
ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Illinois Commission on Equitable Public University Funding

January 23, 2024: 11:00am-2:00pm CT

Meeting #13 Notes

Welcome & Introductions

Executive Director Ginger Ostro opened the meeting with a welcome and shared general announcements that the meeting was being conducted via videoconference pursuant to rules adopted by the Commission at the May 30, 2023 meeting. Notice of the meeting was posted in accordance with Open Meetings Act.

Action: Approval of minutes from January 8, 2024 Commission Meeting

Katie Lynne Morton called the roll to approve the minutes from the January 8, 2024 meeting. Commissioner Sheila Caldwell motioned to approve the minutes. Commissioner Pranav Kothari seconded. The roll was called and twenty-one commissioners approved, one commissioner abstained.

Executive Director Ostro reviewed the agenda.

Framework of a Funding Model

Martha Snyder walked through the framework for an adequate, equitable and stable funding.

Step 1: Build an equity-centered Adequacy Target

Each component of adequacy has a base cost per student. Equity adjustments provide resources necessary to support all students to succeed, grounded in data of which students require adjustments and how much funding to provide. Other cost factors and adjustments account for variation in institutional characteristics and mission.

Step 2: Assess the Resource Profile, the existing resources the institution has available to cover the adequacy target

Equitable Student Share incentivizes affordability and accounts for students' ability to pay. Current State Approps serves as a hold harmless, ensuring institutions receive their current levels of funding.

Step 3: Calculate the Adequacy Gap, the gap in resources

The sum of all institutions' Adequacy Gaps represents the total amount of new state investment required to adequately fund Illinois universities.

Step 4: Allocate new state funds based in part on the size of the adequacy gaps.

The goal will be to fill the statewide gap over a period of time. This goal will drive more funding, more equitably, to universities than in the past.

Timeline and Process

Co-Chair Leader Kimberly Lightford reminded the Commission that a deadline date of March 1, 2024 was set. This deadline will allow the report to be delivered to the General Assembly and allow the Co-Chairs to advance the important reforms that come from the report.

Leader Lightford shared that while the Commission may not reach agreement on all outstanding issues, the Co-Chairs are comfortable leaving some components to the legislative process. The report will accurately reflect where the Commission ended up and

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

include information regarding differing views on concepts where there was not full agreement.

Leader Lightford shared appreciation for the time and expertise of all the Commission members to get to this point. Co-Chair Representative Carol Ammons echoed Leader Lightford's sentiments and shared that the Co-Chairs have heard the concerns and both sides of the components that have not yet been resolved.

The Commission will deliver its report to the General Assembly by March 1st for consideration in the 2024 legislative session

Remaining milestones include:

- Two additional Commission meetings in February
- Resolve handful of key outstanding issues in today's meeting
- Finalize recommendations and draft report (February meetings)

The Commission may not reach agreement on all outstanding issues; some pieces can be left to the legislative process. If the Commission does not have a clear position, the report will present considerations for different approaches.

Topics from Last Commission Meeting

Martha Snyder walked through a chart shared on screen to show the topics from the last commission meeting and the Co-Chair recommendations from those topics. Snyder additionally walked through ESS: Factoring in Financial Aid, Pell & MAP,

The Commissioners raised the following questions/discussion points:

- Concern that not all variations across/within institutions have been considered, regarding PhDs, in a way that could impact the outcomes.
- Concern raised that there is not enough funding in humanities and social sciences to place this burden on the faculty. Concern that this is not realistic at most institutions that faculty can support their PhD students.
- Concern that the mandatory waiver statement shared on screen is incorrect. Tuition would have to be raised 5% or more to cover.
- Argument that the "data doesn't exist" isn't accurate, but that it's not currently collected on a consistent basis. If we don't have the data for an area, it could be brought back to the review committee once the data is available and consistently collected (points for further study to make the formula refined and better).
- Question raised about MAP and whether it's being "double counted" in ESS.
- Agreement for the "leave as is" option for ESS: Factoring in Financial Aid. Leaving as is incentivizes serving a greater number of low-income students.
- ISAC should have at least some of the waiver information (data) by school.
- MAP Grant be expanded to cover more of what Pell covers.
- Concern was raised regarding incentives/disincentives and not being biased.
- MAP is not just funding for public fours, but also goes to Community Colleges, etc. MAP is packaged first, then Pell is packaged second.
- There needs to be a way of showing what the impact is. There needs to be clarity of the relationship between MAP and the State.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Discussion of Remaining Outstanding Issues

Allocation Formula Principles

Will Carroll walked through the Allocation Formula, including a proposal sample output.

Principles that the TWG discussed and is trying to balance:

- Institutions' adequacy gaps should be a primary factor in the allocation, to ensure new funding sufficiently addresses current inequities.
- All schools should receive some reasonable increase (an across-the-board "guardrail") each year there is new money (to help ensure tuition is not a release valve for increasing costs).

These principles present an inherent tradeoff. The larger the guardrail, the more stability for all institutions, but less emphasis on adequacy and equity.

Proposal: Guardrail with remaining increase split 50/50 between the share of adequacy gap percentage and the share of adequacy gap dollars.

- Guardrail: provide the same percent increase to all institutions
- Share of adequacy gap percentage: the percent "fully funded" an institution is divided by the sum of all institutions' percentages
- Share of adequacy gap dollars: a university's total dollar gap divided by the statewide total dollar gap

Key Questions

- What size should the guardrail be (if any)?
- What should the target increase be every year?
- How should cuts be allocated?

Context for Discussion

- A 3% increase in state appropriation does not cover all increases in costs at 3% inflation
- At institutions where tuition makes up a larger portion of total revenue, the increase in state appropriations needed to match inflationary costs while keeping tuition and enrollment flat can be as high as 11%
- Under the current proposal, a 6% appropriation increase would leave 5 institutions below their respective increase needed to match cost inflation

Allocation Formula - Guardrail

A guardrail allocates a portion of the funds in an across-the-board manner, with the remaining increase going through an adequacy gap-based allocation. The guardrail would be calculated as:

- The lesser of inflation or half of the state appropriation increase.

Compared to an "inflation first" approach, this ensures at least half of funds will be allocated based on adequacy even when inflation exceeds the state appropriation. A guardrail factor – or a weight applied to the guardrail – can further adjust how much funding goes out across-the-board versus based on adequacy.

When the State Appropriation increase is twice the size of inflation or less, the guardrail will allocate between 25-50% of the funds. As the guardrail factor increases, fewer funds are allocated based on adequacy and equity.

Impact on Adequacy Gaps of a 4% State Increase

4% Increase in State Appropriations:

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Without a guardrail: Closes adequacy gaps for most but at smaller percentages than a 9% increase; the growth in adequacy gaps for certain institutions is also higher
 - Range of -2.7% (reduction in gap; Governors State) to +0.5% (growth in gap; UI-UC).
- 100% factor: Some institutions would still see increases in their adequacy gap. With a range of -1.4% (reduction in gap; Governors State) to +0.1% (increase in gap; UI-UC).

Note: The growth in the adequacy gap for some institutions in these scenarios is due to state appropriations currently being a relatively small percentage of overall revenue. Until the state appropriation becomes a larger percentage of overall costs, the increase in the adequacy target costs will outpace the increase in state appropriation and ESS.

9% increase in state appropriations:

- Without a guardrail: Institutions that are close to fully funded would see slight increases in their adequacy gap; all other institutions' gaps close substantially.
 - Range of a -6.8% (reduction in gap; Governors State) to a +0.3% (increase in gap; UI-UC).
- 60% factor: The lowest factor at which all adequacy gaps are reduced or flat.
 - Range of -5.6% (reduction in gap; Governors State) to 0% (flat or slight reduction in gap; UI-UC).
- 100% factor: All institutions adequacy gaps are reduced, but smaller reductions to those with the largest gaps.
 - Range of -4.9% (reduction in gap; Governors State) to -0.3% (reduction in gap; UI-UC).

Summary of Guardrail Factors

The higher the guardrail factors:

- Institutions with the largest gaps close their gaps more slowly
- More funding is distributed in an across the board manner, ensuring some minimal increase for all institutions.

The higher the state appropriation, the lower the factor would need to be for all institutions see a reduction in their gap.

- At a 9% increase in state funding, all institutions reduce their gaps at a guardrail factor of 60%.

Guardrail Factor

There is no way to calculate the "right" guardrail factor – it is a decision that weighs the following factors:

- The likelihood of large state increases in funding
- A trade-off between funding adequacy/equity (lower guardrail) and stability (higher guardrail)

Discussion:

- What share of funds should be allocated based on adequacy each year?
- What is the minimum increase an institution should receive that provides stability? Should that be tied to the inflation rate?
- Is there a guardrail factor that appears to strike the right balance?

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Setting a Target Annual Increase

- The Commission can recommend a target annual increase for the General Assembly to appropriate each year (similar to EBF).
- The target increase would be intended to:
 - Close the adequacy gap within a certain timeframe
 - Use state funds to close the inflation-adjusted gap
 - Increase the likelihood of larger appropriations than in years past
- The target increase would not be intended to:
 - Eliminate all future needs to increase tuition
 - Fully cover all cost increases at universities

Target Increase

- \$100m per year: Fully funds all institutions in 15 years, assuming ~3% inflation
- \$135m per year: Fully funds all institutions within 10 years.
- \$60m per year: In Year 15, the state gap is 22% (down from 32%); institutions' gaps range from 11%-31%.

Note: All calculations assume annual increases in ESS and Other Resources equal to inflation. This is not the same as an increase in current tuition levels, as ESS is lower than current tuition.

State Funding Cuts - Options

1. Across the Board
2. Ratio of the statewide adequacy gap to each institutional adequacy gap, plus a guardrail
 - a. Allocates cuts using the same principle as the formula for increases: prioritizing state resources for those farthest from adequacy.

Across the Board

- Each institution would receive a 4% cut in its state appropriation, but the impact on its overall funding would vary based on the portion of its revenue that comes from the state.
- When factoring in state appropriations and tuition resources, a 4% overall cut in state appropriations distributed across the board would result in a total reduction of state and tuition resources ranging from 1.0% at UI-UC and ISU to 2.6% at Chicago State.

Ratio-based Cut and Guardrail

- A 4% cut using Option 2 would result in cuts to state appropriations ranging from 2.6% (Northeastern IL) to 5.6% at UI-UC.
- Option 2 would result in total reduction of state and tuition resources ranging from 0.7% at ISU to 2.0% at Chicago State.
- A 4% cut to state appropriations would increase each institution's adequacy gap, whether distributed across-the-board or some combination of guardrail and ratio. However, the range of the impact on equity gaps would vary.
- A 4% cut across-the-board results in increases in adequacy gaps ranging from 3.4% for Chicago State to 1.0% for Illinois State.
- A 4% cut distributed using a the ratio-based cut and guardrail results in increases in adequacy gaps ranging from 4.0% for SIU-Carbondale to 0.9% for Illinois State.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

State Funding Cuts

Discussion:

- Is the Commission's intent to allocate cuts in the same way as increases (considering adequacy gaps in some part)?
- Or do cuts have an impact such that they warrant a different approach?
- Are there adjustments you'd recommend to either Option?

The Commissioners raised the following questions/discussion points:

- This year will be a tough budget year compared to last year.
- Institutional perspective was shared that there are two main sources to cover operating: tuition and fees, state appropriations. All institutions see inflationary issues.
- Concern that there is resistance to change. There will be bumpy roads and things to iron out as the process continues. There has to be a drive to increase the student population. There isn't enough diversity in Illinois universities.
- The model doesn't look at actual tuition revenue.
- The Commission exists because the Legislature said they wanted higher education funding in a better place, more equitable. The General Assembly has kept their promise on the K-12 front. It matters what we appropriate.
- The work of the Commission is critical and timely. The formula isn't perfect, it may not have everything we need, but it's a great start to move forward with.
- Do the Co-Chairs want the TWG to put together recommendations on specific areas (for example: guardrails)?
- Are there additional state funding cut options? Would like to see an approach with equity in, equity out. The furthest from equity should have the least amount of cut.

Break

The Commission took a short break.

Discussion of Remaining Outstanding Issues (continued)

Accountability & Transparency

Theory of Action - Principles

This proposal seeks to avoid past formula mistakes by improving on the timing of institutional accountability, the issues of interest for which institutions are being held accountable, and the actionable measures taken to regulate institutions actions and decisions in order to align them with stated goals.

To be effective, a funding model must:

- Develop transparency and uniform reporting of university inputs, practices, and outcomes
- Set expectations for universities based on state and institutional goals
- Establish appropriate consequences for falling short of expectations
- Enmesh with existing and relevant accountability systems and agencies
 - Not create undue reporting burdens

Proposed Principles of Accountability System

- Timing: Institutions will be responsible for new accountability measures once they receive new funding and reach an appropriate threshold of adequacy.
- Transparency and oversight for new funds: Universities must spend new funding toward achieving goals, and report that transparently.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- Categorical accountability: Universities must spend new funds such that they improve toward goals in *affordability*, *enrollment*, and *persistence and outcomes*. The categories for accountability are intended to mesh with existing/evolving accountability and transparency efforts, such as IBHE's equity plans.
- Effective & equitable consequences: If universities are not achieving goals, they will be held accountable in ways that inform and direct new funds rather than defunding institutions existing resources.
- Holistic Review: An accountability and transparency body will provide regular oversight by holistically reviewing quantitative and qualitative measures.

Four Accountability and Transparency Categories

- Spending
- Affordability
- Enrollment
- Persistence & Outcomes

Four Accountability and Transparency Categories

- Spending
- Affordability
- Enrollment
- Persistence & Outcomes

Transparency & Accountability Structure

Transparency expectations of all institutions

- Improve data capacity to satisfy higher transparency and reporting needs
- Annual reports of progress against targets
- Annual spending plans and report of previous years' use of new funds

Accountability structure

- Institutions will be held responsible for making progress on metrics once they receive sufficient resources to lower prices and build systems necessary to make progress in enrollment, persistence, and completion.
 - However, data will be gathered and reported throughout
 - Institutional metrics to be determined individually and in concert with state goals
- The metrics that will be used for the accountability and transparency oversight will be integrated into the ongoing work that IBHE has already been doing in *A Thriving Illinois*
- An inside/outside panel will be responsible for general oversight/implementation

Transparency & Accountability Review Panel

Review Panel Responsibilities

- The review panel will be a clearinghouse for all accountability and transparency data created as a part of this funding approach
 - This body will emphasize technical expertise (e.g. some combination of academics, analysts, and student support specialists)
- This group will be responsible for adjudicating instances in which institutions fall short of goals
 - This will include evaluating extenuating circumstances and their effects on progress towards state and institutional goals

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- This will also include determining if and what accountability measure(s) are necessary

The construction of the inside/outside review panel has not yet been determined, but should contain relevant expertise and enmesh with IBHE's plans for an accountability subcommittee. This body should exist *separate and apart* from the formula maintenance body.

Possible Accountability Measures

If after a holistic review an institution is deemed to be adequately funded but has failed to meet stated goals, such as those outlined in the *Thriving Illinois* Equity Plans, possible accountability measures which are aligned with the theory of action are listed below:

- Closer Monitoring of Spending: IBHE accountability subcommittee could request additional data
- More direction in how to use funds: IBHE accountability subcommittee could advise how institutions use some portion of the new funds received
- Deeper category-specific reporting: IBHE accountability subcommittee could request additional data and require a corrective action plan
- Diminished access to additional state funds from the formula: IBHE accountability subcommittee could limit how much new state funds institutions receive from the equitable funding approach.

Recommendations for Operationalization

These principles and structures need to be operationalized, and so we will recommend that the General Assembly assigns the IBHE the charge of creating an accountability system that realizes these recommendations. This system should be complete with:

- Overarching state and institutional goals for each institution to stove towards
- Full system of accountability metrics including targets and anticipated progress toward them
 - These should enmesh with existing accountability systems such as IBHE's institutional equity plans to streamline goals, reporting, and accountability
- Funding levels/thresholds at which an institution can be reasonably expected to make progress towards state goals in each accountability and transparency
- Review current reporting (state and federal) and ensure any new reporting is not duplicative or recommend changes to current reporting that more closely aligns with goals

Open Questions for the Commission

- At what "threshold" will universities be held accountable?
- What is the outward-facing progress report for the A&T work?
- Should we flag in the report that we need to bolster data and technical abilities at IBHE?

The Commissioners raised the following questions/discussion points:

- Echo the support for additional support for IBHE to accommodate the data and technical needs to be accountable and transparent.
- Appreciation was shared about the sensitivity to duplication of efforts in reporting, etc.
- Tracking and data sharing will help institutions learn from each other, which is very valuable (learning and improvement).
- Transparency starts immediately.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- It was shared that IBHE will have a committee of the board focused on accounting, learning, and improvement related to *A Thriving Illinois* which syncs with this very well.
- Perhaps there is an intersection between the Accountability & Transparency function and the guardrail discussion where equity dominates the guardrail decision but there is an inflation trigger for the commission reviewing and revisiting expectations/thresholds?

Medical Cost Factor

Medical Costs

- The Commission looked at different size cost factors to recognize the higher costs of providing medical education, but did not decide on one.
 - Possible range from 450% (national and other state data) up to 1100% (based on costs provided by SIU and UIC).
 - Other health professional programs continue to receive a 100% cost factor.
- The Commission requested we look at a model with colleges of medicine treated as separate schools in the formula.

Separating out Schools of Medicine

- This alternative approach treats the Schools of Medicine at SIU, UI-C, and UI-UC as separate institutions, calculating their own adequacy targets, resource profiles, and adequacy gaps.
- SIU-Carbondale, UI-C, and UI-UC are split into two institutions each, one with college of medicine students and one with all other students.

Separate Schools of Medicine (SOM)

Key Takeaways

- The Schools of Medicine are significantly better funded than the rest of the institutions. SIU SOM is 148% fully funded, UIC's is 78% and UI-UC's is 96%.
- SIU has a large state appropriation per student that appears to be a main driver of it being fully funded. Some of that may support residency costs - as that would not be part of the adequacy framework, we have further work to see how to split this out.
- SIU-Carbondale goes from 88% fully funded to 80% by taking out the school of medicine. UIC and UI-UC have much smaller shifts.
- SIU SOM would get just the minimum appropriation increase every year under the allocation formula. The net effect on the SOMs combined with their main campus is mixed: a gain for SIU and UIC, but a small loss for UI-UC.
- Separating out SOMs has no impact on other institutions' total adequacy gaps, but does lower their allocations in the first year by 1-5%.
- It does not affect the timeline to fully fund all institutions or significantly alter the pace at which other institutions' gaps close over time.
- Using the higher premium (1100% vs 450%) for medical programs increases SOMs' adequacy gap overall and relative to other institutions, but also requires students to contribute much more in tuition. (\$80k-\$110k vs \$45-\$60k).
- This contributes to a lower overall cost to the state by separating out SOMs; the total adequacy gap goes down by \$24m-\$48m.

Next Steps

- Identify how much of SIU SOM's appropriation may be supporting residency (and UI-C and UI-UC if applicable).
- Recalculate gaps and then reassess two key factors:
 - Medical cost factor

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- ESS subsidy rates and ESS per student

Other Resources

Endowment

Commission Discussion and Context:

- Some stated that counting a portion of the endowment will disincentivize future philanthropy and that a substantial portion of the funds are restricted.
- Others voiced that the state must account for these resources in the formula given their scale, inequitable distribution, and impact on student outcomes.
- Estimated annual endowment revenue in the current model ranges from \$95,000 to \$80,000,000.
- Endowment revenue currently provides \$119.6 million towards adequacy costs.
- A \$1 million gift changes an adequacy gap by \$10,500, based on using a 4-year average and 4.2% spend-down rate. This changes the average adequacy gap by 0.01% and the allocation by less than \$100.

Alternative: A Commission member suggested counting endowment revenue only from endowments above a certain value. Endowments should be large enough before they must contribute those resources towards adequacy.

Proposal: Base the minimum for an endowment on its ability to generate funds that support continued fundraising activities. Include 4.2% of the total endowment value, but exempt the first \$1 million in revenue from the formula.

Rationale: This ensures institutions have sufficient resources to support fundraising activities. \$1 million is derived from the overhead spending by the universities' endowment foundations; most lower-resourced institutions spend less than this, while larger endowed institutions spend \$5+ million.

Other Resources - Options

- Percent of Endowment
 - Pro/Rationale: Endowments provide real resources to institutions to cover adequacy costs that the state should consider when allocating its funds; 4.2% is based on the current national level of spending from endowments.
 - Con: New gifts to the endowment would have small impact on universities' state appropriation, which could disincentivize giving.
 - *(Alt: could use current endowment value only and not factor in new gifts)*
- Add fundraising to adequacy costs
 - Pro/Rationale: Brings institutions up to the statewide average of development revenue derived from endowments. All institutions could benefit from additional fundraising capacity; avoids disincentivizing actual fundraising.
 - Con: Equal fundraising capacity will not eliminate disparities in size and wealth of universities' alumni bases. The state's allocation would not account for the difference in access to resources.
- New proposal: Exempted minimum endowment level
 - Pro/Rationale: Protects a portion of endowment revenue that is necessary to support adequate fundraising activities, set at \$1,000,000. Counts 4.2% of any endowment spending that exceeds that protected level.
 - Con: Does not eliminate the potential disincentive on giving.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

The Commissioners raised the following questions/discussion points:

- No questions/discussion points were raised.

Next Steps

What the Commission has Accomplished

The current approach to funding does not support state attainment and equity goals for higher education; funding has been effectively cut over time and it is distributed inequitably.

The funding system we have designed supports access and success by:

- Specifying the actual level of resources needed to be a strong, equitable higher education system.
- Setting a goal for the state to increase university funding by \$1.4 billion, an investment that will benefit all institutions.
- Reducing the tuition burden on students, limiting their share to 42%.
- Providing over \$800 million in new resources for evidence-based, data-driven equity adjustments to address access and success gaps.

The Commission's recommendations fulfill the core charges it was given.

Next Steps

- Two remaining Commission meetings:
 - Early Feb (review draft report)
 - Late Feb (finalize report)
- Next Meeting: Walk through the output of the model based on decisions made today; present the major components of the first draft of the report.
- TWG meets one more time to close out remaining issues and discuss content of the report

Public Comment

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

- Danielle Stanley, Partnership for College Completion. Ms. Stanley read public comment remarks from Madeleine Green (member of the Coalition for Transforming Higher Ed) and Paola Salgado (graduate student). The first statement: As the commission of equitable public university funding continues to prepare for the release of recommendations for an adequate, equitable and stable public higher education funding formula for the state of Illinois we urge you to continue advocating for the students of Illinois. Equal access to funding in the state's higher education system will not only increase access for students, especially our black, Latin X and low income students, but also provide a pathway to degree completion. When students don't have to worry about funding their higher education and focus on what's important to them, their studies, mental health, extracurricular activities, and the quality of life on campus. It has been my experience that equitable funding is not merely a theoretical ideal, but a practical necessity for the success of students within Illinois public higher education system. As a first generation low income student, I was tasked with navigating the complicated system of higher education on my own, when I have benefited greatly so more funding, it would have been integrated might be for more funding. Financial stability can serve as a catalyst for academic success, personal growth and active participation in the college experience. And we advocate for a funding formula that is equitable and stable. It's important to acknowledge that the commitment to equity encompasses individuals like me who are striving to

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

overcome barriers to achieve success as the first in our families to pursue higher education. Student equity standard funding formula is crucial in ending inequitable investment and disinvestment that impacts access and degree attainment. That should be considered when determining how the commission will proceed with this equitable funding plan. The second statement: As the Commission on equitable public university funding continued for parents a release of recommendations for adequate, equitable and stable public higher education funding formula for the state of Illinois. We urge you to continue to advocate for Illinois. It has been my experience that my peers who attend certain public state universities have drastically different experiences than others, largely in the areas of academic support, advising and round services. These differences impact students' mental health dramatically, and often increase the time or hardship required for degrees. And tutoring students who are college bound want to be able to share with young people the boundless opportunities that await them at each of our public institutions statewide. However, with our current lack of an equitable funding formula, that's just not the reality. A student equity center funding formula is crucial in any equitable investment in disinvestment that impacts access to degree attainment. We ask that you consider this when determining how the commission will proceed with his equitable funding plan.

- Margaritta Fultz, Faith Coalition for the Common Good. I would like to read my brief opinion on retaining the PhD population in the funding model from the PhD candidate perspective (I/O Psychology PhD candidate). Ms. Fultz share that she is a faith coalition community leader, a member of the coalition for transforming higher education funding, a taxpayer, a lifelong Illinois resident, and a Western Illinois University and a University of Illinois Springfield alum. She dreams of providing instruction and continuing research and public administration, industrial and organizational psychology focused on educational opportunity pathways to self sufficiency. or marginalized and minoritized segments of society. Her funding came to a screeching halt last month immediately after she passed four weeks of comprehensive doctoral qualifying exams. Industrial and organizational psychology is her dream not to be deferred. She can persist on to become an IO psychologist and subsequently, black faculty member of one of Illinois public universities, of which she is an undergraduate and graduate product. Ms. Fultz pleaded to keep and support an adequacy based funding doctoral students funding model so that students may persist and complete important research and dissertations enabling us to give back and black brown native neurodivergent disabled, urban and low income PhD. The DFI fellowship is the one single Illinois program that supports developing more diverse faculty. Our public universities are practical for her as a black woman and PhD candidate who is now in jeopardy of stopping out the very end all but dissertation when a doctoral candidate has come this far by faith and sweat equity, while working full time in higher education, and civil service position. Funding comes to a screeching halt that is not adequacy based funding is not equity, and a nominal fellowship or DFI all don't greatly appreciate it will not solve for x with her funding, nor will it allow her the opportunity to persist to completion and become faculty. Not only does she pay full tuition, but she also pay mandatory universal student fees, technology fees, each and every term. Please seriously consider including additional funding for PhDs and the name of persistence and completion in the spirit of creating a robust pipeline and an educational opportunity pathway from being PhD candidates to becoming diverse faculty.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Closing Announcements and Adjournment

The Co-Chairs offered words of thanks before closing out the meeting. Leader Lightford shared thanks to the Commissioners for their patience and for the upcoming report and assured the Commissioners that their work has meant a lot to the legislature, to the university system, on how students gain access to better improving their lives. Leader Lightford shared that she will be a good shepherd with the report and would do her due diligence in the legislature to make sure that the Commissioner's opinions are expressed and that she's delivering the message and doing the best to craft the best formula based on the knowledge that has been gained from the efforts. Toya Barnes-Teamer closed out the meeting with three reminders:

- The next Commission meeting will be held February 15, 2024.
- The Technical Modeling Workgroup's next meeting will be held January 25, 2024.
- Commissioners should watch for a post-meeting survey.

Commission Members in attendance

Senate Majority Leader Kimberly Lightford, Co-Chair
Teresa Ramos, designee for Deputy Governor for Education Martin Torres, Co-Chair
Representative Carol Ammons, Co-Chair
Pranav Kothari, Co-Chair
Representative Dan Swanson
Senator Mike Halpin
Representative Katie Stuart
Sheila Caldwell
John Coleman
Lisa Castillo-Richmond
Dr. Wendi Wills El-Amin
Lisa Freeman
Dr. Katrina Bell-Jordan
Matt Bierman
Cheryl Green
Guiyou Huang
Aondover Tarhule
Dan Mahony
Ralph Martire
Brandon Schwab
Zaldwaynaka "Z" Scott
Robin Steans
Respicio Vazquez
Simón Weffer
Eric Zarnikow

Commission Members not in attendance

Senator Dale Fowler
Representative Mike Marron
Senator Terri Bryant
Cherita Ellens
Warren Richards
Brandon Kyle
Dr. Karen Colley
Jack Wuest

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Support Team Members in attendance

Ginger Ostro
David Antonacci
Martha Snyder
Will Carroll
Jimmy Clarke
Toya Barnes-Teamer
Nate Johnson
Katie Lynne Morton
Brenae Smith