

Illinois Youth Budget Commission Meeting

April 22nd, 2022

Commissioners in Attendance: Michael Shaver, Reyahd Kazmi, Laura Zumdahl, Jobi Cates, Evan Kruass.

Others in Attendance: Eric Mayo, Nikki Wegner, John Gordon, Curt Clemons Mosby, Anita Weinberg, Hannah Keller, Brandon Cowhey, Paishynce Prude, Tanisha Harris, Londyn Harris, Grace Glass, Kristina Dion, Julissa Cruz, Dana Kelly, Office of Senator Lightford.

Co-Chair Shaver welcomed those in attendance, including youth representatives who will be joining us to learn about the Youth Budget Commission and hopefully support our work in the future by sitting on an advisory board to the YBC in the future. Co-Chair Shaver discussed the agenda, noting two important presentations today. First, from Dana Kelly of the Commission on Poverty Elimination and Economic Security talking about the Commission's recent report on reducing poverty in Illinois and how young people are involved in that plan. The second presentation from consultant Kelly Sparks on the preliminary FY23 Fiscal Scan findings.

Before getting started with the presentations, Co-Chair Shaver reminded all Commissioners of required trainings to complete this month. Please reach out to Curt Clemons from the Governor's Office if you did receive communication on the trainings.

Chairman Shaver called for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 2021 and February 2022 commission meetings. Commissioner Cates made the motion, commissioner Zumdahl seconded the motion and the minutes were approved by voice vote. Commissioners Huelsmann, Vega, Crabb, and Lightford all designated the chair as their proxy for the vote.

Co-Chair Shaver introduced Dana Kelly-Senior Advisor at the Department of Human Services from the Illinois Commission on Poverty Elimination and Economic Security. Co-Chair Shaver noted how the Commission has been working on the development of a Strategic Plan and report and been on a roadshow to socialize the plan and hear from stakeholders.

Dana Kelly began her presentation by discussing the origin of the Commission from the Intergenerational Poverty Act passed in June 2020 and its three goals as noted in the legislation to reduce deep poverty in the State by 50% by 2026, eliminate child poverty in the State by 2031, and eliminate all poverty in the State by 2036. She noted these are lofty goals, and the first five-year strategic plan released in March 2022 is focused on the first goal related to reducing deep poverty (50% or below the Federal Poverty Line (FPL)) in the State. She highlighted some statistics around Illinoisans in poverty, with 1.4M people living in poverty (100% FPL or below) in the state, with 436,327 being children. Of the 1.4M, 630,012 live in deep poverty.

Kelly then discussed how the Strategic Plan was drafted, including engaging in strategic input from across the State and numerous stakeholders. This included engaging with the community,

Commissioners, listening sessions across the state, an interagency working group, internal IDHS task forces, and advocate input.

Kelly noted how poverty encompasses many factors and touches all areas of the state. She noted deep poverty disproportionately impacts people with disabilities, women, children, and communities of color. Especially relevant to the YBC, is the statistic that 27% of those living in deep poverty in Illinois are under 18. The issue is not rural or urban specifically, while Cook County has the highest volume, Alexander County in Southern Illinois ranks first by percentage of families within a County. She also noted those who are Black or Latino are most likely to be in deep poverty, with deep poverty rates of 12.2% and 6.1%, respectively, compared to those who are White and not Hispanic, with a rate of 4.5%.

Kelly then discussed the pillars of the Strategic Plan, including:

1. Ensure IL is Best in Nation for Raising Families
2. Stabilize Homes and Communities
3. Ensure Just and Equitable Access to Economic Security Programs
4. Address Barriers to Paid Work, Education, and Advancement
5. Support Trusted Community Based Providers to Serve the Needs of those in Deep Poverty

She also discussed how the Commission will measure success, including clear metrics focused for the first five years on reducing deep poverty by 50% for each pillar that will be reported annually. Kelly also highlighted the next steps for the Implementation of the plan. These include awaiting the response of the Governor and Administration by August 1, 2022, and the Commission forming sub-committees, workgroups, and regional councils to begin tackling the recommendations within each of the pillars and developing propels for FY24 to move through the budget process.

After reviewing the report and Strategic Plan, Kelly opened the floor to questions from the Commissioners. Commissioner Cates asked: Do you have an eye on supports for families who have an incarcerated loved one? Beyond some of the things you list in pillar, such as access to legal aid and fines and fees, people who have one household member in prison face a compounding of many of the barriers listed. Kelly responded the Commission serves families of those incarcerated, with efforts under Pillar 2 with its strategy on Investing in Interventions that Address Cycles of Trauma and Violence in our Communities. This is the area they are supporting youth development, after school programming, and programming directed towards teens. Kelly acknowledged additional effort/focus can be placed on coordinating services and breaking down silos across agencies and programs in this area.

Commissioner Shaver noted that as he was looking at the actions, he had questions about break down the explicit targets and in Kelly's view if there was a prioritization to accelerate the work? Is there a specific sequencing? Kelly said the focus of this first five years is on deep poverty, and this Strategic Plan reflects that focus. She noted that if we back of the envelope look to raise incomes directly to pull people from deep poverty to poverty it would be \$1.5-2 Billion. We need to think about how and where we invest and do the work. This includes deep investments, such as the expanded EIC, TANF, direct cash assistance, and a focus on access to educational and financial systems. Kelly noted for attendees to stay tuned for a 40-page report deep diving into each strategy coming soon that will preview some of the tactical steps and actions we can take.

Commissioner Zumdahl asked Kelly how the YBC can support & connect best with these pillars & action steps? Kelly felt there was a strong opportunity for the work of the YBC to fit into Pillar 2 and working with Youth to address Trauma, Mental Health, Social/Emotional needs as well as Pillar 4 where they are looking at additions around how we can engage youth in the employment system.

Co-Chair Shaver thanked Dana Kelly for her time and attending the meeting.

Co-Chair Shaver then introduced Kelly Sparks the consultant supporting development of the FY21 Fiscal Scan to present preliminary findings. Sparks thanked Co-Chair Shaver for giving her the opportunity to share.

Sparks opened with an explanation of the Fiscal Scan and the various youth outcomes the analysis is grounded in: Stable, Educated, Safe, Employable, Healthy and Connected. The Scan supports discussion around expenditures and investments for youth over time and highlights who each State agency invests in children and youth. Some agencies work on specific outcomes, while others work across outcomes. Investments in youth have remained fairly level over time, with 2021 spending the same as 2020, however that was a lower percentage of the State budget with COVID funds not included. COVID relief funds did support youth in 2020, which added an additional \$1.4B in spending to raise the percentage spent on youth to 9.2%. Sparks noted the analysis mainly removes COVID relief funds since the additional funding is temporary, and a second section of the report will include details on COVID related funding.

Sparks reviewed the parameters of the budget analysis, including age, expenditure type, source, original intent, non-operational, non-foundation, and with no proration's and the overall alignment to youth outcomes and goals. The budget lines were categorized into developmental goals based on the Budgeting for Results framework. Sparks highlighted that for FY21, 52% of expenditures on youth fell into the Stable goal, while 40% was in educated with smaller investments in Healthy, Employable, Safe, and Connected. In comparison to 2020, she noted not a whole lot changed with a few changes in less money spent on Educated and slightly more in Healthy, Safe, and Connected.

Sparks posed a question to the group on how the 2021 Developmental Goal Investments by Funding Sources could be broken down to be more useful. Co-Chair Shaver mentioned that knowing what is discretionary versus Federally allocated would be helpful. This would provide a cheat sheet of sorts to understand what is Federally directed versus what departments might be able to allocate. Commissioner Zumdahl agreed with Co-Chair Shaver.

Next, Sparks walked the Commissioners through the next layer of analysis, around service models-where the expenditures were related to Positive Youth Development, Prevention, Treatment/Intervention, and Rehabilitation/Corrective. This structure was developed five years ago when started the fiscal scan and are looking into ways to think about these as a spectrum with sub-categories.

Commissioner Cates posed a question to Sparks, whether she had a sense of why there is so little allocated to Rehabilitation/Corrective models? Sparks noted this is because of the way it was defined and coded and there are broader groups of funds that cross the service models and may be allocated elsewhere. In reviewing these models and categories, we will look at this and share more with Commissioners to get additional input.

Sparks highlighted next the investments by service models for FY21, with 53% Treatment/Intervention, 31% Prevention, 15% Positive youth Development, <1% Rehabilitation/Corrective. This shows very little movement/changes compared to 2020. The biggest increase was \$39M in Positive Youth Development, which has been increasing over time. Sparks noted how in this analysis, looking at these models in two categories, expenditures vs. investments. With Treatment/Intervention and Rehabilitative/Corrective falling under expenditures and Prevention and Positive Youth Development under investments. When the analysis is looked at from this angle, you can see expenditures have fluctuated over time with investments generally increasing.

Co-Chair Shaver noted this was a good framework to assess and determine next steps for the various service models. Sparks noted the goal was to go a level deeper to see where cases exist over time and what the trends are around investments and expenditures.

Sparks also previewed the analysis on a State Agency level. She noted that ISBE, IDHS, DCFS, and the Illinois Student Assistance Commission are the top 4 agencies and represent 90% of funds allocated. She highlighted some changes in investments with the FY21 budget noting that they were either very small or very large for specific programs.

Commissioner Cates observed the disconnect in expenditures of Department of Corrections in terms of increases compared to own interactions/understanding of programs in FY21. Commissioner Cates noted with the incarcerated population decreased, and COVID decreased educational programs, so wondering how the funds were used and allocated. Co-Chair Shaver Commissioner Cates connect with stakeholders on this issue as well as work with Sparks to dive deeper.

Sparks then reviewed the Agency data in terms of service models, noting that most agencies were in the Prevention/Positive Youth Development areas. She also highlighted a few additional updates for the FY21 scan, including a secondary analysis on funds that contributed to multiple goals, subcategories within service models, and an appropriations overview.

Co-Chair Shaver thanked Kelly Sparks for taking in the feedback Commissioners have given and continuing to evolve the fiscal scan over the years.

Co-Chair Shaver noted we did want to give an update on the Youth Advisory Group, but in the interest of time, John Gordon and Eric Mayo will give a written report on how the progress is evolving as part of the notes from the meeting.

Co-Chair Shaver opened the floor to public comment. Hearing none, he noted the Commission is going to go back and revisit timing of the meetings. The Friday afternoon time slot was selected to support engaging Youth and are assessing if this makes sense. If the timing of the meeting is changed, we will communicate clearly. The meeting is tentatively scheduled in June to look at the completed Fiscal Scan and discuss next steps to utilize.

Co-Chair Shaver opened the floor to Commissioners to adjourn. Commissioner Cates motioned to adjourn; Commissioner Zumdahl seconded. Commissioners raised hand and approved adjournment. Co-Chair Shaver thanked Mr. Gordon and Mr. Mayo for their hard work to organize the meeting.