Extension State Advisory Council Meeting  
Monday, February 23, 2008

Present: Brian Basting, Tom Dahlfors, Harvey Davis, John Flaherty, Robert Goelitz, Karen Hawthorne, Art King, Keith Krapf, Michael Lager, Bill Minnis, Elden Niemeyer, Julie Pangrac, Tanesha Pittman, John Sutton, Lee Trotter, Dennis Campion, Marilyn Brengle, and Bruce McVety

The meeting was called to order by John Sutton at 1:00 p.m. He welcomed new committee member, Keith Krapf, and guests Bruce McVety (Administrative Intern in Campion’s office) and Patty Palmer (Campion’s secretary) who would be taking minutes.

Committee members were given the opportunity to review the October 13-14, 2008 meeting minutes which were provided in their packets. After review, a motion was made by John Flaherty to accept the minutes as submitted, seconded by Mike Lager and approved. Tanesha Pittman asked that the motion be rescinded as she was in attendance at the meeting and the minutes did not reflect such. The motion was rescinded and amended by John Flaherty to change the attendance list to include Tanesha Pittman. The motion was again seconded by Mike Lager and approved.

**Administrative & Fiscal Update**

Dr. Campion apologized that John Horton would be unable to attend due to a family matter. He then proceeded to give the administrative and fiscal update. Campion reported that as a College the total expenditures are $178 million. He proceeded to ask Council members where they thought the ACES’ number fits in with the campus. He responded that ACES is third highest with the first being Liberal Arts and Sciences and the second being Engineering. He shared the next pie charts explaining that page two was a breakout/summary of FY09 College expenditures, page three was a summary of FY09 Extension expenditures by fund source and page four was a summary of FY08 Extension expenditures. He shared that as a budget office, Administration and Finance tracks $92 million as a college. The $92 million includes all sources of expenditures with a tag of Extension within the college included. Of the $92 million, $72 million flows through Campion’s office. Campion explained that departmental activity is defined as faculty salaries, revolving accounts for farms (outreach for the department), College based ITCS, grants within the departments. The $72 million would be fourth across campus.

Campion directed attention to the Benchmarking Draft, which includes budgeted items explaining that the chart shows how budgeted money has changed through time. He pointed out that Remaining constant is the State GRF line which hasn’t been able to be moved. With the line not moving, the question was raised as how we are communicating to legislators and what this means. Campion mentioned that this line and the research line have been under pressure by administration to be in competitive grants. Extension has been successful in keeping this line the same. Art King commented that purchase
power is decreasing. Campion indicated that Extension administration has discussed different ways to market programs to generate revenue. Continuing to review the report, Campion explained that the Federal Other line is the 3rd funds. This line is recurring and includes retirement funds. A question was raised as to whether the contribution amount is increasing. Campion responded that money hasn’t change a lot and explained that Smith Lever is used more as an expense line rather than salary line. Continuing to the State GRF line, Campion reported that $5 million is missing, which went to the departments. $10 million resides in Extension. He explained that this impacts Extension the most at the Center level as there has been a decrease from 95 to 86 Center-based educators.

Campion continued explaining the difference in the budget lines and what was contained therein.

- Youth Line – this was itemed out for FY09.
- Grants – ICR is close to generating $1 million. This is high in the college as opposed to departments due to faculty in departments verses academic professionals in Extension.
- ICR – This is a pro-rata amount, 25% goes to campus. This allows for some flexibility.

Campion shared the following:

- There was success in FY07 in getting money into the budget. There was no traction in trying to get CBM, CCI and Youth Development money in FY08. He explained that an annual letter is sent to IDOA requesting funding.

- Overall county and professional staff are doing well based upon the happenings. These are positives. He reported that County Directors have visited with County Boards. County Boards have had an interest in the quality of programs and people in the community. This is an important piece of marketing. He stressed that things are being done to become self-supporting but both local and state support are also needed.

- In FY04 the strategic agenda was put into place and traction is now being seen in the system. Extension now has a tracking method on grant expenditures and ICR associated with it. Traction came in FY05 and more recently. He mentioned that when expenditures go up or down for the College, they do likewise in Extension.

- Only 35% of CBM funding has been received thus far. All has been appropriated but he is uncertain how it is going to pan out. To date, 50% of CCI and 4-H Youth has been received in the IDOA funding request.

Campion reported that Governor Quinn was on campus last week and he indicated he would try to hold the University harmless of any rescission this fiscal year. No mention was made about FY10. Campion indicated that the operative word is try. From the
Provost’s level, in FY10 possibly a 10% reduction. The State is getting $1.7 billion in the form of an Education block grant. According to the appropriation committee none of the money has to be allocated to the local school systems. Trotter and Sullivan lead these committees. John Flaherty indicated the money would be for existing programs - not new programs. The question was raised whether Extension is building in a hold-back for the rest of this year for budgeting. Campion responded that 2.5% was put back. FY10 the possibility of 10% exists. Campion indicated that Extension is not a tuition generated entity. There will be a differential hit to Extension. This will be a budgeting issue. Campion questioned what would happen as more than 50% of funding to University comes from tuition, rather than the State. Would the State build its budget via tuition generated or other generated funds? The State determines where and how the money will be allocated. Regardless of allocation, it will impact Extension greatly.

Being aware of the depressed economy, Tanesha inquired about layoffs of individuals and asked if the counties are doing anything additional to be more responsible to help in this situation? Campion responded that quiet discussions are taking place regarding different ways to look at organizational structure of the units. Bruce McVety is looking at the balance of administrative personnel to program personnel in a given unit. It was reported that 75% of salaries are applied towards administration. Options are being looked at of forming cooperatives rather than combining/merging units. This would reduce the amount of administrative staff and utilize some of those savings for program delivery staff thus increasing administrative capacity of the unit for revenue generation. If cut-backs are made, program delivery will have to be cut-back diminishing the capacity. Ways to form cooperatives and combine services are being evaluated. Additionally incentives on how to bring resources together are being reviewed. Cooperatives would bring units together around a geographical base. Ideas are being looked at to do something as a positive to enhance capacity. Some units may well be unable to do this. These ideas are being considered as a way for units to work with other units around them so they can continue to exist. Cooperatives would also reduce/cut-back on facilities but will allow for a local presence in those counties.

Marilyn Brengle explained the difference between cooperatives and merging. She mentioned that these discussions are in very preliminary stages and conversations and County Directors have not been involved in these conversations. This concept deals more than with an individual being involved with a particular unit but a percentage of staff time bought out by another unit. It is thought that this would make the best use of resources available. She reported that some counties may not be able to sustain themselves as an individual but would be able to sustain if combined with another unit. The physical location of a county would remain. Marilyn shared examples. This is a sharing of resources, not a change of identity. Individuality would be maintained – sharing resources is the goal.

Karen Hawthorn inquired about positive resources and if county boards would be more supportive with the office in their own county. Marilyn responded that it is dependent upon individual county boards and the key players. It will be a careful process where people are engaged in “quiet” conversations on initiating it. Marilyn explained that the
challenge is if we cut back and do creative things to survive will it be looked at as if we are o.k. and will not need more state money. Bruce is looking at a cluster of small units with the same amount of administrative staff. Some units are fiscally unstable and cannot continue and this would allow them to combine so they can still exist. The concept would also offer them opportunities to reduce administrative costs and expand program capabilities by working together. The advantage it is can become very positive. It should not be looked at as scaling back but rather expanding program capacity with existing resources.

The question was raised as to what would encourage a financially stable county to support the less fortunate county and why would they want to do this. Bruce McVety responded that it is proposing incentives to work together. It’s a great opportunity to broaden the capacity locally and for a stable unit to work with an unstable unit. This allows expansion of capacity to create additional revenue generating streams and opens up new opportunities. It makes better use of money to better meet the needs of their area. There would be a savings from the beginning, i.e., fiscal support staff.

The next question raised was where is this going and what the timeline is. Campion responded that three cannot continue to survive. Discussions have been extremely positive. The positive outcome of this is to expand capacity of these units to think of themselves more strategically. Bruce McVety added that there is incentive for the stable unit as county director and educator salaries are comparable and if two county directors are removed, there would be resources for two educators.

Campion explained that this is a thought process. Considering the timing for this meeting and the agenda, he asked that thoughts be held and that questions/discussion could take place at a later time.

**Biomass Feedstock Production Research**

Campion introduced Tom Voigt, Extension Specialist and faculty member in the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences who joined the group and shared a presentation on his specialty on Biomass Feedstock Production Research. Exciting things are happening in this arena. A copy of presentation materials may be acquired from Tom. Tom was thanked for his presentation and time.

**4-H Update**

Lisa Bouillion-Diaz and Bill Million (Extension Specialists, 4-H Youth Development) gave a presentation on One Million New Scientists, One Million New Ideas. Key points of the presentation were:

- Learning by doing
- National 4-H goal in the science, engineering and technology programs is to have 1 million new kids by 2013.
- There is nothing new in the legacy
- The tag line is 1 million scientists, 1 million new ideas

Those present were invited to join in a “hands-on” experience as engineers. Participants were broken up into teams of 2-3, provided with miscellaneous items and asked to design a sailboat using only those materials. When time had ended, each group was asked to share what they had learned through the process. The idea of this exercise was for participants to experience the same type of activities 4-Hers would experience.

After the exercise, Lisa and Bill shared information on the Power of Wind curriculum. Partnerships across campus are being cultivated.

General discussion took place regarding 4-H and programs. It was mentioned that in comparison to other groups that 4-H is doing well in educating staff and children. The goal is to reach diverse audiences. You do not have to have a farm background to participate in 4-H. The rich heritage should be kept but the gate should be opened for other learning opportunities in science, engineering and technology and this program does just that. It is an exciting time for 4-H in Illinois. Marilyn Brengle encouraged ESAC members to share the new initiatives in their counties. Lisa and Bill were thanked for sharing and their presentations.

**Discussion/Questions/Strategies**

John Sutton commented that Tom Voigt shared with him that a building in Taylorville is being heated by grasses and studies are being conducted to see what works, what doesn’t amount of ash, etc. Campion stated that it is a local office being heated, etc. from grasses.

Campion reported that moderately viable areas for wind will have wind farms. There are 436 sites in Henry County. Wind farms will create jobs.

Meeting adjourned 4:56 p.m.
Extension State Advisory Council Meeting
Tuesday, February 24, 2009

Present: Brian Basting, Tom Dahlfors, Harvey Davis, John Flaherty, Robert Goelitz, Karen Hawthorne, Keith Krapf, Michael Lager, Bill Minnis, Elden Niemeyer, Julie Pangrac, Regina Rivers, John Sutton, Lee Trotter, Dennis Campion, Marilyn Brengle, and Bruce McVety

The meeting was called to order by John Sutton at 8:33 a.m. Regina Rivers was welcomed for day two of the meetings.

**Getting Ready for PILD – Panel**
Tanesha Pittman, Tom Dahlfors and Brian Basting were asked to share their experiences from the PILD conference. A summary of each is below followed by suggestions of other ESAC members who have participated:

**Tanesha**
She found the experience very rewarding both personally and professionally. She met individually with three congressional leaders. She felt it is important to establish relationships with congressional leaders prior to going to PILD. In her second year, she visited 4-6 legislators. It was somewhat more challenging but successful. She mentioned the importance of knowing the thrust of the legislator and being prepared to discuss those issues with them. Awareness and knowing about legislators, committees on which they serve, etc. is key prior to meeting with them. She commented that workshops are good. The key piece she learned is that the staffers are aware of what is going on and make things happen. Be sure to appeal to younger generation. Be persuasive, forthright and be specific! Stick to the bullet points identified prior to going into the meetings.

**Tom**
Last year was his first year attending. When initiatives came in, he began to read. He mentioned it is important to do the background checks. Note cards are very helpful and invaluable to highlight so you don’t forget things on the initiatives. You meet many staffers. He suggested beginning with questions such as are you familiar with Extension program and the people we serve and to bring back to their district and how we serve. He then suggests moving into the initiatives and how the University is on the cutting edge of things. The visit to the Hill can be overwhelming. Always be a step ahead. Talked about the interviews – dealing with staffers. Entire experience was overwhelming. Going and presenting ourselves (Extension) is a great opportunity. When he returned, selected a few items off their campaign literature and sent them a letter about a couple of their highlighted areas – looking forward to seeing you in April. Important to follow the things legislators do. Go in with a passion – let them know what your needs are. You have a short span to make yourself known. Overall wonderful experience. He thanksed those that had already been there for their assistance and guidance (comfort zone, per se). He found it beneficial going with someone experienced.
Brian
He has participated three years but it is good to hear the refresher course on the items highlighted above by Tanesha and Tom. Something that stands out to him is the fact that legislators say that sometimes people only come to see them when they want money. His thought is that they already know us but we have a friendly audience. ESAC’s job is to be a “cheerleader.” Trumpet and give the good word on what is being done. Reemphasize that we are serving the public. When you meet with the individual representative, bring home what is happening locally – what is good for their constituents. It is important to have a message. He indicated that Campion, Brengle and staff have done a good job providing emphasis points to stay on the message of what we want to do. Be very specific. You meet with staffers & legislators. Staffers are the point people for the representatives and are very important. They are the ones who will send/carry your message – treat them with a great deal of respect. Follow-up is VERY important. It doesn’t matter what it is – thank them for their time, remind them what Extension is doing. He encouraged other members that when someone is in the community, stop, invite them to activities in the community.

Dr. Campion indicated there will be training for PILD participants this year.

John Flaherty suggested organizing handouts and providing the tokens of appreciation (thumb drives had all our information on them). Know the number of people served with in their districts and served by various programs. Learn to know the people not just in Washington but in their district offices. List all the individuals you can find in respective offices and who they are. Look up information and have background on individuals you’ll be meeting with. Know the legislators biography. Stop by the district office – share materials with the District Director who will share with the legislator.

Karen Hawthorne mentioned the need to have good hard hitting specific pieces to hand them that can be left with them. Be somewhat short but to the point on what Extension is about. Prepare a short message and longer message to expand upon our points. Prefers to see them earlier rather than later. We are the people they are serving – the grassroots. Our message is the BEST! We need to be informed.

Art King – give a one sheet summary – what the impact of the efforts will have on their constituents – include the glossies at the end. Let them know you’re going to provide them a summary – speak with them.

Attempts are made to meet with every representative from the State of Illinois. Materials should be hand delivered even if a face-to-face meeting does not occur.

Understanding Federal Initiatives
Dr. Campion referred to the FY09 Appropriation Request & FY010 Appropriation request. He reported that FY09 is under a continuing resolution until March 6. The General Assembly has rather than determining appropriation back to October 1 set it
aside and therefore a continuing resolution. When looking at numbers going into FY10 and not having final FY09 information, one must go back to 08/09 period. Same numbers as in continuing resolution for FY09.

Campion reported that the purple line items are line items public universities and land grants are looking at. FY07-FY08. Campion reviewed the numbers. These are the ones in FY09. He is uncertain whether they will change but will be close to what it was in FY09. Chart shows appropriations for FY07 & 09.

The Appropriations Request will be the sheet from which PILD participants will work when in Washington as the topic will relate to the FY10 budget. Campion indicated the four over-arching priorities listed on the FY2010 ag appropriations handout are the four issues legislature should consider. He suggested setting 3-4 priority items for those visiting the Hill. Suggestion was made to keep the top items at the top.

After group discussion, the recommendation was made by Tanesha Pittman to use the following initiatives: Smith Lever 3(b)-(c), CYFAR and EFNEP. Campion accepted the recommendation realizing that additional items could be discussed as needed.

**Travel Arrangements**

- Marilyn Brengle asked the group to take out the Travel Regulations and shared with the group the guidelines for reimbursement.

Marilyn mentioned the group would meet together first thing Monday morning at 8:00 a.m. for 45 minutes.

**Discussion/Election of Chairman**

Karen Hawthorne shared a message from Jackie Eddleman. She conveyed that her husband still has undiagnosed health conditions. He is continuing to see several doctors. She is always thinking about Extension and wishing us well.

Campion reported that Glenn Seeber’s wife passed away to cancer. Cards/notes were sent to Rose and Glenn on behalf of ESAC.

It was reported that Ryan Hobson sent his regrets for not meeting with the group. He is assisting in the southern regional director search and hoping to have someone identified soon. Campion reported the close on the 4-H Director position. Interviews have been completed and feedback is being received. He is hopeful to have an individual appointed soon.

Campion reported on field office staff. He mentioned that after looking at several ways of doing business, progress isn’t been seen as related to the budget reduction. In March he visited with each region in terms of accountability. 25% of CBM has been received. Money is continuing to trickle in. Frustration is sensed on the entire staff regardless of
level. We need to plan for rescission in the upcoming years and we may not get full funding. Uof I conversations are on tuition driven programs verses non tuition driven programs. A 10% reduction indicates we do not have the capacity to carry all programs as we’ve done in the past. It is not anticipated that the College will get out of any programmatic area. It is being looked at as to how resources are distributed. Team discussions are different than individual discussions. Have to be sure equal opportunity is given to everyone to be able to apply for the other positions. This will remain to be the case until the Governor’s budget determinations are made. Internal rescissions are sometime more difficult than the other.

Campion reported good news in that more payment has been received on CBM.

Brian Basting inquired what role ESAC will have and if there is any role they can play in assisting. Campion responded that he is uncertain at this point what we are fighting and the priorities determined by the Governor.

The question was raised as to whether it seemed reasonable for ESAC to do the same within the state as they do in Washington. Currently they present informally but would it be beneficial to do on a more formal level. Campion responded that Extension Partners are the contact at the State level. They are there fighting for Extension. Elden Niemeyer encouraged them to become members of Extension Partners if they were not as membership helps pay for the lobbyist (fighter for Extension). The more groups we can have at the local level, the better. Members were encouraged to say thank you to legislators and to simply touch base with them. Something trivial may gain points down the road. Members were encouraged to view the Extension Partners website for additional details. Membership fee $20/year – going up July 1. They do hire Pam Weber who is the eyes and ears in Springfield. www.extensionpartners.org

Campion reported that the amount appropriated is 85%. Directive from the Governor to IDOA was to hold in reserve 3%. Functionally 82% if we receive all money appropriated. To date we have received a little less than one-half

Elden Niemeyer inquired about Ag Legislative day for 4H where kids did exhibits and were given the opportunity to meet with legislators. Campion indicated that this next year there is not a plan for that activity.

Karen Hawthorne inquired if other revenue enhancing efforts are being made and what is the status and efforts implemented. Campion responded counties/units have been encouraged to increase revenue streams, a target, goal. John Horton worked with them on in-out and it is in place. Approximately 23% to that 10% goal. This began on July 1. He is uncertain what happened before as we didn’t have the tracking. Will represent about $3 million coming in on the way they manage their programs. Mostly program fees. Some received significant increase in their CBM. Those that haven’t shown any activity are cause for concern and those need to be looked at.
Inquiry was made about the $20 4-H fee – what is the status? Campion indicated it is getting closer with September enrollment. The outcome will be different based upon individual communities. Some communities can pay, some cannot. Campion is hopeful that it will be a learning opportunity. The 4-H office is putting together marketing materials for that. Sponsorship has been sought. Marilyn Brengle reported that most units who implemented a fee did have a family plan. There will be several ways of sustainable revenue to sustain the program in counties.

Karen Hawthorne inquired about college fundraising efforts and if there are any significant new efforts to acquire donations? Campion responded that there is a University campaign ($174M College of ACES) – 65% at this time. He mentioned that the Development office has not had an initiative to include Extension. There are now materials that have Extension listed in it. Angie Barnhard is focused on 4-H. Foundation efforts are generally on teaching/research. We will be better served in investing in Louise’s office (ACES Advancement) an Extension person but that is not something on the screen at this time. At one point two people suggested – one at the local level who works with counties (Campion suggested should be county funded) but there wasn’t support for it. The other would be statewide (programmatic level). The funding isn’t there for that right now.

**Election of Chairperson**

The recommendation was made that since membership is 3-year terms that someone with 2 years remaining be selected, the first year to serve and the second to assist the new chairperson. Recommendation was made for Brian Basting. Brian agreed to serve in this capacity. All approved.

It was announced that Julie Pangrac and John Sutton would be completing their terms in the fall.

Campion thanked all for their assistance, help and advice. He welcomed Regina back.

Meeting adjourned and members enjoyed lunch together.