

Southern District Resource Management Team (SDRMT) January 27, 2006

In attendance: Dave Wachter, Tom Schmitz, Steve Kohlstedt, Peggy Compton, Matt Hanson, Lee Cunningham, Becky Gutzman, Jane Schaaf, Dick Pederson (Advisor).

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 am.

Approval of the December 7, 2005 meeting minutes-motion made by Steve and second by Lee. Motion passed unanimously.

Budget Discussion: In response to the Resource Management Team's charge to trim approx. \$36,000 from the District's base funds, we heard and recorded ideas from the team members and the counties represented on the teleconference. The counties also were encouraged to send their ideas (via e-mail) to the SDRMT so they could be included "verbatim" in the meeting minutes. Those ideas submitted via e-mail are recorded as submitted in Appendix A. Ideas presented at the meeting (in person and/or via telephone are recorded below).

Richland County

- Cut "73rd County"
- Evaluate retirements
- Volunteer partial appointments

Grant County

- Evaluate retirements
- Volunteer partial appointments
- Generate/see, one time funds (to get us to the next budget)
- Alternative staffing (across county lines)
- Cutting back on District meetings
- (Tollway on Hwy 151)
- (\$1 Auction)

Dodge County

- Cut "73rd County"
- Reject promotion increases at this time
- Combine program areas (ANRE and CNRED)? Keep coverage with fewer agents
- Departments look at number of faculty per program area per county
- Department look at the number of faculty more broadly (ie the number of promotions they give each year, number of tenured faculty, reduce# of faculty that get tenure each year)
- Increase probationary status length of time (longer before tenure occurs) for faculty
- Ask Counties to raise their "contribution" from 40% to 45 or 50%

Crawford County

- Evaluate retirements
- Volunteer partial appointments
- Cutting back on District meetings
- Looking at number of District Wislines
- Have County pay Dept. Head travel expenses

- Reducing Professional Dev. Funds
- Every person in the district voluntarily give up one day of pay “Donate a Day”
- Reduction of overnight district meetings

Columbia

- Evaluate and/or encourage retirements
- Volunteer partial appointments
- Reduce Professional Dev. Funds
- Eliminate one district (go from 6 to 5)
- Reduce \$\$ for promotion increases
- Reject promotions at this time

Dane County

- Eliminate “73rd County”
- Incentives to retire
- Volunteer reduction in appointment
- Reduce the amount of pay increase per person for promotion
- Combine districts (reducing administration)

Lafayette County

- Limit the number of times one can get professional development funds in a year
- Cut back the cap for professional development from \$500 - \$450
- Voluntary reduction of appointment for staff for a specified period of time (person may want to come back full time at a later date)
- Encourage staff to apply for grants outside of Extension
- If staff is to be reduced it should be at all levels not just in the county

Rock

- Cut the “73rd County”
- Voluntary reduction of appointments
- Would support the “Donate a Day” idea
- Always have one open position “floating” around the district
- Process of evaluate/prioritize
- Revenue requirement
- Other alternative funding sources, private/public partnerships (ie Hort agent funded by Rotary Gardens)

Iowa County

- Voluntary reduction of appointments
- (concern: county match of proposed promotion salary increase)
- (concern: Retirements- don’t want to erode the base (ie give away dollars) because may need them to get a good re-hire)

Walworth

- Voluntary reduction of appointments-with ability to go back up to 100% at a later time
- (question: how much money would Donate a Day save? Save \$10,000-14,000)

Alternative staffing concept elaboration: multi-county positions; eliminating “double” program area coverage within a county (through attrition, not losing a person’s job)

Vernon

- Voluntary reduction of appointments-some concern
- Decrease professional development funds
- Hold positions open longer (ie maybe one more month)

Green

- (Concern about a decrease in professional development funds because County won't pay any part of their PD travel)
- (Concerned with transferring % of county share (40 to 45%)
- Reduce the promotion increase in pay
- Don't implement the promotion increase in pay at this time
- Reduce the number of District all faculty meetings

Other Concerns and Comments:

Rock, Columbia, Walworth, Green, Vernon and Iowa concerned about: Any "plan" that would have the county increase it's share; voluntary reduction of appt. would probably permanently lose the county dollars

Donate a Day is really just a voluntary salary reduction?

Rock: Voluntary reduction of appt. turned into an elimination of a position

Columbia, Rock Walworth thought they were only to look at salary saving ideas

What could you "Rally around"? Donate a Day (Crawford County)

Dick's comments:

- \$5000 in the district annually for PD funds
- the \$36,000 cut equals about 1.9% (would equal approx. 1 base funded position)
- base funded positions are dollars that flow through the district; other positions such as the Basin Educator positions are not affected by/salaries do not contribute to this situation
- this may just be the beginning of tough budget times, so this is very important work
- real challenge of program coverage (program areas not represented in one county, but the needs are still in that county and the clientele ask across county lines)
- Earlier this week, Arlen announced that the February 21st CEAC meeting would be a full day meeting directed at having a thorough and thoughtful discussion on these budget issues.

Following the teleconference, the SDRMT discussed the ideas and options. Steve suggested that the Academic Departments could ask for the letters of intent of promotion earlier than usual so there is a better idea of the actual dollars needed for promotions. Lee suggested ideas for "revenue generation" and suggested that the individual gets a percentage of the revenue as a "kick-back".

The SDRMT discussed the many options and ideas presented and (in the table below) estimated the savings from some of the ideas that were presented.

Action	Who	Savings from	Estimated Savings for the Southern District
Reduce the “new” promotion increase by ½ (save \$9,000) OR Reject promotion increases at this time (save \$18,000)	CEAC	Base	\$9,000-\$18,000
Retirement savings: If you are going to retire by June 30, 2007 and are willing to share your intent then we can factor in salary savings towards meeting the goal of \$36,000 savings -strive for a \$10,000 savings of salary + benefits. That will be split \$6,000 District Savings and \$4,000 county savings; 2 retirements	District	Base	\$12,000
Floating vacancy: One position in the district remains open until another is vacated (this would not work in conjunction with the “Hold positions open longer option” (ie represents one position open at all times	District	One-time funds	\$30,000
Hold positions open longer before refilling (possibly 90 days) (this is an either/or with the floating position concept)	District	One-time funds will help to provide PD funds if the \$5,000 is given over	\$5,000
Everyone in the District “Donates a Day” (give back salary equivalent of one-day)	District	Base	\$5,000
Take the \$5,000 set aside for PD; use one-time savings (varies each year) as PD dollars (this reduces or jeopardizes the Innovative Grants dollars)	District	Base	\$5,000
One person voluntarily reduces his/her appt. from 100% to 80% (\$45,000 position)	District	Base	\$6,000
Cutting back on District meetings (ex. Eliminate overnight retreats)	District	Onetime	\$500
Elimination of one Dept. head face to face meeting	District	One-time funds	\$500
Revenue generation: Each person is required to generate \$500 in outside revenue; sent to a district funds pool	CEAC	One-time	\$50,000
“73 rd County” county-based faculty who get moved onto 100% state dollars. When that person leaves the	CEAC	Base	If position is eliminated then base savings could be

system, we believe that the base dollars should be retained by the District.			substantial (\$30,000+) If the position is reinstated at the county level then the base savings is similar to the savings of a retirement (\$6,000)
Eliminate one district statewide	CES	Admin funds	unknown

The time frame for continued work on the reduction of base funds is:

1. Get colleague input
 - a. Send it out via e-mail; ask colleagues for feedback
 - b. Determine which draft ideas should be carried forward (possibly “rank” ideas)
 - c. Get input to SDRMT prior to Feb 21;
 - d. Have Dept. Head respond to everyone on the SDRMT

2. Meet with Dan Malacara to discuss feasibility of some of the options/ideas.
 - a. Dave, Peggy and Dick
 - b. By Feb. 21st if possible; otherwise by March 7th

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Steve; second by Matt. Motion passed unanimously.

The next meeting of the SDRMT will be held on Tuesday, March 7th, 2006 at the Dane County Extension Office at 9:00 am.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy Compton
Southern District Resource Management Team Secretary

Appendix A:

THE ITEMS BELOW WERE E-MAILED TO THE SDRMT IN RESPONSE TO OUR REQUEST FOR IDEAS FOR REDUCING BASE FUNDS BY \$36,000.

From Betty Gleason/Lafayette County

- Limit the number of times one can get professional development funds in a year.
- Cut back the cap for professional development from \$500 - \$450.
- Voluntary reduction of % of appointment for staff for a specified period of time(person may want to come back full time at a later date).
- Encourage staff to apply for grants outside of Extension.
- If staff is to be reduced it should be at all levels not just in the county.

We are for sharing across county lines, but this could go too far so that we forget why we exist and the local people cannot travel the distance to meetings. (Technology could be the answer here if a regional or state program could be brought to a local site.)

From Carolyn Belczyk/Walworth County

Basic position: Make no cuts to Walworth County's share of the base dollars because:

- County has a long and rich history of extension programming and support
- Currently the county is one position "under" the district's core principle of representation by each program area in each county.
- County is looking to build back CNRED position in the future

Possible ways to cut base dollars:

- Cut in % of time (one unpaid day/year, etc.). Acceptable to most staff if this were treated as an unpaid day of leave; if it were a "come to work as usual and not get paid for it day," then there would be less support for the idea and also concerns about insurance, workman's comp, etc.
- Eliminate Milwaukee-based old SE District Office
- Voluntary reduction in appointments, to .8 perhaps, but would have to come with a guarantee that it would rebound to 1.0 the following year. There were concerns expressed about the impact of this on county partner, future of funding from the county, etc.
- Reduce professional development \$\$.
- More multi-county sharing of second state-funded positions (i.e. share dairy-livestock agents or crops-soils agents between counties, instead of having both in each county); through attrition and re-assignment to priority positions; no one should lose his/her job.
- Eliminate multiple state-funded positions within same program area; through attrition and re-assignment to priority positions; no one should lose his/her job.

We would not support any plan that would pass a larger share of staff funding or state/district travel or other expenses to the county.

From Kathleen Haas, Columbia County:

...”to use a portion of the 1% & 2% raises to offset the SD deficit (\$36,000)?”
I also think pending retirements \$ is another possible avenue.