Resource Workgroup Meeting #1 - June 16, 2022 (1pm-4pm CT) Meeting Notes

### **MEETING OBJECTIVES**

1. Review Commission input to identify common themes and topics for the workgroup to address.

2. Discuss the reports provided (readings # 1+2) and matrix of state and K12 (EBF) presentations to build toward a common understanding of different resources available and how they vary across institutions.

3. Identify additional information needed to understand use of different resources, considerations for students ability to pay and ability to equitable serve students.

#### Welcome & Agenda Overview

Ginger Ostro opened the meeting with 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.

#### Workgroup Overview (Objectives, Meeting Calendar)

Martha Snyder provided an overview of the Resource Workgroup. It was noted that the Adequacy Workgroup is working in parallel and that there will be a total of three Workgroups over the time of the Commission's work.

The Adequacy, Resources and Technical Workgroups (workgroups) for the Illinois Commission on Equitable University Finance (Commission) will inform the analytical, data and technical modeling of the Commission's work. The workgroups are composed of a subset of Commission members or other assigned representatives. The workgroups, supported by IBHE and HCM, will expand the capacity of the Commission's work between full Commission meetings, providing opportunities to dig deeper around concepts and considerations advanced by the Commission.

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) as a "gap analysis" between institutional adequacy and resources. This effort may include evaluating factors such as:

- Understanding and defining the types of resources to be considered,
- Evaluating the different scopes of resources across institutions,
- Assessing and incorporating students ability to pay into resource considerations, and
- Resource Mapping: Variations in Resources across IL institutions

Representatives were selected by the co-chairs with  $\sim 10$  members for each workgroup. Membership will reflect groups and organizations on the Commission with regional, mission and other attributes represented.

- Adequacy: Conceptual, Policy and Analytical skills
- Resource: Conceptual, Analytical skills

• Technical Modeling: Policy, Data Analytics and Modeling skills

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.

The Commission's definition of "adequate funding" was shared 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.

#### **Team Building Activity**

Chief of Staff Ja'Neane Minor used Zoom Whiteboard to facilitate a Team Building/Ice Breaker activity for the group. Workgroup members were asked to respond to the question "What is your favorite song and what feeling it evokes when you hear it?" on the Zoom Whiteboard. Once all workgroup members answered the question, the group was asked to guess which answer belonged to which workgroup member.

#### Commission input (Jamboard): Considerations for types of Resources

Chief of Staff Ja Neane Minor facilitated a session with the workgroup members. The question "Other than state funding, what types of resources should be considered when assessing institutional adequacy and ability to equitably serve students?" was asked during the May Commission meeting. The Jamboard that was created by the full Commission during the May meeting to answer the above question was brought forward for the workgroup to break down into categories. The workgroup members worked collaboratively to break down the sticky notes into the following themes/categories: Federal Resources, State Resources, Restricted Funds, Unrestricted Funds, Endowment, Student, Private Resources, Institution.

#### **Reports outlining Types of Resources across Institutions**

Martha Snyder facilitated a discussion around understanding the types of resources that institutions have, where they come from, whether they are specifically or generally used to support the services provided to students (help address the adequacy conversation). To help facilitate the conversation, a number of resources (reports) were shared with the workgroup ahead of the meeting.

Nate Johnson gave an overview of the report "Understanding Higher Education Finance: Sources of Postsecondary Funding and Implications for Low-Income Students," which he wrote. The report describes most revenue sources institutions and students rely upon and offers key dimensions include magnitude, student focus, connection to enrollment and completion, flexibility, and volatility. Nate shared a spreadsheet on screen that showed funding sources, types and the link between enrollment, completion, recession, and flexibility. There was also further discussion around MAP grants, Pell grants and student

versus institution (who the funds follow and who is the recipient of the funds). Commissioner Kinzy suggested bringing in a CFO from one of the institutions to help provide additional information and answer any questions.

Martha Snyder gave an overview of the "Understanding Higher Education Finance: Sources of Postsecondary Funding and Implications for Low-Income Students" report. The report does a good job breaking down the types of federal and state support for higher education and provides a good overview of different categories and uses of funding.

Martha Snyder walked through the state matrix that was shared with the workgroup members. The matrix encompasses information from all of the states that the Commission heard from (Oregon, Tennessee, Colorado, Louisiana), as well as the EBF K12 information and additional information from the California Community Colleges. The matrix is broken down by component areas. Are the components used to calculate adequacy? Are there other resources? To what degree is stability referenced within the resources? The workgroup members shared that the state matrix was a helpful tool to have.

#### Break

The workgroup took a ten minute break before reconvening.

#### Prep for Meeting #2: Understanding uses of Resources/Factoring in Students Ability to Pay

Martha Snyder thanked the workgroup members for their active participation in the Jamboard activity and discussion around resources. HCM would take the Jamboard activity and provide a more structured framework to share with the workgroup members ahead of the second meeting. Discussions for the second meeting will be around resource types and uses, including what are the uses of different resources identified? How do they factor into an institution's capacity to serve students and invest in proven strategies/supports/practices and carry out its mission? The second meeting would also allow time for review and discussion around factoring in a student's ability to pay (what factors determine a student's ability to pay?)? There was also discussion around adult education.

The workgroup members did not have any questions or concerns about the next steps. Additional resources (reports/papers) would be shared out with the workgroup members. Workgroup members were asked to volunteer to read one of the resources and take initiative in reporting out to the rest of the workgroup.

### **Public Comment**

There were no members of the public that requested to make public comment.

### **Next Steps and Adjournment**

Clarity was provided to the workgroup around what the expected deliverable/end product of the workgroup would be. Martha Snyder provided clarification that the workgroup would start by looking at the resources available, then would break down and pull out resources that should be considered (or not considered). Once there is a set of resources that could be added up to make a "resource profile," each institution's profile would be built out. The institutional resources would be the final product for the workgroup.

The workgroup members were asked whether there was a desire to meet in person or continue to meet virtually. The workgroup did not have strong feelings to meet in person

and decided to continue to meet virtually. The workgroup members were also asked to affirm that they see themselves as an "advisory" committee in order to be able to meet virtually. All affirmed, there were no disagreements. The second meeting was scheduled for July 14, 2022 (1pm-4pm CT).

Workgroup Members in attendance Lisa Castillo-Richmond Zaldwaynaka "Z" Scott Terri Kinzy Vicky Gress, designee for Andreas Cangellaris Jack Wuest Jacqui Moreno, designee for Eric Zarnikow Dr. Wendi Wills El-Amin Dr. Diane Hayes David Glassman Gloria Gibson Ketra Roselieb, designee for Guiyou Huang

Support Team Members in attendance Ginger Ostro Ja'Neane Minor Jaimee Ray Martha Snyder Toya Barnes-Teamer Nate Johnson Katie Lynne Morton