
ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

Technical Modeling Workgroup Meeting #23 - January 25, 2024 (9am-11:30am CT)
Meeting Notes

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Close out Commission requests
2. Discuss report content

Welcome & Agenda Overview

Executive Director Ginger Ostro opened the meeting with a general welcome and announcements regarding Open Meetings Act and instructions for any members of the public who would like to participate in Public Comment. Executive Director Ostro provided an overview of the agenda.

Action: Approval of minutes from January 11, 2024 Workgroup Meeting

Commissioner Simón Weffer made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 11, 2024 workgroup meeting. Beth Ingram seconded the motion. Eleven workgroup members were present and in favor. One workgroup member abstained.

Close Out of Commission Requests

Process and Timeline

- March 1st: Deliver report to General Assembly
- February Commission meetings
 - February 15, 2024: runthrough of model and draft report
 - February 27, 2024: discuss final report
- Remaining Topics
 - Accountability, Allocation Formula, Schools of Medicine, Other Resources
- The Commission may not reach agreement on all these; some pieces can be left to the legislative process. The report will note principles the Commission agrees on while providing considerations for different approaches.

The Workgroup members raised the following questions/discussion points:

- How will agreement/consensus be determined? There is no intention that there will be a vote. Rather, it's looking at whether we've been consistent in the direction and approach that's taken in the funding model. Shepherding this to a conclusion of the best representation that can be made from the discussions and recommendations of the commission without itemizing each component of the model. Each piece builds on the prior pieces.
- Concern that agreement hasn't been reached on a number of the pieces/components. To present that the workgroup was in general agreement on all aspects of the model (with minor exceptions) would be a misrepresentation and that needs to be acknowledged clearly in the report.
- There are areas that weren't fully fleshed out.
- Frustration was raised about "losing" two months of work time during the Commission's pause.
- Desire to create a list of the core pieces that are "line in the sand" for those on the workgroup.
- Desire to step back and see the big picture and be able to fully explain all components of the model.
- Concern that there wasn't enough time for the workgroup to cover all components.

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

- The model is complex, but follows a logic that is “followable.”
- Is the model so complex that leadership won’t be able to make decisions on the spot, understand the outcome and have to understand how decisions impact the future?
- Concern raised that the ESS component doesn’t make sense with a higher education lens.
- This is the first ever of this formula, and is relying on data sets that may need to be cleaned up over time. This is bringing concepts into higher ed funding that have never been as aspect of higher ed funding in Illinois before. Once the model is in place, likely folks will have a great understanding of how it works within a year or so. There will be some adjustment during that time.
- While there may not be agreement with every single concept in the model, it’s close enough to a rational approach in something that works and is relatively fair in giving the demographics of enrollment at the different universities, that for a first formula this is okay.
- There will be areas that need to be cleaned up, which the review group can do in a few years, but having placeholders in the model now is important as a starting point.
- Elements are in place and while they may not be perfect in 3-5 years, they at least move the needle towards putting a formula in place.
- Concern was raised over concepts of the model that were not revisited after initial conversations.
- A simple model is not reality.
- While there may not be agreement for every concept in the model, it’s better than what is currently in place.
- Suggestion for a section of the report that outlines potential areas to look further into in 4-5 years down the road.

Walk Through of the Model

Will Carroll pulled up slides from previous meetings to help level set and ground the conversation.

Carroll next pulled up the model spreadsheet on the screen and spent time walking through the components for the workgroup members.

The Workgroup members raised the following questions/discussion points:

- Deferred maintenance is a component that has a cost factor that will not be resolved by the Commission.
- Is FTE more appropriate than headcount?
- On the part time side, there is a need to recognize that many campuses have committed to serving part time students. There is a balance between the support needed to support these students.
- Concern was raised around whether headcount also ended up duplicating data for some institutions based on how it’s currently reported to IBHE. It overstated their headcount, which was another basis for recommending FTE.
- The workgroup previously agreed to limiting to degree-seeking (taking out dual enrollment). Data being used now has unique student identifiers.
- Part of core revenue (tuition) tends to be more tied to FTE. If 100% funded from the state, there would be a stronger case for using FTE.
- UIC is widely recognized for serving low-income diverse population, yet they are in the middle of the pack in regard to ESS. Concern was raised that this may be

ILLINOIS COMMISSION ON EQUITABLE PUBLIC UNIVERSITY FUNDING

another area where the outcome is unfavorable since graduate and professional students have not been adequately recognized Grad and Prof students.

- Concern was raised that the base cost for students may be off. Additional conversation needed. The baseline used is not a one size fits all; an average was used. It's constructed differently based on campus.
- A reminder was shared of the hold harmless.

Public Comment

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

Wrap Up and Adjournment

Executive Director Ostro shared that the walk through and discussion was very helpful. She suggested that the spreadsheet that the workgroup walked through be made one step simpler so that the workgroup members could look into the impact that each component/factor has and be able to see the outcome for each institution in order to analyze and understand more clearly.

Executive Director Ostro thanked the workgroup members for the flexibility and for bringing forward important pain points. Originally, there were no February workgroup meetings planned, but the Technical Modeling Workgroup would meet on Thursday, February 8, 2024 (9am-11:30am CT). The chat from the meeting would be sent around and publicly posted.

Workgroup Members in attendance

Mike Abrahamson, designee for Lisa Castillo-Richmond
Kim Tran, designee for Zaldwaynaka Scott
Sandy Cavi, designee for Aondover Tarhule
Robin Steans
Ralph Martire
Simón Weffer
Corey Bradford, designee for Cheryl Green
Beth Ingram, designee for Lisa Freeman
Dan Mahony
Michael Moss, designee for Karen Colley
Andrew Rogers
Zach Messersmith, designee for Ketra Roselieb, designee for Guiyou Huang

Support Team Members in attendance

Ginger Ostro
Jaimee Ray
Will Carroll
Martha Snyder
Nate Johnson
Jimmy Clarke
Katie Lynne Morton
Brenae Smith