
ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Illinois Commission on Equitable Public University Funding

May 25, 2022: 10:00am-1:00pm CT

Meeting #4 Notes

Welcome & Agenda Overview

Executive Director Ginger Ostro provided background information regarding the meeting logistics and fulfilling the requirements of the Open Meetings Act. Executive Director Ostro also walked through an overview of the agenda for the meeting with highlights of the topics to be covered. Katie Lynne Morton confirmed there was a quorum in attendance.

Action: Approval of minutes from April 2022 Commission meeting

Katie Lynne Morton called the roll to approve the minutes from the April 22, 2022 meeting.

- Commissioner Zarnikow motioned to approve the minutes. Co-Chair Representative Carol Ammons seconded.
- The roll was called and eighteen commissioners approved.

Commission Reflection: Charge, Objectives, Meeting Arc

Co-Chair Representative Ammons walked through a number of slides to help reground the Commission members in the work of the Commission, where it came from and why it is so vital. Co-Chair Representative Ammons members of A Thriving Illinois, the IBHE Strategic Plan, which was developed through stakeholder survey responses, community engagement and virtual focus groups across the states. A thriving Illinois has an inclusive economy and broad prosperity with equitable paths to opportunity for all, especially those facing the greatest barriers. The three strategies for a Thriving Illinois are:

- Close the equity gaps for students who have been left behind,
- Build a strong financial future for individuals and institutions, and
- Increase talent and innovation to drive economic growth.

When A Thriving Illinois was developed, a set of principles were outlined for a public higher education funding system that is equitable, stable and adequate. Those principles include:

- Provide equitable funding so that students can receive the best educational experience and succeed;
- Support a thriving postsecondary system that enriches the state and its residents;
- Fund institutions sufficiently to achieve student, institutional, and state goals;
- Ensure affordability for all students;
- Recognize institutional uniqueness;
- Provide predictability, stability, and limited volatility;
- Include a "hold-harmless" provisions;
- Support accountability;
- Support a collaborative higher education system; and
- Encourage partnerships outside higher education.

Co-Chair Representative Ammons shared the Legislative Charge with the Commission members. The goals and objectives of the Commission are anchored in establishing:

- a shared understanding of current funding structure in IL;
- learning from other states to understand various approaches to issues of post-secondary finance;
- and ultimately developing recommendations centered on increasing access and success for historically underrepresented students—Black, Latinx, low-income, rural, and working adults, among others who have been underrepresented and underserved;

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Approaches to state investments that address historical inequities and reflect adequate funding policies; and
- and supporting the varied missions of our universities.

Co-Chair Representative Ammons shared a reminder of the workplan for the Commission, which includes three phases. The Commission is currently in Phase One. Phase 1 is meant to establish common understanding and context by

- Grounding us in alignment across work - in our first meeting we made connections to A Thriving Illinois, and the principles for an equitable, adequate, and stable funding system; the Chicago State University Equity Working Group recommendations;
- Aligning around conceptual definitions of terms, through two rounds of surveys; and
- Learning from other states and sectors for how they have approached some of the concepts and objectives put forward in the legislative charge.

Phase Two of the process will be focused on analysis and modeling:

- Establishing and measuring adequacy for IL universities,
- resource mapping and resource variation across universities,
- formula components and data analysis,
- modeling distribution options and various implementation scenarios.

During Phase Three, the Commission will finalize analysis and modeling and hone in on a set of recommendations. There will be obvious overlap and transition between phases to facilitate us towards conclusion.

To support the next phases of the work, the Commission plans to establish three workgroups.

State Example: Tennessee

Co-Chair Representative Ammons introduced Steven Gentile, Chief Policy Officer at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Mr. Gentile shared about Tennessee's funding model, first established in 2010 to align with the state's master plan.

The Tennessee Outcomes-Based Funding Formula

Gentile gave an overview of the Tennessee higher education landscape, outcomes-based funding (OBF) history and guiding principles, OBF mechanics (outcomes, focus populations, mission weights), and Tennessee's OBF mapped onto Illinois' legislative charge (stability, equity and adequacy).

Public Higher Education Structure

Gentile gave an overview of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and the structure, including the University of Tennessee System, locally governed institutions and the Tennessee Board of Regents. Twenty-two institutions fall into the OBF formula. The common thread of the institutions that fall into the OBF formula serve predominantly undergraduate students.

Outcomes-Based Funding History

1979: performance-based funding began in Tennessee

1990s: increased funding proportion distributed through PBF from 2.0% to 5.45%

2010: TN passes the Complete College Tennessee Act, establishing the outcomes-based funding (OBF) formula, moving to 100% of funding based on outcomes

2015: first five-year review of the OBF model completed

2020: second five-year review of the OBF model started

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

2022: second five-year review of the OBF model completed

Formula Guiding Principles

- The Commission will use the formula in all funding scenarios.
- The formula will sign with the education goals of the state, providing incentives for productivity improvements consistent with the statewide master plan.
- The formula will continue to incorporate outcomes across a range of variables, reflecting differences in institutional missions.
- Any new outcomes will be incorporated only after rigorous evaluation of data quality and integrity.

Sector-Differentiated Outcomes

University: Students accumulating 30 hours; Students accumulating 60 hours; Students accumulating 90 hours; Associate degrees; Bachelor's degrees; Master/Ed. Specialist degrees; Doctoral/law degrees; research & service; Degrees per 100 FTE; and Six-year graduation rate.

Community College: Students accumulating 12 hours; Students accumulating 24 hours; Students accumulating 36 hours; Dual enrollment; Associate degrees; Long-term certificates; Short-term certificates; Job placement; Transfer out with 12 hours; Workforce training; and Awards per 100 FTE.

For the most part, the outcomes are overall counts.

Focus Populations

There are focus populations, which is how populations are addressed that either require more support to cross the graduation stage or there is a need to disincentivize institutions from not focusing on these students and just focus on the students that are "easier" to get across the stage. Populations are adult (25 and older), low-income (Pell eligible) and in the community college sector only: academic underprepared (based on ACT). These focus populations align with Tennessee's master plan.

Students at different institutions are different people with different missions. Gentile gave an overview of university weights based on what each institution focuses on.

Stability

- Limits volatility through three-year averaging.
- Mathematically scales all outcomes to better compare apples (e.g., bachelor degrees) to oranges (e.g., research and public service).
- When implementing any new measure, seeks to maintain an overall volatility of between -7% to 7%, give or take.

Equity

- Rewards focus populations premiums for students who historically require more wrap-around support.
 - Incentivizes enrolling underrepresented students.
 - Supports institutions who historically serve and complete underrepresented students.
- Defines "success" as growth on institution's outcomes base.
 - Recognizes institutional missions and does not incentivize a race to "flagship" status.
 - Ensures that an open-access institution can compete against a selective institution.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Revisits formula outcomes and mechanics annually in a public meeting forum. Committee represents all institutions and state stakeholders.
 - Ensures that new measures are not exclusionary.
 - Allows institutions to address perceived inequities in current model.

Adequacy

- Adequacy measure not inherent to model but we use growth in outcomes to advocate for more funding.
- Monitor institutional financial health (composite finance index) to determine whether institutions are in need of further help.
 - Informs all our fiscal policies, not just operating request.
- Offer occasional grants to institutions to improve outcome performance - to ignite perpetual outcome performance.

Outcomes Funding Distribution History

Gentile shared that there is a community college sector in Tennessee. In 2014, the state implemented the nation's first state-wide university scholarship program for tuition-free education in the community college sector. Outcomes greatly rose for this sector. The history overtime shows how the funding can shift from one institution to another over time. Enrollment greatly informs where outcomes may go.

Dr. Toya Barnes-Teamer facilitated a question and answer session with Mr. Steven Gentile following his presentation. Commissioners raised the following questions:

In terms of the measurement descriptors, we're focusing on equity from an underrepresented group perspective. Is there some reason behind how descriptors (adult, low-income, etc.) came about?

- These descriptors came naturally through discussion of the Tennessee Master Plan. Academically underprepared would come up organically in conversations and it was important not to lose sight of these students.

In your experience with the formula, how frequent is it to see an institution to improve in every category and still suffer a loss of OBF?

- There have been instances in the last 11 years where there is great improvement across all and in a no-new funding situation, those institutions would lose funding. In all but one year, institutions have stayed positive in their funding. It is incumbent on us to present to all the Boards, administration, faculty senates to talk about how the formula works. The formula is primarily account based. The formula was molded in the best way to tie into the mission of the institution. It's imperative to have a large information campaign (ongoing) to get through the different nuances of the formula.

Within all the 4-year public universities from year to year, the funding varies from year to year very slightly. How do you respond to this observation?

- The share of funding distribution shows changes in the hundredths of percents of funding share, which is minimal (overall), which gets to the question of stability. The shares can come down to a sizable change in state appropriations for each institution. The volatility is low so that institutions do have some stability from year to year. It looks like a small change, and it is, but moves money in a way that gets their attention to focus on outcomes. From year to year, the variation on outcomes are typically between two and five percent.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

What have been the changes in terms of student outcomes, specifically for students of color, low-income students and some of those other target equity populations? Is this formula achieving the goals that the state has for it?

- The low-income associate degree count over the last ten years (a focus population) has increased 34 percent. The throughput (degrees per FTE) of that population has increased from 15 associate degrees per 100 FTE to closer to about 30 overall, so there has been an increase in efficiency. If going back ten years, there will be differences seen. For example, Austin Peay's share has increased from about 4 percent in 2010 to 5 percent of the total share. In actual dollar amounts, their appropriation has doubled in ten years. The minimum amount of increase has been 16 percent. Institutions are asking "what is going on there and how can we get it here?"

Was race explicitly looked at when looking at target populations?

- Institutions care about enrollment as well, probably more so than state appropriations. The emphasis is on enrollment. There were conversations about race and it was decided that was not the way to go. There are mechanical things to consider when serving historically underrepresented students.

What's been the impact on the demographics of students across the state?

- We have seen an increase in completion rates of our students across demographics. Gaps between students of different demographics have stayed the same even though they have increased over time (completion rates). Gaps remaining the same is a persistent problem. A formula is just one tool in the toolkit to focus on many concerns.

How are you measuring service? The impact of the campuses in different regions is huge. Can the model account for the fact that there's way more research dollars that then come "unrestricted" funds for the university?

- Indirect costs come from research grants. The formula doesn't specifically account for this. Some institutions may have more resources than others, which is why the institutional outcome improvement fund grant to recognize that some institutions may need additional start-up dollars. Public service activities definition involves activities such as those directly funded by Department of Energy.

How do you view the outcome measurements impact on having, for example, a flagship institution actually enrolls and graduate more underrepresented students?

- When the formula was created in 2010, the weights of the focus populations were 40 percent. Feedback was provided that said the premiums were good but not enough to move the needle on implementing these practices. Since then, there has been a shift to the 80, 100, 120 due to feedback. There are other ways, outside of the formula, practices that help and advocate for students that tie back into the formula. The formula is one tool in the toolkit.

Dr. Toya Barnes-Teamer shared that Commission members should share questions with Ginger Ostro to be compiled and send to Mr. Steven Gentile for answers.

Reflections on State Presentations & Higher Education Funding Policies

Ms. Martha Snyder presented and reflected on the information shared to date, including Tennessee's presentation earlier in the meeting, to help ground the Commission in terms of

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

the national landscape and also in principles and considerations as the Commission enters into phase two of the work.

Common Formula Components in Higher Education Funding Models are typically broken down into four categories: Base+, Enrollment, Student Outcomes and Mission + "Other." Most states have hybrids or integrated variations of the components. In an effort to build a strong university funding system, a funding system that supports the capacity of the institution that factors in various components is needed (Base, Enrollment, Demographic/Equity, Student Supports, Outcomes, Mission/Other). Funding models in higher education are meant to provide the parameters for higher education.

Addressing Equity in Higher Education Funding Models

Snyder shared that Considerations for student demographics or other factors have not historically been a factor in higher education funding models. This is most commonly reflected in outcomes-based components of funding models, but equity could be reflected in other components as well (enrollment, student supports). Extra weighting is needed for successful outcomes for identified student populations and the most common student populations include: Low-income, adult, academically underprepared, Racial and ethnic minoritized groups. A limitation is that even in cases where equity is reflected, often times not empirically informed based on the supports and resources necessary to help students succeed.

The following examples were shared that address equity in funding models:

Base +: Colorado (base/step 1); several states in context of COVID budget decisions;
Enrollment: California community colleges, K12, Louisiana (cost component), and Colorado (base/step 1);
Evidence-based practices/Costs of Supports: K12; and
Student Outcomes: reflected in most outcome model components, often more "art" than "science."

Adequacy: Why does Funding matter?

- Declines in college resources and increased student employment have been shown to negatively affect time-to-degree.
- Changes in state funding have effects on academic spending; with academic support spending, including tutoring, advising, mentoring particularly responsive to changes.
- Investment/expenditures in certain student services/academic support affect graduation and persistence, with higher impact at less selective institutions.

Adequacy in Higher Education Finance

- Few states have any measures of adequacy
- Analysis of costs in higher education often based on expenditures;
 - Lower-resourced institutions serve higher-need students. Have less and spend less.
- Typically not empirically derived or focused on student access, success
 - Adequacy is linked to historical "base" allocations and costs such as personnel costs and/or inflation.
- Absence of analysis of how much it costs to successfully serve students
 - Lack of understanding of varying costs for different student groups
 - Lack of understanding (or at least scaling) of effective practices that support student success.
- This hinders the ability to orient around a rational financing structure.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Field is moving in this direction: to better understand costs that can help inform funding levels and strategies.

Developing Understanding of Adequacy in Higher Education Finance

Student Centered Adequacy components:

- Examples of analysis: Enrollment and Success (costs of programs, supports, interventions); Student characteristics (varied level of support needed to enroll and serve different students).

Other/Mission components:

- Variations in programmatic areas/different degree types (costs); Institutional Mission.

Other Considerations for Addressing Adequacy: Resources

Institutions that serve higher numbers of low-income, minoritized students are often more reliant on state support and have lower levels and fewer sources of other resources. This could include:

- In-state tuition levels;
- Out-of-State enrollment/tuition revenue;
- Alumni Giving (wealth disparities; types of careers); and
- Endowments/Reserves.

Stability: State Commitments in Higher Education Funding

State Commitment = state's investment in higher education costs

- Few states articulate specific targets or commitment of state support
 - Even those that do, no requirement to meet commitment
 - Discretionary vs. entitlement distinction
- State Commitment should be informed by and linked to adequacy work
 - Factor in other institutional revenue resources
 - Considers student socio-economic profiles (ability to pay)
- Stability comes from this more predictable level of support + a funding model that is clear and transparent
 - can inform implementation of new funding model;
 - can provide for more rational approach to guide investments (and potentially cuts)

Other Considerations of Formula Development and Implementation

- Recognize that funding models are policy tools and should therefore be grounded in state goals, priorities and needs
- Formula should not be static – fix it and forget it

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- As with any policy, it should be reviewed, evaluated and adjusted both to address any unintended consequences and to sharpen alignment to state needs.
- Should be balanced with stability
- Implementation Matters
 - Supporting institutions in understanding the funding model
 - Support them in analyzing results and aligning to best practices for change

K12 vs. Higher Education Formulas

Snyder shared key differences in K12 versus Higher Education formulas, broken down into the following categories: Adequacy, Entitlement/State Commitment, Other Funding Sources, Student Background, Supports/Interventions and Stability.

While Higher Education and K12 funding are historically different (K12 is considered an entitlement and formulas inform appropriation amounts; higher education is typically a discretionary investment at the state level), the approach to K12 funding and the factors included can inform considerations for building more adequate and equitable higher education funding models.

Snyder also shared with the Commission the Matrix (resources for comparisons across state models) that incorporates the information previously shared in past Commission meetings from a variety of states (and the K12 EBF model).

When looking ahead at building an adequate, equitable and stable funding system, adequacy and resources need to be considered.

- Topics to explore:
 - Review of research on adequacy in PS, lessons from K12
 - Adequacy considerations
 - Base/Full cost components of adequacy
 - Student-Centered adequacy components to consider: e.g., Enrollment + Success (costs of programs, supports, interventions proven to support student enrollment, progression and success)
 - Options for other aspects of adequacy: Mission + Program
 - Resource Mapping: Considerations of students' ability to pay

When looking ahead at modeling, implementation and stability:

- Topics to explore:
 - What valid and reliable data are available aligned to adequacy components and resource work

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Resource and gap analysis
- Modeling various funding model scenarios for state investment and allocation of resources
- Implementation options to support adequacy, equity and stability

Snyder offered time for Commission members to ask questions, make comments or clarify anything regarding the state matrix that was shared.

Commissioner Steans shared that Snyder's presentation was very helpful. The way it was broken out shows where the gaps are and how best to approach the work moving forward.

Commissioner Zarnikow shared similar comments to Commissioner Steans. The presentation was helpful and highlighted that there is not a lot of guidance about these issues.

Break

The Commissioners took a five-minute break.

The Research Base for Defining 'Adequate' Funding for Public Universities in Illinois

Dr. Barnes-Teamer introduced Dr. Nate Johnson, Founder and Principal Consultant at Postsecondary Analytics and Senior Affiliate at HCM. Nate is the founder and principal consultant of Postsecondary Analytics, LLC. He specializes in quantitative and qualitative research in state, federal and institutional policy, flexible strategic planning, financial comparisons, data visualization, student success, and financial aid.

Dimensions of Adequacy Addressed by Research

- Student Choice
- Student Characteristics
- Institutional Capacity
- Program effectiveness
- Program Costs

Working Definition of Adequacy

Dr. Johnson shared the definition of adequate funding and called out specific words from the definition that are the "core" words to focus on. He also pulled out how the K12 funding formula defined adequacy.

Dr. Johnson shared an approach to K12 adequacy funding which also describes some elements of possible Illinois public 4-year funding adequacy. He then applied this same approach to public 4-year institutions. A working definition considers other ways that funding affects student and institutional capacity, including:

- the choice to enroll in public education;
- student and institution's mutual choice of one another;
- level of intensity in student's participation in the system; and
- student's choice of program to pursue.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Two Ways to Use an Additional Dollar to Improve Student Outcomes

- Keep institutional programs and services the same, but lower the price for students; and
- Keep the price for students the same, but invest in programs/services that improve student outcomes.

Funding Adequacy and Prices

- Lower prices improve low-income student outcomes
 - more likely to choose institutions with higher graduation rates
 - more likely to graduate, shorter time-to-degree
- Higher-income students not as sensitive to price
- Two types of costs in “new price of attendance”
 - direct: tuition, fees, books, transportation
 - indirect: housing, food, time off work, childcare
- “Sticker” prices can also be a factor

“Adequate” Institutional Funding can Improve Student Outcomes by Supporting:

- Well-structured and predictable pathways to graduation,
- Research-based advising and instructional practices,
- Programs that reduce student direct or indirect costs

Student Characteristics Associated with Higher Need for Institutional Spending to Achieve Same Outcome

- *Academic preparation*
- *Lower-income*
- *Parental status*
- *Time elapsed since last enrollment*
- *Distance from institution*

Dr. Johnson shared that spending does matter, but is not everything.

Research Base for Institutional Spending and Funding Adequacy

- Funding is necessary but not sufficient,
- There is a harder “floor” than “ceiling,”
- Similar findings in studies with different beginning/end points, more control variables,
- Direct instructional expenditures tend to have most consistent correlation with outcomes, and
- Student support can be highly effective, but depends more on program design.

How Program/Major Costs Affect Funding Adequacy

Examples of higher-cost programs: most engineering disciplines, most licensed health professions, most performing arts.

Consistent across multiple states with cost studies: IL, OH, MN, FL, TX.

Dr. Johnson shared a table that outlines pathway costs, output and costs per completion at USACC. He also shared the Washington State Institute for Public Policy Cost-Benefit Calculator (<https://www.wsipp.wa.gov>).

Practice Example: Research-Justified for CUNY

- ASAP (Accelerated Study in Associate Programs) aimed to improve outcomes for low-income students

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- block scheduling,
- supplemental advising and other supports, and
- financial benefits for students.
- MDRC controlled sample study;
- Significantly higher completion rates;
- Significantly higher cost per student; and
- Lower to moderately higher cost per degree.

Dr. Barnes-Teamer facilitated a question and answer session.

Commissioner Martire asked about the legend on the graphic shared during the presentation: how did that control for income and/or race?

- It was not a controlled study, but rather a simple correlation.

Work Session: Activity, Reflections and Discussion

The adequate funding definition was shared with the Commissioners as a reminder: The amount of funding necessary to equitably support all students to enroll and complete a degree without placing undue financial burden on students/families and for each university to carry out its mission. The cost of adequacy will vary across institutions based on the different needs of students being served, different degree types offered and the different mission components across institutions. Achieving adequacy requires directing new state investments to institutions with the greatest gap after accounting for other revenue sources.

Chief of Staff Ja'Neane Minor introduced the work session activity, which took place using JamBoard. A link to the JamBoard was shared in the chat and the Commissioners (only) were asked to follow the link. A "practice" JamBoard was presented for the Commissioners with the question: How Do You Feel Right Now?

JamBoard #1 posed the question: With this definition in mind and from what you heard about other states' funding models, the K12 EBF model, and today's discussion, what components (or elements) should be included when developing an adequate funding structure for universities?

After answering the questions using sticky notes on the screen, Commissioners were given time to reflect and elevate their thoughts. Answers provided on the JamBoard include but are not limited to: closing gaps, size, mission, student credit hours, lower income status, rural students, program array, diversity, affordability, Pell eligibility, race, students served, equitable, programs of study and degree type.

JamBoard #2 posed the question: With this definition in mind, other than state funding, what types of resources should be considered when assessing institutional adequacy and ability to equitably serve students?

After answering the questions using sticky notes on the screen, Commissioners were given time to reflect and elevate their thoughts. Answers provided on the JamBoard include but are not limited to: age of facilities, scholarships, program delivery, family income, federal funding, student zip codes, foundation support, partnership agencies, indirects recovered from research, institutional revenue, unrestricted endowment, and structural deficits.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Dr. Barnes-Teamer asked Commissioners to share what they observe has been elevated as what the workgroups should be talking about and focusing on as they start meeting. Dr. Barnes-Teamer elevated themes that emerged on each of the JamBoards.

Charge to Workgroups and Next Steps

Co-Chair Representative Ammons shared next steps in relation to the workgroups.

There were three workgroups proposed. The first workgroup will be focused on adequacy, the second workgroup will be more focused on resources and the third workgroup will be focused on the technical and modeling aspects of any formula considerations. These workgroups will add additional capacity to inform the Commission's work, but will not replace it.

A deeper description of each workgroup was provided:

- **Adequacy workgroup:** The adequacy workgroup will focus on evaluating and understanding various issues and concepts of adequacy in postsecondary finance. The workgroup will support the Commission's work in identifying the components that comprise an adequate and equitable finance structure for universities as well as consideration for the varying scope of resources across institutions to consider as a factor for investing new state resources.
- **Resources workgroup:** The resource workgroup will help define the different types of resources to be considered as a way to assess adequacy and inform how to equitably invest new state resources toward achieving adequacy for institutions. The outcome of this workgroup will be resource mapping across each institution that can be used (in conjunction with the adequacy workgroup) a "gap analysis" between institutional adequacy and resources.
- **Technical Modeling Workgroup:** The technical workgroup will build upon the conceptual framework established by the Commission (informed by the adequacy workgroup) and begin identifying metrics/data, modeling distribution mechanisms and various funding scenarios/implementation options based on spending considerations. The workgroup's analysis will incorporate the varying levels of resources (revenue streams) across institutions, as outlined by the Commission.

The co-chairs selected participants for the workgroups. If Commissioners are unable to attend the workgroup, they may select a designee to serve on their behalf. The first meeting(s) of the Adequacy and Resource workgroups are anticipated to begin in June 2022. These meetings will be open to the public.

Public Comment

Dr. Barnes-Teamer reminded members of the public that they have up to three minutes to provide public comment.

- **Maureen Maglioco, retired University Professor and member of faith coalition for the common good.** Ms. Maglioco shared that she fought for reform of the K12 funding formula and is equally committed to equity in the funding of higher education so that all students can prosper and realize their full potential. Fundamental to adequacy is a healthy and safe environment where mold does not grow on the walls of classrooms and residence halls, where ceilings do not leak while the professor is trying to teach, where fumes from chemicals in science classrooms are removed, where students can safely drink the water. In many universities in Illinois, this is not the case because of years and years of deferred maintenance. Adequate and equitable funding would also ensure that campus health centers are sufficiently staffed, that advising centers,

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

tutoring centers and writing centers are available in a timely manner to all students who need them. And that advisors don't have hundreds of students to advise leading to delays in graduation counseling centers without adequate psychiatric help, which is especially important in these days of mass shootings. Surveys show that 47 percent of college students report depressing and/or anxiety and suicide as the leading cause of death. Students of color should have access to at least one counselor who looks like them and funding for multicultural centers should be increased, not cut. Because students need the kind of support they provide. Essential to a quality university is a curriculum and faculty that can compare to any throughout the country. That means money to recruit and retain a diverse faculty to support library, science and technology labs. And money to bring to campus nationally known and diverse representatives from a variety of fields to inspire students and help them feel competitive with students from other locations.

- Jocelyn Bravo, Young Invincibles. Ms. Bravo asked the commission to consider an institution's percentage of underrepresented students as recommendations for an equity-centered funding model. As a student, Ms. Bravo was involved in various programs including research at the institute of health research and policy internships. During her time there, she noticed the same students would take advantage of the resources available. These resources, experiences and connections allow students to turn a degree into a career. She thinks about the students who are working 40 hours per week to afford tuition, fees and housing and what happens to them? How will they be able to develop the experience and connections that will help them after they graduate? Ms. Bravo urged the commission to think about an equity-centered model that considers an institution's percentage of underrepresented students, a model that allows working class students to take advantage of resources without having to worry about tuition and fees, and a model that also considers first generation students and the unique challenges that come with navigating the system on their own. Institutions have a responsibility to help students reach their full potential by providing the appropriate support. A funding model is needed that prioritizes institution's high percentages of working class and first-generation students.

Next Steps, Closing Announcements and Adjournment

Dr. Barnes-Teamer shared that assignments for the Adequacy and Resource workgroups would be sent out via email. Co-Chair Representative Ammons offered words of thanks to the Commission members. Co-Chair Torres also shared his appreciation to IBHE and HCM Strategists. The next meeting is scheduled for September 1, 2022. At this next meeting, the Commission will hear from both workgroups and hear from a student panel.

Commission Members in attendance

Senate Majority Leader Kimberly Lightford, Co-Chair
Representative Carol Ammons, Co-Chair
John Atkinson, Co-Chair
Deputy Governor for Education Martin Torres, Co-Chair
Representative Katie Stuart
Representative Mike Marron
Lisa Castillo-Richmond

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Cherita Ellens
Lisa Freeman
Gloria Gibson
David Glassman
Dr. Diane Otieno Owino
Guiyou Huang
Terri Kinzy
Dan Mahony
Ralph Martire
Dennis Papini
Elizabeth Hamilton, representing Javier Reyes
Zaldwaynaka "Z" Scott
Robin Steans
Simón Weffer
Eric Zarnikow

Commission Members not in attendance

Senator Scott Bennett
Assistant Republic Leader Chapin Rose
Deputy Republic Leader Dan Brady
Senator Dale Fowler
Andreas Cangellaris
Dr. Wendi Wills El-Amin
Cheryl Green
Brandon Kyle
Jack Wuest

Support Team Members in attendance

Ginger Ostro
Ja'Neane Minor
Jaimee Ray
Emily Chase
David Antonacci
Toya Barnes-Teamer
Martha Snyder
Jimmy Clarke
Katie Lynne Morton