think that you can kind of approach both issues collectively with a combined set of activities underneath that that would address both? Or are both issues distinct enough if they were to require activities that support each one individually? I think that's really probably the core of the question that we're trying to answer.

>> The word, "strategic" Changes. Because if you strategically make your partnerships, you would take that into consideration. The other activities under consideration I think as you make those partnerships. Is this the partnership that's going to give you that opportunity to try to develop these leaders to put into connection with those individuals and those organizations? Am I on the same page with everybody?

>> It puts the onus on us that we have to -- we can't just say, oh, we made a partnership, so that's good enough. They have to be partnerships that actually do something. And get to the goal. That's the way I'm reading it.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay. We need to -- we still need to discuss the rest of the objectives and have a public comment period. So in the interest of time, I'm going to put it back to please let me know, either raise your hand on your camera or raise the hand with the button or put it in the chat if you would like to keep it separate or combine it.

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Ann's hand is up and I want to make sure that she has a chance to talk.

>> Linda just put something in the chat.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, I see it, thank you.

>> I think it needs to be voiced though. It says, this is the issue, who will voice for us between disabilities and deaf people? I think separate. Is there any other discussion people want to make?

>> KATY MYERS: Chris, have you changed your mind? Would you like to keep them separate or combine them?

>> I want them to stay combined. Be strategic at it.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, and Ann, what do you think?

>> I think we should -- we can keep them together. My question was answered. Just a question, is this a vote or a consensus?

>> KATY MYERS: This is just a consensus. And to be clear, Linda thinks that the objectives should be separate.

>> Yes.

>> KATY MYERS: Is there anybody else that thinks they should be separate?

>> This is Luis, let's combine them.

>> KATY MYERS: All right, so what we're going to do is, we're going to move on to vote and approve all five combinations as they are. With the word strategic. Julie said combined with change is this final or change later? Again, nothing about anything we approve today is final forever. We can revise anything after this. I also want to take a moment to, before we move to the vote on these combinations, I want to quickly address some feedback and suggestions that Linda sent via email either yesterday or today. The reason I want to address it now is because in the chat, what she is saying is, she's asking about, if I'm understanding correctly, who will voice, like who will be representing and be acting as the voice for deaf people? And so what I want to say is that she also suggested a couple of things. And related to the objectives. Linda suggested explicitly naming deaf, hard-of-hearing and deaf-blind Hoosiers and youth and young adults in transition as populations of focus. She suggested using deaf and ASL users and deaf culture in our language and suggested adopting at least one objective focused on deaf, hard-of-hearing, deaf-blind, communication access and CIL capacity and at least one focus on youth transition leadership. So what I want to say in response to that is she also suggested language of these objectives. Most everything she is suggesting will be addressed at the activities level. So because the language of the goals and the objectives do not call out one particular population or community, those populations and communities can be noted separately in an activity related to them. Additionally, there's a separate section of the SPIL that is different from the goals, objectives and indicators, and that is where we identify who the unserved and underserved populations are for the next three years. Based on a compilation of all of the data analysis. We are still drilling down and analyzing that data and making sure that identifying who is unserved and underserved is

accurate. And so it is -- we can look at addressing the hard-of-hearing, deaf-blind community in that section of the SPIL and we can also look at addressing those communities in the activities part of this section of the SPIL. And so that is -- because no one -- the suggestions that Linda sent, the rest of the committee hasn't had time to look at, I just wanted to acknowledge them today to say that all of her suggestions are good. We can work all of them in. But they will be addressed in other sections of the SPIL that we're not discussing today. Okay, Linda says in the chat, what if Indiana association for the deaf speaks for all people with disabilities? How would you feel? I'm not sure how to respond to that question. And then she also said, the reach I mentioned it, many individuals refused to provide any communication access. Therefore, they aren't getting services. I think that whether or not CILs are providing communication access is something we can talk about offline. I want to stay focused on the votes and the discussions of today. Especially in interest of time and of the public comment section. Okay? We have a consensus that we're going to leave -- Ann, your hand is up?

>> I was just going to say, when we get past this part, we can move onto the activities down the road. One of the activities might be work so there is more interpreters and more access to interpreters across the state.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, absolutely.

>> That can be a goal, or not a goal, but --

>> KATY MYERS: An activity, that's right. And so I'm going to hand it back to Ann here, and we're going to do a roll call vote to approve all five combinations.

>> ANN BARNHART: We're going to do a roll call vote to, like Katy said, adding the word, "strategically"

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you for pointing that out and I did note that.

>> ANN BARNHART: To the last one.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, thank you for noting that.

>> ANN BARNHART: I'll call the names now. Ann Barnhardt, yes.

>> KATY MYERS: Can someone first --

>> ANN BARNHART: Sorry, I need a motion.

>> I would like to say something real quick before we motion in helping with combining this. You know, with out strategic partnerships, we can't get into conversations that allow opportunities for individuals with disabilities to get connected on boards and councils and committees and commissions. So that's why combining these two, it's not saying that we can hide under and have one part be stronger than the other part. They have to work together strategically, because without those partnerships, we can't get individuals with disabilities into spaces on boards and councils and committees. It has to develop over a time. So --

>> KATY MYERS: Excellent, thank you for that. Okay. Ann, back to the vote and I want to be conscience about time.

>> ANN BARNHART: I need a motion, please.

>> This is Luis, I motion that we combine them. Is that what you're looking for?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, please.

>> ANN BARNHART: Second, please?

>> This is Anna, I second the motion to leave them combined.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right. I will call the roll. Ann Barnhardt, yes. Halie Brown.

>> Yes.

>> Jeanine Coleman-Miller is not here. Abigail Fleenor is not here. Linda Greeno. Linda, could you put in the chat possibly? What you think?

>> KATY MYERS: She votes yes.

>> ANN BARNHART: Thank you. Anna Thompson Jones.

>> Yes.

>> ANN BARNHART: Jared Quarles.

>> Yes. Luis Roman.

>> Yes.

>> Julie Scher.

>> Yes.

>> Chris Spinks.

>> Yes.

>> Cierra Thomas-Williams.

>> Yes.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, thank you, it has passed.

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you, everybody.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, we're going to go on to proposed objective slate discussion and approval. This will cover all of the rest of the objectives we have talked about. As I mentioned, committee members have seen the objectives, the supporting data and were able to give feedback. now is another opportunity to discuss any individual objective and recommend it be combined with another revived or removed. Members can either approve the full slate, including the combination decision just made, or hold one or more objectives for a revision and approve the remaining objectives, and the combination decision. Does anyone have any questions? Does anybody have any revisions or combinations or questions that aren't covered? All right. I will repeat the question. In the objectives that were sent out to us, we have looked at before, do you have any revisions or, wanting to remove any, or do you want to combine any?

>> KATY MYERS: Ann, can you repeat some of these questions for Linda?

>> ANN BARNHART: That's what I'm trying to do.

>> KATY MYERS: I'm sorry, I was looking at the Q&A. I apologize.

>> ANN BARNHART: We can either approve the full slate, including the combination decisions just made, if there are combinations. Hold one or more of the objectives for revision and improve the remaining objectives, approve them with any changes that might have just been made. So basically, we can look at the objectives that were sent out and that we have talked about. Is there any changes anybody wants to make on them? And if there are, what changes do you want to make? Then we'll talk about it and we can approve all of them with the changes that have been made, or we can hold one back and approve just ones that we agree on. Any questions? Any comments?

>> This is Chris. You have the objectives, are you talking about these five that are on this one page?

>> ANN BARNHART: No, I'm talking about all of the rest of them that we had talked about before. The ones that we have gone over in our meetings where we rated them. All of those.

>> This is Luis. I say that we accept.

>> This is Halie, I second that.

>> ANN BARNHART: Linda says, my worry is who are the partnership groups? That's something to be determined I think.

>> KATY MYERS: Yep, we're not there yet. That's exactly right. I think when we get into the activities, that's when we can be more specific about how, when we say strategic partnerships, exactly what does that mean? Who are we going to be reaching out to? Who are we going to be in partnership with? We're not quite to that level yet.

>> I have to agree.

>> ANN BARNHART: It's still to be determined. All righty. Does anybody have any changes or any questions or any combinations or do they want to take out any of the objectives we have talked about in the past?

>> This is Luis, I do not.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, Luis, did you make a motion to approve?

>> Yes, I am Luis, and I motion to approve.

>> ANN BARNHART: All righty. Do we have a second?

>> This is Cierra, I second.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, thank you. I will read the roll then. Ann Barnhardt, yes. Halie Brown.

>> Yes.

>> Jeanine Coleman-Miller. She's not here, I'm sorry. Abigail Fleenor is not here. Linda Greeno. She said yes. Anna Thompson Jones.

>> Yes.

>> Jared Quarles.

>> Yes.

>> Luis Roman.

>> I do.

>> Julie Scher.

>> Yes.

>> Chris Spinks.

>> Yes.

>> And Cierra Thomas-Williams.

>> Yes.

>> ANN BARNHART: I'm sorry. All right.

>> KATY MYERS: Ann, I apologize, I was answering some questions in the Q&A. Can someone please tell me who went to the first and the second for that vote?

>> MIKE FODDRILL: I have that.

>> KATY MYERS: You have got it?

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Luis made the motion and Cierra seconded it.

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, the next thing, the committee requests that INSILC staff distribute the approved goals and objectives that which just approved to the following for feedback and comment. The Centers for Independent Living directors, consumers, members of the public and other network members and partners. The committee requests that the state plan workers begin drafting activities and indicators, performance metrics, implementation recommendations.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay. Sorry, Ann.

>> ANN BARNHART: Go ahead.

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you for giving those instructions. We will be sure to publish all of the language that was approved today online and start promoting it to the public and to consumers, we will also send everything to the CIL directors and make sure they each have ample opportunity to give their full revisions and comment. And we will also start drafting the activities and implementation activities and evaluation methods based on these objectives which again, once we draft the activities, those will also be put out for public comment and revision. So this is a process, we plan on having three full drafts of the SPIL between now and June, so everything that we have approved today is just a jumping off point.

>> ANN BARNHART: Ann, could you mention the information about the Town Hall next week where people can give feedback on these?

>> KATY MYERS: Absolutely, INSILC is hosting a disability point hall, this coming Tuesday, September 29th. The in-person event is

from 5:30 to 7:30:00 p.m.

but there's also going to be a live stream. The primary focus of the program is going to be about the Medicaid waiver reset. We have two leadership members from FSSA to come to talk to us. There's going to be a facilitative discussion, followed by audience question-and-answer. If you attend in person, there will also be snacks and community exhibiter tables. During the event, we will touch on the development of the 2027-2030 state plan. We will have the goals and objective language available at the INSILC table, and there will be a way for people to give their feedback. So anyone who attends either online or in person, we won't read through everything, because we want to mostly focus on Medicaid waiver reset. But we will talk about it, and we will publicize the fact that they're published. And the fact that -- and a mechanism for people to give their input.

>> ANN BARNHART: All righty, thank you for that update. Now, unless anyone has something else, we're going to move into the open public comment period. Each speaker will have a 3 minute time limit. We will keep track, and we'll state when the time has ended and mute the speaker after that limit. Comments not received today can be shared via other methods listed at INSILC.org/feedback. The public comment policy is on page 12 of the public facing policies document, located at the bottom of the about page at INSILC.org. Please identify yourself before speaking and speak slowly for accessibility.

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, okay. I want to say that we had a request in, before we take the first public comment, I had a request in the Q&A to share my screen with the goal language. Because we read them earlier. But they went fast. So I'm going to share that right now. Linda, we spotlighted the interpreter, so you should be able to access them, but if not, let us know. Okay, what I'm displaying on the screen right now is, it's an excel file. And there are four navy blue box was white text. The first one says, goal one, increase opportunities for individuals with disabilities to live independently and participate fully in their communities.

that goal is labeled community living and inconclusion. Goal two is about Independent Living core services and consumer access. The

detail reads, expand access to core Independent Living services that support community living, self determination and it consumer choice. Goal 3, systems advocacy and public policy. Remote systems change through advocacy leadership and public policy representation, and finally, goal 4, network capacity and sustainability, effectiveness and leadership of Indiana's Independent Living network. Okay. Marcy has had her hand up. Marcy is an attendee, she has had her hand up for a while. So Marcy, I'm going to press the "Allow to talk" Button and you should be able to make your comment, okay? You are muted right now. But you should be able to speak.

>> ANN BARNHART: Can you ask her to unmute?

>> KATY MYERS: Sure. Yeah, hit the button that says, ask to unmute. It's also possible that Marcy has her hand up and doesn't realize, or she doesn't want to make a public comment. Oh, she put in the Q&A, she doesn't know how she got her hand raised. So I don't believe that Marcy has a comment. So that's cool. Is there anyone else that would like to make a public comment? I know there were some comments. Jeremy Warner would like to make a comment. Okay, great.

>> Okay, this is Jeremy Warner. Can you all hear me?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, hi, Jeremy.

>> Okay, thank you, good. And I am with my own organization, in walking spirit. And so I want to thank you for finally putting the goals up so that we could see them. I guess I want to say that being acknowledged as a public meeting, it's very hard as a member of the public to follow along with what you are all talking about it things like this, that -- for this conversation, for it to be accessible to the public, having this information available in the meeting documents, when you click on that link instead of it just taking it to an agenda that talks about -- that just mentions these categories, but doesn't actually say what the goals are that you're talking about, what the objectives are that you're talking about, what the combinations of those objectives are, that makes it very very hard for us to follow along and to be able to give you good constructive feedback when we're in it. I do want to acknowledge, I think the concern that Ann has brought up a couple of times about combining objectives does

create an opportunity for progress to be plained with out actually having real substantial progress towards those objectives if they are combined. In some cases, it makes perfect sense. In other cases, it could allow one thing to not be addressed while the other is. And I think it's very hard to give you that feedback with out actually having to see that while you guys are having the conversation. So I think that kind of covers pretty much what I guess I would say in regards to these goals. I think it's important for you guys to have a statement in the SPIL about -- and I think maybe you're trying to get there, but to have a clear statement about building an engaged public. And I know that you have that in one of these goals to grow participation. So it concerns me I guess, you're throwing goals out before actually talking about how they meet the definition of a smart goal, being such, measurable, achievable, relatable and timed. So I know it falls into the activity category that you haven't talked about yet. But if you're putting goals and objectives out there to consider, we need to see how they're actually achievable and relatable goals, not just words on the page.

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you, Jeremy. I want to respond to a couple of your comments. The first is in terms of why we dependent publish the bowl and objective language with the meeting documents, we want to give the committee the chance to affirm and confirm the language of the draft before we send it out on the public. After as of tomorrow, you will have an opportunity to really get into the nitty gritty. In terms of your concern about combining two objectives and potentially allowing for progress, lack of progress to be kind of hid, or not apparent, you will have opportunities to give us revision on the evaluation methods that we come up with. So when it comes time to preparing reports for the 27-30 SPIL, and you are looking at us to know if we completed the objective or not, there will be evaluation methods listed and you will have an opportunity to give notes on those. And finally, building engagement and participation is absolutely important to us. I think that that concept could be supplied in probably all four of these goals. And you also mentioned smart goals. We have received feedback, and we fully agree that the next SPIL, the 27-30 SPIL, needs to utilize the short methodology to be very measurable, very

specific. And that's the type of language this you're going to see in the activities. So we just quite aren't there yet. You know, the goals, it's kind of a big giant umbrella and the objectives are big big buckets, and it's the activities and the evaluations where we're really going to have the opportunity to drill down and make these goals really really mean something. Okay, I'm going to --

>> ANN BARNHART: Thank you, Jeremy.

>> KATY MYERS: All right, who else would like to make a comment? I know, there were some comments put in the Q&A. I responded to at least one individual asking for elaboration, so we were happy to do that. Okay, Brianna, go for it, Brianna.

>> Okay. You guys are able to hear me?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, Ma'am.

>> Awesome. So my question is, really just what input you guys were able to base these goals off of? Was it the public input? Was it -- and what public input? Was it director input, staff input? What were these goals based off of?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, we have a good list. I can't -- I don't have it memorized and I can't pull it up because I'm sharing the screen right now. I will publish the list of data sources along with this. And a little bit of detail about each one. So don't sue me, because I'm not going to remember all of them right now. But the first is public comment. So the public comments that we received over this fiscal year, we put a lot of weight behind those. We also pulled data from the American community survey, as well as data for the actual Centers for Independent Living. We pulled in -- we looked at other state SPILs in terms of what are they looking at? We looked at what the federal priorities are. There are a couple of different versions of quantitative and qualitative data sources, but we put all of it, we analyzed all of them together and we provided a summary of that data analysis to the SPIL committee. So as they looked at each individual objective, they saw kind of like a breakdown of what the data said about each idea that is reflected in the objective. The committee members also have the opportunity to give their input additionally on the objectives by giving scores related to like considering like how strong the data support was, what the individual committee member felt was the priority, like our ability to

influence and how important that particular objective is. So there were lots of different ways that we pulled data together, and then there were multiple ways that the SPIL committee members were able to give input on the drafts.

>> That's good, and just a quick followup question, not to cut you off.

>> KATY MYERS: Sorry, I didn't mean to talk.

>> No, you're good. And then are these in order of importance? Or are these just random order and this is just what we came up with.

>> KATY MYERS: These are not in order of importance. And they're not in random order. So if you will notice, that goal four has to do with capacity and sustainability of the network, it's really -- we learned that it's really common for other states to recognize making sure that there is a strong effective state council, and objectives are related to just that. We also recognize that in order to be able to do what we do best, and then also expand what we do, we need funding, but we receive feedback in early forums with SPIL leaders and CIL staff, so in the current SPIL, we have the network and the funding and capacity listed first, and that that can give a message that we care more about funding than we do about people. So we made sure that the goals here kind of put people first and so that's why they are ordered in this way.

but they are not ordered by importance. They're all very very important.

>> Cool, thank you.

>> KATY MYERS: Absolutely. Ann, our committee member has her hand raised. And then I see that Amanda would like to make a public comment.

>> ANN BARNHART: I would like to say real quick in response to Brianna's first question, we also had access to all of the public comment. So we could go back through and look through all of the public comments and see what the public was saying. So it wasn't just taking somebody else's word for it, or whoever analyzed it's word for it. We could go back and look at the public comments ourselves.

>> KATY MYERS: Thank you, Ann. Okay, Amanda had her hand up first, so we're going to take her public comment. Okay, Amanda,

you should be able to talk. You're on mute. There you go. Got it.

>> So my question is, when you say you're wanting to put people first, where in this, you say you want to do corporate initiatives, working with corporations, I'm not hearing anything that you want to reach out to people. So where in this are you reaching out to individuals?

>> KATY MYERS: So first, a point of clarification, the word, "corporation" Does not appear in any of the goals or objectives that we approve today. I believe what you might be referring to is partnerships, and so that can mean a lot of different things. It doesn't exclude corporations, but it can mean self advocacy groups, a group like the Indiana association for the deaf. Or the Arc of Indiana, or there are literally dozens. I wouldn't even try to name all of them. It could also mean partnerships with different elements of the family and social services administration. It can mean partnerships with educational entities. And so those are all just examples that we have not drafted yet, but examples of organizations that having a partnership with would allow us access to be able to work and engage with individuals on an individual basis.

>> You're not doing that now?

>> KATY MYERS: The answer is yes. The first thing is, CILs, Centers for Independent Living, they are all about the individual relationship and the partnership with the individual consumers, and let the consumers lead that relationship and the discussions and whatever they work towards. Second of all, in terms of the state council, which is INSILC, we are -- it's important to know that we're not allowed to give direct services to individuals, but we do still engage with individuals all the time. We engage with individuals at our events that we host at the meetings that we host, so I know that you have attended our virtual forums, public meetings such as this. We also engage with individuals when we bring an INSILC table to other community events. So if a Center for Independent Living hosts a community event, INSILC will bring a table. If there's a big long list of other events -- for example, we went to Indiana black expo this year and had a table for three days, so we interact

with individuals on that level. And we interact with people by taking their comments and surveys and that's individual work. So these are all of the ways that the centers and the council work with individuals. Okay. Theresa is next. You should be good, Theresa.

>> Can you hear me?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes, Ma'am.

>> Wonderful. I think what I want to say is that it is most unfortunate that INSILC and this committee continue to reference all of the public comment and public input that you claim to have received from people across the state at your various events, each of which either myself or someone from my staff was in attendance. I do not recall any of those events at which the public was advised as to the purpose of the state plan, nor given opportunity to provide input into the development of the state plan, and you have acknowledged that people's numbers were counted over and over. So I think it is unfortunate that either you are fooling yourself, or others, but you are giving an impression of having gotten input from all kinds of places, and you have not.

So that's unfortunate. You know it, I don't want to argue about it, but you know that you are attempting to create the illusion of having actively solicited and considered informed input from 500 people across the state. And that did not happen. But thanks.

>> KATY MYERS: Hi, Theresa, okay, so a couple of things. First of all, we have a new web page, and I can put it in the chat. But it outlines our activities.

>> I've seen it. Doesn't change.

>> KATY MYERS: And first of all, we have said that we have engaged with 500 individuals. We have said that we have taken comment from only about 115, I forget the exact number. We have not said that we have gotten 500 comments from 500 people. At our events, we do talk about the SPIL. We don't always get into a lot of detail. A lot of times we do preserve time for the speaker agenda. However, if someone gives us a public comment about their priority and what is important to them, that applies to the SPIL. We have heard what is important to the person, therefore, we can apply it to what the public said. Second of all, we had 12 virtual input forums with the explicit purpose of informing the SPIL. I don't

know how many comments we received exactly from those virtual events, but which mentioned a lot that the input we received at public events and meetings is used to develop the state plan. We have received an incredible increase this year in number of public comments than what we have received in the last two or three years combined. And we will always, always, always be striving to get more comments, more input from different parts of the state, from all parts of the state. But we have made a concerted effort to get public input and you can see that by the number of events and meetings that we have hosted this year. You can see that by the number of comments that we have received, many of which are from you and your colleagues, and you can see that in the number of people that we received. Or the number of people that actually made comments. So we're being very transparent, we're doing our very very best in everything that we do. And we can say with confidence that the information that has led to the drafting of these goals and objectives are based on the input that we received, quantitative and qualitative sources. We're confident with the data we have been using. Okay. Christian fuller would like to make a comment. And then we can come back to Theresa for another comment from Theresa.

Christian, you should be good.

>> Can you hear me?

>> KATY MYERS: Yes.

>> So I appreciate that you just made that large statement in regards to Theresa's question or comment and that you feel you're confident. But in your own statement, you said a large number of comments were from someone at everybody counts, so that confirms counter data. The fact that you're saying that you got public comment, you got it from us, so you didn't get that much public comment, especially since we're the ones that attended the meetings and you counted us multiple times and multiple meetings, and the fact that you met with 500 people. You probably met with 100 and you counted them over and over again, which was us. So you kind of still are missing the public input. You got it from us and maybe one or two public people and that's more accurate than 150, or even 500.

>> KATY MYERS: Christian, is that the end of your comment?

>> That is the end of my comment, yes.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay, great. Okay, the number of comments that we received is separate from the number of people who have made comments. If you would like, you can go through every single comment that we received this fiscal year and count for yourself how many of them came from you, how many of them came from others. I think anyone can do that and determine whether or not it was substantial or sufficient. So I'll let you dig into the data if you're available. Let's see, we have 4 more minutes, so Theresa would like to make another comment. Just give me one second. Theresa, you're good.

>> Thanks, listen, when you let people know that you are unmuting them, it would be considerate to also let them know when you're muting them again, such as you did me, when I was attempting to point out to you what I will say now. None of the people whose comments you say went towards the state plan were informed that their comments were going toward the state plan. So that's not informed input. It's not respect. And it's not representing truth. If you say we touched on the state plan, we mentioned the state plan, it doesn't say openly, here's what we want you to provide comments on. So they knew what you were doing with their comments. I call that using people with out their permission. And so thank you so much for cutting off my mic earlier so I had to ask for it again. I appreciate the notice.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay, Theresa, is your comment complete?

>> Sure. Thanks for asking.

>> KATY MYERS: Okay. I removed your permission to talk because you were talking over me, and that's difficult for the interpreters. We did, and we do notify people that public comments go towards the state plan. How do you want to characterize that based on exactly how many words, based on how and when we did that based on whatever event you did attend, and however you want to characterize that is up to you. We're proud of the public comment that we have received. And we will always be striving to receive more. Okay? Okay. We are at 3:29. We only have the interpreters for about one more minute. So we no longer need a roll

call vote to adjourn, but if there's any last comments, questions, concerns from the committee, I will take just a quick -- Linda, I see that you made a comment. I will send you an email in response. Okay? So let's do a quick adjournment.

could I please have a motion? We don't need to do the full roll call, but can I do a motion? Ann, I'll let you do that.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right. Do we have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

>> This is Cierra, I move to adjourn the meeting.

>> Do we have a second?

>> This is Chris. Go ahead, Anna.

>> I think we have a double second. This is Anna, and I motion to adjourn.

>> ANN BARNHART: All right, I would like to thank all of the committee members and attendees for coming today. And I will adjourn this meeting. Thank you.

>> KATY MYERS: Thanks, everybody.

>> MIKE FODDRILL: Thanks, everyone.

>> ANN BARNHART: Have a good afternoon.