

Youth Budget Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, June 21st, 2022 3:30pm - 5pm

Commissioners in Attendance: Co-Chair Shaver, Commissioner Montorio-Archer, Commissioner Zumdahl, Commissioner Villa, Commissioner Huelsmann, Commissioner Thompson.

Commissioners in Attendance via proxy: Commissioner Cates.

Others in Attendance: Hannah Keller, Ali Schoon, Nikki Wegner, Nate Cox, Londyn Harris, Tanisha Harris, Gabriel Morales.

1. Welcome, Co-Chair Shaver

Co-Chair Shaver welcomed the Commission and stated the Commission will be meeting on Tuesdays at least while the General Assembly is out of session. Co-Chair Shaver mentioned the focus of today's meeting will be over the new fiscal scan. He also stated that Commission staff will review the newly formed youth working group. Co-Chair Shaver asked Eric Mayo to do the roll call for Commissioners. Mayo proceeded with the roll call and asked each commissioner to state they are present, can see and hear, and approve the use of a voice vote for the remainder of the meeting. Commissioners Shaver, Montorio-Archer, Zumdahl, Villa, Huelsmann, and Thompson were present. Commissioner Cates sent a proxy that was present. A quorum was present. All Commissioners stated they could see, hear, and consented to doing a voice vote for the remainder of the meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes, Co-Chair Shaver

Co-Chair Shaver asked the Commission to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. Commissioner Zumdahl motioned to approve the minutes. Commissioner Montorio-Archer seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Fiscal Scan Presentation, Kelly Sparks

Co-Chair Shaver welcomed Kelly Sparks to present on the 2021 Fiscal Scan. Sparks reviewed the additional analysis that was conducted as a new part of the fiscal scan she had presented on in April. Co-Chair Shaver instructed Commissioners to ask questions as they came up throughout the fiscal scan overview. Sparks reviewed the \$6.3 billion invested in youth in FY21 which was 7.7% of the overall state budget excluding COVID relief funds or American Rescue Plan funds. She restated the investments stayed the same at \$6.3 billion from FY20 to FY21 but the overall portion of the state budget being spent on youth decreased from 8.4% to 7.7%. Sparks noted if they were to include the COVID relief funding within the analysis it increases the investment for youth to another \$1.4 billion but it will not be included in the main fiscal scan. She stated that she will provide some of the COVID relief investments as context moving forward. Sparks reviewed the developmental goals they use to look at the budget: stable, educated, healthy, employable, safe, and connected. She also reviewed the funding amount in each developmental goal category. Sparks stated that her team has done a secondary coding of the funds since the last Commission meeting in April. She said her team looked at whether the purposes of those funds could have a secondary purpose that aligned with a different developmental goal than the most obvious. Sparks stated that they saw a difference in the funding with the secondary goals which

provided more context to the budget. She reviewed that healthy and employable developmental goals saw an increase in funding with a secondary coding. Sparks paused for questions.

Co-Chair Shaver asked where the added funding came from for the secondary coding in those categories. Sparks stated that the secondary coding for the developmental goal of stable showed money coming from educated and safe while the secondary coding for the developmental goal of educated showed money coming from stable, connected, and safe. The secondary coding for the developmental goal of healthy showed funding coming from stable and educated with a small portion from safe. The secondary coding for the developmental goal of employable showed funding coming from educated, safe, and stable. Commissioner Montorio-Archer asked, based on this overlap, if Commissioners should look at rethinking some of the categories. Sparks responded saying she didn't think the categorical structure needed to change because it makes sense for there to be some overlap in these goals and now that the team has set up the capability to do the secondary coding, it will provide a lot of context to the fiscal scan moving forward. She provided the example of technological training which would be seen in the developmental goal of education but also provides a pathway for youth to be employed so should be reflected in employable. Commissioner Montorio-Archer agreed and stated that it is important for those dualities to be included so people are making decisions based off of the appropriate context. Co-Chair Shaver stated it is helpful the team is providing this context in the fiscal scan.

Co-Chair Shaver asked if the effort to do the secondary coding was grueling. Sparks responded that the work to do it was intensive this year but now moving forward it will be easier. Sparks stated that they can work on making the graphic contain more clear descriptions of where the secondary funding is coming from. Commissioner Zumdahl agreed and stated the added descriptions would be helpful.

Sparks reviewed the service models and what investments fall into each category. She reviewed the data showing \$3.3 billion in treatment/intervention \$1.9 billion in prevention, \$970 million in positive youth development, and \$1 million in rehabilitation/corrective. Sparks stated they looked at expenditures versus investments and the difference between those types of funding that the Commission wanted to be reflected in the data. She reviewed the expenditures are being used to solve a problem whereas investments are prevention-based funding trying to reduce issues before they happen.

Sparks highlighted that the state investments have been increasing over time since 2018. Sparks shared that the team looked at the expenditure categories to break the services up by goal to show how much investment is in the treatment/intervention and rehab/corrective categories. She stated that there is a huge span of services between the two categories and asked if Commissioners felt it would be helpful to have something between them on the continuum or if that would be slicing the cake too much. Co-Chair Shaver stated that there are diminishing returns if you start to slice things up too much however, if the Commission or team felt it was worthwhile to look at they could. Commissioner Thompson stated that she found it interesting to see how much the state spends on prevention areas versus treatment areas. She stated that being able to see that balance is crucial. Commissioner Villa also agreed and stated that the expenditures versus investments powerpoint slide was the most eye-opening part. Commissioner Villa mentioned that being able to see those groupings by department would be especially helpful for policy makers. Sparks stated she would look into doing that and mentioned that if there was any kind of data the Commission wanted to see like that they could reach out at any time.

Sparks displayed how much of the expenditure categories invest in each service area and DHS, ISBE, HFS, DCEO have the largest budgets represented but there are also over 21 agencies included with smaller pieces. Commissioner Thompson asked if the broader service areas listed under those categories could be more detailed. She provided the example of mental health services since it is such a broad category

and could mean many things. Sparks stated that she can't provide more clarification for those because that is how it is coded in the budget.

Sparks stated that now they've done this work it will be easier to do it for future fiscal scans. She thanked Commissioners for their questions and feedback because it is helping to improve the fiscal scans. Sparks then displayed the investment categories and programs that are in prevention. She pointed out that the biggest buckets are in the nutrition program (free and reduced lunch program) and CCAP followed by preventative health programs. Co-Chair Shaver asked if CCAP could be broken out by ages to reflect how much is very young children and how much is actually spent on youth. Sparks stated that you can't categorize the ages with CCP because of how they parcel the data. Curt Clemons Mosby stated that they are doing a lot of changes across state agencies when it comes to collecting demographics so it is entirely possible that in a few years CCAP will have data available by ages.

Sparks then showed the investment categories for positive youth development and the largest investment buckets in those categories. The largest bucket was scholarships, workforce development, and career/technical education. Sparks stated that to Commissioner Villa's earlier point, they can display which departments are overseeing the funds that support these programs if needed. Sparks stated that the team is working on the written report by the end of the month for the fiscal scan and it will be finalized by July with the goal for it to be designed for public release in September.

Co-Chair Shaver thanked Sparks and her team for this analysis. He reiterated that Commissioners can always reach out with questions or feedback so that Sparks can get back to them on it.

4. Update/Introduction of Youth Working Group, John Gordon & Eric Mayo

Co-Chair Shaver stated that a few new people have joined for the meeting today as part of the youth working group. He stated that Commission staff are still trying to figure out the best structure for this crew moving forward and they're very excited about this new addition. He turned it over to John Gordon to introduce the youth working group.

Gordon stated that there are a few youth involved in the youth working group who are present at the Commission meeting. He stated that the first working group meeting will be held shortly to discuss the budget process and get feedback on how to ensure the sustainability of the working group. Londyn and Gabriel introduced themselves as youth in the working group and Gordon gave a brief background for the rest of the youth who weren't present. Gordon stated that he will have youth members connect with Commissioners to introduce themselves and talk about public policy in Illinois.

Co-Chair Shaver thanked the youth from the working group for their attendance and their work in the future as part of the working group.

5. Public Comment, Co-Chair Shaver

Co-Chair Shaver opened the floor for public comment. There was no public comment.

6. New Business, Co-Chair Shaver

Co-Chair Shaver stated that the next Commission meeting will be in August. He asked if anyone had an issue with Tuesday afternoons as a meeting time. There were no issues or comments raised.

7. Adjournment, Co-Chair Shaver

Commissioner Villa moved to adjourn and Commissioner Zumdahl seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 4:28pm.