

## **Youth Budget Commission Meeting**

02/05/2020

Minutes

**In attendance in Chicago:** Co-Chair Shaver, Commissioner Kazmi, Commissioner Montorio-Archer, Commissioner Zumdahl

**In attendance in Springfield:** Commissioner Crabb, Commissioner Cates

**In attendance via phone:** Commissioner Flores

### **1. Welcome**

Curt Clemons-Mosby, staff director for the Commission, welcomed everyone to the Commission's second meeting. Clemons-Mosby took a roll call of commissioners; a quorum was confirmed. Co-Chair Shaver began the meeting by reviewing the progress made at the first meeting and highlighting what was on today's agenda.

### **2. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2019 meeting were provided to the Commissioners for their approval. Seeing no discussion, Commissioner Kazmi motioned to approve the minutes as written. Commissioner Montorio-Archer seconded the motion, and the minutes were adopted unanimously.

### **3. Using Research to Influence Policy – Presentation by Bryan Samuels, Director of Chapin Hall**

Co-Chair Shaver then introduced Bryan Samuels. Samuels is the Executive Director of Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. Co-Chair Shaver discussed why he asked Mr. Samuels to present to the Commission. He is a leader in the field of social sciences research and was there to discuss how to connect research best practices to policy.

Mr. Samuels began by discussing broadly the work Chapin Hall does. They are not a classic research institution; rather, they partner with other entities to try and solve pressing policy issues. Each project Chapin undertakes is built around their stakeholders – their goal is to produce something that other people can run with and guide policy decisions. Samuels then discussed different projects Chapin has undertaken that encompass youth and younger adults. During a 12-month period, 8.5 million youth between the ages of 13-25 had trouble with housing. Their research showed that you were equally likely to be runaway or homeless if you lived in urban or rural areas, and that the greatest risk factor to housing insecurity was not graduating high school.

Samuels next spoke about how Chapin worked with several cities throughout the country on their afterschool programs. In this project, Chapin looked at how these systems use data to inform their decision-making process, and whether there was the necessary infrastructure in place to use data effectively. Essentially, Chapin was looking at how to use research methods to move programs and systems forward.

Samuels then spoke about the Youth Quality of Life Index. Developed in conjunction with the City of Chicago, the fundamental question Chapin had to answer was how to define and measure what it means for youth to be thriving. Four domains were ultimately chosen: success in school, safety in the community, healthy relationships, and physical health. Chapin then looked at what outcomes should they expect to see given those domains and how best to measure them.

Samuels spoke about the work Chapin is doing around the Families First Prevention Act. They work with states to define populations that have the best chance of seeing significant impacts from interventions. He then concluded by talking about what constitutes success for Chapin. Defined succinctly, Chapin is successful when using research methods and data to help drive decisions of policymakers.

With that, Co-Chair Shaver opened the floor to questions.

Commissioner Montorio-Archer asked if all the above-mentioned initiatives were linked. Samuels said that they are all separate projects, but all relate to the age population in question. Commissioner Montorio-Archer also asked over what time frame should we evaluate whether Illinois is meeting its goals for youth. Samuels said that you want to be collecting data right away, but it is challenging to evaluate impact without 2-3 years of data, and there needs to be an effort to constantly improve the quality of implementation.

Commissioner Crabb asked whether there were foundational issues that prevent implementation. Samuels said that all their projects encounter these issues, but you can work around them using different research designs.

Commissioner Zumdahl asked if there was any specific research in Illinois we should be aware of and the best advice Samuels could give to the Commissioners. Samuels responded that Chapin does a lot of work analyzing DCFS data, and they are currently working with states such as Illinois to help them identify families who are receiving multiple services from different agencies. The best advice Samuels could give was to take time to decide what success looks like and what data you need to make the determination if an intervention was successful.

Commissioner Kazmi noted that by only looking at evidence-based programs, we do not want to get stuck in the mud, and would like the state to be more open-minded about the programs it is willing to fund. Samuels said that he would agree. Co-Chair Shaver noted that we needed to be intentional on how we do research and build evidence and that we must find the balance between policy and being intentional in our approach. Samuels agreed and added that using evidence is more important than using a program just because it is listed as an evidence-based program.

Hearing no further discussion, Co-Chair Shaver moved on to the next agenda item.

#### 4. Measuring Youth Success in Illinois – Presentation by Eric Mayo

Co-Chair Shaver introduced the next presentation from Eric Mayo.

Mayo began by explaining the inspiration for this presentation came from last meeting's discussion on outcomes and how we could make the developmental goals more tangible to someone who has never seen the fiscal scan. The presentation was meant to be a broad overview of what cities, states,

the federal government, and advocacy groups are focused on to improve the lives of youth and young adults.

Mayo began by defining the terminology that would be used throughout the presentation. Goals referred to the six developmental goals that the fiscal scan looks at. They came directly from Budgeting for Results. Objectives referred to specific (usually a percentage) improvements or reductions in a particular area, previously defined by an outside entity. Local objectives were included if the data could be accessed on a statewide basis. Finally, indicators referred to datapoints that could measure progress towards a goal, but no entity has defined a target reduction or improvement.

Mayo then went through the different sources used throughout the presentation. Most of the objectives came from Healthy People 2020, which provides science based national objectives for improving the health of all Americans. Other resources included strategic plans from the City of Chicago and the state of Illinois.

Mayo then went into the first goal (Stable) and broke down the related objectives and indicators. Commissioner Cates suggested looking at youth who has one or more incarcerated parents, and how that is interconnected to some of the other goals. Mayo agreed, saying that this was just a first pass and that the Commissioner's expertise will be valuable in refining and updating the final product.

For the second goal (Safe), Commissioner Montorio-Archer asked about how the objectives differentiate between violent and non-violent crime. Mayo agreed that there should be a better delineation between the two. Commissioner Cates noted that determining whether or not a person is exposed to violence isn't easy to indicate and recommended some resources from the Crime Lab at the University of Chicago that would be helpful.

Commissioner Crabb asked about the availability of data statewide if the objective came from a Chicago based source. Mayo replied that in those cases, the data Chicago was tracking was based on the Census or another source that has statewide data available. Commissioner Zumdahl cautioned about being overly reliant on census data, as census data comes out relatively infrequently. Co-Chair Shaver recommended that if Commissioners had other suggestions for data sources, to send them to Commission staff to review.

For Educated, Commissioner Montorio-Archer noted the lack of objectives around middle and high school, and Commissioner Zumdahl noted that vocational education objectives were missing as well. Commissioner Kazmi mentioned that UIC created an initial report on youth who are out of school and out of work, and data from that report was collected statewide and may be beneficial to this discussion.

At the end of the presentation, the floor was open to additional questions. Commissioner Montorio-Archer commented he was having a hard time connecting the goals to the objectives, and whether or not the Commission was able to create its own objectives. Mayo responded that objectives are what other people have said we want to be doing as a state to achieve the goal, while indicators help us understand if we are getting closer to our objectives. In response to the second half of the question, Mayo said this presentation was only designed to show what already existed, and that the Commission can create objectives as they see fit. The only piece that is set in stone are the six developmental goals.

Commissioner Cates asked whether her observation that there were more metrics available for youth under 18 versus the 18-25 range was accurate. Mayo said he would agree with that assessment.

To close the conversation, Co-Chair Shaver noted that at the next meeting in April we want to have a similar conversation that includes the Commissioner's feedback. We will then be in a better position to approach agencies about what outcomes they are looking at when making funding decisions.

#### 5. Feedback on Fiscal Scan for FY 19

Co-Chair Shaver then introduced Kelly Sparks, who is the consultant who works on the Fiscal Scan. Sparks went over some of the parameters for the upcoming fiscal scan and potential changes that could be made to the analysis.

Co-Chair Shaver noted that when the fiscal scan is due to be released, we would have appropriations data from FY 19, expenditure data from FY 19, and appropriations data from FY 20. Shaver asked Clemons-Mosby if it was feasible to include FY 21 appropriations data as well. Clemons-Mosby replied it was not since even if the state budget is passed on time, it takes some time for GOMB staff to code expenditures as they relate to Budgeting for Results. The question was raised whether to include the available appropriations data going forward: the commission unanimously agreed that was a good idea.

The next question was on whether to include operational and administrative budget items in the analysis in addition to the programmatic items already included. Commissioner Crabb said that administrative costs should be included because professional development is so crucial to the work, and without it, the programming doesn't happen. Co-Chair Shaver noted that the budget wouldn't have on the ground level detail of provider expenditures. He then recommended to task Sparks to review the available operational and administrative data to see what if any meaningful analysis could be conducted. Commissioner Zumdahl seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Sparks then brought up the process of recoding line items, which was discussed at the last meeting. Clemons-Mosby reported that his office had some success in this budget cycle getting agencies to re-code their data and was hopeful that the data would be more accurate.

#### 6. Public Comment

Amy Crumbaugh from After School Matters provided public comment. She first thanked the commission for their important work. She then suggested the commission review the report "A Promise of Adolescence", which talks about the potential for adolescent brain development. Crumbaugh also asked if you would link food security to the health goal, and suggested some potential resources, which Mayo agreed to investigate.

#### 7. New Business

Commissioner Cates asked about the potential of receiving an update from the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) on how they are spending their funds. Clemons-Mosby responded that he would reach out to IDJJ to see if they had any additional information.

Commissioner Crabb asked if future scans can look at geographical distribution of programs as well, and if there are other equity lens we can look to in the future. Clemons-Mosby said GOMB is in the early stages of building some GIS tools to help with geographic analyses of budget data.

Finally, Co-Chair Shaver asked if Deputy Governor Flores could talk to the Commission about her view of human services in Illinois. Clemons-Mosby said he would reach out to her office.

#### 8. Adjournment

At 12:30 PM, Commissioner Zumdahl made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Montorio-Archer and approved unanimously.