

Master Plan Town Hall Meeting  
132 Townsend Hall  
May 28, 2013  
2:00-4:00 p.m.

Minutes

Agenda: Cooperative Extension and Research

Dean Rieger opened the meeting at 2:10 with a welcome to the third and final master plan session.

Cooperative Extension – Michelle Rodgers

Michelle shared this presentation as well with the Advisory Board members and administrative team. She focused on strategy planning and funding. There is a new Extension national marketing campaign in place nationwide with new branding that every State is requested to use. In 2014, Cooperative Extension celebrates 100 years of the Smith-Lever Act. Extension has developed a logic model by identifying inputs and measureable outcomes for the Plan of Work. She discussed the areas of Extension that comprise the Plan of Work. This work is in conjunction with Delaware State University. Michelle then discussed funding sources for Extension.

Clicker question #1 asked which is the largest funding source. The poll showed that most chose grants, which is the correct answer. The funding source in order of percentage is Grants and contracts, Federal, State, Local funds. Most State and Federal funds support personnel. Besides federal, state, local, and grant funding, RBB is another source of funding, which primarily supports faculty, and some gift accounts, that are largely used for operations. Federal sequestration 2013 was 7.6%, which totaled over \$100,000. There was a State budget reduction of 15% two years ago. Despite this, salary and benefits were increased, and there will be a 1.9% increase in salaries in FY14.

Staffing for Extension includes about 24 FTE in agriculture, 15 FTE in 4-H Youth development and 5 in Family and Consumer Sciences.

Clicker question #2 asked where are the largest number of staff funded? The correct answer is 4-H; 54% are on leveraged funds, followed by FCS with 43% on grants and 18% on grants in Agriculture. In planning for a sustainable funding model, Michelle stated that we must reflect the will of the client, collaborative innovation, technology, system level thinking, and new approaches. She also stated that the College is taking a look at cost recovery in Extension and examining areas where we could recover some of the costs. She presented examples. Michelle also mentioned county funding, gift/development plan and greater inclusion of salary on contracts and grants.

Clicker question #3 asked which one of the cost recovery generating ideas should take priority? The poll result indicated that the audience thought that cost recover and a development plan focused on program and personnel were equal priority areas. Michelle opened the floor for discussion. Doug Tallamy stated that marketing is important with cost recovery so that people would understand why there are no charges for some services, and in particular, that tax dollars do not cover all expenses. Joanne Whalen mentioned that distinguishing between private vs. public services might be a challenging issue. Jenny McDermott asked about balancing cost recovery with the land grant philosophy of meeting people's needs. Michelle replied that will have to be a factor in exploring this issue. Sherry Kitto asked how this would affect volunteers who are asked to assist with a program. Sue Snider asked about a system to take advantage of gift opportunities from foundations. Michelle explained that all these areas have potential, but we need to expand our portfolio in new ways and she asked the audience for their participation as we move forward.

#### Research – Janine Sherrier

Janine stated that the research in the College is mission driven and determined in large part by the research interest of the group leader. She presented a slide of research expenditures.

Clicker question #1 asked what the audience thought was the largest cost. The participants responded personnel time. Personnel time is the correct answer. Janine continued to say that 75% of funds come from Hatch support and hatch multistate funds (25%). Hatch was established for the purpose of food security and Delaware received 90,000 acres for an experiment station, and at this time UD became of Land-grant University. Janine continued with other examples of funding sources. A question arose about funds being captured and how open are these funds. Janine answered that some funds are committed while others are not. She explained that these are all formula (capacity) funds with accountability. Michelle explained the difference between capacity funds and competitive funds.

Clicker question #2 asked that for my research, UD should pay for everything, facilities and utilities, use of shared facilities, or graduate studentships. The participants chose facilities and utilities.

Clicker question #3 asked what percentage is a reasonable F&A rate for research. The participants chose 20%. Janine presented a slide that depicted the different F&A rates for research between Federal, State, and Industry funds. The rates ranged from 23.3% to 41%. She described the differences and asked the faculty to keep good account of where these funds are allocated. She continued by sharing where overhead funds were spent and explained RBB and how the College receives these funds based on teaching hours (75%); approximately 25% is distributed by research spending. She stated that grant money is included in F&A costs, but gift funds are not.

Clicker question #3 asked which was most helpful for your research program. The audience chose studentships. A question arose about rules that would determine how this money would be spent,

i.e., would faculty be involved in the way the funds are distributed? Janine explained that the chairperson of each department determines how these funds are distributed. A question arose about the effect on teaching just CANR students vs. students from other colleges would have on these funds. Janine stated that the funds are based on the number of students who are enrolled in classes in our college. Katie Hutton added that a certain percentage is based on who the instructor is teaching the course. Limin Kung expressed concern about courses that were maxed out. Katie Hutton suggested that faculty consider collaborations with other colleges for the same course. Janine Sherrier reiterated the importance of teaching courses under CANR, but also commented that compared to other colleges and considering the colleges' size, that the faculty in CANR are doing a great job! She encouraged everyone to consider making plans to travel with the dean throughout the State.

The Master Plan meeting today was recorded and can be view at:

<http://udel.adobeconnect.com/townhall/>.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cathy Kinney