

Draft
Buffalo County Minutes

Committee/Board: Agriculture and Extension Education Committee

Date of Meeting: December 19, 2018

Electronic and Hardcopy Filing Date January 3, 2019

Call to order: Meeting called to order at 6:18pm by Chair Don Black.

Members present: Don Black, Nettie Rosenow, Jon Seipel

Others present: Sonya Hansen, Carl Duley, Annie Lisowski, Roxane Weisenbeck, and Pat Malone

Public Comments regarding Agenda Items: None

Review/Discussion/Action – Minutes of November 7, 2018, meeting:

Motion by Rosenow/Black to accept minutes of the November 7, 2018 meeting as printed. Carried

Review/Discussion/Action – Changes and the evolution of the financing of the county partnership. How has the UW-Extension Reorganization impacted the partnership?

Malone made a presentation that discussed the evolution of the financial relationship between the county and the state for UW-Extension services. The summary and a chart that discusses the changes are on file.

Review/Discussion/Action – 2nd Invoice from UW-Extension: Second invoice for UW-Extension services was discussed. Motion by Seipel/Black to reduce the LTE cost on the bill by \$2200.00. The motion carried. This information will be shared back with the university and the revised bill will be sent to the county for payment.

Review/Discussion/Action – Lisowski's civil rights backfill in 2019: Lisowski discussed her responsibilities under her civil rights buyout. It includes educating staff on our obligations associated with Federal and state civil rights. She also conducts civil rights reviews in other county offices. She would like to continue with this role.

Review/Discussion/Action – Alternatives for providing 4-H program support: 4-H options were discussed. They would like the AED to ask Chad and Brian if there is any way to adjust the numbers through reconciliation. They feel strongly that the county must receive eight hours per week from the Ruff position for 4-H backfill for civil rights. The chart outlining the options is on file. The committee agreed on option 2 for 2019. The committee's long-term goal is to move towards a 4-H program coordinator (option 3). The committee directs the staff to take the actions necessary to move this plan forward.

Review/Discussion/Action – 2019 136 Contract with UW-Extension: Motion by Seipel/Black to approve the 2019 136 contract with 4-H program support at \$16,796. Carried.

UW-Extension Educator Reports:

- a. Lisowski shared Wood's report with the committee. One highlight is that she is trying to add elements of entrepreneurship to the Reality Check program
- b. Lisowski shared information on the work her coalition is doing on their KNOW METH campaign. Their work is funded by a small grant the coalition received. They are distributing these materials broadly.
- c. Duley provided a brief update on future hemp plot work. He highlighted his producer-led work group efforts. They are going to do a landowner education program on farmland rental and how to include conservation practices in the contract. He is working to get mailing lists to target for training programs.

Review/Discussion/Action – Establish next AEEC meeting date and identify future agenda items: The next meeting is set for February 2, 2019, at 6:00 p.m. They would like to meet every other month at 6 p.m.

Public Comments Not Relating to the Agenda: None

Adjournment: Meeting declared adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Submitted by:
Patricia Malone
Area Extension Director

The evolution of the county partnership with UW-extension – a brief overview.

Patricia L. Malone, Area Extension Director for Pepin, Buffalo, Trempealeau, and Jackson Counties

Introduction.

- UW-Extension continues to be a partnership between the Federal government through USDA, the State through the University, and county government.
- The organization has evolved over time to reflect changes that have occurred for the partners.
- Some key changes occurred with the Great Depression, World War II, Johnson's War on Poverty, and the creation of the UW-System.
→ These changes typically impact the financial relationship between the partners.

The 60/40 Partnership.

- Extends back many decades.
- Originally educators were employed by both the county and the state. We were considered employees of both. We received two paychecks and a mix of state and county benefits.
- The state moved to the "133 Contract."

The 133 Contract.

- About 1989, the state moved to a formal contract with counties signed every year.
- The contract identified programs and educators.
- "County" educators became 100% state employees.
- The cost to the county was 40% of the individual educator's salary and benefits. The state paid 60% of the salary and benefits. Each pay raise, promotion, and department head stipend was split 60/40.

Major Budget Cuts.

- Our share of the UW System cuts is \$3.6 million cut/year.
- Cooperative Extension undertakes major reorganization to meet new financial reality. Implementation begins in 2017. In late 2017, we are told that we will be merging with UW-Madison. We are still working through the implications associated with both of these changes.
- The new financial picture caps county staff numbers at ~220. We made most of the progress towards this number through attrition and a retirement incentive program.
- This did not lead to a strategic arrangement of staff throughout the state. As we move forward, we are trying to work with our partners and institutes to be more strategic in our workforce arrangement.

The 136 Contract.

- First contracts signed in 2017 to cover the 2018 fiscal year.
- It is an annual contract that follows the calendar year.
- The contract identifies 'services' to be provided to the county by the state.
- Individual educators are no longer identified by name.
- Counties are charged a "flat fee" for each type of service.
- The educators receive their regular salary and benefits.
- Currently the county pays a fee for professional development and receives a discount of \$10,000. The discount is not expected to continue past 2019.
- Counties do not share in the cost of individual raises or promotions; however, as the total costs increase, the flat fees will be adjusted.
- This is no longer a 60/40 split.

A Comparison of the 133 Contract and the 136 Contract

Responsibilities	133 Contract	136 Contract
Contract?	Yes – follows academic year. Signed annually.	Yes – follows calendar year. Signed annually prior to the start of the new year.
Who actually employs the educators?	The state. The county pays 40% of any given educator’s salary and benefits. State pays 60%.	The state. The county pays a flat fee depending on services.
Who pays for raises and promotions?	County and state share cost based on 60/40 split.	State pays for raises and promotions. Expect flat fees to rise over time to account for increased costs.
Who pays for local administration costs?	60/40 split for local department head.	State pays full costs of Area Extension Directors.
Who pays for support staff?	County	County
Who pays for facilities for county-based educators?	County	County
Who pays for supplies and travel?	County	County
Who pays for professional development?	Mixed – the amount provided by counties varied greatly. State can also provide professional development funds.	Counties contribute a set amount for professional development – included in contract. State can also provide professional development funds.
Who pays for FoodWise?	State through Federal grant.	State through Federal grant.
Who pays for technology support? This includes things like Wisline, Zoom, hot spots, computers, printers, and other items.	County and State – arrangements have changed over time as county capacity increased.	County and State
Who pays for communications and marketing efforts?	Mostly the state. Some counties invest money locally.	Mostly the state. Some counties may choose to invest money locally.
Who pays for Campus specialists and centers including facilities, travel, and supplies?	State	State
Who pays for access to the national land grant system?	State	State
Who identifies priority programming issues?	County and State. However, it has been a number of years since the state did a significant issue identification process. <i>Local educators are all expected to identify local issues particular to their programming area.</i>	County and State. <i>Local educators are all expected to identify local issues particular to their programming area.</i>
12/18/18. DRAFT. This chart is an initial effort to compare the old model (133 contracts) and the new contract system (136). It is just for discussion. Not general release.		

4-H Program Support Options for Buffalo County

Areas of Impact	Option 1.	Option 2.	Option 3.
	Continue 4-H Program Support Position through 136 contract.	Maintain 4-H Support Position with hours increased to 1040/year.	Hire a county-funded 4-H Program Coordinator position. The assumption is a 1.0 FTE split between Pepin and Buffalo Counties.
Total Estimated Cost Impact on Levy.	\$12,868 \$7868 (continues 2018 expense; remaining balance (\$5000) from Teen Court. This amount is currently in the budget.)	\$16,796.00. Assumes \$15/hour plus FICA. No additional levy required if Leaders' Board contributes \$4000. If they do not, it would require an additional \$4000.00 from levy.	\$34,400 (assumes salary of 44,000 plus PD + expenses/mileage.) Would need additional \$17,604.00.
Impact on State Type of Position Process	None 4-H Program Support Run it through 136 contract.	None 4-H Program Support Run through 136. Whatever steps needed to increase budget.	None. They cannot share cost because of budget limitations. 4-H Program Coordinator Run through 136. Whatever steps needed to increase budget.
Impact on program	At 797 hours, ~15 hours per week are available.	Buy an additional ~240 hours for a total of 20 hours per week. Many 4-H activities can be covered. No teaching can be provided.	Buy half-time position. Expected to cover most 4-H program management responsibilities.
Requirements to hire Additional considerations	Whatever county establishes. NA	Whatever county establishes. Not ideal, but takes us further down the road to a 4-H Program Coordinator position.	BS minimum, MS preferred. More costly, a longer term target. Could share position with Pepin County. That would require more negotiation and time. Will a half-time position be enough to support your 4-H program?
Assumptions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Do not use LTE position through county. Discussed with Ms. Hansen, and it does not meet the requirements (wage and purpose). Wage of current position holder stays at \$15.00/hour plus FICA for a total of \$16.15/hour. Assume a salary of \$44,000 for 4-H program coordinator multiplied by 1.45 for the benefits; \$250 for professional development (if shared); and between 2000 and 2250 for travel expenses. This could change if position is split. A 4-H Program Coordinator is a salaried position. It is difficult to say the exact number of hours, but it is safe to assume between 20 and 30 hours per week if position is split. The impact on the levy is dependent upon using Teen Court money and Leaders' Board support (\$9000 total) to defray the cost. 		

