



Board of Public Overseers Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: June 6th, 2008
UMass Collaborative Services Center, Shrewsbury, MA

Members Present: Nancy Garrabrants, Jack Angley, Sharon Kennaugh, Art Eve, Eugene Tworek, Pat Bigelow, Ed Bourgeois, Fred Dabney, Ted Wales, Michael Lueders, Ed Davidian

Guests: Mary Jane Bacon, Sharon Fross, Joe Shoenfeld, Robert Macleod, Scott Jackson, Bob Luczai

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM.

Chairman Jack Angley called meeting to order and requested approval on notes from the March 28th meeting. Ed Bourgeois requested language be changed under item “#4 Board Structure” to read that the planning and evaluation committee be “utilized,” striking the word “created.”

Fred Dabney voted to accept the minutes. Ed Davidian seconded. Minutes were accepted as amended.

1. Role of the Board

Nancy recognized the commitment of the Board and proposed to the Board that an action plan be developed as a strategy for next 1-5 years. Essentially to provide a roadmap for how the Board operates and seeks to accomplish. She suggested the hiring of a facilitator to set goals, review board structure, develop meeting structure, and advise on role of working subcommittees such that substantive reports come from the committees.

Nancy asked Michael Lueders and Bob Macleod to discuss recent experiences within their groups.

Michael Lueders briefly noted the value of using a facilitator to help his board understand their role. He then asked the board for their reaction.

- Ed Bourgeois suggested the Board pursue functioning subcommittees.
- Pat Bigelow spoke to value of the facilitator to the process.
- Eugene Tworek noted support for using a facilitator.
- Jack Angley voiced support for and the value of such an activity.
- Fred Dabney noted the Board's role is budget review and this is clear. That he didn't see the value of a facilitator.
- Michael Lueders noted he felt we could do a better job on both budget and advocacy for Extension.
- Mary Jane Bacon noted the current approach of the board –which might be described as a frontal assault on the budget – has not worked, and another approach is needed.

Jack Angley asked Bob Macleod to describe the recent experience of the 4-H Foundation. Bob presented an overview of a very positive process initiated by the Foundation, utilizing a consultant. Bob went on to describe several products, including a business plan, that resulted from this process.

Jack then asked for a show of hands on who supports a facilitated approach. A large majority of members indicated support. Ed Davidian voiced concern that we have done some of this work before.

In response to a question from Ed Davidian, Bob Schrader stated conversations were held with this group as a part of the stakeholder listening process for FY07-11 Plan of Work in the spring, 2006.

As a next step, the group agreed to utilize the September meeting for this purpose. Nancy Garrabrants was charged with developing this process for the September meeting.

2. Outreach Structure

Sharon Fross provided an overview of University Outreach. Elements included a review of administrative models nationally; UMass and Outreach Administrative organizational charts; services provided by Outreach Administration to Extension; and a review of sources and uses of funds for both Outreach and Outreach Administration. In response to a question from Ed Davidian, Sharon voiced support for the current model as providing stronger access to university leadership.

3. New Extension Website

Nancy Garrabrants enthusiastically introduced the launch of a revised web site for UMass Extension. While Joe Shoenfeld navigated, Nancy noted significant improvements to the sections on answering public questions as well as locating Extension programs in communities. She noted the official launch would be later today (June 6).

4. FY09 Budget Debriefing

UMass Budget: Sharon Kennaugh distributed and discussed a chart showing FY09 budget based on House and Senate budgets. She noted a projected net increase, after factoring in salary increases, of approximately 2.4%. She also noted new funds, beyond inflation costs will be dedicated to hiring under the "Faculty 250 Plan."

Ed asked, given the focus on the Faculty 250 Plan, how Extension can expect to gain new funds? Sharon Kennaugh suggested best route is to discuss with appropriate dean, positions that are needed by Extension. Sharon Fross noted she is requesting new funds from the Chancellor but does rely on Extension to bring the needs of Extension forward.

Ed Bourgeois asked what the incentive is for NRE Dean Steve Goodwin (or any Dean) to fund a faculty position that benefits Extension? Sharon Fross stated this is a current conversation she is having with Steve Goodwin, noting there is a need to more clearly articulate faculty expectations.

MDAR Budget: Scott noted \$100,000 for Extension 4-H is in the Senate budget but not the House budget. This funding will be resolved via the legislative conference committee.

Jack Angley briefly described the recent failed attempt to earmark, via amendment, the UMass budget in the Senate, and asked how the Board should proceed with a budget strategy. Sharon Kennaugh suggested the best route is to look for additional funds via a separate line item.

Discussion followed on how best to position support for Extension. Ted Wales suggested the list of products for the facilitators to work on needs to include a list of "projects" the Board will support. Sharon Kennaugh suggested the line item language, if pursued, should be inclusive of all four programs. Mary Jane Bacon suggested Extension would benefit from tracking the new faculty hires and connecting them to Extension capacities. A case can then be made for investment in Extension.

5. Extension Budget

Nancy Garrabrants introduced the topic by noting the need for coordination among NRE and Extension to access funds via grants and contracts. Scott Soares noted new opportunities that will come through the Farm Bill.

Nancy briefly reviewed the status of Extension budgets in the northeast, noting that many states are experiencing a decrease in funding.

Fiscal Trends: Bob Schrader briefly presented the FY97-FY09 Fiscal Trends summary.

Projects and Staff Days Matrix: A new reporting tool, drawn from the Extension Planning and Reporting information System for Massachusetts (PRiSM), for tying staff days to projects was presented and discussed. There was much positive feedback of the value of this as an initial tool. Fred Dabney said such reports should be produced annually and that Extension funds should be delineated from funds provided by colleges, and counties as these funds are not managed by Extension.

6. Extension Organization Structure Subcommittee Update

Ed Davidian noted that the committee data to date is similar to data presented by Sharon Fross on national administrative models. Jack Angley asked if the charge to the committee is clear. Ed replied that he has a good understanding of the university's position but needs to hear the view of the dean or college based model. Ed requested that the charge be a part of the work of the facilitator.

Closing Discussion focused on defining the goals and agenda for the facilitated meeting. Nancy was charged with developing the overall structure for the event. Bob Macleod, Nancy Garrabrants and Michael Lueders agreed to meet with consultant to develop charge and agenda for meeting. The same group that met with the chancellor was charged with overall development of the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05

Note taker: Bob Schrader, Associate Director

Accepted by Board: September 5th 2008