

Youth Budget Commission Meeting

05/21/2021

Minutes

Commissioners in attendance: Commissioner Cates, Commissioner Flores, Commissioner Huelsmann, Commissioner Krauss, Commissioner Maley, Commissioner Montorio-Archer, Co-Chair Shaver, Commissioner Thompson, Commissioner Vega, Commissioner Zumdahl

Children's Home & Aid staff and others in attendance: Andi Durbin, Shontay Ford, Paula Corrigan-Halpern, Kiara Jackson, Eric Mayo, Curt Clemons-Mosby, Lisa N, Tony Raden, Ali Schoon, Kelly Sparks

1. Approval of the Minutes (Co-Chair Shaver)

Co-Chair Shaver welcomed the Commission and reviewed the last few Commission meetings in preparation for this meeting's agenda. Shaver highlighted a few ways in which this meeting looks a little different than the meeting plan the Commission had initially laid out. Co-Chair Shaver stated that today the Commission will go through a deeper dive into the data for FY20 and then in June, the Commission will review the Fiscal Scan. Co-Chair Shaver discussed that today was a session day so legislators who were Commissioners can't participate. He stated that they have also pushed back the Children's cabinet presentation to another meeting. Co-Chair Shaver hands it over to Eric Mayo to do the roll call.

Mayo did the roll call of Commissioners present and confirmed that they could all see and hear. Commissioners Shaver, Vega, Zumdahl, Flores, Cates, Krauss, Huelsmann, Thompson, Maley were present for the meeting. All Commissioners present stated they could see and hear during the meeting. Commissioner Montorio-Archer joined the meeting late.

Co-Chair Shaver asked the Commission for any changes to the minutes from last month or any questions. Hearing none, Co-Chair Shaver asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Cates motioned and Commissioner Zumdahl seconded the motion to approve the minutes. Mayo did a roll call vote to approve the minutes. The minutes from last meeting were approved and Commissioner Maley abstained due to missing the previous meeting.

2. FY20 Data Deep Dive (Kelly Sparks)

Co-Chair Shaver wanted to gain some feedback on the education sessions that were held over the last few meetings and if there was anything they should look at adding. Co-Chair Shaver introduced Kelly Sparks to review the data from FY20 that will be used for the upcoming Fiscal Scan. Sparks set the stage to review preliminary data from FY20. Sparks asked for feedback throughout the presentation on how the data could be presented or if there is any confusion about the findings. Sparks stated that the final Fiscal Scan will be done at the end of June. She reviewed what the Fiscal Scan is and that this is the fourth scan to be completed. She displayed some of the preliminary data that will be used in this Fiscal Scan showing that \$6.3 billion was invested in youth ages 8-25 years which is 8.4% of the total state budget. Sparks pointed out that if you look over time at what has been invested in youth over the last few years, the funds invested has increased but the percentage of funds as part of the entire budget has largely stayed the same.

Commissioner Montorio-Archer stated that it would be helpful to see what the numbers looked like before 2015 to see if the pace of increase is the same or if it has changed. Sparks stated that she can try to get that information with Curt Clemons-Mosby's assistance with Budgeting for Results (BFR).

Sparks reviewed the parameters of the analysis for the Commissioners and pointed out that there are funds that aren't included in the analysis because they are only foundational services rather than supplemental.

Additionally, she reminded Commissioners that there are funds included in the analysis that might also be going to other age groups since it is difficult to piece out funding if the program includes services to a larger age group such as Title I funds through Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). Sparks stated that the team has discussed with departments how and if the analysis can get more nuanced with those numbers over time. Sparks then reviewed a few of the largest budget line increases for 2020 including Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), mental health programs through the Department of Human Services, family reunification & substitute care through the Department of Child and Family Services, the Monetary Award Program (MAP), and Title I and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funds. Sparks stated that she will send the specific dollar amount for each budget line increases to the Commissioners after the meeting.

Co-Chair Shaver pointed out it might be worth understanding how much of these funds are actual investments increased for services provided to youth. Mayo stated that, to Andrea Durbin's (ICOY) comment, that it would be important to know how much of the increases over the years for youth investments is a change in the number of people accessing services versus an intentional increase in investments to those services. Sparks stated that she doesn't know that from the data but asked if that is something Clemons-Mosby's team and the departments can include as a side bar within the analysis to provide context. Clemons-Mosby stated that is something their team at BFR can help with.

Sparks then reviewed the developmental goals showing that 52% of investments are in stable, 41% in educated, 4% in healthy, 2% in employable, and less than 1% in safe and connected. She pointed out that this is a big change as ISBE's nutrition program moved from the developmental goal of educated to the developmental goal of stable which is about a \$750 million change.

Commissioner Montorio-Archer commented that the \$24M decrease in the developmental goal of healthy is concerning especially given that we are still in the middle of a pandemic which has greatly impacted the health of youth. Co-Chair Shaver agreed that it will be important to see what those numbers look like in FY21. He stated he is also struck by how heavy the investments are on the back end/corrective side for youth while being light on the prevention side of investments. Co-Chair Shaver stated that it is the goal of the Commission to review those investments and make recommendations on how and where to focus prevention investments for youth. Commissioner Montorio-Archer agreed.

Paula Corrigan-Halpern asked Sparks if the Commission always releases the Fiscal Scan for the deadline as required in legislation as June 30th and can sometimes include appropriations for the following fiscal year by that time. Sparks agreed that the deadline in June 30th, 2021 and that they will have appropriations for FY2021 at that time. Corrigan-Halpern stated that the context setting for the pandemic years is important when talking about investments because it will be one of the first things people look at.

Commissioner Maley asked if Sparks could provide an example of what program would be considered rehabilitative/corrective compared to a program that is listed as treatment/intervention. Sparks responded that she would get to that point in a few slides.

Sparks reviewed the source of funding for these developmental goals and pointed out that healthy and employable goals are mostly federal funds whereas safe and connected goals are mostly state funds.

Sparks then reviewed the service models that are included in the Fiscal Scan. She discussed the difference between treatment/intervention and rehabilitation/corrective service models to answer

Commissioner Maley's question and said that is a gray area between what is defined as those service models versus what they actually do. She stated this is something departments and BFR will be working on for future scans and the Commission can revisit those definitions for future Fiscal Scans.

Commissioner Huelsmann asked if any DCFS funded residential treatment centers would fall under those two service models. Sparks answered that they do not because DCFS doesn't breakdown their line items in enough detail for her to know what service model it should fit under.

Co-Chair Shaver noted the time for the Commission and stated that they will push back some of the other agenda items until the next meeting.

Corrigan-Halpern stated that it might be helpful to include within the Fiscal Scan some of the issues the Commission has been handling when organizing this data and defining service models so that it is clear to readers where the scan can evolve in future iterations.

Sparks continued to review in further detail the investments by service model. She showed that \$3.4 billion was invested in treatment/intervention, \$1.9 billion in prevention, \$932 million in positive youth development, \$32 million in uncategorized/multi category, and \$1 million in rehabilitation/corrective. Commissioner Montorio-Archer commented that uncategorized/multi category doesn't really convey anything and it is hard to tell what that means. Sparks stated that they can rename the category to better reflect that it is. Sparks continued to review the increase in investments by service model and the agencies that are contributing to those investments compared over previous years.

Commissioner Cates and Corrigan-Halpern asked what the funding for Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school district programs meant. Sparks stated that it is educational programs provided to youth in facilities. Clemons-Mosby stated that those funds are for DJJ school districts that they operate to educate youth in their custody in the Department of Corrections.

Sparks asked Commissioners how they wanted to categorize and display COVID relief funds in future analyses and how they have impact on investments for youth in the 2020/2021 Fiscal Scan. She showed some data on which agencies have expenditures related to COVID-19 funds for youth which equaled almost \$1.785 billion. Commissioner Vega stated that there are so many things that have changed since the pandemic started especially when it comes to service delivery and it is crucial to include those funds in the analysis in some way. Commissioner Krauss stated that he saw COVID relief funds as being an addendum or a separate, paired analysis. He commented that a lot of the relief funds are federal funds that aren't sustainable so it should be separate until it is clear what will be long-term investments. Mayo agreed and said that these relief funds could be in their own section of the analysis with provided context to these funds.

Co-Chair Shaver stated that this data is an opportunity for the Commission to provide recommendations on what funds are true investments headed in the right direction and which are just funds being spent. He commented that the developmental goals provide good insight on if the spending is forward, prevention looking, and what is more on the back end. He thanked Sparks for her work on this and asked for her to help guide them in looking at patterns or trends in the data. Sparks stated that she appreciated Co-Chair Shaver's definition of spending versus investments as being an important distinction. She reiterated that the service model of "positive youth development" provides some real opportunities to talk about true investments rather than just spending. Sparks stated that she will continue to display trends in data where she sees it. Co-Chair Shaver commented that the Commission can probably easily tease out what DCFS spending is prevention focused investment and what isn't. Sparks agreed that they can look at subcategories for those pockets especially when it comes to mental health investments.

Commissioner Krauss thanked Sparks for her work as well and stated that he appreciates her patience and flexibility as the Commission tackles these issues and how to present the data. He pointed out that maybe the bigger trends to frame is that the state isn't actually investing in youth but is simply spending. Co-Chair Shaver agreed that if the data displays that then the Commission can use that as helpful context to make recommendations in the right direction.

3. Community Engagement Plan (Kiara Jackson and Eric Mayo)

This agenda item was pushed back to another meeting due to time constraints.

4. Public Comment

Co-Chair Shaver opened the floor to public comment; there were no public comments.

5. New Business

Co-Chair Shaver referenced the YBC Year Plan.

6. Adjournment

Co-Chair Shaver asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Vega motioned to adjourn, and Commissioner Krauss seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 3:01pm.