



UMass Extension Board of Public Overseers
January 9, 2009
Meeting Notes

Present: Nancy Garrabrants, Jack Angley, Michael Lueders, Ted Wales, Douglas Petersen, Fred Dabney, Eugene Tworek, Bartley Morse, Lynn Griesemer, Ed Bourgeois, Rena Prendergast

Guests: Bob Schrader, Jay Vogt, Bob Luczai, Mary Jane Bacon, Nathan L'Etoile, Kathy Carroll, Fran Petersen, Sharon Fross (via conference call)

1. Welcome (9:00 AM)

Jack Angley opened the meeting and requested a motion to accept the notes of the November 14th meeting. A motion to accept was made by Michael Lueders. Motion was seconded by Eugene Tworek. Notes were accepted.

2. UMass Update

Sharon Fross joined the meeting via conference call to provide update on UMass budget. She noted the campus is facing a \$50 million dollar projected shortfall for FY10. The campus is looking at all cost saving options including reducing the number of colleges from nine to six. All academic units have been asked to prepare impact statements for reductions of 3%, 6% and 9%. Outreach has been notified of an estimated \$1.8 million dollar reduction - \$1.5 million to Continuing and Professional Education and approximately \$300,000 (20% university funds) for Extension. Sharon noted a team has been created to develop a plan, by March 1st, for restructuring Outreach.

Rena Prendergast asked if budget cuts to Extension were proportional to other campus units. Sharon replied that it was too early to know as other reductions have not been made. Sharon noted the campus was focusing on maintaining academic programs.

In response to a question from Fred Dabney, she noted FY09 reductions to date have been 5% of all academic units.

Nancy Garrabrants provided an update for Extension, noting the Extension quarterly newsletter, InCommon, would focus solely on the Asian Longhorn Beetle infestation in Worcester. Nancy then reviewed a fiscal trends document distributed to the board showing sources of funds from 2003-2009. Lynn Griesemer suggested that Extension needs to develop a summary of match requirements and current sources of match to accompany the budget.

Nancy moved to a discussion of the FY09 and FY10 budget. The UMass FY09 budget reduction was 4.4% or \$75,000. This was in addition to the \$100,000 for 4-H removed from the MDAR budget. She explained Extension would cover these reductions through leaving two open positions vacant and using federal carry forward funds from FY08. Looking to FY10, she has asked program directors to provide projections for a 20% and 30% budget reduction.

The conversation turned to developing talking points for the meeting with Chancellor Holub. Mary Jane Bacon reiterated the need to focus on the match requirement and the impact of the potential loss of federal funds. She suggested the conversation should focus on dollars. Nathan L'Etoile suggested including connections to alumni and industry as significant values. Nancy noted today's agenda included advocacy and asked the board to defer discussion to that agenda item.

3. Membership and Bylaws Committee

Lynn Griesemer reported the committee had not met and there were no actions to report.

4. Planning and Evaluation Committee

Ed Bourgeois reported the committee is focusing first on review of the planning process. Ed noted the process he perceived going forward was to request advisory group lists and minutes in order to understand the extent of the advisory process. The committee will then identify formal means of input and planning via meetings with the program directors. Related planning processes – Outreach Marketing and Communications, Outreach strategic plan, campus and national planning processes - will then be reviewed, with a goal of recognizing trends and looking to see how Extension fits within this context. Key elements of these processes will be reviewed prior to the next meeting of the board.

5. Budget and Advocacy Committee

Ted Wales provided an update, noting he had drafted initial talking points for use with the legislature and chancellor for Extension. The talking points were also edited by Nancy Garrabrants. Ted expressed the need for the chancellor to add dollar value to the university and a focus on industry relations as well as match data.

Jack Angley noted he had been in contact with the chancellor's office and a meeting with a committee of the board was to be arranged. Jack agreed to follow up and set a meeting.

Lynn Griesemer suggested using this meeting with the chancellor as an educational opportunity. Topics could include the land grant mission; Extension's role in receiving grant, fee and gift resources; focus on research and teaching; and the value of a statewide network of offices. The conversation should focus on the positive aspects of all work.

Nancy Garrabrants agreed to produce one page of talking points and a map with offices and program impact for Extension.

Doug Petersen stated that a legislative advocate or point person for Extension would be a good step. Lynn Griesemer suggested a legislative caucus would be a further positive step. Brief discussion of the merit and mechanics of developing a caucus followed. The issue of developing a legislative caucus was tabled to the next meeting.

Conversation turned to the opportunity and value of expanding the Board of Public Overseers. After significant discussion the board adopted the following motion: "to support the filing of a bill by the Farm

Bureau to amend the enabling legislation of the board.” Nathan L’Etoile noted the bill, if filed, would be for the current two year legislative session.

6. Closing Comments

Fred Dabney reported he had received, per his request, background information from Bob Schrader on the transfer of Extension from the College to Outreach in 1995. Fred cited a quote from Bob noting that “no document from the dean or associate dean was located providing a rationale for the transfer.”

Nancy Garrabrants noted the board members would be receiving an invitation to the February 8th UMass basketball game. She also noted Extension was developing a packet of information sheets for Ag Day at the Statehouse. The board agreed to provide a letter of support for Extension to be provided as an insert to the packet.

7. Meeting Assessment

Jay Vogt provided a review of the meeting, citing the committee reports as positive steps in creating a proactive working model for the board. He suggested that as a future best management practice each committee provide short “bulleted” reports prior to the meeting.

Tasks:

- Develop final draft of talking points
- Draft letter for enclosure with legislative packets

Meeting Adjourned 11:55 AM

Robert Schrader
Associate Director
November 18, 2008