

SPIT – November 13, 2008

In attendance: Charlene B., Jim G., Amy O., Julia P., Charlie F., Mike K., Darrel C., Lisa T.

Jim provided a budget update. We're going to experience some tough fiscal times, with increased costs (salary increases last year) and reduced revenue (though less grant dollars, etc.). Although we have reserves, because the university as a whole needed to dip into reserves over the maximum allowable – and Extension was fairly conservative in our use of reserves, choosing instead to keep some positions open for a period of time to save money.

John has formed a budget reduction committee (Hugh is chairing) to make recommendations to John on how to go about addressing future budget cuts.

Staff in county visits are saying they are concerned about spending money on significant issues when we are going into rough budget times. SPIT needs to make a recommendation regarding funding for significant issues in the next two years.

We brainstormed ideas for rewarding and encouraging significant issue work -- that may not mean allocating \$100,000 toward RFP:

- Fund professional development
- Allow staff release time
- Provide bonuses for getting grants - i.e. a percentage of the indirect cost as a bonus
  - Need to consider how a county educator might be rewarded for supporting a grant that a specialist brings in
- Shouldn't forget the grassroots way to go – that is if a group of specialists see an important issue they think they could work together on – they will likely make it happen. Many already have some money in internally designated funds, endowments, or indirect cost recovery – if they get together and pool money, then we could have enough to do some things.
  - Think of ways to get specialists to do this?
- Perhaps alter the RFP to indicate we're providing seed grants – with the expectation that all funded projects bring in additional grant dollars.

If we (as SPIT) recommend to move forward with \$100,000 toward 2009 RFP, pending Provost approval, will the L Team support it? We discussed recommending a lesser amount than \$100,000 as well.

After considerable discussion, we decided we didn't think the organization should simply do nothing, but just wait and see and become stagnant in our programming. Knowing that we're moving into more tight budget times, it's VERY important to help staff practice and be successful at getting grants. The RFP process will not only show our

public value (that we're truly addressing important issues) but also help our staff to be more successful in being entrepreneurial in the future. We would like to share some of the successes – i.e. outcomes, of the already funded projects as well.

Three *cross-cutting* themes we drew from the list, as well as what specialists came up with:

- Energy
- Socio/economic issues
- Land use and community design
- (later, through email exchange, the list was expanded to include Healthy youth, families, and communities)

We decided we didn't need to create a matrix after all, but we do need a thorough write-up of each key issue prior to an RFP being released in January.

L-team meeting next Wed:

- Remind of process (for those not on SPIT)
- Justification – even though we know we're coming into tough fiscal times – we are being fiscally responsible, but we need to move forward with this, with understanding that decisions regarding budget might change in the future. Remind them that we have already experienced good outcomes with previous issues.
- We also support being entrepreneurial and want to continue to encourage staff to find grants.
- Review list of ALL proposed Key Issues (sent to them ahead of time). Lisa will reorganize and send to the SPIT group prior to sharing with L-team.
- Strongly encourage all of these to be fully developed (if they aren't already) into key issue statements – prior to RFP. We also hope to share these with the UNH Foundation.

Public Value training in June – Can we work with George M to do this internally, instead of paying for Laura K to come? Yes. The next step is bringing those who really want to do this more in depth and write better public value statements. i.e. a staff member (preferably COA, a council member from each county, plus specialists who were interested).