



**ADEQUACY IN HIGHER
EDUCATION FUNDING**

**CONVENING
SUMMARY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. Background
- B. Purpose

II. COMMON THEMES

- A. Performance-based funding (PBF) and other policies designed to incentivize completion have real limitations. Equitable and student-centered approaches, such as an adequacy-based approach, offer promising alternatives.
- B. Strong and equitable systems that incorporate transparency and accountability are necessary to ensure that all students, especially those historically underserved by the higher education system, enroll, persist and graduate.
- C. While many have begun to explore and develop, there is not a current working framework of adequacy in higher education funding.
- D. There are many complexities in identifying what should sit within an adequacy formula and identifying how funding responsibilities are divided among entities (e.g., federal, state or institution of higher education).
- E. An adequacy-based funding approach may allow systems to better address affordability.

III. CONCLUSION

IV. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

V. APPENDIX

- A. Attendee list
- B. Agenda

Adequacy in Higher Education Funding Convening

INTRODUCTION

In September 2022, Advance Illinois, Complete College America (CCA) and the Partnership for College Completion (PCC), with support from the Lumina Foundation and the Annie E. Casey Foundation, held a day-long convening exploring frameworks for and implications of an adequacy-based approach in higher education funding at two-year and four-year public institutions. The convening took place at Harold Washington College in Chicago, Illinois. There were roughly 50 people in attendance, including higher education funding experts, academics, institutional and agency leaders, researchers, and advocates from Illinois and around the country.

Background

The value of higher education is clear: of the jobs added since the 2008 recession, most have required college credentials, and a bachelor's degree translates to \$600,000 more in individual lifetime earnings. A college degree is even more valuable for students of color, increasing lifetime earnings by 67% for Black college graduates and 78% for Latinx college graduates, compared to 59% for white college graduates.¹ At the state level, college degrees lead to increased tax revenue and decreased use of government services,² in addition to higher rates of civic engagement, volunteering, and charitable giving.³ While a postsecondary degree remains critical for employment, equity, and a thriving state economy, years of federal and state disinvestment and growing tuition rates have made higher education less accessible,

¹ Georgetown CEW. "Our Separate & Unequal Public Colleges: How Public Colleges Reinforce White Racial Privilege and Marginalize Black and Latino Students." 2018. https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/SAUStates_ES.pdf

² Association of Public and Land Grant Universities. "How do college graduates benefit society at large?" 2015. <https://www.aplu.org/our-work/4-policy-and-advocacy/publicvalues/societal-benefits.html#44>

³ Lumina Foundation. "It's Not Just the Money: The Benefits of College Education to Individuals and to Society." 2015.

particularly to students of color and students from low-income households.⁴ Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) across the nation have seen enrollment declines⁵, as well as significant enrollment and completion gaps for Black and Latinx students.⁶

Funding is a critical tool for addressing those equity gaps, and equitable funding mechanisms have the power to ameliorate historic disinvestment and racial inequity in higher education. However, while state budgets have largely recovered from the 2008 recession, higher education funding has not.⁷ Of the funds states do set aside for higher education, many states, including Illinois, have no real system for equitably distributing the majority of those dollars. A large number of states have implemented performance-based funding models for their public institutions, but the results of performance-based approaches have been mixed, including some worrisome equity implications with colleges focusing on those students who were historically most likely to succeed versus supporting underrepresented groups who may need more resources.⁸ Higher education systems need sufficient funding and resources to support all students, especially students of color, low-income students, and first-generation students, to enroll, persist, and graduate.⁹ But to do so, states must see their role in funding higher education institutions as vital and necessary—and they must understand how much funding institutions actually require to successfully serve their particular student bodies.

⁴ Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. “State Higher Education Funding Cuts Have Pushed Costs to Students, Worsened Inequality,” 2019. <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/state-higher-education-funding-cuts-have-pushed-costs-to-students>

⁵ National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. “Fall 2022 Enrollment.” 2022 <https://nscresearchcenter.org/stay-informed/>

⁶ National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. “Completing College National and State Reports.” 2022 <https://nscresearchcenter.org/completing-college/>

⁷ The PEW Charitable Trusts. “Two Decades of Change in Federal and State Higher Education Funding.” 2022. <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2019/10/two-decades-of-change-in-federal-and-state-higher-education-funding>

⁸ Lumina Foundation. “The Rise of Performance-Based Funding.” 2019. <https://www.luminafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/performance-based-funding.pdf>

⁹ Inside Higher Ed. “Racial equity in funding for higher ed.” 2020. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/10/29/racial-disparities-higher-education-funding-could-widen-during-economic-downturn>

The goal of the September 2022 convening was to explore a different kind of funding approach: one that takes adequacy, or the minimum funding level required for institutions to successfully serve their students and achieve intended outcomes, into account. While adequacy funding is a more familiar concept in K-12 education systems,¹⁰ as well as in the healthcare industry, it has not been implemented or fully explored in higher education.¹¹ With that in mind, the objectives of this convening were:

- To develop a shared understanding of the research base that exists regarding funding adequacy in higher education;
- To discuss frameworks or approaches to frameworks that identify the key components, limitations, and complexities of funding adequacy at two- and four-year public institutions;
- To connect with experts and policymakers nationwide to learn more about best practices;
- And to begin to identify how institutional transparency and accountability might be facilitated through an adequacy funding approach.

Purpose

This paper aims to share key themes and takeaways from the convening with experts and leaders in higher education funding who are exploring similar challenging questions. The major takeaways from the event fall within five common themes:

- 1) Performance-based funding (PBF) and other policies designed to incentivize enrollment and/or completion have real limitations. Equitable and student-centered approaches, such as an adequacy-based approach, offer a promising alternative.
- 2) Strong and equitable systems that incorporate transparency and accountability are necessary to ensure that all students, especially those historically underserved by the higher education system, enroll, persist and graduate.

¹⁰ West Ed. "From Adequacy to Equity." 2000. https://www2.wested.org/www-static/online_pubs/po-00-03.pdfv

¹¹ Ithaka S+R. "An Overview of State Higher Education Funding Approaches." 2020.

<https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/an-overview-of-state-higher-education-funding-approaches/>

- 3) While many have begun to explore and develop, there is not a current working framework of adequacy in higher education funding.
- 4) There are many complexities in identifying what should sit within an adequacy formula and identifying how funding responsibilities are divided among entities (e.g., federal, state or IHE).
- 5) An adequacy-based funding approach may allow systems to better address affordability.

While many of these takeaways apply across both two- and four-year institutions, there are some areas where the unique institutional context creates additional considerations. The convening, as expected, raised more questions than it provided definitive answers, but was a helpful step forward in supporting a national dialogue on the possibilities and complexities of using adequacy as an anchor in postsecondary funding.

COMMON THEMES

- 1) Performance-based funding (PBF) and other policies designed to incentivize enrollment and/or completion have real limitations. Equitable and student-centered approaches, such as an adequacy-based approach, offer a promising alternative.

Over the past several years, most states have adopted outcomes- or performance-based funding (PBF) models in their higher education systems, with 33 states using some version of PBF for a portion of their funding.¹² Performance-based funding policies allocate a specific proportion of state higher education resources based on certain performance measures, such as credit hour attainment or degree completion. Many of the conversations throughout the convening acknowledged this current context and highlighted both the advantages but also some of the related risks and limitations of this approach.

¹² The Education Trust. "Re-imagining Outcomes-Based Funding." 2021 <https://edtrust.org/resource/re-imagining-outcomes-based-funding/>

The notion of performance-based funding offers an opportunity for states to transform arbitrary and historically inequitable postsecondary funding formulas by working to strategically allocate funding based on a set of measures that considered priority outcomes.

While research on the impact and efficacy of these models is still relatively limited, findings have revealed little evidence of improved enrollment or graduation rates for students of color, and some mixed evidence that PBF may even reinforce funding inequities.¹³ Researchers at the convening contended that performance-based funding models, as they have been constructed and implemented thus far, have not created the mechanisms necessary to correct historic resource inequity. Instead, they presented compelling evidence that PBF models often create a system of winners and losers, where institutions compete for limited funds and rarely achieve their intended outcomes.

These experts identified two central issues with performance-based funding. First, PBF models often fail to integrate racial equity. Out of the 33 states that use outcomes-based or performance-based models, only 7 include enrollment of students of color as a metric.¹⁴ Enrollment remains a critical component for equity given that no state has a public university with a student body that matches its demographic profile.¹⁵ Researchers noted that incorporating race-based metrics is crucial to addressing historical racial inequities. While some existing funding approaches may take advantage of highly correlated student demographic metrics like income for example in an effort to address racial inequities, income is not a perfectly accurate proxy for race. They emphasized that definitions of equity must be more inclusive, extending beyond income to also consider race and ethnicity.

¹³ The Century Foundation. "Why Performance-Based Funding Doesn't Work. 2016.

<https://tcf.org/content/report/why-performance-based-college-funding-doesnt-work/>

¹⁴ The Education Trust. "Re-imagining Outcomes-Based Funding." 2021 <https://edtrust.org/resource/re-imagining-outcomes-based-funding/>

Illinois currently has a performance-based funding formula for public universities, but it was never funded beyond 0.5%, with the vast majority of state funds distributed without any mechanism.

¹⁵ McKinsey. "Racial and Ethnic Equity in US Higher Education." 2022

To address the first concern, experts highlighted a few different avenues for incorporating a broader definition of equity into funding and accountability models:

- Campus climate metrics. Climate survey responses and faculty and administrative diversity, researchers noted, are vital metrics for racial equity as they center student experience.
- Weighting. Equity can also be embedded in a model by weighting funding needs by student demographics, such as students of color or students from low-income households. In regards to weighting, it is important to consider the specific demographics in question and recognize the difference between broadly accounting for students of color and specifically including certain groups such as Black and Latinx students.¹⁶
- Diversity and inclusion. Researchers also underscored the significance of having a diverse and inclusive decision-making table in the development and ongoing review of any funding model. Indeed, participants noted that the unintended consequences and negative impacts of previous approaches resulted, in part, from not having representative voices included in model development conversations.¹⁷

Secondly, speakers highlighted that performance-based funding models do not focus on the sufficiency of resources available, nor do they attempt to identify the actual cost of providing a high-quality education. Experts indicated the importance of shifting from a solely performance-based approach to an approach that integrates and ensures public institutions receive adequate funding to actually meet their attainment goals and successfully serve their students. But to do so, states must first understand and identify what adequate funding actually entails for their postsecondary institutions.

¹⁶ It is important to acknowledge there may be certain legal considerations to race-explicit measures. Though each state must contend with their specific context and legal parameters, experts highlighted the clear value of incorporating racial and ethnic equity in a model, including the value of race-conscious strategies to redress historic and ongoing discrimination and inequity.

¹⁷ While student voice was not present at this particular convening, it is vital that those most impacted by the system are included in efforts to design and inform these models, and we look forward to continued opportunities to engage all communities in these conversations.

2) Strong and equitable systems that incorporate transparency and accountability are necessary to ensure that all students, especially those historically underserved by the higher education system, enroll, persist and graduate.

Despite the concerns with performance-based and outcomes-based funding models, researchers agreed that effective, holistic, and equitable accountability and transparency mechanisms play an important role in strong higher education funding systems. They also discussed the overall need for better and more accessible data in postsecondary education and highlighted the transparency that better data creates.

Acknowledging the limitations of PBF, researchers emphasized the importance of coherence and clarity in accountability methods. Rather than solely funding based on certain outcomes, such as graduation rates, they underscored progress metrics, such as student persistence, as promising tools for incenting attention to and progress against those outcomes. Participants also identified process metrics around evidence-based student support services, like advisor-to-student ratios. Speakers noted that overcomplicated accountability mechanisms can act as a barrier to successful execution, and progress metrics can potentially help simplify these measures, put faith in funding methods, and help promote evidence-based practices.

Transparency, researchers noted, is central to accountability conversations in higher education funding. As such, speakers highlighted the need for more robust and accurate postsecondary data and raised concerns about how data is collected at postsecondary institutions. For example, enrollment data is typically captured by full-time equivalent (FTE) calculations. In this calculation, three part-time students are equal to one full-time student. This can lead to inaccurate perceptions of enrollment, particularly at community colleges. Additionally, experts raised the issue of data gaps across types of programs. For example, graduate schools, particularly programs such as medical and pharmacy schools, typically do not have as robust data as undergraduate programs. Furthermore, while some research exists on predictors of college completion, such as GPA and credit attainment, there is little comparative

data across institutions on these predictors.¹⁸ With this in mind, speakers also emphasized the need for data on evidence-based practices and student services at different institutions. Ultimately, having clear and comprehensive data for higher education institutions is an essential part of building healthy and effective accountability and transparency mechanisms.

Finally, a critical piece of accountability is increasing funds and actually funding the system sufficiently to encourage institutional change. To truly be able to need to adequately fund higher education regularly. Experts argued that using an adequacy-based model to holistically capture the varied costs required to support all students to enroll and complete a high-quality degree could help states increase the size of the funding pie, and, more importantly, redefine the pie. Ultimately, implementing an adequacy-based approach can incent progress toward full and equitable funding.

3) While many have begun to explore and develop, there is not a current working framework of adequacy in higher education funding.

One emerging theme from the convening was that adequacy remains an obscure term in the higher education funding space. There is no common or socialized definition or framework of adequacy in this context, but experts described it as the amount of funding institutions need to achieve certain outcomes. They also highlighted that capturing adequacy in higher education requires an understanding of the wide variation between different public institutions, including the variation between types of programs, the actual costs of instruction and other services provided, and the characteristics of students enrolled and graduated.

¹⁸ American Council on Education, Center for Policy Research and Strategy. "Identifying Predictors of Credential Completion Among Beginning Community College Students." 2017.

In an effort to move towards a framework for adequacy in higher education funding, experts outlined some specific questions and considerations to have in mind:

- Responsibility for adequacy definitions. First, researchers raised the question of authority. When investigating the many complexities of what comprises an adequacy model, experts asked the question: who ultimately makes the determination of what students need and how to capture costs—is it the state or the institution’s responsibility?
- Institutional variation. In an adequacy-based approach, experts recognized that while states may provide an overall funding framework, individual institutions may receive unique “adequacy targets” to capture what it means to sufficiently fund that institution.
- “Student-centered” vs “institution-centered” adequacy. When discussing “sufficient funds” for institutions, researchers highlighted that this could potentially refer to what institutions require to fulfill their missions, such as research, public service, etc. However, this could also involve what students need to succeed and complete a high-quality degree or credential, such as academic support, social-emotional services, instruction, affordability, etc. “Student-centered” and “institution-centered” adequacy approaches have different implications, both in terms of how they are defined, and in how they are operationalized. During the convening, experts noted the value in both approaches but emphasized the importance of “student-centered” adequacy in prioritizing equity and student need.

One of the reasons adequacy remains so nebulous in higher education is simply because it has not been done before. While there are learnings from other sectors, these examples are not fully applicable to the postsecondary landscape. Adequacy formulas do exist in education funding, specifically in K-12 education, including Illinois’ Evidence-Based Funding (EBF) formula.¹⁹ Postsecondary and K-12 funding systems are similar in some ways, such as in how they account for varying

¹⁹ Illinois State Board of Education, 2022. <https://www.isbe.net/Pages/EvidenceBasedFunding.aspx>

needs, adjust for changes in enrollment and demographics, and include multiple sources of revenue. However, there are also many differences between K-12 and higher education funding landscapes. In addition to the contrasts in instruction, programs, research, degree-type, and “big costs” (i.e., hospitals, athletics, etc.) in higher education, there are also distinct legal implications in each funding system. In the K-12 system, experts noted that the state is required to provide a high-quality public education to all schools, lending itself to an adequacy model where those costs are defined and accounted for. However, researchers emphasized that the same legal obligation does not exist in higher education for either four-year or two-year public institutions where participation is voluntary and discretionary on the part of both the state and the student. This lack of legal grounding potentially creates political barriers to an adequacy model but also means that many conceptual and technical aspects of adequacy funding have not yet been fully investigated in the postsecondary context.

4) There are many complexities in identifying how funding responsibilities are divided among entities (e.g., federal, state or IHE).

Experts on both two-year and four-year public institutions grappled with the various technical considerations involved in understanding adequacy in the postsecondary space, including identifying costs, deciding what is in scope versus out of scope for a model, and determining state responsibility (e.g., what percentage or amount of services the state should fund). While these conversations did not produce specific resolutions, they illuminated the complex nature of adequacy-based funding and provided helpful structure and guidance for its application in higher education.

In the discussion of what should explicitly be included in a funding model versus considered separately, experts explained that if a particular cost component is placed outside of a funding formula, that does not mean it is not relevant to adequacy or that it is not/will not be funded. Rather, it indicates that certain cost components, for various technical, political, and data-related reasons, might not be included in the calculation of each institution’s adequacy target.

In establishing what is within the scope of an adequacy-based funding formula, speakers underscored numerous technical considerations to examine. They noted the challenges inherent in determining cost differentials across different types of higher education programs, such as a medical residency program versus a core undergraduate lecture course. In cases such as this, researchers posited that wide funding variations may warrant placing certain components outside of an adequacy formula. Furthermore, experts noted that programs and auxiliary services beyond direct academics (such as housing, parking, dining, etc.) might be more appropriately considered and funded outside of a proposed adequacy model due to variations between institutions in the services themselves as well as in how they are currently funded. One reason to exclude these components is that some of these auxiliary services can be revenue generating for some institutions further complicating matters while others posited that excluding these services further imbeds inequity amongst public universities. While two-year institutions do not have the same level of programmatic differentiation, community colleges still possess differences in size and scope that might suggest some elements be considered outside of a core funding formula.

Experts cautioned that while there are many complexities to consider in deciding what should sit inside versus outside an adequacy model, states should not be too granular in such a calculation. For example, in conversations regarding deferred maintenance (infrastructure repairs that are delayed due to budgetary limitations), researchers first acknowledged that the short-term nature of these funds makes them difficult to account for and suggested they are omitted from an adequacy calculation. Experts then emphasized that discussions about the particulars of operational costs may take away from thinking about how funding drives outcomes. They argued that a poorly funded institution may not require a dissection of existing funds and costs, but rather strategic investment in currently underfunded areas. This balance between identifying existing costs and appropriating sufficient funds to advance outcomes and equity is a nuanced one, and almost certainly necessitates an understanding of both the funding required to sustain the status quo, as well as a defined notion of the “full funding” required to support a postsecondary system that can operate effectively to meet institutional and student needs.

One limitation of establishing what costs should be included in a formula is data availability. Both two-year and four-year institutional experts noted that postsecondary data reporting has gaps and in some areas lacks consistency. In community colleges, there is a significant amount of non-credit work on which there is little data. Additionally, understanding the academic backgrounds of students in postsecondary institutions could provide useful context for an adequacy model, but there is limited data sharing between K-12 and higher education systems, and between two- and four-year systems. Furthermore, there are significant variations in data definitions between institutions and across states. For example, some institutions include athletics in student services within their budgets, while others separate it into auxiliaries. Ultimately, identifying what might be included within an adequacy calculation may be influenced, at least in part, by what data is available and how it is defined, rather than by policy priorities.

Finally, the group acknowledged that there is a general value to including as many elements as possible in any model for another more political reason: that is, when elements are considered separately, it creates space for political forces, bias, or other pressures to come into play. While leaving specific components outside of a model may, in certain circumstances, be prudent, it can leave room for funding inequity and potentially reduce the anticipated impact of a model. Creating multiple funding streams outside of a model can work against equity by allowing dollars to flow based on other considerations. As such, it is important to thoroughly consider the inclusion of cost components and to create a formula that is comprehensive and integrated, accommodating multiple stakeholder interests. Indeed, one of the lessons from Illinois' K-12 funding reform was the power of a comprehensive formula in enabling and driving equity.

In deciding what entity (e.g., federal, state or IHE) should be responsible for what funding, experts noted that in addition to identifying costs, a model would also need to account for the mix of funding resources, such as federal, state, tuition and fees, and restricted grant sources. This would require an examination of the reliability and robustness of each revenue stream, to ultimately determine the state's role in funding institutions.

In discussions regarding four-year public universities, experts noted the importance of considering both fixed costs (renting and maintaining buildings, land

purchases, etc.) and variable costs (instructional supplies, salaries, etc.). Some participants posited that the state should be responsible for fixed costs in an adequacy formula, while variable and other costs might come from a combination of the state, tuition, and external funding. Other speakers presented questions about delineating the state's funding responsibility, arguing that such matters may vary by state, but that, as a public good, the state should be responsible for the majority of public university funding.

Ultimately, both two-year and four-year speakers recognized the numerous complexities of determining responsibility and identifying cost components in a postsecondary adequacy funding model. Experts expressed hope that these complex discussions could ultimately help provide possible parameters, outline considerations, and inform the development of a higher education adequacy-based framework.

5) An adequacy-based funding approach may allow systems to better address affordability.

Experts also discussed how access to and affordability of postsecondary programs should and could factor into an adequacy-based approach. Higher education has become less financially accessible over the past 20 years, with disinvestment leading to tuition increases, and financial aid covering a smaller share of overall costs. University and community college enrollment is generally declining in many states, with significant declines specifically among students of color.²⁰ In discussions about state and federal financial aid, speakers noted that while such aid is significant, in recent years it has not been sufficient to support students and families to access higher education. Student and family needs, researchers argued, are not always accurately estimated. Participants shared that part of the goal of an adequacy model should be to reduce the burden on students and families, both equitably accounting for financial aid and also driving institutional dollars toward holistic student support services.

²⁰ CollegeBoard. "College Enrollment and Retention in the Era of Covid." 2020. <https://research.collegeboard.org/media/pdf/enrollment-retention-covid2020.pdf>

While speakers highlighted the importance of financial aid and the possibilities of improving access and affordability in an adequacy model, they also recognized some potential challenges. One expert noted that if an adequacy model attempts to solve tuition problems solely through state funding, it may overburden the state, or the state may not be able to ensure adequate appropriations. With that in mind, speakers recommended all aid be considered collectively, ensuring alignment between federal and state aid.

A central goal of an adequacy approach in higher education funding, researchers concluded, is that it may serve as a tool for improving access and affordability, both in terms of how the model accounts for financial aid and student supports, and because such a model could identify the actual cost of providing high-quality postsecondary education. Having an adequacy framework can help justify state funding, providing a funding target to work towards that is evidence-based and student-centered. Experts shared that this shift in perspective and incentives might ultimately help address broader structural issues of disinvestment and equity gaps, especially given the mixed outcomes of performance-based funding models.

CONCLUSION

A healthy higher education system requires long-term adequate and equitable investment in institutions. However, state disinvestment, high tuition rates, and limitations of current funding methods, exacerbated by the lingering effects of the pandemic, have all presented challenges in higher education funding across the country. The Adequacy in Higher Education Funding Convening provided an opportunity for researchers, practitioners, and advocates to thoughtfully engage in discussion around postsecondary funding adequacy, underscoring and examining considerations in determining what might go into an adequacy formula. While this is still a relatively novel approach in higher education, many common areas of thought emerged, and those involved expressed confidence that such an approach holds real promise and can inform and transform state funding approaches. We hope this summary helps elucidate considerations involved in an adequacy-based funding approach and provides structure and direction to leaders and scholars exploring similar and related critical questions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There were many people instrumental in bringing this convening to life. Thank you to all of our speakers and moderators for sharing their passion and expertise with us. Thank you to the Lumina Foundation and the Annie E. Casey Foundation for your support and thought partnership. Thank you to the Partnership for College Completion and the Center for Budget and Tax Accountability for helping us build the agenda and content for this event. Thank you to our partners at Complete College America, specifically Charles Ansell and Marián Vargas, whose planning, energy, and deep content knowledge were essential to actualizing this convening. We also want to express our gratitude to our friends at City Colleges and Harold Washington College for generously hosting us. And finally, thank you to all who attended this convening for engaging in these critical conversations.

APPENDIX

A: Adequacy in Higher Education Funding Convening Attendee List

Michael Abrahamson, Partnership for College Completion
Charles Ansell, Complete College America
Fructoso Basaldua, University of Illinois at Chicago
Rachel Bates, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Corey Bradford, Governors State University
Brendan Cantwell, Michigan State University
Lisa Castillo Richmond, Partnership for College Completion
Andrew Clinger, Nevada System of Higher Education
Will Davis, Advance Illinois
Caitlin Donnelly-Power, Partnership for College Completion
Brian Durham, Illinois Community College Board
Amberly Dzieszinski, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Kayla C. Elliott, Education Trust
Quanic Fullard, Annie E. Casey Foundation
Denisa Gándara, The University of Texas at Austin
Cheryl Green, Governors State University
Nia Haydel, Complete College America
Kimberly Holingsworth, Olive-Harvey College
Xiaodan Hu, Northern Illinois University
Beth Ingram, Northern Illinois University
Scott Jenkins, Lumina Foundation
Nate Johnson, HCM Strategists
Hannah Keller, Young Invincibles
Sarah Labadie, Women Employed
Lori Lindenberg, Maricopa Community Colleges, District Director of Enterprise Analytics and Strategy; KEA Consultants
Ralph Martire, Center for Tax and Budget Accountability
Renee Nagy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Grant McClintock, Civic Federation
James McGee, Atlanta Metropolitan Community College
Katie Lynn Morton, HCM Strategists
Ja'Neane Minor, Illinois Board of Higher Education
Jim O'Connor, Advance Illinois
Ginger Ostro, Illinois Board of Higher Education
Sarah Pingel, Ithaka S+R
Brian Prescott, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Abby Railsback, Advance Illinois

Gerson Ramirez, Advance Illinois
Jessica Ramos, Advance Illinois
Jim Reed, Illinois Community College Trustees Association
Andrew Rogers, Northern Illinois University
Ayesha Safdar, Advance Illinois
Robin Steans, Advance Illinois
Joyce Taylor Gibson, Roxbury Community College
Jason Theisen, Advance Illinois
Marián Vargas, Complete College America
Sarah Wasik, Center for Tax and Budget Accountability
Mercedes Wentworth-Nice, Advance Illinois
Sarah Wetmore, Civic Federation
Ann Whalen, Advance Illinois
Katie Zaback, Zaback Solutions

B: Adequacy in Higher Education Funding Convening Agenda

8:00-8:30AM: Breakfast

8:30-9:00AM: Welcome

Speakers:

- Robin Steans (Advance Illinois - President)
- Charles Ansell (Complete College America - Vice President of Research, Policy, and Advocacy)

9:00-10:00AM: Opening Panel – Adequacy at 2-Year and 4-Year Institutions

This presentation and panel discussion will explore definitions of adequacy, highlight examples of adequacy in different sectors, and examine the research base for adequacy in higher education funding. Panelists will also discuss the complexifying factors across two-year and four-year institutions and share foundational core concepts of adequacy, helping inform our conversations throughout the rest of the convening.

Moderator:

Lisa Castillo-Richmond (Partnership for College Completion - Executive Director)

Panelists:

Kayla C. Elliott (The Education Trust - Director for Higher Education Policy)

Brian Prescott (NCHEMS - Vice President)

Xiaodan Hu (Northern Illinois University - Associate Professor of Higher Education, Coordinator of Community College Leadership Program)

10:15-11:30AM: The Costs and Components of Adequacy (Breakouts)

Panelists will explore concepts for student-centered models for institutional adequacy, unpacking components of adequacy, differences across programs, departments, and degree levels, and how to tackle affordability and improve equity.

Breakout 1: The Costs and Components of Adequacy at 4-year Institutions

Moderator:

- Scott Jenkins (Lumina Foundation - Strategy Director for State Policy)

Panelists:

- Brian Prescott (NCHEMS - Vice President)
- Xiaodan Hu (Northern Illinois University - Associate Professor)

Breakout 2: The Costs and Components of Adequacy at 2-year Institutions

Moderator:

- Quanic Fullard (Annie E. Casey Foundation - Program Officer)

Panelists:

- Charles Ansell (Complete College America - Vice President of Research, Policy, and Advocacy)
- Lori Lindenberg (KEA Consultants and Maricopa Community Colleges, District Director of Enterprise Analytics and Strategy)

-15 minute break-

11:45-1:00PM: The Role of the State in Funding Institutions (Breakouts)

Panelists will share their understanding of the role of state funding in an adequacy model at public institutions, exploring themes including state responsibility, accounting for differences in student background and need, considerations for different revenue streams, and what a “fully funded” system may look like.

Breakout 1: The Role of the State in Funding 4-year Institutions

Moderator:

- Ayesha Safdar (Advance Illinois - Senior Policy Associate)

Panelists:

- Brendan Cantwell (Michigan State University - Associate Professor, Coordinator, Higher, Adult and Lifelong Education Program; Director, Center for Higher and Adult Education)
- Sarah Pingel (Ithaka S+R - Senior Researcher)

Breakout 2: The Role of the State in Funding 2-year Institutions

Moderator:

- Quanic Fullard (Annie E. Casey Foundation - Program Officer)

Panelists:

- Charles Ansell (Complete College America - Vice President of Research, Policy, and Advocacy)
- Lori Lindenberg (KEA Consultants and Maricopa Community Colleges, District Director of Enterprise Analytics and Strategy)

1:00-1:30PM: Lunch

1:30-2:00PM: Conceptualizing Adequacy - Group Share-Out

One person from each breakout session shares key takeaways and themes, with panelist response time.

2:15-3:15PM: Accountability and Incentives in Higher Education Funding

Panelists will discuss the role of incentives in achieving equity goals, how they can be integrated into a distribution mechanism, and different avenues for addressing transparency and accountability to create healthy higher education systems.

Moderator:

- Robin Steans (Advance Illinois - President)

Panelists:

- Kayla Elliot (The Education Trust - Director for Higher Education Policy)
- Denisa Gándara (UT Austin - Assistant Professor in Department of Educational Leadership and Policy)

3:30-4:30PM: Putting Frameworks into Action (Working Session)

Attendees will break into groups according to state/institution type, using the themes from the previous discussion to inform conceptualizations of adequacy and next steps.

4:45-5:00PM: Closing Remarks

Speakers:

- Marián Vargas (Complete College America - Policy Analyst)
- Robin Steans (Advance Illinois - President)

C: Adequacy in Higher Education Funding Convening Resources

Presentations and resources from the convening can be found [here](#).