
ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Illinois Commission on Equitable Public University Funding

May 30, 2023: 9:00am-12:00pm CT

Meeting #8 Notes

Welcome & Agenda Overview

Executive Director Ginger Ostro opened the meeting with a general welcome and notification that the Commission would need to vote to approve two motions before beginning.

Action: Approval of Motion 1 (Advisory Bodies to Continue to Remain Virtual)

The Illinois Commission on Equitable Public University Funding ("Commission") adopts procedural rules in compliance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/7) to allow members of the Commission to meet by other means than in-person meetings.

It shall be the policy of the Commission that members of this Body are allowed to meet virtually and/or telephonically, pursuant to 5 ILCS 120/7(d)(D)(ii). The Commission is an advisory body that does not have authority to make binding recommendations or determinations or to take any other substantive action.

It shall be the procedure of the Commission to continue to abide by the notice, posting, recording, and all other provisions of the Open Meetings Act for members of the public and other stakeholders to fully participate in the proceedings of the Commission.

Co-Chair Representative Carol Ammons made a motion to adopt Motion 1. Commissioner Lisa Freeman seconded the motion. There were no questions or discussion. The roll was called and twenty commissioners approved.

Action: Approval of Motion 2 (Rule for Public Comment)

This motion is to adopt a rule for public comment before the Illinois Commission on Equitable Public University Funding ("Commission").

Members of the public are offered the opportunity to address the Commission virtually at each properly noticed public meeting pursuant to the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120). The public's ability to comment at public meetings is only constrained by procedural rules put in place by each subject public body.

As such, the Commission requires that members of the public request an opportunity to provide public comment at a time and manner specified at the beginning of each meeting. Public comment may be made virtually and/or telephonically. The Chair or designee will recognize public commenters in the order in which they registered their interest in providing comment. While the Commission welcomes public comment, the Chair is permitted to limit the time comment may be made by an individual to no more than three minutes to permit as many comments as possible while also maintaining decorum of each public meeting.

Commissioner Eric Zarnikow made a motion to adopt Motion 2. Co-Chair Representative Carol Ammons seconded the motion. There were no questions or discussion. The roll was called and twenty commissioners approved.

Executive Director Ostro shared general announcements regarding Open Meetings Act, that the meeting will be recorded and instructions for any members of the public who would like to participate in Public Comment. Ostro also offered thanks and congratulations to the Governor's office, members of the General Assembly and others who were part of the

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

budget process. Highlights were provided from the passed budget. Co-Chair Deputy Governor Martin Torres offered thanks for those who supported the budget and noted that this is a historic year for higher education. Co-Chair Representative Ammons offered thanks and remarks. Co-Chair Board Chair John Atkinson offered thanks for those who supported the process.

Action: Approval of minutes from April 2023 Commission meeting

Katie Lynne Morton called the roll to approve the minutes from the April 17, 2023 meeting. Commissioner Robin Steans motioned to approve the minutes. Commissioner Z Scott seconded. The roll was called and twenty commissioners approved.

Executive Director Ostro provided an overview of the agenda.

Commission Reflection: Charge & Objectives

Martha Snyder 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. Ms. Snyder shared 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;
- Approaches to state investments that address historical inequities and reflect adequate funding policies; and
- Supporting the varied missions of our universities.

Martha Snyder shared a consolidated version of the work plan for the Commission, which includes three phases. Phase one (meetings 1-4), where we established common understanding and context, has been completed. We are now in Phase two (meetings 5-8), where we build out the analysis and discuss models. Then we will fully transition to Phase three (meetings 9-10), where we 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 Phase 2 and 3 of the work, the Commission established three workgroups. It was shared that the Technical Modeling workgroup has been meeting every two weeks and would provide an update report during the meeting.

Technical Modeling Workgroup Overview

Martha Snyder gave an overview of the Technical Modeling workgroup. The charge of the workgroup is to build upon the conceptual framework established by the Commission (informed by the Adequacy and Resource workgroups) and begin identifying metrics/data, modeling distribution mechanisms and various funding scenarios/implementation options based on spending considerations.

Start with an Equity-Centered Adequacy Target

Martha Snyder walked through the conceptual model, similar to the K-12 EBF which was shared on the screen as a reminder. Each institution will have an Adequacy Target, built

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

from the components of what it costs for students to succeed and will vary based on student need. Equity adjustments will be made based on variable student need to reflect the priority of increasing more equitable access and success for historically underserved student populations. Adequacy will also consider research, service, and artistry missions. Cost for facilities operations and maintenance included, as well.

Conceptual Model

Identify Available Resources: include existing state funding as base, account for “expected tuition,” and other resources, like endowment. “Expected tuition” rather than actual tuition helps address more equitable affordability.

State Funds fill in Gap in Resources: model to be developed, but goal to distribute new state investments to institutions with the greatest gap between equity-centered adequacy target and current available resources (state, expected tuition and other).

Technical Modeling Workgroup Workgroup Update

Will Carroll walked through the progress that has been made by the Technical Modeling workgroup members to date.

- Adequacy Targets: near complete
 - Remaining work: refine equity adjustments, O&M proposal, small school and concentration adjustments, data updates, and draft university targets
- Resource Profile: strong progress
 - Remaining work: complete expected tuition proposal, other resources, auxiliaries (e.g., dining services, housing), and draft resource profiles
- Implementation Issues: starting
 - Accountability & transparency, allocation formula, path to full funding, and formula review and upkeep

Equity-Centered Adequacy Targets

Martha Snyder walked through a proposed approach to calculating adequacy targets. Baseline Spending (start with the per pupil funding levels derived from expenditures in IBHE’s Revenue & Expenditure (R&E) report) + Equity Adjustment (Close equity gaps by adjusting the baseline spending for certain student, program, and institutional characteristics) + Base Adjustment due to Underfunding (Recognize Illinois’ history of underfunding higher education, increase the baseline per pupil expenditures to a sufficient level) = Adequacy Target.

Adequacy Target Components

Student Centered Access Components

- Equity Adjustment
 - Applicable populations: adults, URM, low-income, rural (undergraduates)
 - Amounts: \$500 and \$1,000. Amounts derived from costs of evidence-based practices that increase college enrollment among historically underrepresented students.
 - Purpose: Incentivize and support activities that increase the enrollment of historically underrepresented student groups. Populations were identified based on 4-year college enrollment rate gaps in Illinois; groups with larger gaps receive the higher adjustment amount.

Academic & Non-Academic Supports

- Equity Adjustment
 - Applicable populations: Adults, URM, low-income, rural, low high school GPA, EBF Tiers 1 & 2 (undergraduates)

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Amounts: \$2,000, \$4,000, \$6,000 and \$8,000. Amounts derived from costs of holistic evidence-based practices that increase college retention and completion among historically underserved students.
- Purpose: Incentivize and support activities that increase the retention and completion of historically underserved student groups. Populations were identified based on retention rate gaps in Illinois; groups with larger gaps receive the higher adjustment amount.

Core Instruction Program Costs

- Equity Adjustment - Diversifying Faculty
 - Applicable populations: all students
 - Amounts \$422. Amount is based on the average costs of current initiatives at some Illinois universities.
 - Purpose: Incentivize and support activities that recruit and retain a more diverse faculty. Applied to all students given it is a university-wide effort.
- Equity Adjustment - Diversifying High-Cost Programs
 - Applicable populations: URM in high-cost and medical professional programs
 - Amounts: \$1,321 (high-cost) and \$3,962 (medical professional). Amounts are the premiums needed to equalize funding going to URM students given their underrepresentation in these programs in Illinois.
 - Purpose: Incentivize and support activities that increase the enrollment of URM students in high-cost and medical professional programs. Populations were identified based on disproportionately low rates of representation in these fields.
- High-Cost Program Adjustment
 - Applicable programs: select high-cost and medical professional programs
 - Amounts: 20% (high-cost) and 100% (medical professional) weights applied to the average core instructional program cost for enrollment in these programs. Amounts are based on analysis of the cost per credit hour.
 - Purpose: Recognize the variation in costs of certain programs and the different mix of programs at universities. High-cost programs are those where costs are consistently high in multiple years and at multiple institutions for the particular level (Lower, Upper, Grad I, Grad II).

Instruction and Student Services

- Benchmarking Cost Adjustment
 - Applicability: all instruction and student services costs for all students
 - Amount: \$4,276. Amount is the estimated increase in investment associated with raising the Illinois statewide average graduation rate to 70% given research linking state appropriations to graduation rates and the spending level of high-performing institutions. The 70% graduation rate is used purely to help define an adequate level of funding using an external benchmark. It is not meant to be a school-specific or statewide expectation.
 - Purpose: Raise the floor for all universities to a base level, recognizing that average state spending levels are not sufficient given historical disinvestment from the system.

Co-Chair Deputy Governor Torres raised a question regarding the student-centered access components and whether institutions would be expected to implement the research-based practices and whether there would be an accountability factor aligned. If so, what does that vision look like? This is an important part of the implementation conversation. The intention is not to say that every institution is implementing each of the evidence-based practices that were identified and used to benchmark the adjustments. The hope is that institutions

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

would take the resources and use in a way to best serve their student populations currently enrolled and as part of their future enrollment. As part of accountability and transparency, it's important to support institutions during implementation so they understand where the resources can best be used to support their students.

Commissioner Cherita Ellens echoed Co-Chair Deputy Governor Torres' comments. There should be trust in that the universities will use the funds in the spirit in which they are given, there also needs to be a mechanism built in to force accountability to ensure funding is having the intended impact. Commissioner Ellens also asked about first-generation students and whether they are being considered. First-generation students is a data gap and they cannot be included at this time. If the Commission believes it's important to capture these students, a data piece would need to be started to track this data moving forward. Similarly with student parents. Commissioner Castillo-Richmond echoed both Deputy Governor Torres and Commissioner Ellens. Given the conceptual model, Castillo-Richmond shared that a conceptual conversation on accountability should be considered. Commissioner Martire shared experiences from the K12 EBF in that districts can implement as they see fit during the early years of funding when the model is not yet fully funded. Martire also shared that research takes ten years to see improved outcomes (test scores, graduation rates, etc.) and see statistically meaningful correlations. An approach needs to be considered here that will help generate adequate data along the way to offer appropriate evaluation.

Representative Katie Stuart shared that many institutions draw from other states and asked how to account for this when taking into consideration the EBF tiers. Martha Snyder raised that this could be a data limitation as well. If these students fall into other categories, they would qualify in other ways. Representative Stuart realizes the data correlation issue, but raised this as something to think about moving forward. Commissioner Scott emphasized that when looking at evidence-based practices, the costs of implementing can be very high. Chicago State University's Student Success Taskforce was able to visit a number of schools where these practices were successful. However, for example, Georgia State's program was seeing significant gain but was also heavily funded by a nonprofit organization. There may be other adjustments needed as the process moves forward. Commissioner Tarhule offered thoughts on accountability, including the consideration of what has been discussed so far is based on input and not output. One way to have accountability may be to incentivize or reward output based on year over year improvement. Tarhule also shared that change management is very hard to achieve in higher education and many of the areas discussed in the Commission will require change management.

Commissioner Javier Reyes raised the idea that there is a possibility that budgets increase or decrease and that enrollment dynamics can be beyond control. It's important to remember there are scenarios where institutions see a decrease in enrollment but are having success in retention and graduation of students. To that end, Reyes raised that it's important that the budget not be fully managed based on enrollment growth. Commissioner Robin Steans shared her appreciation for the conversation around accountability and transparency. Steans flagged that there needs to be balance and a dynamic relationship between the two over time.

Commissioner Sheila Caldwell shared her agreement around incentivizing. All institutions should be held accountable in the same way. Commissioner Lisa Freeman raised the point that if a mistake is to be made, it should be in trusting the institutions to do their job, as opposed to prematurely imposing performance standards that demolish what is trying to be

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

achieved with the adequacy, equity-based formula. Co-Chair Board Chair John Atkinson asked whether Commissioner Freeman thought that equity plans needed to have a condition precedent rather than a baked-in performance plan. Commissioner Freeman shared information regarding the makeup of equity plans. The institutions need to be transparent about their equity plans, goals and progress.

Research and Public Service Mission

- Adequacy Cost with Institutional Mission Adjustment
 - Amounts: \$800, \$1,400, and \$4,000. Amount includes \$200 for the artistry component of mission at all universities, based on national data on the additional cost of artistry instruction. Provides \$600, \$1,200 and \$3,800 to support research aligned to Carnegie classification. Amounts are derived from actual institutional expenditures on research.
 - Purpose: Ensure a minimum level of basic research at all universities while also providing additional resources to institutions with a mission that includes greater levels of research.

Calculating the Per Student Base Funding

The various components of Instruction and Student Services combine into the above formula. An institution's adequacy target is calculated by multiplying the per student base funding amount to all degree- and certificate-seeking students, with equity and programmatic adjustments being applied to the respective eligible students.

Forthcoming Adjustments

- Small School/Size Factor
 - To account for fixed costs and economies of scale
 - May be incorporated into the O&M adequacy component
- Concentration Factor
 - To account for higher costs associated with educating high percentages of historically underserved students
 - Could be incorporated into the equity adjustments

Adequacy Components

Discussion

- Are there pieces of the adequacy calculation you have questions about? Are there pieces you really like?
- Does the current model include the right factors to reflect all the intentions and objectives of the work?
- What could accountability or transparency related to use of funds look like?

Commissioner Huang asked what the current definition for "small schools" is. Currently, there is not a definition but the workgroup is working through this. Commissioner Huang shared that he liked a number of components shared, including considering how to address various functions of the different institutions, the formula centering around increasing access and success for underrepresented students, the recognition of O&M, proposal to calculate adequacy targets, applicable population adequacy targets (mentioning rural is very important). It's good to recognize that there are gaps based on different institutions.

Commissioner Eric Zarnikow asked whether the calculated need for base funding looks like for the state in total? The workgroup has started to pull it all together and look at the costs. Before finalizing, feedback was requested from the full Commission.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Commissioner Ellens asked for clarification around the base adjustment: is deferred maintenance being considered? Deferred maintenance was discussed previously as something that will be treated and handled outside this funding formula, through a separate appropriations process. Commissioner Ellens shared that if deferred maintenance is not addressed, that the new funding may end up going towards some of those issues. Deputy Governor Torres weighed in and acknowledged that brick and mortar support is needed from the state and that the issue does still need to be addressed, likely separate from the formula.

Commissioner Tarhule shared his observation regarding Illinois' status of number two in the nation of exporting students. Part of this is due to preference and programs offered, but part is also due to cost. Students will continue to be lost. As developing the formula, we need to look at how/if the formula makes Illinois competitive.

Commissioner Robin Steans echoed Commissioner Ellen's comments regarding deferred maintenance. There should be some explicitly about mentioning it. The state will need a long term plan to get to adequacy. Deferred maintenance is an added stressor and a separate capital campaign that goes hand in hand with the formula may be ideal.

Commissioner Simón Weffer appreciated Commissioner Tarhule flagging the ecosystem of the state. How does financial aid work at each institution? How are they different at each institution?

Commissioner Ralph Martire chimed in around affordability. In the last 20 years, Illinois moved from having the 13th highest to third highest average tuition at public universities. Whatever is done with deferred maintenance, we need to be aware of its impact on affordability and competitiveness.

Break

The commission took a brief break before reconvening.

Affordability and Expected UIF

Expected UIF ("University Income Fund")

Problem Statement

- Tuition levels impact equitable access; state disinvestment exacerbates access and affordability
- Schools that enroll high levels of low-income students can't and shouldn't rely as much on tuition for revenue to meet the adequacy target
- A new approach should encourage enrollment of low-income students and ensure tuition isn't used as a release valve to meet adequacy costs.

Principles of Expected UIF approach

- Incentivize enrollment of historically underrepresented students
- Shift some of the cost burden from students to the state to increase affordability

Factoring in Affordability Through Expected UIF

- Currently, the state allocates funds to universities, and universities fill in the remaining gap to costs through tuition and fees, often unaffordable.
- The new model would assign each university an "Expected UIF" based on its student body, recognizing the make-up of a student body affects a school's ability to generate tuition.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- This example assumes:
 - The Adequacy Target is higher than the current amount a college spends to educate students
 - The Expected UIF will be lower than current tuition collected.

Considerations

- The model does not specify tuition levels
- Universities can still use institutional aid as they choose
- The model doesn't dictate how a school spends the state funding (that falls under accountability and transparency)

Approach under Consideration

- Define state share levels that indicate how much *on average* the state will cover of the adequacy cost for students of different characteristics.
- The state share amounts would be additive (a student with two characteristics equal to a 25% state share = 50% total state share), but wouldn't exceed 100%.
- Calculate an institution's Expected UIF based on the percent of students at that school in each state share level.

Expected UIF: State Share Levels

The Technical Modeling Workgroup discussion of these levels noted the following:

- Current graduate pricing is highly variable
- Pell and URM are the highest priorities for state share
- Graduate IL residents and graduate low-income or URM also warrant some state share
- Pell-eligible is as important as Pell recipient

Commissioner Zarnikow asked if a student that doesn't fall into any of these categories would pay the full cost and not receive any support from the state? The adequacy cost will be different than the exact tuition level. This consideration reduces the amount overall that is expected for the institution to bring in, in terms of tuition.

Commissioner Scott asked whether there was discussion around adult learners. The workgroup has not yet discussed adult learners. Commissioner Scott shared that the average age of students at Chicago State University is 29, which brings a lot of life and family responsibilities for students. Adult learners are a large population in the state. Corey Bradford shared that many students will fall into multiple groups and during discussion, they were looking for the gaps that needed incentive. Commissioner Martire shared that if data is collected on adult learners moving forward, then it would make sense to add them as a category. He also explained further in detail how the populations were chosen and the rationale behind.

Board Chair Atkinson echoed Commissioner Scott's comments that adult learners are an important component of the ecosystem and are a growing part of the student population.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Commissioner Freeman raised concern around alignment between the graduate/professional state share and previously shared information. It may be worth looking at the taxonomy of graduate and professional programs. Graduate programs at NIU are placed in three buckets: graduate programs focused on research and artistic creation, graduate programs focused on regional, state and national workforce needs and graduate programs focused on the preparation of students for other advanced programs. This would add complexity but the level of nuance may be helpful. Commissioner Martire shared that the first pass was focused on undergraduate due to the data available.

Commissioner Steans shared that in dealing with affordability, it's still unclear of where MAP and Pell are factored in. She shared some nuances between tuition and ability to get to adequate funding to be able to correctly directly share dollars to the priority populations.

Representative Stuart raised the point of view that Illinois is a net exporter of students. Institutions need a certain level of student population in order to be a viable institution. Institutions may lose population/enrollment due to a possible increase in tuition.

Commissioner Zarnikow echoed Representative Stuart's comment. Ability to pay may not equate to willingness to pay, given alternatives that are available in other states. He shared that he was struggling to really see the percentages without seeing the actual data in a full formula (individual components).

Expected UIF

This approach advances the principles

- Students in the higher state share levels (e.g., low-income, students of color) will lower a university's Expected UIF; which increases its gap and brings in more state resources
- This would be paired with incentives in the formula (TBD) for universities to lower their tuition in order to match their actual UIF to the Expected UIF.

Discussion Questions

- Are these the right groups of students? Are the relative sizes of the state shares right?
- How should the workgroup consider what is reasonable for students of different characteristics to pay?
- Should the model reflect that, on average, students don't pay more next year than currently?
- Should the model address affordability for costs beyond tuition and fees (e.g., room & board)?
- Are there other ways the Commission wants to address affordability?

Commissioner Reyes shared that room and board should definitely be included. Many students need to be and are more successful when they're in the dorms. The cost of room and board 15 years ago was 35 to 40 percent of the cost of attending, a number which is now closer to 55 percent. Commissioner Huang echoed Commissioner Reyes' point of cost

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

beyond tuition and fees.

Representative Ammons asked for clarification of whether the data/numbers would be skewed if the room and board amount goes to a third party. What is driven by market and what is the actual cost to the university? Similarly, with meal plans: who incurs the cost? If they are to be included in what is considered adequate, there needs to be more information. Deputy Governor Torres echoed that it's hard to look at this in a vacuum without seeing what the state would be on the hook for overtime. Likely, this formula is going to create a number that everyone will have to look at to see if it's achievable across the spectrum. Deputy Governor Torres noted that there are "wants" and "needs" and from a state perspective, this should be a "want."

Commissioner Tarhule advocated that, on average, the model should reflect that students don't pay too much more than surrounding states. If the base this year is already higher than the surrounding states, it could be used as a benchmark moving forward. There are two types of populations that must be attracted to remain competitive. There is a need to reduce the amount of students being lost to other states.

Commissioner Steans shared that the state does not fully enroll significant segments of the population that should be/could be in postsecondary education. There also needs to be stronger persistence.

Commissioner Zarnikow raised the truth in tuition law in Illinois, in that tuition is set for four years when a freshman enrolls. A number of the public universities have a base rate and then charge a higher rate for other programs (accounting, engineering). If you change programs, the rate may increase but with truth in tuition, tuition shouldn't increase.

Commissioner Caldwell asked what sources were being used to make distinctions between enrollment changes in demographics and referenced the recently published *LEVEL UP: Leveraging Explicit Value for Every Black Learner, Unapologetically* report. If specifically looking at enrollment for African American and Hispanic students, it's important to note that those demographics have not changed.

Next Steps

Executive Director Ginger Ostro walked through the upcoming timeline. The Commission was expected to meet a July 1, 2023 deadline. It was proposed to cancel the upcoming June 9, 2023 Commission meeting to allow the Technical Modeling workgroup to continue to refine the components and recommendations. The June 29, 2023 Commission meeting would be kept as scheduled. There was also a recommendation to continue the work through Fall 2023, with meetings scheduled for September 2023 and October 2023, with the Technical Modeling Workgroup continuing to meet over the summer months. The Co-Chairs weighed in with their appreciation for the amount of work that has been completed and shared agreement for an extended timeline. Representative Ammons shared the importance of doing what is necessary to get the best recommendations out of the process. It is worth

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

taking the time to get the right outcome, not necessarily the fastest outcome.

Public Comment

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

- Jennifer Delaney, member of the IBHE and faculty member at UIUC. Ms. Delaney shared an important conceptual problem with the model being proposed and to urge that this problem be resolved by the group. The issue relates to the way the concept of adequacy is being applied to higher education. This is a fundamental building block of the formula, and unfortunately, currently is not conceptually sound. Ms. Delaney shared that she has noted this consistently throughout this process, especially in the technical workgroup. To briefly lay out the issue: in a K-12 adequacy model, there are inequities across communities in local property tax levels. Local property taxes are public funds that are contributed to by all members of the community to support local schools. The underlying idea is that *all* members of a community benefit from providing education to kids and this supports the idea of education as a public good. The state role is therefore to fill in funding to make sure that all school districts are funded adequately. However, she shared that this model does not easily translate in higher education. The public universities are not locally serving and instead have the entire state as their service area. Local revenues are non-existent for most four-years in most years. All of the money is state money. There is no need to “fill in” since the state money is simply allocated across institutions. The state could simply allocate state resources using an equity-based distribution formula. Ms. Delaney shared that if the model continues to treat tuition the same as state funding and to conceptually equate student tuition with local property tax, then students are treated like trees where as much revenue as possible should be harvested. This moves in a direction that is the opposite of affordability goals. The same concern holds for other “revenue” streams. Tuition is not the same as state funding, especially from the point of view of students and families. Tuition is a private burden, not a public one. Moving to think about tuition as a “public benefit” holds great risks of creating a regressive system, which will work against both equity and affordability goals. Ms. Delaney encouraged the commission to address the problems with the conceptual foundation being used before the details of how the formula should be adjusted and implemented are settled. If the model will only enhance affordability if there are clear accountability mechanisms that will put a check on tuition growth, then those discussions are needed since those will be the real policy drivers for achieving affordability in this model. She believed that a new definition of adequacy needs to be used. In addition, Ms. Delaney advocated for a much simpler model, since the current one is overly complex. One solution (and there may be others) would be to use a considerably simplified model of adequacy. Perhaps using the EBF Tier 1 or Tier 2 measures already identified could be promoted to become the adequacy model. The basic idea would be to put forward a simple conceptual model – perhaps that the state should not spend less on a student in college than they did when the student was in the K-12 system. This would tie the adequacy concept directly to the definition of adequacy used in K-12. Other subsidies can then be set for different student populations, but this would preference those students from low-income high schools to set an adequacy floor for in-state undergraduates. A second step would be to set a standard for how affordable college should be for these students. Here again, a simple principle could be applied – perhaps that low-income students, those who are eligible for MAP and/or Pell, should attend college for free. Beyond this conceptual work, Ms. Delaney encouraged the

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

commission to directly address the issue of stability in funding, one of the core principles laid out in the charge for this commission but that she noted does not yet appear in the proposed funding formula. Especially with the expanded timeline for this work, it seems important to go back to fundamentals and to make sure that these are done right so that the conceptual foundation will support a conceptually sound formula.

Next Steps, Closing Announcements and Adjournment

Deputy Governor Torres offered thanks, on behalf of the Co-Chairs, to the workgroup for their time and expertise with the request that even with an extended timeline that the workgroup and Commission continues to move forward through the summer. The next Commission meeting was scheduled for June 29, 2023. In addition, the Commissioners were asked to watch for a post-meeting survey to be sent.

Commission Members in attendance

Deputy Governor for Education Martin Torres, Co-Chair
John Atkinson, Co-Chair
Representative Carol Ammons, Co-Chair
Representative Dan Swanson
Representative Katie Stuart
Sheila Caldwell
Dr. Bill Bernhard
Lisa Castillo-Richmond
Dr. Wendi Wills El-Amin
Cherita Ellens
Lisa Freeman
Gloria Gibson
Warren Richards
Guiyou Huang
Aondover Tarhule
Ralph Martire
Javier Reyes
Zaldwaynaka "Z" Scott
Robin Steans
Respicio Vazquez
Simón Weffer
Jack Wuest
Eric Zarnikow

Commission Members not in attendance

Senate Majority Leader Kimberly Lightford, Co-Chair
Senator Dale Fowler
Representative Mike Marron
Senator Terri Bryant
David Glassman
Cheryl Green
Brandon Kyle

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Dan Mahony
Dennis Papini

Support Team Members in attendance

Ginger Ostro
Ja'Neane Minor
David Antonacci
Jaimee Ray
Jerry Lazzara
Toya Barnes-Teamer
Martha Snyder
Will Carroll
Nate Johnson
Jimmy Clarke
Katie Lynne Morton
Brenae Smith