



Ohio Independent Living Network

Final Organizational and Network Capacity Assessment

August 2026

Prepared by
Bottom Line Consulting Group
Aligning People. Accelerating Progress.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
1. Assessment Purpose and Scope	7
2. Methodology and Stakeholder Participation	7
3. The Stakeholder Map: Understanding the People and Relationships	8
4. What Is Already Strong	9
5. The Network Story	9
6. What the Survey Data Says	10
6.1 Capacity Across Key Organizational and Network Functions	10
7. Strategic Findings	12
7.1 OSILC Organizational Capacity	12
7.2 Governance and Leadership Systems	13
7.3 Compliance and SPIL Monitoring Structures	13
7.4 Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Processes	13
7.5 Collaboration and Coordination Across the CIL Network	14
7.6 Operational Efficiency and Shared Services Opportunities	14
7.7 Statewide Stakeholder Ecosystem Dynamics	14
8. How the Findings Should Inform the 2028–2030 SPIL	15
9. Strategic Recommendations	16
10. Three-Year Focus and Implementation Roadmap	25
11. Measurement Framework	28
12. Implementation Conditions and Risks	29
13. Conclusion: The Work Ahead	29
Appendix A. Stakeholder Map and Detailed Analysis	31
Appendix B. Participant, Respondent, and Engagement Detail	31
Appendix C. Companion Documents, Contract Alignment, and Supporting Deliverables	33
Appendix D. Stakeholder Role Clarity Risk Summary	34
Appendix E. Living Documents for Follow-Up Measurement	35
Follow-Up Tool Templates	35

Executive Summary

Ohio's Independent Living network has a strong heart. Across stakeholder interviews, the network survey, assessment tools, and listening sessions, participants described a system grounded in Independent Living values, built on trusted relationships, led by committed leaders, and characterized by a shared willingness to help one another solve problems. The Ohio Statewide Independent Living Council (OSILC) is viewed as an important statewide connector, convener, provider of fiscal and compliance support, technical assistance resource, steward of the State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL), and an emerging backbone intermediary—an organization that helps coordinate, connect, and support shared work without directing local organizations.

The assessment does not tell the story of a broken network. It tells the story of a network that has grown more complex than its current operating structure can support. Relationships have carried the work through leadership changes, limited resources, differences among Centers for Independent Living, and rising statewide demands. Those relationships remain the network's greatest asset. They are also being asked to carry too much of the system without sufficient shared structure, documentation, communication rhythm, accountability, data, distributed leadership, and organizational capacity.

“The collaboration should not be treated as broken. It should be treated as under-structured.”

The evidence is consistent. Twenty-eight stakeholder interviews provided depth, and fifty-two anonymous survey responses tested whether those experiences were broadly shared. Assessment tools organized the evidence into a structured view of organizational capacity, network effectiveness, and collaboration health. Three listening sessions with 12 participants then validated the findings, added practical context, and moved the assessment toward solutions that could be implemented across a network of organizations with varying needs and capacity levels.

The overall assessment places OSILC and the broader network between Developing and Defined. OSILC's organizational capacity and network effectiveness each averaged 2.6 out of 5, while collaboration health averaged 2.8 out of 5. These scores are not grades, audits, or judgments of individual organizations. They indicate that formal structures and strong relationships exist, but implementation remains uneven, institutional knowledge is insufficiently distributed, and too much progress depends on a relatively small number of people.

The recommended direction is not more bureaucracy, greater centralization, or reduced CIL independence. It is a stronger statewide operating framework that protects relationships, distributes responsibility, makes progress visible, strengthens local capacity, and helps OSILC, CILs, Council members, committees, partners, and people with disabilities work together more effectively.

A central implication of the assessment is that OSILC should more intentionally define and strengthen its role as a statewide backbone intermediary. OSILC already performs many backbone functions, including convening the network, supporting SPIL implementation, providing fiscal and compliance assistance, connecting stakeholders, responding to technical questions, and helping statewide work move forward. However, its role, authority, capacity, and value are not consistently understood.

The next stage should connect statewide coordination to practical application. OSILC's value should not be measured solely by the number of meetings held, reports produced, or requests answered. It should also be measured by whether CILs have easier access to practical tools, peer learning, targeted technical assistance, usable data, shared resources, and coordinated support that strengthen their ability to serve people with disabilities.

A stronger backbone role would not mean directing local CIL operations. It would mean creating conditions that enable locally governed, community-responsive Centers to operate more effectively, learn from one another, meaningfully participate in statewide priorities, and contribute to collective impact.

Eight Summary Findings

The assessment surfaced eight summary conclusions:

1. OSILC serves as a statewide backbone intermediary, yet its role, authority, and value are not consistently understood.

Stakeholders do not always share a common understanding of OSILC's responsibilities, decision-making authority, relationship to CILs, or role in statewide coordination. Clearer role definitions and communication are needed.

2. OSILC's responsibilities may exceed the staffing and infrastructure currently available to support them.

Expectations for governance, fiscal administration, compliance, SPIL stewardship, technical assistance, communication, partnership coordination, and statewide engagement pose capacity and continuity risks.

3. Governance structures are in place, but Council and committee engagement is uneven.

Participation, role clarity, leadership distribution, committee activity, and follow-through vary. Stronger onboarding, clearer expectations, workplans, succession planning, and accountability are needed.

4. SPIL monitoring is underway, but progress is not consistently visible, understandable, or linked to local implementation.

Stakeholders need a clearer view of what is underway, who is responsible, what has been completed, where barriers exist, and how statewide objectives connect to local CIL activities and community outcomes.

5. Communication and collaboration rely too heavily on informal relationships and individual follow-through.

Trusted relationships are a major strength, but statewide coordination needs more consistent communication routines, documented decisions, accessible information, commitment tracking, and shared accountability.

6. CIL capacity varies significantly, and sufficient capacity for current work does not always mean capacity to take on more.

Capacity differs by size, geography, staffing, funding, governance, infrastructure, and leadership tenure. Survey findings show particular constraints in community awareness, outreach, sustainability and resource development, strategic planning, consumer engagement, and staffing. Statewide expectations, technical assistance, and participation structures should account for these differences rather than assuming that every Center has the same resources or readiness.

7. The network seeks practical technical assistance, peer learning, shared tools, and selected shared services.

Stakeholders are seeking support that addresses real organizational challenges, including governance, onboarding, financial management, human resources, data, evaluation, communications, advocacy, succession planning, compliance, grant development, and workflow documentation.

8. OSILC should strengthen its backbone-intermediary role by linking statewide priorities to practical application, local capacity building, consumer voice, data, visibility, sustainability, and advocacy coordination.

OSILC should help translate statewide goals into adaptable tools, peer-learning opportunities, targeted technical assistance, shared resources, data practices, community-engagement pathways, and selected shared-service pilots. This role should strengthen—not replace—local leadership, CIL independence, and community responsiveness.

Three-Year Direction

The next three years should move Ohio's Independent Living network from relationship-dependent coordination to relationship-supported systems. The goal is not to replace people or relationships with process. It is to build sufficient practical infrastructure to protect those relationships, distribute knowledge, clarify responsibilities, support CILs at different capacity levels, and sustain statewide progress.

Year One: Establish the Operating Foundation

Year One should focus on the basic systems needed to strengthen the backbone and improve statewide coordination:

- Clarify OSILC, Council, committee, CIL, and partner roles.
- Define decision rights and shared responsibilities.
- Establish a predictable communication rhythm.
- Implement commitment tracking and documented follow-through.
- Make SPIL progress visible through an accessible dashboard.
- Strengthen onboarding for Council members, committees, staff, and network participants.
- Document critical workflows and institutional knowledge.
- Complete a practical assessment of CIL technical assistance and capacity-building needs.
- Establish a shared-resource library.
- Create recurring pathways for consumer and community input.

Year Two: Test and Embed Practical Supports

Year Two should shift from system design to application:

- Launch peer-learning cohorts for CIL leaders and staff.
- Deliver targeted technical assistance based on identified needs.
- Test selected shared-resource and shared-service pilots.
- Support CILs in adapting statewide tools to local conditions.
- Develop common data definitions and accessible visualizations.
- Connect SPIL priorities more directly to local activities, barriers, and outcomes.
- Establish practical committee workplans.
- Create cross-CIL problem-solving opportunities.
- Strengthen statewide communication and advocacy resources.
- Evaluate which supports are useful, accessible, and realistic.

Year Three: Institutionalize Learning and Shape the Next SPIL

Year Three should use the stronger operating framework and evidence base to inform future planning:

- Use implementation experience to shape the 2028–2030 SPIL.
- Reassess organizational capacity, network effectiveness, and collaboration health.
- Evaluate whether technical assistance, peer learning, shared tools, and shared services strengthened CIL capacity.
- Assess changes in communication, accountability, SPIL visibility, community participation, and statewide coordination.
- Identify which backbone functions should become permanent.
- Determine the staffing, funding, technology, and partnership resources required for sustainability.
- Strengthen statewide advocacy and collective impact communication.
- Formalize ongoing consumer leadership and community-input structures.
- Establish the next capacity-building and sustainability agenda.

The ultimate test of this work is not whether OSILC creates more structure. It is whether that structure helps the network function better for the people it exists to serve.

“Don’t lose sight of who we’re trying to help—the person with the disability, regardless of their disability.” —
Listening-session participant

The assessment shows that Ohio’s Independent Living network has the trust, shared purpose, practical knowledge, and commitment needed to advance to its next stage of development. The opportunity now is to build a backbone structure strong enough to support the network without centralizing it, to strengthen CIL capacity without diminishing local independence, and to make community voice, shared learning, advocacy, and collective impact more visible in the next SPIL and beyond.

Full Report

1. Assessment Purpose and Scope

Bottom Line Consulting Group was engaged to conduct an Organizational and Network Capacity Assessment for the Ohio Statewide Independent Living Council (OSILC) and the twelve Centers for Independent Living (CILs) that comprise Ohio's Independent Living network. The assessment was designed to move beyond a list of concerns and deliver an integrated set of findings, recommendations, tools, and implementation steps that OSILC can use for planning, accountability, and preparation for the 2028–2030 SPIL.

The engagement evaluated OSILC's organizational capacity; governance and leadership systems; compliance and SPIL monitoring structures; communication and stakeholder engagement processes; collaboration and coordination across the CIL network; operational efficiency and shared-service opportunities; and dynamics of the statewide stakeholder ecosystem.

The purpose of the final report is not merely to describe what is working and what is not. It is to answer a more useful question: what does Ohio's Independent Living network need to become clearer, stronger, more equitable, and more sustainable over time?

Key Terms for External Readers

- **Independent Living (IL):** A disability-led philosophy and service approach centered on consumer control, choice, self-determination, accessibility, community living, advocacy, and full participation.
- **OSILC:** Ohio Statewide Independent Living Council, the statewide council responsible for SPIL development, monitoring, coordination, and related Independent Living responsibilities.
- **CILs:** Centers for Independent Living, locally governed organizations that provide Independent Living services, advocacy, and community-based supports.
- **SPIL:** State Plan for Independent Living, the statewide plan that establishes Independent Living goals, priorities, and responsibilities.
- **OOD/DSE:** Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities / Designated State Entity, referenced in this report in connection with state-level administrative, fiscal, and coordination responsibilities.
- **Backbone intermediary:** A coordinating and support role that helps multiple independent organizations work toward shared goals without directing or controlling their local operations.

2. Methodology and Stakeholder Participation

The assessment used multiple forms of engagement so the findings would reflect both the depth of individual experience and the breadth of network perception. The methods were intentionally connected: interviews identified the story, the survey tested its reach, assessment tools explained what the patterns meant, and listening sessions helped determine what should happen next.

Method	Participation	Timing	Who Was Represented	Contribution
Stakeholder interviews	28 interviews	April-May 2026	Council members, OSILC staff, CIL directors and staff, OOD/state representatives, advocacy partners, and community stakeholders	Provided depth: experiences, role tensions, barriers, risks, and emerging opportunities.

Method	Participation	Timing	Who Was Represented	Contribution
Network survey	52 anonymous responses	Closed May 22, 2026	CIL executive directors, CIL staff, OSILC Council members, OSILC staff, partners, and other network stakeholders	Provided breadth: tested whether interview themes were broadly shared.
Listening sessions	3 sessions; 12 participants	June 2026	7 CIL directors, 1 CIL staff member, 2 Council members, 1 OSILC staff member, and 1 system partner	Validated themes and prioritized practical solutions.
Assessment tools	Tool suite applied to evidence base	June 2026	Capacity, collaboration, stakeholder, and network-functioning evidence	Translated qualitative and quantitative patterns into baseline measures.

Survey participation should be interpreted with care. Approximately 65% of respondents were staff, seven were CIL executive directors, and two were Council members. The survey therefore offers a strong view of staff experience but should not be treated as equally representative of all stakeholder groups. Interviews and listening sessions provided context on leadership, governance, partners, and systems.

Interview Category	Number Interviewed	What This Group Helped Us Understand
OSILC staff and executive leadership	3	Internal capacity, staffing, workflow, documentation, fiscal processes, SPIL coordination, communication, and follow-through.
OSILC council members, council leadership, and committee participants	12	Governance, committee structure, council engagement, lived experience, decision-making, SPIL visibility, accountability, and community voice.
CIL executive directors and CIL staff	7	CIL capacity, service-delivery realities, rural and urban differences, peer learning, technical assistance needs, shared supports, SPIL implementation, and local-state alignment.
OOD/state representatives or state-system partners	2	State alignment, fiscal and administrative relationship, funding role, SPIL connection, and broader system coordination.
Advocacy, grassroots, technical assistance, and community partners	4	Cross-disability collaboration, advocacy capacity, visibility, public engagement, consumer voice, policy opportunities, and external ecosystem dynamics.
Total	28	Some interviewees hold overlapping identities or roles; each person is counted once by primary interview category.

3. The Stakeholder Map: Understanding the People and Relationships

To better understand the health and effectiveness of Ohio's Independent Living network, a stakeholder mapping analysis assessed five dimensions across key stakeholder groups: influence, engagement, trust, role clarity, and system criticality. The analysis found that the network rests on a strong foundation of trusted relationships, a shared commitment to the Independent Living philosophy, and broad recognition of OSILC's value as a statewide convener. Across stakeholder groups, OSILC is viewed as a credible, respected organization that provides essential leadership, coordination, technical assistance, and support.

At the same time, the assessment identified key opportunities to strengthen the network's overall effectiveness. Stakeholders with the greatest influence on statewide outcomes, including CIL Executive Directors, Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities (OOD), people with disabilities, and key advocacy partners, are not consistently engaged through structured statewide processes. In addition, role clarity varies across stakeholder groups,

engagement levels are uneven, and OSILC staff capacity is stretched by rising expectations for statewide coordination, technical assistance, compliance, and leadership within the network.

Overall, the stakeholder mapping indicates that the network's primary challenge is system-building rather than relationship-building. Ohio's Independent Living network has the trust, credibility, and collaborative spirit needed to achieve greater statewide impact. The next stage of its evolution will require strengthening governance, clarifying roles and responsibilities, expanding opportunities for meaningful engagement, building organizational and leadership capacity, and establishing more consistent accountability mechanisms. These findings informed the recommendations throughout this report.

*The complete Stakeholder Mapping Matrix is provided in **Appendix A***

4. What Is Already Strong

The assessment begins by focusing on strengths. Stakeholders consistently described shared Independent Living values, trust in OSILC, strong relationships, committed leaders and staff, valuable lived experience, and a strong foundation for statewide advocacy. These strengths form the basis for the next stage of network development.

- Shared Independent Living values: consumer control, choice, self-determination, accessibility, community living, disability-led decision-making, advocacy, and full participation.
- Trust in OSILC: OSILC is generally viewed as credible, responsive, knowledgeable, accessible, and committed.
- Strong relational capital: relationships across the network are stronger than they were in the past and help people solve problems.
- Committed leaders and staff: the assessment did not find a lack of commitment; it found people who are committed and stretched.
- Statewide advocacy potential: participants believe the network is strongest when it speaks with a shared voice.

5. The Network Story

The assessment's strongest message is that Ohio's Independent Living network has a strong heart. People believe in the mission. They value one another. They recognize OSILC as an important statewide anchor. Some Directors call one another, while newer Directors feel isolated. OSILC staff answer questions and help resolve problems. Council and committee leaders, along with experienced Directors, often step in because they know the history and understand how the system works.

That relational strength has helped the network survive change, limited resources, leadership transitions, and the diverse realities of 12 independent Centers for Independent Living. But the same strength has become a source of vulnerability. Too much information depends on knowing whom to call. Too much follow-through depends on one person's memory. Too much institutional knowledge resides with a small group of experienced leaders. Too many responsibilities are shared without clear assignment.

The opportunity is not to replace relationships with rules. It is to build enough structure to protect those relationships. Strong systems should make it easier for people to participate, for OSILC staff to coordinate, for CILs to connect local work to statewide priorities, and for people with disabilities to see and influence the work.

Core Story

The next stage of network development is not about control. It is about clarity, communication, capacity, accountability, data, and voice.

6. What the Survey Data Says

The data tells a clear, balanced story. Stakeholders value OSILC and the network, trust the mission and relationships, and want more reliable ways to communicate, make decisions, track commitments, use SPIL as a management tool, engage people with disabilities, and support centers at different levels of capacity.

Data Point	What It Shows
Network value	51 of 52 respondents (98%) said participation in the statewide network added value to their work.
Meaningful collaboration	Collaboration contributing to meaningful outcomes averaged 3.71 out of 5.
Trust	Trust across the network averaged 3.62 out of 5; trust to address difficult issues averaged approximately 3.40.
Conflict resolution	Conflict resolution averaged 3.38, showing less confidence when relationships are tested.
Role clarity	Approximately 60% reported clear understanding of OSILC's role; about 40% did not report strong clarity.
Communication	Communication effectiveness averaged 3.30; communication gaps were selected by 21 of 52 respondents as an urgent barrier.
Participation	Only 34% of survey respondents described themselves as very active in the network.
Accountability	Accountability for organizational commitments averaged 3.33; shared accountability for statewide outcomes averaged 3.38.
SPIL visibility	SPIL monitoring averaged 3.52, with many respondents neutral, suggesting monitoring is not consistently visible.
Capacity baseline	OSILC organizational capacity and network effectiveness each averaged 2.6 out of 5; collaboration health averaged 2.8.
Support needs	Cross-CIL collaboration was a high-priority support need, with 20 high-need and 7 urgent-need ratings. Orientation/onboarding received 15 high-need and 8 urgent-need ratings.

6.1 Capacity Across Key Organizational and Network Functions

As part of the assessment, participants were asked to rate current capacity across key organizational and network functions. Ratings ranged from **Minimal to No Capacity** to **Able to Add Within Current Capacity**, providing a more detailed picture of where existing capacity is sufficient, where organizations have room to grow, and where additional support or resources may be needed.

These findings reflect responses from assessment participants representing perspectives across Ohio's Independent Living network. Response totals vary by capacity area because not every participant answered every question. Percentages are therefore presented to support comparison across capacity areas; the **n** column shows the number of respondents who answered each item. Additional information about assessment participants and data collection is provided in Section 2.

The results show that capacity is not uniform across the network. In many areas, respondents indicated that current capacity is sufficient to meet existing needs. At the same time, several functions show more significant constraints, particularly those related to community awareness, outreach, sustainability and resource development, strategic planning, consumer engagement, and staffing.

Table 2. Current Capacity Across Key Organizational and Network Functions

Function	n	Minimal / No Capacity	Lower Than Needed	Meets Needs / Requirements	Above Minimum Needs	Able to Add Capacity
Governance and Board Leadership	39	8%	18%	54%	15%	5%
Organizational Management and Leadership	40	3%	13%	45%	28%	13%
Strategic Planning	38	5%	21%	45%	18%	11%
Data and Performance Management	39	0%	10%	62%	21%	8%
Providing Core Services	40	0%	8%	50%	35%	8%
Equity and Accessibility Practices	42	2%	5%	48%	31%	14%
Advocacy Strategy and Work in Community	42	0%	19%	29%	36%	17%
Consumer Engagement and Lived Experience	43	0%	23%	42%	16%	19%
Staff Workloads and Activity	45	4%	9%	44%	40%	2%
Shared Accountability and Follow-Through	45	4%	13%	58%	20%	4%
Fiscal Management and Operations	36	0%	6%	61%	22%	11%
Outreach to the Community	44	9%	32%	36%	16%	7%
Community Awareness of CILs	44	16%	43%	30%	9%	2%
Overall Staffing Levels	43	5%	21%	58%	16%	0%
Sustainability, Funding, and Resource Development	39	0%	41%	46%	10%	3%

Rating scale: Minimal/No Capacity = little or no current ability; Lower Than Needed = insufficient to consistently meet needs; Meets Needs/Requirements = sufficient for current work; Above Minimum Needs = some room for additional demands; Able to Add Capacity = additional work can be absorbed without substantial new resources.

Note: n = number of respondents answering each item. Response totals vary by item because not every participant answered every question. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

What the Capacity Findings Tell Us

The capacity findings reveal an important distinction between **having enough capacity to perform current work and having enough capacity to take on more**. Across several core functions, respondents reported that capacity generally meets current needs. Data and performance management, fiscal management and operations, shared accountability and follow-through, core service delivery, and equity and accessibility practices were among the areas where relatively strong proportions of respondents indicated that current capacity meets or exceeds requirements.

At the same time, several areas warrant particular attention.

Community awareness represents the most pronounced capacity challenge. For Community Awareness of CILs, 16% of respondents reported minimal to no capacity and another 43% reported capacity lower than needed. Together, nearly six in ten respondents identified a capacity gap in this area. This finding suggests that the network's ability to communicate the role, reach, and value of CILs may not be as strong as its ability to deliver core services.

Sustainability and resource development also emerged as a significant concern. Forty-one percent of respondents reported capacity lower than needed for sustainability, funding, and resource development. This finding is particularly important because financial and resource-development capacity affects organizations' ability not only to maintain current operations but also to respond to emerging needs, invest in infrastructure, and pursue future opportunities.

Outreach capacity presents another notable gap. Forty-one percent of respondents rated outreach to the community below needed capacity, including 9% reporting minimal to no capacity and 32% reporting capacity lower than needed. Strengthening outreach may therefore be closely connected to improving community awareness, consumer engagement, and the visibility of the Independent Living network.

Staffing findings reveal a different type of capacity concern. While 58% of respondents indicated that overall staffing currently meets needs, no respondents indicated that their organizations were able to add responsibilities within existing staffing capacity. This distinction is important: organizations may be successfully managing current responsibilities while having little ability to absorb additional work, initiatives, or expectations.

Strategic planning and consumer engagement also demonstrate areas where additional capacity could strengthen the network. Twenty-six percent of respondents rated strategic planning capacity below what is needed, while 23% reported lower-than-needed capacity in consumer engagement and lived experience.

Overall, the findings do not describe a network without capacity. Rather, they point to a network with **meaningful existing strengths, uneven capacity across functions, and limited excess capacity in several areas.** The challenge is therefore not simply to “build capacity” broadly. It is to protect what is working while strategically strengthening the functions that affect sustainability, community reach, consumer voice, and the network's ability to take on future priorities.

Implications for Moving Forward

These findings reinforce the need for a **capacity-sensitive approach to statewide improvement.** New expectations should not simply be layered onto organizations that are already using much of their available capacity to meet current responsibilities. Instead, implementation should emphasize prioritization, practical tools, shared supports, peer learning, clear roles, realistic timelines, and opportunities to reduce duplication or administrative burden.

The capacity findings also support a phased approach to implementation. Early efforts should focus on strengthening the operating foundation and addressing priority gaps before expecting organizations to assume substantially expanded responsibilities. As systems, supports, and shared practices become more established, the network will be better positioned to expand statewide coordination, advocacy, consumer engagement, visibility, and continuous improvement.

7. Strategic Findings

The following findings are organized around the seven areas for which OSILC retained BLCG for evaluation. Each finding includes what was learned, the consultant's insight, and a direction for improvement.

7.1 OSILC Organizational Capacity

What we learned: OSILC is functioning as an informal statewide backbone organization. It is expected to convene stakeholders, support council and committee operations, coordinate statewide communication, support SPIL development and monitoring, manage administrative and fiscal processes, provide or coordinate technical assistance, support advocacy, and respond to emerging issues.

Consultant insight: OSILC has strong credibility, committed staff, and valuable institutional knowledge. The risk is that too many essential functions depend on a small team and a limited number of people.

Recommended direction:

- Conduct a formal workload and staffing assessment.
- Document critical operating procedures.
- Develop succession and emergency continuity plans.

- Identify backup responsibility for essential functions.
- Assess administrative, communications, data, and project-management support needs.

7.2 Governance and Leadership Systems

What we learned: OSILC has formal governance structures, including council meetings, committees, voting processes, financial oversight, and staff support. Some council members and committees are deeply engaged, while others are less connected or less confident in their roles.

Consultant insight: The governance issue is not the absence of a formal structure. It is whether the structure is perceived as active, inclusive, transparent, accessible, and action-oriented.

Recommended direction:

- Develop a Council Engagement Plan.
- Clarify council member responsibilities beyond attendance and voting.
- Create a council member expertise and relationship inventory.
- Standardize committee operations and reporting.
- Provide onboarding for council members, committee chairs, and new participants.

7.3 Compliance and SPIL Monitoring Structures

What we learned: SPIL monitoring is underway, but stakeholder understanding of the process varies. Some participants believe the monitoring is effective, while others are unclear about what is tracked, who owns specific goals, and how progress is reviewed.

Consultant insight: The SPIL should serve as a living statewide strategy, not merely a compliance document. Monitoring should support learning, advocacy, planning, and improvement.

Recommended direction:

- Develop a plain-language SPIL summary.
- Create an accessible quarterly SPIL dashboard.
- Identify owners, partners, timelines, barriers, and status for each goal.
- Connect committee work to SPIL objectives.
- Clarify the distinction between SPIL monitoring and CIL oversight.

7.4 Communication and Stakeholder Engagement Processes

What we learned: OSILC staff communication is generally strong internally. Communication across the full network is less consistent, and information often depends on role, relationship, or access to specific individuals.

Consultant insight: The network does not need more noise. It needs organized, targeted, accessible, and actionable communication linked to feedback loops.

Recommended direction:

- Establish a monthly network update.
- Develop a shared calendar and communication dashboard.
- Standardize meeting and committee summaries.
- Clarify what information goes to directors, staff, council members, consumers, and partners.
- Create a “You Said, We Did” feedback process.

7.5 Collaboration and Coordination Across the CIL Network

What we learned: The network has strong relationships and shared values, but collaboration is inconsistent. The monthly directors group is an important forum, though participation, openness, and perceived value vary. Staff performing similar functions across CILs may have limited contact with one another.

Consultant insight: The network has significant relational capital, but collaboration requires formal pathways, a clear value proposition, dedicated support, and differentiated participation options.

Recommended direction:

- Strengthen the purpose and format of the CIL directors group.
- Create confidential director problem-solving sessions.
- Establish peer cohorts by role.
- Develop regional clusters for rural and geographic collaboration.
- Track resources and solutions generated through peer groups.

“We’re only as strong as our weakest link.”

— CIL executive director

7.6 Operational Efficiency and Shared Services Opportunities

What we learned: Centers often recreate tools, templates, forms, policies, and procedures that already exist elsewhere in the network. Participants requested shared access to policies, job descriptions, evaluation templates, board materials, fiscal tools, onboarding resources, training materials, program documents, and SPIL resources.

Consultant insight: Shared infrastructure could reduce duplication, improve consistency, and increase capacity without compromising local control.

Recommended direction:

- Inventory existing tools across all centers.
- Create a searchable and accessible resource repository.
- Establish ownership, version control, accessibility standards, and maintenance responsibilities.
- Conduct a shared services feasibility analysis.
- Begin with one or two voluntary pilots.

7.7 Statewide Stakeholder Ecosystem Dynamics

What we learned: OSILC operates within a complex ecosystem that includes CILs, state agencies, disability advocacy organizations, grassroots advocates, developmental disability organizations, blind and low-vision communities, Deaf communities, aging systems, housing, transportation, education, legislators, funders, and community organizations.

Consultant insight: Visibility is not merely a communications matter. It is an issue of awareness, access, engagement, participation, and equity.

Recommended direction:

- Develop a statewide stakeholder map and update it annually.
- Identify missing and under-engaged groups.
- Create a plain-language public education strategy.

- Build partnerships across disability, aging, education, housing, transportation, healthcare, and community systems.
- Develop shared advocacy messages and district-level impact briefs.

“People with disabilities shouldn’t be an afterthought.”

— CIL executive director

8. How the Findings Should Inform the 2028–2030 SPIL

The assessment findings suggest that the 2028–2030 SPIL should be designed as both a statewide plan and an implementation framework. Stakeholders strongly value OSILC and the Independent Living network, but the data also indicate that implementation will require clearer roles, more consistent communication, useful data, visible SPIL monitoring, practical technical assistance, onboarding, peer learning, and differentiated support for centers at different levels of capacity.

The next SPIL should therefore serve as more than a compliance document. It should become a working statewide roadmap that links local CIL work, OSILC coordination, council and committee responsibilities, consumer voice, data, advocacy, and capacity-building.

SPIL Design Element	Useful Example
Plain-language goals	Each SPIL goal includes a plain-language version that consumers, CIL staff, council members, and partners can understand.
Lead and partner roles	Each goal identifies who leads, who supports, who implements, who reports, and who monitors.
Quarterly progress review	OSILC uses a dashboard showing goal, owner, progress, barrier, support needed, and next step.
Consumer voice	SPIL engagement includes surveys, listening sessions, phone feedback, peer-led conversations, advisory groups, and regional outreach.
Data for advocacy	SPIL measures include service reach, rural access, consumer outcomes, district-level impact, and stories.
Capacity support	Each SPIL goal identifies the technical assistance, peer learning, tools, or staffing support needed for implementation.
Differentiated CIL support	The SPIL recognizes that rural, smaller, newer, or lower-capacity centers may need different supports to meet shared goals.

Example SPIL Goal Area	Lead Responsibility	Supporting Partners	What Each Group Does
Strengthen statewide communication	OSILC staff	CIL directors, council, committees	OSILC coordinates updates; CILs share local information; committees report progress; council reviews themes and barriers.
Expand consumer voice	OSILC and council	CILs, consumers, advocacy partners	OSILC creates engagement structure; CILs help reach consumers; council reviews input; partners help connect under-engaged groups.
Improve data and impact reporting	OSILC	CILs, OOD/DSE, committees	OSILC coordinates dashboard; CILs provide agreed-upon data; OOD/DSE aligns required reporting where possible; committees review progress.

Example SPIL Goal Area	Lead Responsibility	Supporting Partners	What Each Group Does
Build CIL capacity	OSILC	CILs, peer cohorts, TA providers	OSILC coordinates support; CILs identify needs; peer groups share tools; TA providers offer coaching and templates.

SPIL Priority	Possible Measure	Why It Is Useful
Communication	Number of monthly network updates sent and stakeholder satisfaction with usefulness	Shows whether information is moving consistently.
Consumer voice	Number of consumers engaged through non-survey methods	Shows whether engagement is broader than formal board or council participation.
Rural access	Number of rural counties reached through outreach, services, or partnerships	Helps show rural service realities and gaps.
Peer learning	Number of active peer cohorts and participating centers	Shows whether shared learning is becoming more structured.
SPIL visibility	Quarterly dashboard updates completed	Shows whether the SPIL is being used as a working plan.
Capacity-building	Number of CILs receiving technical assistance and type of support provided	Helps identify support needs and track response.

9. Strategic Recommendations

The assessment findings point to a clear strategic direction for OSILC and Ohio's Independent Living network. The network does not need a new mission, a centralized operating model, or additional structure for its own sake. It needs a more intentional statewide framework that clarifies existing relationships, responsibilities, resources, and commitments and makes them more reliable in practice.

These recommendations aim to shift the network from relationship-dependent coordination to relationship-supported systems. They recognize that trust, mission alignment, and informal relationships are key strengths that should be safeguarded. At the same time, those strengths must be supported by clearer roles, accessible communication, practical capacity-building resources, visible accountability, stronger data, and more consistent community participation.

The recommendations are mutually reinforcing. No single action will resolve the challenges identified in the assessment. Together, however, they offer a practical path to strengthening OSILC's backbone-intermediary role, supporting CIL independence and capacity, improving statewide coordination, and preparing the network for a stronger 2028–2030 SPIL.

1. Clarify Statewide Roles, Decision Rights, and Participation Expectations

What the Assessment Found

OSILC already performs many statewide backbone functions, including convening, fiscal and compliance support, SPIL stewardship, technical assistance, communication, and partnership coordination. However, stakeholders do not consistently understand OSILC's authority, responsibilities, limitations, or its relationship with the Council, committees, CILs, OOD/DSE, and other partners.

Council and committee structures exist, but participation and follow-through are uneven. Some responsibilities are formalized, while others are carried out through tradition, informal understandings, or the initiative of

individual leaders. This creates uncertainty about who should make decisions, who should be consulted, who owns follow-through, and where accountability lies.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should facilitate the development of a practical statewide framework for roles and decision rights that identifies:

- Responsibilities of the Council, Council officers, committees, OSILC staff, CILs, OOD/DSE, and other key partners.
- Decisions that belong to the Council.
- Decisions that belong to OSILC staff.
- Decisions requiring CIL input, consultation, or shared agreement.
- Responsibilities connected to SPIL planning, implementation, monitoring, and reporting.
- Participation expectations for meetings, committees, workgroups, and statewide initiatives.
- Procedures for documenting decisions, resolving uncertainty, and escalating unresolved issues.
- Boundaries that protect local CIL governance and independence.

This framework should be concise, accessible, and practical for daily operations. It should not become a lengthy governance manual that few people use. A visual role map, decision-rights matrix, committee charters, and an onboarding guide would likely be more useful than a single large policy document.

Why It Matters

Unclear roles increase the communication burden, delay decisions, weaken accountability, and create frustration. They also place additional pressure on long-tenured staff, Council members, and CIL leaders, who carry institutional knowledge.

Clearer roles will enable stakeholders to participate more confidently and reduce the likelihood that the same issue is discussed repeatedly without a clear decision or an owner.

Future Impact

Over time, the network should experience:

- Faster and more transparent decision-making.
- Stronger Council and committee participation.
- Reduced duplication and role conflict.
- More consistent follow-through.
- Greater understanding of OSILC's backbone value.
- Stronger protection of local CIL authority and independence.
- Less dependence on a small number of individuals to interpret how the system works.

2. Build a Communication System That Reduces Burden Rather Than Generating More Email

What the Assessment Found

Communication occurs frequently across the network, but important information is not always easy to find, understand, prioritize, or translate into action. Information may be shared through email, meetings, individual calls, documents, committees, and personal relationships, without a consistent system to determine what stakeholders need to know, where information will be stored, and what response is expected.

The challenge is not simply a lack of communication. In some cases, stakeholders may already receive a high volume of information. The deeper issue is the absence of a predictable communication structure that separates updates, decisions, action requests, technical assistance, SPIL information, and opportunities for engagement.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should establish a coordinated communication system with a limited number of clearly defined channels.

The system should include:

- A predictable statewide communication calendar.
- A brief recurring network update organized by decisions, action items, deadlines, opportunities, and information.
- A central, accessible location for current documents, tools, meeting materials, and SPIL updates.
- Clear subject-line and message conventions that indicate whether an item is informational, requires action, or requires a decision.
- Meeting summaries that identify decisions made, commitments, owners, and deadlines.
- Role-based communication so stakeholders receive the information most relevant to them.
- Accessible formats, plain language, captions, and other accommodations.
- A feedback mechanism to determine whether communications are useful and manageable.
- Clear guidance on when email, meetings, shared platforms, calls, or other communication methods should be used.

The goal should be fewer disconnected messages and more usable information.

Why It Matters

When communication is fragmented, people may miss key decisions, repeat work, or feel excluded from statewide activities. The communication burden also disproportionately affects organizations with fewer staff and leaders who juggle multiple roles.

A stronger communication system would help level the playing field for participation between larger and smaller CILs.

Future Impact

A more intentional communication system should result in:

- Easier access to current information.
- Reduced duplication and email burden.
- Better preparation for meetings and decisions.
- Greater participation from CILs with limited staff capacity.
- Increased SPIL visibility.
- Stronger trust in statewide processes.
- Fewer commitments lost between meetings.
- Better continuity when leadership or staffing changes occur.

3. Create Visible, Supportive Accountability Through Commitment Tracking, Committee Charters, and Quarterly SPIL Reviews

What the Assessment Found

Stakeholders are committed to the network and generally willing to collaborate. However, follow-through is inconsistent, and commitments may depend on individual memory or informal reminders. Committee activity and clarity vary, and SPIL progress is not always communicated in a way that helps stakeholders understand what is complete, delayed, at risk, or connected to local implementation.

Accountability is sometimes viewed as punitive or compliance-driven. The network needs an approach that frames accountability as a shared support for completing agreed-upon work.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should implement a small, visible set of accountability practices:

- A shared commitment tracker that documents actions, owners, deadlines, status, barriers, and support needed.
- Concise committee charters that define purpose, membership, leadership, decision authority, annual priorities, meeting rhythm, and expected outputs.
- Committee workplans directly connected to SPIL goals and statewide priorities.
- Quarterly SPIL reviews that assess progress, barriers, local implementation, data, community input, and required adjustments.
- A decision and action log that preserves institutional history.
- A standard process for identifying when a commitment is delayed and what assistance is needed.
- Periodic reporting to the Council and network on completed actions, unresolved barriers, and emerging priorities.

Accountability should focus on visibility, problem-solving, and support rather than blame.

Why It Matters

Without visible accountability, stakeholders may be uncertain whether decisions are being implemented or whether participation is producing results. This uncertainty can weaken confidence and reduce future engagement.

Supportive accountability also enables OSILC to distinguish between a lack of follow-through and legitimate capacity barriers that require technical assistance, resources, or revised expectations.

Future Impact

Expected benefits include:

- More commitments completed on time.
- Clearer committee contributions.
- Stronger connection between meetings and action.
- More visible SPIL implementation.
- Earlier identification of barriers.
- Greater confidence among Council members, CILs, partners, and community stakeholders.
- A stronger evidence base for annual review and future SPIL planning.

4. Strengthen OSILC Internal Capacity, Continuity, Workflow Documentation, and Backup Coverage

What the Assessment Found

OSILC has a broad set of statewide responsibilities, but some systems and activities still rely on individual knowledge, relationships, and follow-through. Limited staffing and infrastructure may make it difficult to sustain statewide coordination, respond to technical-assistance needs, support governance, manage compliance, track SPIL progress, and document institutional knowledge.

Assessment findings reinforce the importance of approaching capacity development strategically. Across the network, many respondents reported sufficient capacity to meet current responsibilities, but considerably less capacity to absorb additional work. This distinction is particularly evident in staffing, where 58% reported that current staffing meets needs, yet no respondents indicated that additional responsibilities could be added within existing staffing capacity. Capacity constraints were also evident in sustainability and resource development, community outreach, and community awareness of CILs.

As OSILC strengthens its own internal infrastructure and supports greater statewide coordination, new processes and expectations should therefore be designed to reduce burden, clarify priorities, strengthen continuity, and make better use of existing capacity rather than simply adding responsibilities.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should complete a focused internal capacity and continuity review addressing:

- Current responsibilities compared with staffing and available time.
- Critical functions that depend heavily on one person.
- Workflow documentation for recurring operational, governance, fiscal, communication, and SPIL activities.
- Backup coverage for essential responsibilities.
- Staff roles, workload distribution, and decision authority.
- Technology and information-management needs.
- Calendar and deadline management.
- Records retention and shared document access.
- Staff onboarding and cross-training.
- Leadership succession and emergency continuity.
- Functions that could be simplified, delegated, automated, contracted, or supported through partnerships.
- Additional capacity required for a stronger backbone role.

OSILC should prioritize the functions most essential to legal compliance, SPIL stewardship, governance, communication, and network continuity before adding new responsibilities.

Why It Matters

OSILC cannot sustainably strengthen the broader network if its internal systems are overextended or overly reliant on individuals. Expanding technical assistance, data coordination, community engagement, peer learning, and advocacy without addressing internal capacity could create additional risk.

The backbone role must be adequately supported, not merely added to existing workloads.

Future Impact

Strengthening internal capacity should produce:

- Greater operational reliability.
- Reduced risk during staff transitions or absences.
- Better response time and follow-through.
- Stronger governance and committee support.
- More consistent SPIL monitoring.
- Greater ability to coordinate technical assistance and peer learning.
- Improved staff sustainability and reduced overload.
- Clearer information for future staffing and funding decisions.

5. Formalize Peer Learning, Onboarding, and Practical Technical Assistance

What the Assessment Found

CIL capacity varies significantly across the state. Centers differ in organizational size, staffing, geography, funding, governance, technology, leadership tenure, and access to specialized expertise. At the same time, the network holds considerable knowledge and experience that is not consistently organized or shared.

Capacity findings also reinforce the value of peer learning and practical technical assistance. Because capacity varies across organizations and functions, statewide supports should help organizations build on areas of

strength, access expertise from one another, and address specific gaps without assuming that every CIL needs the same type or level of assistance.

Stakeholders expressed interest in practical technical assistance, peer learning, onboarding, shared tools, and opportunities to work through real problems with others facing similar challenges.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should establish a coordinated capacity-building system that integrates peer expertise with external technical assistance.

The system should include:

- A recurring assessment of CIL capacity and technical-assistance needs.
- Role-based peer cohorts for executive directors, program leaders, fiscal staff, data staff, board leaders, and other priority groups.
- Structured onboarding for new CIL leaders, Council members, committee members, and OSILC staff.
- A statewide technical-assistance calendar based on identified priorities.
- Practical sessions focused on current organizational challenges.
- Templates, policies, examples, checklists, and implementation guides.
- Peer mentoring or leadership-transition support.
- Follow-up sessions that assess whether participants applied what they learned.
- Multiple participation formats, including virtual, regional, recorded, and self-guided options.
- A mechanism for CILs to identify areas in which they can offer expertise to others.
- Evaluation of usefulness, application, and capacity change.

Priority topics may include governance, board development, fiscal management, human resources, compliance, grant development, communications, data, evaluation, succession planning, advocacy, community engagement, and operational documentation.

Why It Matters

One-time training does not necessarily change organizational practice. Capacity building is more effective when people receive relevant tools, apply them to real work, learn from peers, and return for problem-solving and follow-up.

A structured system would help reduce disparities in access to knowledge and specialized support across CILs.

Future Impact

A stronger capacity-building system should lead to:

- More confident and better-supported CIL leaders and staff.
- Faster onboarding and leadership transition.
- Reduced duplication of problem-solving across Centers.
- Greater use of proven practices and shared tools.
- Stronger governance and administrative systems.
- More equitable participation across CILs of different sizes.
- Increased readiness to implement SPIL priorities.
- A network culture that treats learning as an ongoing shared responsibility.

6. Explore Voluntary Shared Supports Through a Feasibility Scan and Small Pilots

What the Assessment Found

CILs face recurring challenges that may be difficult or costly for individual organizations to address alone. These may include specialized training, data visualization, grant research, human resources support, communications, technology, purchasing, legal consultation, policy development, and other administrative functions.

The capacity findings provide additional rationale for exploring voluntary shared supports. Where multiple organizations experience similar capacity constraints, shared resources or collaborative approaches may offer a more feasible solution than expecting each organization to independently build new infrastructure.

Stakeholders expressed interest in selected shared supports but emphasized the need to protect local independence and avoid centralized requirements that may not fit every Center.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should conduct a structured shared-support feasibility scan before establishing any statewide service.

The scan should examine:

- Areas of common need.
- Current costs and staff burden.
- Number of CILs likely to participate.
- Legal, fiscal, governance, procurement, and confidentiality implications.
- Existing providers and partnership options.
- Whether a support should be centralized, regionally coordinated, jointly purchased, or made available through a vendor list.
- Whether participation should be voluntary.
- Required funding and administrative capacity.
- Risks to CIL independence.
- Measures of usefulness, cost savings, quality, and participation.

OSILC should then conduct a limited number of small pilots with interested CILs. Pilots should be time-limited, evaluated, and expanded only if they demonstrate value.

Potential pilots could include:

- Shared training.
- Group purchasing.
- Data and dashboard support.
- Communications templates.
- Grant-research resources.
- Human resources consultation.
- Technology assistance.
- Policy-template libraries.
- Specialized professional-services access.

Why It Matters

Shared supports could reduce duplication, improve quality, and increase access to expertise. However, poorly designed shared services could create new administrative burdens or be perceived as undermining local control.

A feasibility-first approach allows the network to test what is useful without making premature commitments.

Future Impact

Successful pilots could result in:

- Reduced administrative burden.
- Greater access to specialized expertise.
- Cost savings or better purchasing power.
- Improved quality and consistency in selected functions.
- More staff time available for direct service and advocacy.
- Stronger collaboration without forced centralization.
- Evidence to guide future investment decisions.

7. Use Data, Community Voice, and Advocacy More Intentionally

What the Assessment Found

The network has strong mission commitment and significant local knowledge, but it does not yet consistently use collective data, consumer experience, community input, and coordinated advocacy to tell a statewide story or to inform decisions.

People with disabilities may be engaged in formal planning activities without equally visible pathways to influence implementation, evaluation, and ongoing priority setting. Data practices also vary across organizations, making it difficult to communicate statewide reach, outcomes, unmet needs, geographic differences, and collective impact.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should develop an integrated framework for data, community voice, and advocacy.

This should include:

- A limited set of statewide data definitions and measures.
- Clear distinctions between required reporting data, learning data, advocacy data, and public-impact information.
- Accessible dashboards and visual summaries.
- Processes for identifying data gaps and differences in CIL reporting capacity.
- Technical assistance that helps CILs collect and use data without creating unreasonable burden.
- Ongoing opportunities for people with disabilities to shape planning, implementation, evaluation, and advocacy.
- Multiple engagement formats, including virtual, regional, accessible, and community-based options.
- A process for documenting how consumer input influenced decisions.
- Shared storytelling and communications resources.
- A coordinated approach to identifying statewide advocacy priorities.
- Clear pathways for CILs and consumers to elevate local issues requiring statewide action.
- Stronger use of data and lived experience in policy communication.

Community voice should not be treated as a single consultation step. It should be integrated into the network's ongoing operations and learning structure.

Why It Matters

The Independent Living network exists to advance the independence, inclusion, rights, and self-determination of people with disabilities. Its statewide systems should therefore demonstrate how people with disabilities influence decisions and how the network improves conditions in their communities.

Stronger data and community voice will also help OSILC and CILs communicate their value to government leaders, funders, partners, and the public.

Future Impact

This recommendation should lead to:

- Greater influence by people with disabilities.
- More transparent decision-making.
- Stronger evidence for statewide advocacy.
- Better understanding of unmet needs and regional differences.
- More consistent communication of network impact.
- Stronger funding and partnership cases.
- Greater visibility of Independent Living outcomes.
- A clearer link between local experience and statewide policy priorities.

8. Use Assessment Findings to Shape the Engagement, Measures, Priorities, and Accountability Structure of the 2028–2030 SPIL

What the Assessment Found

The current assessment identified recurring strengths and challenges across roles, communication, accountability, OSILC capacity, CIL capacity differences, technical assistance, data, community voice, and advocacy. These findings go beyond a retrospective description of the network and provide a practical evidence base for designing the next SPIL process and its implementation structure.

If the next SPIL is developed without incorporating these lessons, the network risks repeating the participation barriers, unclear responsibilities, limited visibility, and uneven follow-through that were identified in the assessment.

Strategic Recommendation

OSILC should use the findings as a foundation for the full 2028–2030 SPIL cycle, spanning engagement, priority setting, implementation, measurement, review, and public communication.

The next SPIL process should:

- Begin engagement earlier and provide multiple ways to participate.
- Include people with disabilities throughout development, not only at selected listening points.
- Clearly communicate how stakeholder input affects priorities and decisions.
- Recognize differences in CIL capacity and provide accessible participation options.
- Use assessment findings to identify priority infrastructure and capacity needs.
- Establish a limited set of measurable statewide outcomes.
- Define roles and ownership for each SPIL objective.
- Connect statewide objectives to local implementation.
- Identify the data needed to monitor outcomes and barriers.
- Include quarterly or semiannual progress reviews.
- Use an accessible public dashboard or progress summary.
- Establish procedures for adjusting strategies when conditions change.
- Connect SPIL activities to peer learning, technical assistance, advocacy, and community engagement.
- Include measures of organizational capacity, network effectiveness, collaboration health, and consumer influence.
- Communicate annual progress, lessons learned, and next steps.

The SPIL should become a living framework for coordinated action and learning rather than a document revisited primarily for compliance or formal reporting.

Why It Matters

The 2028–2030 SPIL represents the network’s most significant opportunity to translate assessment findings into long-term structural improvement. It can provide the shared direction, measures, participation expectations, and accountability framework needed to sustain progress beyond individual leaders, committees, or projects.

Using the findings will also demonstrate to stakeholders that their participation in interviews, surveys, and listening sessions led to meaningful action.

Future Impact

A stronger SPIL process should produce:

- Priorities more clearly grounded in evidence and community experience.
- Broader and more equitable participation.
- Clearer ownership and accountability.
- Better alignment between statewide and local work.
- More visible progress.
- Stronger data and advocacy.
- Greater capacity to adjust strategies based on learning.
- Increased confidence that participation leads to action.
- A stronger statewide platform for improving the lives of people with disabilities.

10. Three-Year Focus and Implementation Roadmap

A Capacity-Sensitive Approach to Implementation

The three-year roadmap is designed to move Ohio’s Independent Living network from relationship-dependent coordination to relationship-supported systems without adding unnecessary burden. Assessment findings indicate that many organizations can meet current responsibilities but have limited room to absorb additional work. Implementation should therefore be sequenced: strengthen the operating foundation first, test and embed practical supports second, and institutionalize effective practices while shaping the next SPIL third.

Each phase should establish clear ownership, use available capacity realistically, test practical solutions, review evidence, and adjust before expanding. Shared tools, peer support, technical assistance, streamlined processes, or additional resources should be added where they reduce burden or strengthen the network’s ability to carry out agreed priorities.

Three-Year Phase	Primary Focus	Desired Shift
Year One: Build the operating and backbone foundation	Consistent with the capacity findings, Year One emphasizes clarifying and strengthening existing structures before introducing significant new expectations or responsibilities. Activities: Clarify roles, decision rights, participation expectations, communication rhythm, committee charters, commitment tracking, SPIL dashboard requirements, onboarding, workflow documentation, consumer-engagement pathways, and OSILC backbone capacity needs.	The network understands who does what, where information lives, how decisions and commitments are tracked, how people with disabilities influence the work, and how SPIL progress will be reviewed.

Three-Year Phase	Primary Focus	Desired Shift
Year Two: Test and embed practical capacity supports	Year Two builds on the operating foundation by testing supports that can address identified capacity gaps, reduce duplication, strengthen peer learning, and make statewide participation more manageable across organizations with differing levels of capacity. Activities: Launch an accessible shared-information and dashboard solution; pilot onboarding; implement peer cohorts and targeted technical assistance; test voluntary shared supports; create local and statewide data visualizations; and expand consumer and community engagement.	The network begins using shared tools, learning structures, and support systems that reduce burden, strengthen CIL capacity, and make collaboration more equitable and effective.
Year Three: Institutionalize learning, align to the next SPIL, and reassess progress	Repeat the capacity assessment using the same or comparable measures established through this assessment to determine where capacity has strengthened, remained stable, or declined. Particular attention should be given to staffing, sustainability and resource development, community outreach and awareness, consumer engagement, and organizations' ability to absorb additional responsibilities. Reassess OSILC capacity, network effectiveness, collaboration health, and consumer influence; evaluate pilots; refine systems; strengthen statewide advocacy; and integrate learning, measures, and accountability into the 2028–2030 SPIL. Compare results to the baseline established in this assessment and use the findings to inform the 2028–2030 SPIL, technical assistance priorities, shared-support decisions, and future resource development strategies.	OSILC and the network move from a time-limited assessment and implementation project to a sustainable backbone, capacity-building, and continuous-improvement system.

Start Here: First Five Moves

1. Approve the process for developing the statewide role map and decision-rights framework.
2. Begin a concise monthly network update and standardized post-meeting decision and action summary.
3. Create the first version of the quarterly SPIL progress dashboard.
4. Launch two peer-learning cohorts: one for CIL executive directors and one for a priority functional area such as data and evaluation, youth transition, fiscal management, governance, or communications.
5. Inventory existing templates, tools, policies, training resources, and organizational expertise for an accessible shared-resource library.

Phased Implementation Roadmap

Timing	Priority Actions	Primary Lead / Shared Ownership	Expected Output
First 90 days	Confirm implementation priorities; identify an implementation lead or small workgroup; approve the role-map process; launch the commitment tracker; create the committee-charter template; begin the monthly network update; define SPIL dashboard requirements; conduct an immediate OSILC workload, continuity, and backbone-capacity review; and establish how people with disabilities will participate in implementation oversight.	Council leadership, OSILC staff, CIL director representatives, and people with disabilities	Agreed priorities, implementation governance, initial communication rhythm, accountability structure, consumer-participation pathway, and identification of immediate OSILC capacity risks.

Timing	Priority Actions	Primary Lead / Shared Ownership	Expected Output
Months 4–6	Finalize the role and decision-rights framework; implement committee charters and workplans; design onboarding; document critical workflows; begin quarterly SPIL reviews; establish CIL peer cohorts; complete a CIL technical-assistance and capacity-needs profile; and define requirements for an accessible shared-information system.	OSILC staff, Council committees, CIL workgroup, and consumer representatives	Role framework, functioning committees, documented processes, onboarding framework, first SPIL dashboard, peer-learning structure, capacity-needs profile, and shared-system requirements.
Months 7–12	Select and launch an accessible shared-information and dashboard solution; pilot onboarding; complete succession, continuity, and backup-coverage plans; develop a statewide technical-assistance calendar; conduct the shared-support feasibility scan; establish recurring community-engagement pathways; and design local and statewide impact visualizations.	OSILC, Council, participating CILs, accessibility or technology partners, and selected vendors	Operational shared-information solution, onboarding pilot, continuity plan, technical-assistance calendar, shared-support recommendations, engagement structure, and data-visualization plan.
Months 13–18	Deliver targeted technical assistance; pilot one or two voluntary shared supports; expand peer cohorts; launch broader consumer and community engagement; develop CIL-level, regional, and statewide impact tools; define an advocacy-coordination model; and review participation, application, and follow-through data.	OSILC, participating CILs, advocacy partners, technical-assistance providers, and people with disabilities	Technical-assistance results, shared-support pilot findings, community input, impact visualizations, advocacy framework, and documented mid-course adjustments.
Months 19–24	Evaluate Year Two pilots; refine communication, accountability, learning, data, and engagement systems; assess whether tools and technical assistance are improving CIL capacity; identify sustainable backbone functions; and begin integrating lessons, outcomes, and measures into the 2028–2030 SPIL development process.	Council, OSILC, CILs, OOD/DSE, evaluator or designated workgroup, and community stakeholders	Pilot evaluations, refined statewide systems, backbone-function recommendations, early capacity findings, and draft SPIL measures and accountability concepts.
Months 25–36	Reassess OSILC organizational capacity, network effectiveness, collaboration health, CIL support, and consumer influence; finalize the 2028–2030 SPIL engagement and accountability structure; establish the statewide advocacy agenda; strengthen the public impact story; confirm the sustainable data and technical-assistance system; and adopt an annual continuous-improvement cycle.	Council, OSILC, CILs, OOD/DSE, partners, people with disabilities, and evaluator or designated workgroup	Updated assessment, sustainable backbone and capacity-building structure, stronger advocacy and public-communication framework, and a network prepared for effective SPIL implementation—not only SPIL development.

Implementation Principles

The roadmap should be guided by the following principles:

- **Protect CIL independence.** Statewide systems should support local governance and community responsiveness rather than centralizing authority.
- **Build with the network, not for it.** CIL leaders, staff, Council members, partners, and people with disabilities should participate in designing and testing the systems they will use.
- **Start small and demonstrate value.** Tools and pilots should be expanded only when they are useful, accessible, and sustainable.
- **Align expectations with capacity.** Participation and technical assistance should account for differences in CIL size, staffing, geography, funding, and readiness.
- **Use accountability as support.** Tracking should help identify barriers and needed assistance rather than create a punitive compliance system.
- **Keep the community voice continuous.** People with disabilities should influence implementation, learning, evaluation, advocacy, and future SPIL decisions.
- **Review and adjust.** Quarterly and annual reviews should identify what is working, what is burdensome, and what needs to change.

Intended Three-Year Impact

By the end of the three-year period:

- OSILC's backbone-intermediary role should be clearer and adequately supported.
- Council, committee, OSILC, CIL, partner, and consumer roles should be easier to understand.
- SPIL implementation should be visible and connected to local action.
- CILs should have greater access to practical technical assistance, peer learning, tools, and selected shared supports.
- People with disabilities should have stronger and more continuous influence.
- Statewide data should more clearly communicate outcomes, unmet needs, and collective impact.
- Advocacy should be better coordinated across local and statewide priorities.
- The network should be less dependent on individual memory and informal follow-through.
- The 2028–2030 SPIL should begin with a stronger operating, learning, engagement, and accountability structure already in place.

11. Measurement Framework

The assessment should serve as the starting point for a simple, practical, and repeatable system for learning and accountability. The purpose of the follow-up measures is not to create an additional reporting burden. It is to help OSILC, the Council, CILs, partners, and people with disabilities understand whether the recommended changes are improving the statewide network's operations.

The measurement framework integrates annual assessments, quarterly dashboards, meeting-level tracking, community engagement documentation, and structured learning reviews. Together, these tools will track progress across six priority areas:

- Role clarity and shared understanding of responsibilities
- Communication and access to useful information
- Accountability and follow-through
- SPIL visibility and local-to-statewide implementation
- OSILC and CIL capacity building
- Consumer voice, advocacy, data use, and statewide influence

The tools are intentionally designed for specific purposes and review cycles. Annual surveys and assessment tools will indicate whether organizational and network conditions are improving over time. Quarterly dashboards will make SPIL progress, advocacy activity, data, barriers, and support needs more visible. Commitment trackers and engagement logs will strengthen day-to-day follow-through and document how community input influences decisions.

The Annual Learning Review will consolidate measures. Council members, OSILC staff, CIL representatives, OOD/DSE, partners, and community representatives should use the review to identify progress, understand persistent barriers, adjust priorities, and determine where additional capacity or support is needed.

The value of the dashboard system will depend on maintaining its focus. OSILC should start with a limited set of meaningful indicators, assign clear ownership, use existing data where possible, and avoid collecting information that will not inform decisions or actions.

Over the next three years, this framework should help OSILC determine whether the network is becoming clearer, more connected, more accountable, better supported, more responsive to people with disabilities, and more prepared to implement the 2028–2030 SPIL.

The ultimate goal is to shift the assessment from a completed report to a living, continuous-improvement process in which the network regularly asks:

- What has improved?
- Where are barriers still present?
- Which supports are helping?
- What is the network learning?
- What should be adjusted next?
- How are people with disabilities experiencing the results?

12. Implementation Conditions and Risks

The recommendations should not be interpreted as a call for OSILC to control CILs, add unnecessary bureaucracy, or create additional reporting without providing support. The intent is to build shared infrastructure that facilitates collaboration, reduces duplication, supports centers with varying capacities, and keeps people with disabilities at the center.

Risk	Why It Matters	Safeguard
Adding responsibilities without capacity	Replicates the staff capacity problem the assessment identified.	Match new responsibilities with staff, contractor, or shared ownership capacity.
Creating more emails, meetings, or reports	Adds burden without improving coordination.	Use one portal, concise updates, and retire duplicative practices.
Treating coordination as control	Could undermine CIL independence and reduce buy-in.	Use agreements, transparency, peer accountability, and voluntary pilots.
Uniform expectations without differentiated support	May disadvantage smaller or rural centers.	Maintain common outcomes while differentiating tools, timelines, and assistance.
Collecting data without using it	Dashboards become compliance exercises.	Use data in Council, committee, CIL, advocacy, and resource decisions.
Engaging stakeholders without closing the loop	Trust declines if people do not see how input shaped decisions.	Report back what was heard, what changed, and what could not be acted on.

13. Conclusion: The Work Ahead

Ohio's Independent Living network does not need a new mission. It already has one. It does not need to manufacture trust. Trust, commitment, and shared Independent Living values are already present throughout the network. It also does not need to become rigid, overly centralized, or disconnected from local communities. CIL independence, consumer control, and community responsiveness must remain central to the work.

The assessment shows that OSILC, the Council, CILs, partners, and people with disabilities have sufficient shared purpose and relational strength to advance to a more mature stage of statewide coordination. The opportunity is to build practical systems around those relationships so that statewide work is clearer, more consistent, more visible, and less reliant on individual memory, informal follow-through, or the capacity of a small number of people.

Over the next three years, OSILC should continue to strengthen its role as a statewide backbone intermediary. That role should not be defined by control or centralization. Instead, it should be defined by OSILC's ability to connect people, clarify roles, support implementation, build capacity, make progress visible, strengthen communication, coordinate learning, and help local experience inform statewide action.

The work ahead should focus on:

- Clarifying statewide roles, authority, decision rights, and participation expectations.
- Building communication systems that reduce burden and improve access to useful information.
- Making accountability visible, practical, and supportive.
- Strengthening OSILC's staffing, infrastructure, continuity, and operational capacity.
- Expanding peer learning, onboarding, technical assistance, and access to adaptable tools.
- Testing voluntary shared supports that strengthen CIL capacity without weakening local independence.
- Making SPIL implementation more visible and connected to local activity and community outcomes.
- Using data, lived experience, and collective stories to strengthen advocacy and statewide visibility.
- Creating ongoing pathways for people with disabilities to influence planning, implementation, evaluation, and improvement.
- Using the assessment findings and implementation lessons to shape the 2028–2030 SPIL.

“The report should not become a binder on a shelf.” — Listening-session participant

That statement captures the central challenge. The value of this assessment will not be determined by the quality of the report alone. It will be determined by whether the findings lead to clearer decisions, stronger capacity, better follow-through, more useful support for CILs, greater consumer influence, and measurable improvement in the statewide network's functioning.

The next phase should therefore be treated as a continuous learning process rather than a one-time implementation. OSILC and the network should begin with a focused set of priorities, assign ownership, track progress, review evidence, learn from what works, and adjust when strategies create unintended burdens or fail to achieve intended results.

The network's future strength will not come from replacing people with process. It will come from using process to protect relationships, distribute leadership, preserve institutional knowledge, reduce inequities in access to support, and translate shared Independent Living values into consistent statewide action.

By the end of the three-year period, success should mean more than new tools, dashboards, meetings, or documents. It should mean that:

- OSILC's backbone role is clearer and adequately supported.
- CILs have greater access to practical assistance and peer expertise.
- Council and committee structures are more active and accountable.
- SPIL progress is easier to understand and connect to local implementation.
- Communication is more useful and less burdensome.
- People with disabilities have stronger and more continuous influence.
- Statewide data and advocacy more clearly reflect local needs and collective impact.
- The network is less vulnerable to leadership changes and loss of institutional knowledge.
- The 2028–2030 SPIL begins with stronger systems already in place.

Ultimately, the work ahead is not about strengthening structure for its own sake. It is about strengthening the statewide conditions that enable people with disabilities to exercise greater independence, choice, inclusion, rights, and self-determination.

The most important measure of progress will be whether OSILC and the Ohio Independent Living network can better translate shared values into coordinated action—and whether that action yields meaningful, visible improvements in the lives and communities of people with disabilities.

Appendix A. Stakeholder Map and Detailed Analysis

Stakeholder	Influence	Engagement	Trust	Role Clarity	System Criticality	Key Interpretation
OSILC Council	4	3	4	3	High	Important governance body with strong leadership, but uneven participation, committee follow-through, and between-meeting engagement.
OSILC Staff	4	4	4	3	Very High	Staff keep the system functioning through coordination, fiscal operations, documentation, compliance, meeting support, and follow-up. Capacity is a major pressure point.
CIL Directors	5	3	4	3	Very High	Essential to statewide implementation. Relationships with OSILC are generally positive, but engagement and follow-through vary across centers.
OOD / State	5	2	3	2	Very High	Holds major system influence and funding connection, but the relationship is not fully defined beyond fiscal and administrative responsibilities.
People with Disabilities	5	2	3	2	Very High	Central to the mission and legitimacy of the network, but broader community participation pathways are limited.
Advocacy Organizations	4	3	4	3	High	Strong partners and credible allies. They see OSILC as a connector, but want greater visibility, coordination, and cross-disability advocacy infrastructure.

The map reinforces the central finding: OSILC's greatest challenge is not a lack of relationships. The network has trust, credibility, and shared commitment. The bigger challenge is converting those relationships into a clearer statewide operating system with defined roles, stronger staff and partner capacity, better engagement pathways, and more consistent follow-through.

Appendix B. Participant, Respondent, and Engagement Detail

This appendix is intended to support transparency about who was engaged and how the evidence base was developed. Because survey responses were anonymous and interview findings were synthesized by theme, individual comments should not be attributed in public-facing materials without confirming permissions and titles.

Evidence Source	Count	Participant Groups	Notes
Interviews	28	OSILC Council members, OSILC staff, CIL directors and staff, OOD/state representatives, advocacy partners, and community stakeholders	Names and titles should be confirmed against the master interview tracker before external release.
Survey	52	Anonymous respondents including CIL executive directors, CIL staff, OSILC Council members, OSILC staff, partners, and other stakeholders	No individual names available because responses were anonymous.
Listening sessions	3 sessions / 12 participants	7 CIL directors, 1 CIL staff member, 2 Council members, 1 OSILC staff member, 1 system partner	Known names reflected in notes include Carla Scott, Beth Glas, Jeremy Caffee, Kevin Flynn, Chris Gerbetz, Tami Gaugler, Jené Conway, and facilitator Chris Howse.

Evidence Source	Count	Participant Groups	Notes
Assessment tools	Tool suite	Evidence from interviews, survey, listening sessions, project records, and working analyses	Tools can be repeated annually for follow-up measurement.

Stakeholder Engagement Roster

The roster below reflects names and roles captured in project records and listening-session notes. Interview findings were synthesized by theme and survey responses were anonymous.

Name	Source in Project Record	Position / Role in the Network as Reflected in Notes
Jeremy Morris	Interview notes / project records	OSILC Executive Director; statewide network coordination and SPIL stewardship perspective
Chris Gerbetz	Interview and listening-session notes	OSILC Operations Coordinator; fiscal, meeting logistics, communication, SPIL, and internal operations perspective
Christy Carpenter	Interview notes	OSILC Program Coordinator; OSILC staff role, projects, SPIL and internal operations
Kara Ayers	Interview notes	OSILC Council Chair / Council leadership perspective
Kevin Flynn	Listening-session notes	OSILC Council member; former chair and legal / leadership perspective
Marci Straughter	Interview notes	OSILC Council member leadership perspective
David Bertsch	Interview and listening notes	OSILC Council member leadership perspective; bridge to blind community and disability advocacy systems
Courtney Hines	Interview notes	OSILC Council member / lived-experience advocacy perspective
Katie Shelley	Interview notes	OSILC Council Committee leader perspective
Tom Webb	Interview notes	OSILC Council member perspective
Chelsea Stinnett	Interview notes	OSILC Council Committee leadership perspective
Carla Scott	Interview and listening-session notes	CIL Executive Director/ Western Reserve Independent Living Center
Beth Glas	Interview and listening-session notes	CIL Executive Director/ LEAP (Linking Employment, Abilities and Potential)
Jeremy Caffee	Interview and listening-session notes	CIL Executive Director/ Access Center for Independent Living
Tami Gaugler	Interview and listening-session notes	CIL Executive Director/ Advancing Independence Network
Rob Festenstein	Listening-session notes	CIL Executive Director Independence Alliance / Cincinnati
Shannon Monyak	Interview notes	CIL Executive Director/ Services for Independent Living
Davey McNelly	Interview notes	CIL Executive Director/ Southeastern Ohio Center for Independent Living
Pam Drake	Interview notes	CIL Executive Director/ Independent Living Center of North Central Ohio
Yolanda Bolden	Interview notes	CIL Executive Director/ Mid-Ohio Board for an Independent Living Environment
Kristina Kapp	Interview notes	CIL Executive Director/ Center for Disability Empowerment

Name	Source in Project Record	Position / Role in the Network as Reflected in Notes
Ash Lemons	Listening session notes	CIL Executive Director/ The Ability Center of Greater Toledo
Dawn Engel	Listening-session notes	Youth Transition Services Specialist perspective from Independence Alliance
Jené Conway	Interview and listening-session notes	System Partner/Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities
Paul Jarvis	Interview notes	System Partner/Ohio Developmental Disabilities Council
Beth Kowalczyk Kelsey Bergfeld	Interview notes	System Partner/Chief Policy Officer-Ohio Association of Area Agencies on Aging
Jennifer Kucera	Interview notes	Advocacy Org/The Center for Disability Empowerment
Brittanie Maddox	Interview notes	Advocacy Org/Disability Rights Ohio
Kerstin Sjoberg	Interview notes	System Partner/Disability Rights Ohio
Paula McElwee	Interview notes	TA/Policy/University of Montana
Jason Beloungy	Interview notes	National/CIL in Wisconsin-Access to Independence
Brooke Wilson	Interview notes	National/Oregon DHS
Sandra Breitengross	Interview notes	National/University of Montana

Appendix C. Companion Documents, Contract Alignment, and Supporting Deliverables

The final report is the integrated summary of the assessment. The following companion documents provide detailed evidence, analysis, validation, and implementation tools that support the report's conclusions and recommendations.

Contract Alignment and Deliverables

This section demonstrates how the final report and related tools align with the contracted assessment scope. The report is intentionally organized to connect the network story to the specific areas OSILC asked BLCG to evaluate.

Contracted Evaluation Area	Where Addressed in the Report
OSILC organizational capacity	OSILC capacity, staff workload, workflow documentation, succession, continuity, and capacity maturity score.
Governance and leadership systems	Council engagement, committee structure, leadership dependency, onboarding, succession, and committee workplans.
Compliance and SPIL monitoring structures	SPIL dashboard, quarterly review, fiscal/compliance supports, reporting tools, and role clarity around monitoring.
Communication and stakeholder engagement processes	Network communication rhythm, stakeholder map, community voice, engagement tracker, and accessible participation pathways.
Collaboration and coordination across the CIL network	Peer cohorts, CIL director engagement, role clarity, network effectiveness score, and shared follow-through structures.
Operational efficiency and shared services opportunities	Shared-resource library, shared-services feasibility tracker, pilot recommendations, and operational efficiency opportunities.

Contracted Evaluation Area	Where Addressed in the Report
Statewide stakeholder ecosystem dynamics	Stakeholder Mapping Matrix, OOD/State alignment, advocacy partners, people with disabilities, cross-disability engagement, and statewide advocacy.

The assessment also completed the four project phases: engagement design and alignment; organizational capacity assessment; statewide network and ecosystem assessment; and synthesis, including an implementation roadmap, performance dashboard tools, and presentation-ready findings.

Companion Document	Purpose and Recommended Use
Stakeholder Interview Findings	Summarizes experiences and perspectives gathered through stakeholder interviews. Use this document to understand the deeper story behind the findings, including role clarity, governance, leadership, CIL capacity, communication, advocacy, data, and system-level risks.
Network Survey Findings	Tests whether interview themes were broadly shared across the network. Use this document to understand patterns, perceptions, priority needs, and areas where respondent experiences differed or remained uncertain.
Assessment Tools and Themes	Organizes the evidence into structured tools, including the Capacity Maturity Index, Network Effectiveness Tool, Collaboration Health Snapshot, Stakeholder Mapping Matrix, and Network Mapping Dimensions. Use this document to establish baselines and reassess progress over time.
Listening Session Findings	Shows how stakeholders validated, refined, and prioritized the preliminary findings. Use this document to understand the practical conditions for implementation, including role clarity, communication, accountability, capacity support, shared services, data use, and consumer engagement.
Best-Practice SILC Scan	Provides a consultant-informed benchmark of strong statewide Independent Living practices. Use this scan to consider practices that may fit Ohio, such as role clarity, backbone infrastructure, shared measurement, consumer voice, strategic communication, cross-sector partnerships, supportive accountability, and data-informed planning.
Living Progress Tracker	Serves as the active implementation workbook for tracking actions, owners, deadlines, barriers, evidence, and progress. Use this tracker to keep the final report alive as a three-year improvement system.

Companion documents should be kept as separate files so OSILC can use the final report as the public-facing synthesis and retain detailed working documents for Council discussion, staff work planning, SPIL preparation, partner alignment, and follow-up measurement. These companion documents may be provided as separate attachments or kept internally as working documents, depending on OSILC's preferred distribution approach.

Appendix D. Stakeholder Role Clarity Risk Summary

Role clarity is one of the most important systemic risks because it affects trust, participation, decision-making, capacity, and accountability. The following summary should inform the role map and the decision-rights guide.

Stakeholder Group	Role Clarity Risk	Why It Matters
OOD/State	High	Relationship is important but not fully defined beyond fiscal and administrative functions.
People with disabilities	High	Central to the mission, but broader pathways into decision-making are limited.
OSILC staff	Moderate	Staff know their work internally, but expectations from CILs, committees, council members, and partners are not always clear.

Stakeholder Group	Role Clarity Risk	Why It Matters
Council	Moderate	A formal role exists, but expectations between meetings and committee responsibilities need clarity.
CIL directors	Moderate	Local authority is clear, but statewide expectations vary.
Advocacy partners	Moderate	Partners trust OSILC but need clearer pathways for coordinated advocacy.

Appendix E. Living Documents for Follow-Up Measurement

The following living documents are intended to help OSILC, the Council, committees, CILs, and partners continue their work over the next three years. They are not one-time forms and should be updated, reviewed, and refined as implementation progresses.

Living Document	Primary Use	Recommended Owner	Update Cadence	Review Forum
Annual Network Capacity Scorecard	Tracks progress against the assessment themes and three-year targets.	OSILC Executive Director, Council leadership, designated committee leads	Annually, with a mid-year check	Council retreat or annual planning session
Quarterly SPIL / Strategic Progress Dashboard	Connects action, ownership, barriers, and evidence to SPIL and strategic priorities.	OSILC staff with committee input	Quarterly	Council and committee meetings
Shared Commitment Tracker	Makes decisions, deadlines, owners, and follow-up visible after meetings.	OSILC staff and committee chairs	Monthly or after each statewide meeting	Standing meeting follow-up
Role and Decision-Rights Log	Clarifies who recommends, decides, implements, communicates, and monitors recurring work.	Council leadership and OSILC staff	Quarterly during first year; annually after adoption	Governance/Executive Committee
Communication Tracker	Reduces email overload by defining audience, channel, cadence, and message type.	OSILC staff	Monthly	Staff and Council leadership check-in
TA and Peer Learning Tracker	Tracks peer cohorts, technical assistance, shared templates, and role-based learning.	OSILC staff with CIL participants	Quarterly	Director meetings and staff cohorts
Shared Services Feasibility Tracker	Tests voluntary shared supports without undermining CIL independence.	OSILC and interested CILs	Quarterly during feasibility/pilots	Pilot workgroup
Community Voice and Engagement Tracker	Documents who was heard, what was learned, and how input shaped decisions.	OSILC/CILs/partners	After each engagement activity	SPIL and community engagement planning
Data, Advocacy, and Visibility Tracker	Turns data into maps, impact stories, policy messages, and public awareness.	OSILC staff, CILs, advocacy partners	Quarterly or campaign-based	Advocacy and communications planning
Risk, Continuity, and Sustainability Log	Tracks key-person dependency, capacity risk, workflow gaps, and mitigation.	Executive Director and Council leadership	Quarterly	Executive/Governance review
Committee Charter and Workplan Scorecard	Tracks committee purpose, annual deliverables, meeting cadence, participation, decisions, actions completed, and Council reporting.	Committee chairs with OSILC staff support	Quarterly	Council and committee meetings
Participants, Evidence, and Source Log	Maintains the evidence base for future reports, annual reviews, and SPIL planning.	OSILC staff or designated evaluator	Ongoing	Evaluation and reporting review

The detailed follow-up tool templates are included below so OSILC, the Council, CILs, and partners have a complete implementation reference within this final report.

Follow-Up Tool Templates

Each template below corresponds to a companion tracker or workbook tab. The workbook should be treated as the active implementation tracker; this appendix documents the purpose and fields for each follow-up tool.

Annual Network Capacity Scorecard

Use this once a year to assess whether the network is moving from “developing” toward “defined,” “aligned,” and eventually a more optimized practice. It should be reviewed against the assessment baseline and updated before annual planning.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Theme / Domain	One of the seven core assessment themes or a related capacity domain.
Baseline 2026 Finding	The starting point for the final assessment is such that it is developing, uneven, person-dependent, or needs broader pathways.
Follow-Up Measure	The specific question, score, count, or evidence source used to track progress.
2027 / 2028 / 2029 Targets	The expected three-year improvement path.
Current Result	Updated result from survey pulse, dashboard, documentation review, or other evidence.
Status	Not Started, In Progress, On Track, At Risk, Off Track, Completed, or Deferred.
Owner	The person, committee, or group responsible for monitoring the domain.
Evidence Source	Survey, dashboard, tracker, meeting records, engagement notes, SPIL documentation, or other support.
Next Step	The immediate action needed before the next review.

Quarterly SPIL / Strategic Progress Dashboard

Use this quarterly to make SPIL implementation visible. This tool connects priorities, owners, activity, targets, barriers, and follow-up so progress is easier to monitor and explain.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Year and Quarter	The reporting period.
SPIL / Strategic Priority	The SPIL goal or strategic capacity priority being advanced.
Goal / Outcome	The change the network is trying to produce.
Lead Owner	Person, committee, staff role, or workgroup responsible for coordinating the work.
Key Activities	Major actions completed or underway during the quarter.
Metric, Target, Actual	Quantitative or qualitative measure, expected result, and actual result.
Status	Clear color/status indicator for quarterly review.
Barrier / Support Needed	Capacity, timing, data, communication, or decision barrier that needs attention.
Decision / Follow-Up	What needs to be decided or completed before the next quarter.

Shared Commitment and Follow-Through Tracker

Use this after Council, committee, director, and statewide meetings. It is designed to reduce reliance on memory and make accountability supportive, visible, and practical.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Action / Commitment	The specific task, decision, or deliverable agreed upon.
Theme	Assessment theme or strategic priority connected to the action.
Owner	Person or group responsible for moving the item forward.
Support Needed	What the owner needs to complete the action.
Start Date / Due Date	Timeline for follow-up.
Status and Priority	Progress and importance.
Last Update	Most recent update date or meeting where it was discussed.
Evidence / Link	Supporting document, meeting note, dashboard item, or resource.
Next Step	Immediate action before the next check-in.

Role Clarity and Decision-Rights Log

Use this to clarify recurring decisions and work processes. It should distinguish coordination from control and help stakeholders understand who recommends, decides, implements, communicates, and monitors.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Decision / Process	Recurring decision, meeting process, committee function, or implementation activity.
Who Recommends	Group or role responsible for preparing a recommendation.
Who Decides	Group or role with final authority.
Who Implements	Group or role responsible for carrying out the decision.
Who Communicates	Group or role responsible for sharing updates and context.
Who Monitors	Group or role responsible for progress review.
Frequency	Monthly, quarterly, annually, or as needed.
Status / Notes	Where clarification is still needed.

Communication Rhythm and Information Flow Tracker

Use this to define what needs to be communicated, to whom, through which channel, and how often. This is intended to reduce the burden and prevent more unstructured email.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Communication Need	The information, decision, deadline, resource, or action summary that must be shared.
Audience	Council, CIL directors, CIL staff, partners, consumers, committees, or other groups.
Channel / Tool	Email, dashboard, meeting, resource hub, webinar, direct outreach, etc.
Cadence	After each meeting, monthly, quarterly, annually, ongoing, or as needed.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Owner	Person or group responsible for sending or posting the information.
Message Type	Information, decision, action item, deadline, urgent issue, resource, or SPIL progress.
Success Measure	How will OSILC know the communication is working?
Status / Notes	Current state and changes needed.

Technical Assistance and Peer Learning Tracker

Use this to formalize peer learning, role-based cohorts, and practical technical assistance across the network.

Field	Definition / How to Use
TA / Peer Learning Topic	Capacity area such as fiscal management, data, board development, grants, onboarding, SPIL, communications, or succession.
Audience	CIL directors, fiscal staff, program staff, data staff, Council members, or partners.
Need Addressed	The capacity difference, compliance challenge, or learning opportunity being addressed.
Format	Cohort, template, office hours, webinar, peer exchange, shared toolkit, or one-on-one TA.
Lead / Facilitator	OSILC, a CIL peer, external partner, or committee.
Participation Count	Number of people/organizations participating.
Outputs / Tools Created	Templates, guides, recordings, checklists, or examples produced.
Status / Next Step	Progress and follow-up.

Voluntary Shared Services and Supports Feasibility Tracker

Use this to explore practical shared supports without requiring all centers to participate or reducing local independence.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Shared Support Opportunity	Possible finance, HR, IT, data, grant, onboarding, or administrative support.
Need / Problem	Capacity burden, duplication, compliance challenge, or resource gap it addresses.
Interested Centers	Centers that want to explore or pilot the support.
Potential Model	Template library, shared vendor, cohort, pooled TA, fiscal support, data tool, etc.
Feasibility Status	Not started, scanning, designing, piloting, scaling, or deferred.
Cost / Resource Need	Funding, staff time, technology, consultant support, or in-kind contribution needed.
Risks / Equity Considerations	How to avoid burdening small/rural centers or erasing local variation.
Pilot Decision / Next Step	Decision point and immediate action.

Community Voice and Engagement Tracker

Use this to ensure that lived experience and community voice are documented, accessible, and connected to decisions.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Engagement Activity	Listening session, advisory group, survey, town hall, interview, community meeting, or accessible virtual session.
Audience / Community	People with disabilities, family members, caregivers, advocates, specific regions, or underrepresented groups.
Region / CIL Area	Where the input came from.
Accessibility Supports	Captions, plain language, ASL, accessible materials, transportation, virtual access, etc.
Participation Count	Number of participants or responses.
Key Themes Heard	Major input themes.
How Input Was Used	Decision, plan, SPIL element, advocacy message, or practice changed because of input.
Owner / Status / Follow-Up	Responsibility and next engagement step.

Data, Advocacy, and Visibility Tracker

Use this to turn data into useful messages for advocacy, public awareness, partner engagement, and funding.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Data Product / Story	District map, service trend, impact snapshot, legislative brief, story bank, dashboard, or annual report item.
Purpose	Advocacy, funding, public awareness, partner engagement, SPIL planning, or learning.
Audience	Legislators, funders, partners, CILs, Council, public, or state agencies.
Data Source	CIL reports, SPIL data, surveys, community engagement, public datasets, or partner data.
Geography	Statewide, region, county, legislative district, or CIL service area.
Update Cadence	Quarterly, annually, campaign-based, or as needed.
Status / Evidence / Use	Progress, supporting link, and how the data was used.

Risk, Continuity, and Sustainability Log

Use this quarterly to manage key-person dependencies, workflow gaps, capacity limitations, and implementation risks.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Risk / Sustainability Issue	Issue that could disrupt progress, continuity, trust, or implementation.
Why It Matters	The potential impact on OSILC, CILs, Council, SPIL, or statewide coordination.
Likelihood / Impact	Low, medium, or high.
Mitigation Strategy	Action to reduce risk.
Owner	Person or group responsible for monitoring.
Review Date	When the risk should be revisited.
Status / Notes	Current status and follow-up.

Participants, Evidence, and Source Log

Use this to maintain the evidence base for future updates, reports, annual reviews, and SPIL planning. This helps distinguish confidential input from public or documented participation records.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Evidence Source	Interview, survey, listening session, assessment tool, meeting, public comment, dashboard, or document review.
Date / Period	When the evidence was collected or updated.
Participation Count	Number of people, responses, organizations, or sessions.
Stakeholder Group / Role	Council, OSILC staff, CIL director, CIL staff, OOD/state partner, advocacy/community partner, consumer, etc.
Participant Name if Publicly Recorded	Use only where the source record supports naming; keep confidential inputs aggregated.
Confidentiality / Notes	State whether findings are anonymous, confidential, aggregated, or publicly recorded.
How Evidence Informs Follow-Up	What the evidence should be used to monitor, decide, or improve.

Suggested Annual Follow-Up Cycle

Timeframe

Recommended Action

Output

Quarter 1

Refresh dashboard, confirm owners, update role/decision log, and identify support needs.

Updated quarterly dashboard and action tracker.

Quarter 2

Conduct a short network pulse survey focused on the assessment themes.

Mid-year pulse results and priority adjustments.

Quarter 3

Review TA/peer learning outcomes, shared support pilots, community engagement, and data products.

Implementation learning memo and revised supports.

Quarter 4

Complete annual scorecard, summarize progress, identify risks, and prepare next-year priorities.

Annual network progress brief and next-year action plan.

SPIL Preparation Years

Use evidence from all tools to inform consumer engagement, priorities, measures, and statewide planning.

Evidence base for the next SPIL cycle.

Suggested Standing Review Questions

- What moved forward since the last review?
- What stalled, and is the barrier role clarity, communication, capacity, authority, data, or follow-through?
- What support is needed before the next quarter?
- What does the tracker show that is not being discussed in meetings?
- What evidence should be carried into annual planning and SPIL preparation?

Committee Charter and Workplan Scorecard

Use this quarterly to strengthen committee structure, work planning, participation, and reporting. This scorecard helps committees connect their purpose and deliverables to Council priorities, SPIL implementation, and follow-through.

Field	Definition / How to Use
Committee Name	Name of the Council committee or workgroup.
Purpose	Why the committee exists and how it connects to the SPIL or statewide priorities.
Annual Goals	Specific outcomes or deliverables for the year.
Meeting Cadence	Monthly, quarterly, or as needed.
Chair / Co-Chair	People responsible for convening and guiding the committee.
Members / Participants	Council members, staff, CIL representatives, partners, or community members involved.
Key Deliverables	Products, recommendations, reports, events, tools, or decisions expected.
Decisions Needed	Items requiring Council, OSILC, or partner action.
Action Items	Tasks assigned after each meeting.
Owner / Due Date	Person responsible and completion timeline.
Status	Not Started, In Progress, On Track, At Risk, Completed, or Deferred.
Council Report Date	When the committee reports progress to the full Council.
Support Needed	Staff, data, partner, accessibility, or resource support needed.

Annual Learning Review Agenda

Use this agenda once a year to review progress, decide what to adjust, and carry evidence into annual planning and SPIL preparation.

Agenda Item

Purpose

Review annual scorecard

Understand progress against the assessment baseline.

Review SPIL dashboard

Identify progress, barriers, and support needs.

Review role clarity and decision-rights issues.

Clarify where responsibility or authority remains unclear.

Review communication and engagement data.

Determine whether information is reaching the right people.

Review TA, peer learning, and shared supports

Decide what to continue, adjust, expand, or stop.

Review community voice findings.

Confirm how lived experience influenced decisions.

Identify risks and capacity concerns.

Address risks related to staffing, continuity, funding, or participation.

Set next-year priorities

Select the highest-value actions for the next year.