

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [James Villa](#); [John Yingling](#)
Subject: Brief Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 12:22:00 PM

Jim and John,

How does this potential email to the Chancellors sound? Probably copy Mike Falbo and Regina.

Ray

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss that with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that “...this is shared governance.”

So what's next?

The “big three” want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a “work group” (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Jane Radue](#)
Subject: FW: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Wednesday, January 07, 2015 11:05:00 AM

Jane,

Could you share this with all Regents?

Thanks,

Ray

From: mjfalbo1@gmail.com [mailto:mjfalbo1@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 07, 2015 9:57 AM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: Re: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Ray
Maybe this should go to all Regents
Mike

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2015, at 2:57 PM, Raymond Cross <rcross@uwsa.edu> wrote:

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be

impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that "...this really is shared governance."

So what's next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a "work group" (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [James Villa](#); [John Yingling](#)
Subject: FW: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 4:29:00 PM

I thought you might find this interesting.

This effort seems to have opened the door to the concept of total autonomy for each campus, the elimination of the System with the concurrent creation of a "service center" (either regional or centrally operated), and, ironically, the request for the System to support (read financial help) with individual campus pursuits after it has virtually been eliminated. Incredible logic!! I find this most troubling!!! I thought Jim was a bit more thoughtful than this.

Furthermore, most chancellors don't understand that the UW Colleges have been centralized and their buildings have been or are being paid for by the counties which makes them extremely efficient compared to their respective campuses (the back offices have, for the most part been centralized). Additionally, they forget that Extension gets 40% of its salaries from the counties and most of its funding from the federal government!! The second or third largest recipient of federal dollars (UWM is slightly above or below Extension each year!!) in the System.

Most of this was input from his staff – not from Jim. He wouldn't know most of this! Frustrating perceptions out there!

Ray

From: Schmidt, James C. [mailto:JSCHMIDT@uwec.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 4:14 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Ray,

Here is some very **candid** thinking about our conversation yesterday.

I have consulted with my executive team and we want to express our support for your legislative plan to propose greater autonomy System-wide in exchange for a significant biennial budget reduction in 2015-17. We see great opportunity for the UW System and for UW-Eau Claire in addressing these challenges proactively and with a focus on improved effectiveness for our students.

A legislative agreement that would have the greatest impact and benefit for the entire State of Wisconsin should include the following components. We will work with you to advocate for these elements:

1. Locked-in baseline of state appropriation. We propose \$1 billion for the next 10 years, funded from State tax revenue. This offers the legislature the ability to control

the growth of government.

2. A tiered level of autonomy & accountability. This will enable those institutions who are able to manage with maximum flexibility to do so. The more autonomy granted, the greater accountability, as illustrated by the University of Virginia model.
3. Smaller, decentralized UW System with enhanced regional collaborations. To manage the transition, UW System will absorb a significant portion of the biennial budget cut, allowing campuses the space and time to reconfigure and integrate new flexibilities. UW System will no longer provide Academic and Student Affairs functions or legal services. We envision the potential for some services to be provided regionally, through campus coalitions, especially legal, audit, purchasing, IT, human resources, risk management, etc.
4. Two-year transition. Implementing the new flexibilities and making the budget adjustments will require a two-year transition period, at minimum.
5. Tuition authority. The UW System Board of Regents would have autonomy to set tuition levels (perhaps with a cap at a percentage over the inflation rate for undergraduate resident students). This includes flexibility to support differential tuition programs at the campus and/or program levels. We advocate for tuition levels set individually by campus and approved by the Regents.
6. Administrative autonomy. This would enable the UW System to oversee personnel and bonding authority for the campuses. We would encourage the ability to continue to do GPR bonding through the non-state agency process. Autonomy would entail the flexibility to work outside the current constraints of the Department of Administration.
7. Retirement and healthcare programs. We realize that maintaining access to the Wisconsin state retirement and healthcare programs will be important to current faculty and staff, however there may be opportunities for a comparable and more flexible healthcare program under System autonomy.
8. Extension and Colleges. Significant administrative savings can be gained by putting UW Extension under UW Madison and by assigning the 2-year colleges to relevant campuses as direct feeder campuses.
9. Shared Governance. We unreservedly support the role of shared governance and tenure at UW-Eau Claire and throughout the UW System and will advocate on its behalf. There are opportunities to explore moving this mandate from legislative action to Regent oversight.
10. Interest revenue retained. Tuition and program revenue fees will be retained and administered by the university, not the State.

Regardless of the outcomes of the current legislative discussions and the level of flexibility that we are granted, the anticipated budget reductions will have a significant impact on UW-Eau Claire and its future. We recognize that the reductions are inevitable and that employee layoffs will be necessary. To that end, we are taking steps now to address the implications of a significant budget reduction.

We ask for UW System support as UW-Eau Claire pursues the following initiatives:

- Comprehensive restructuring of student services functions into a single service center
- Campus-wide administrative process review and improvement designed to significantly enhance efficiencies
- Regional partnerships with UW-River Falls and UW-Stout (with potential partnerships with UW-Superior as well) around shared services that include: IT, HR, Purchasing, Risk Management, Auditing, Accounting and Library services
- Programmatic prioritization with the goal of streamlining the curriculum, identifying and implementing high-growth programs and enhancing enrollment
- Identifying and implementing academic collaborations with regional partners, including transfer agreements, shared programs, etc.

Jim

From: Raymond Cross [<mailto:rcross@uwsa.edu>]

Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 3:58 PM

To: Chancellors

Cc: James Villa; Mike Falbo; Regina Millner

Subject: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that "...this really is shared governance."

So what's next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a "work group" (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Tomas Stafford](#)
Subject: FW: My notes for both meetings tomorrow
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 8:37:00 AM
Attachments: [Notes for Monday Meeting with the Chancellors.docx](#)
[Notes for Monday Meeting with the Faculty Reps.docx](#)

Tom,

I forgot to include you on this – sorry about that!!

Ray

From: Raymond Cross
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 4:30 PM
To: James Villa; Jessica Tormey; John Yingling; Nicholas Probst; Jeff Buhrandt; David Ward; David Miller; Jane Radue
Subject: My notes for both meetings tomorrow

If you have some thoughts, please send them along or see me early tomorrow morning!!

Thanks much everyone -- we have done the best we could while keeping the long term viability of the university in mind!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Chancellors](#)
Cc: [James Villa](#); [Mike Falbo](#); [Regina Millner](#)
Bcc: [John Yingling](#); [Jessica Tormey](#)
Subject: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 3:57:00 PM

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that “...this really is shared governance.”

So what’s next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a “work group” (or

perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [James Villa](#); [Jessica Tormey](#); [John Yingling](#); [Nicholas Probst](#); [Jeff Buhrandt](#); [David Ward](#); [David Miller](#); [Jane Radue](#)
Subject: My notes for both meetings tomorrow
Date: Sunday, January 04, 2015 4:30:10 PM
Attachments: [Notes for Monday Meeting with the Chancellors.docx](#)
[Notes for Monday Meeting with the Faculty Reps.docx](#)

If you have some thoughts, please send them along or see me early tomorrow morning!!

Thanks much everyone -- we have done the best we could while keeping the long term viability of the university in mind!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Dennis Shields](#)
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 5:11:00 PM

Thanks Dennis – I like your questions, comments, and ideas!! Don't go silent on me now!!

Thanks much!!

Ray

From: Dennis J Shields [mailto:shieldsd@uwplatt.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 5:07 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: Re: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Let me know of any way I can be helpful (which can include keeping my mouth shut---- Smile).

Dennis

From: Raymond Cross <rcross@uwsa.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 3:57 PM
To: Chancellors
Cc: James Villa; Mike Falbo; Regina Millner
Subject: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply

encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that "...this really is shared governance."

So what's next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a "work group" (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Mark Mone](#)
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 7:11:00 PM

Thanks Mark – yes, please feel free to discuss this with your team as you see fit. Please know that any deal or potential agreement could fall through at any moment. But, this is an opportunity to assume the offensive and we are putting a plan in front of the Gov and the Ldrs – in concept. Let's see what they can sell and agree to. We shall see.

This will not be easy and we will get consider push back from our faculty and staff; however, this is something we might not get a shot at for another 20-30 years.

Thanks Mark,

Ray

From: Mark A Mone [<mailto:mone@uwm.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 6:19 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Hi Ray:

Thanks so much for the follow up on this important topic. I wanted to catch you yesterday to apologize for my lateness. I was giving Jill updates as the delayed travel progressed (via Jackie)—an hour to go 10 miles on I-43 south alone and another 30 minutes to go 4 miles west---. This hasn't happened to me in decades and it won't happen again.

On the Faculty Rep side, you have received many positive comments for your inclusion and we are keeping the calm here. I met with our UC today and they are understandably concerned. May I share the next steps with our UC and administrative team?

Finally, given that we have the UWS strat planning team in place, that might be a good group to help convene with what is proposed or a variation on that. I'm happy to help, as needed.

Best,

Mark

Mark A. Mone, PhD
Chancellor
UW-Milwaukee

From: Raymond Cross [<mailto:rcross@uwsa.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 3:58 PM

To: Chancellors
Cc: James Villa; Mike Falbo; Regina Millner
Subject: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that “...this really is shared governance.”

So what's next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a “work group” (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Gary Miller](#)
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 4:09:00 PM

Thanks Gary – will do!!!

Ray

From: Miller, Gary [mailto:millerg@uwgb.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 4:03 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Thanks for your work on this Ray. Let me know if I can help.

gm

From: Raymond Cross [mailto:rcross@uwsa.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 3:58 PM
To: Chancellors
Cc: James Villa; Mike Falbo; Regina Millner
Subject: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that "...this really is shared governance."

So what's next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a "work group" (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for you counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Patterson, Bernie](#)
Subject: RE: Meeting on Jan 5
Date: Monday, December 29, 2014 2:26:00 PM

That had to be a wonderful Christmas!!!!

Congratulations!

Ray

From: Patterson, Bernie [<mailto:Bernie.Patterson@uwsp.edu>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 2:09 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: RE: Meeting on Jan 5

I understand—no problem—I have already sent my RSVP to Jill.

Made it to Oklahoma city last week to spend Christmas with my five month old granddaughter—my first grandchild!!! I am expecting everyone to look at baby pictures and lots of them.

bernie

From: Raymond Cross [<mailto:rcross@uwsa.edu>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:43 PM
To: Patterson, Bernie
Subject: RE: Meeting on Jan 5

Thanks Bernie. We thought about locating this elsewhere; however, we intend to meet with the Faculty Reps in the afternoon so that would further complicate arrangements.

I understand and appreciate the traveling concerns; however, this is REALLY important, otherwise I wouldn't have requested a "face-to-face" meeting.

Hope you and your family had a wonderful Christmas!

Thanks Bernie,

Ray

From: Patterson, Bernie [<mailto:Bernie.Patterson@uwsp.edu>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: Meeting on Jan 5

Ray,

We have received word of the meeting at System on January 5. This poses no problem for me and I plan to be there unless we have a significant weather event. I am thinking, however, of our colleagues across the state who have a much longer drive than I do, some on two lane highways. Just wanted you to know we are always happy to host a meeting at Point. UWSP and UWMC are likely the two most centrally located campus in the system. Just a thought—see you on the 5th.

bernie

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Patterson, Bernie](#)
Subject: RE: Meeting on Jan 5
Date: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:42:00 PM

Thanks Bernie. We thought about locating this elsewhere; however, we intend to meet with the Faculty Reps in the afternoon so that would further complicate arrangements.

I understand and appreciate the traveling concerns; however, this is REALLY important, otherwise I wouldn't have requested a "face-to-face" meeting.

Hope you and your family had a wonderful Christmas!

Thanks Bernie,

Ray

From: Patterson, Bernie [mailto:Bernie.Patterson@uwsp.edu]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: Meeting on Jan 5

Ray,

We have received word of the meeting at System on January 5. This poses no problem for me and I plan to be there unless we have a significant weather event. I am thinking, however, of our colleagues across the state who have a much longer drive than I do, some on two lane highways. Just wanted you to know we are always happy to host a meeting at Point. UWSP and UWMC are likely the two most centrally located campus in the system. Just a thought—see you on the 5th.

bernie

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [David Ward](#)
Subject: RE: My notes for both meetings tomorrow
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 8:23:00 AM

Thanks David, I think that is good advice!

Ray

From: David Ward
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 8:22 AM
To: Raymond Cross
Subject: RE: My notes for both meetings tomorrow

Ray,

I would eliminate point 3(e) under the section on state budget projections. Sounds defensive and you make the point in other parts of the outline.

Otherwise I think this is a good approach.

Also support Jane Radue's comments.

dave

From: Raymond Cross
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 4:30 PM
To: James Villa; Jessica Tormey; John Yingling; Nicholas Probst; Jeff Buhrandt; David Ward; David Miller; Jane Radue
Subject: My notes for both meetings tomorrow

If you have some thoughts, please send them along or see me early tomorrow morning!!

Thanks much everyone -- we have done the best we could while keeping the long term viability of the university in mind!

Ray

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Rebecca Blank](#)
Subject: Re: Conversation
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 9:50:50 PM

Becky,

I want to chat with you as well -- do you have time tomorrow morning?

Ray

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 5, 2015, at 7:01 PM, Rebecca Blank <rblank@chancellor.wisc.edu> wrote:

Ray -- hope all your mtgs today went well. We'll see what pops out publicly by tomorrow morning. I have my faculty exec comm committed to letting negotiations move forward without public outcry, but I don't know if they contain certain elements of the faculty.

Any chance we could talk briefly tonight or tomorrow? I wanted to pass along a couple of thoughts about some of your items under negotiation. If tonight call me at [REDACTED], tomorrow I'll be in the ofc all day.

Becky

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Rebecca Blank](#)
Bcc: [Jill Mueller](#)
Subject: Re: Conversation
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 6:41:54 AM

Let's try 8:00 -- I'll call you Becky.

Thanks,

Ray

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 6, 2015, at 5:52 AM, Rebecca Blank <rblank@chancellor.wisc.edu> wrote:

Ray -- if you're in around 8 or 8:15, I'm available. Otherwise I'll have Mary call your office and set something up later in the morning.

B

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

Raymond Cross <rcross@uwsa.edu> wrote:

Becky,

I want to chat with you as well -- do you have time tomorrow morning?

Ray

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 5, 2015, at 7:01 PM, Rebecca Blank <rblank@chancellor.wisc.edu> wrote:

Ray -- hope all your mtgs today went well. We'll see what pops out publicly by tomorrow morning. I have my faculty exec comm committed to letting negotiations move forward without public outcry, but I don't know if they contain certain elements of the faculty.

Any chance we could talk briefly tonight or tomorrow? I wanted to pass along a couple of thoughts about some of your items under negotiation. If tonight call me at [REDACTED], tomorrow I'll be in the ofc all day.

Becky

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

From: [Raymond Cross](#)
To: [Jane Radue](#)
Cc: [James Villa](#); [Jessica Tormey](#); [John Yingling](#); [Nicholas Probst](#); [Jeff Buhrandt](#); [David Ward](#); [David Miller](#)
Subject: Re: My notes for both meetings tomorrow
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 6:36:36 AM

Thanks Jane, good counsel!

Ray

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 4, 2015, at 11:37 PM, Jane Radue <jradue@uwsa.edu> wrote:

Hi Ray.

I think your notes provide important background and accurately reflect what was discussed on Friday. A couple of possible additions:

(1) Would you want to mention to the chancellors (if not at the outset, then before the conversation is over) that the reps also have been invited to have a conversation with you, and explain why? Maybe chancellors already know about the afternoon meeting -- I didn't see whatever correspondence was sent - - but if not, it would be good to give the chancellors a heads up.

(2) The reps will undoubtedly be anxious to understand why they're being consulted about the budget by the President at special meeting -- my guess is it's unprecedented. Would you want to say something about your commitment to working throughout the budget process to retain the components of Chapter 36 that are of such high value to faculty and staff (or whatever you would feel comfortable saying)?

Not related to your notes -- but one other thought for tonight: Should there be a plan to update other cabinet members at some point? They'll probably hear about the two Monday meetings, one way or another.

Thanks for the opportunity to preview your notes.

--Jane

From: Raymond Cross

Sent: Sunday, January 4, 2015 4:30 PM

To: James Villa; Jessica Tormey; John Yingling; Nicholas Probst; Jeff Buhrandt; David Ward; David Miller; Jane Radue

Subject: My notes for both meetings tomorrow

If you have some thoughts, please send them along or see me early tomorrow morning!!

Thanks much everyone -- we have done the best we could while keeping the long term viability of the university in mind!

Ray

From: [David Ward](#)
To: [Raymond Cross](#)
Subject: RE: My notes for both meetings tomorrow
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 8:22:07 AM

Ray,

I would eliminate point 3(e) under the section on state budget projections. Sounds defensive and you make the point in other parts of the outline.

Otherwise I think this is a good approach.

Also support Jane Radue's comments.

dave

From: Raymond Cross
Sent: Sunday, January 04, 2015 4:30 PM
To: James Villa; Jessica Tormey; John Yingling; Nicholas Probst; Jeff Buhrandt; David Ward; David Miller; Jane Radue
Subject: My notes for both meetings tomorrow

If you have some thoughts, please send them along or see me early tomorrow morning!!

Thanks much everyone -- we have done the best we could while keeping the long term viability of the university in mind!

Ray

From: [Jane Radue](#)
To: [Raymond Cross](#)
Cc: [James Villa](#); [Jessica Tormey](#); [John Yingling](#); [Nicholas Probst](#); [Jeff Buhrandt](#); [David Ward](#); [David Miller](#)
Subject: Re: My notes for both meetings tomorrow
Date: Sunday, January 04, 2015 11:37:11 PM

Hi Ray.

I think your notes provide important background and accurately reflect what was discussed on Friday. A couple of possible additions:

(1) Would you want to mention to the chancellors (if not at the outset, then before the conversation is over) that the reps also have been invited to have a conversation with you, and explain why? Maybe chancellors already know about the afternoon meeting -- I didn't see whatever correspondence was sent -- but if not, it would be good to give the chancellors a heads up.

(2) The reps will undoubtedly be anxious to understand why they're being consulted about the budget by the President at special meeting -- my guess is it's unprecedented. Would you want to say something about your commitment to working throughout the budget process to retain the components of Chapter 36 that are of such high value to faculty and staff (or whatever you would feel comfortable saying)?

Not related to your notes -- but one other thought for tonight: Should there be a plan to update other cabinet members at some point? They'll probably hear about the two Monday meetings, one way or another.

Thanks for the opportunity to preview your notes.

--Jane

From: Raymond Cross
Sent: Sunday, January 4, 2015 4:30 PM
To: James Villa; Jessica Tormey; John Yingling; Nicholas Probst; Jeff Buhrandt; David Ward; David Miller; Jane Radue
Subject: My notes for both meetings tomorrow

If you have some thoughts, please send them along or see me early tomorrow morning!!

Thanks much everyone -- we have done the best we could while keeping the long term viability of the university in mind!

Ray

From: [Rebecca Blank](#)
To: [Raymond Cross](#)
Subject: Conversation
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 7:01:55 PM

Ray -- hope all your mtgs today went well. We'll see what pops out publicly by tomorrow morning. I have my faculty exec comm committed to letting negotiations move forward without public outcry, but I don't know if they contain certain elements of the faculty.

Any chance we could talk briefly tonight or tomorrow? I wanted to pass along a couple of thoughts about some of your items under negotiation. If tonight call me at [REDACTED] tomorrow I'll be in the ofc all day.

Becky

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE DROID

From: [Rebecca Blank](#)
To: [Raymond Cross](#)
Subject: FYI
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 11:19:36 AM

Just talked with DB. I will allow him to work closely with you on one condition: involve him in your negotiations/discussions immediately! I talked thru the 14 points with him...he asked a set of very astute questions that I can't answer, but which need to be considered. It would be good to have his expertise ... he has knowledge the others on your team don't. I realize this might cause awkwardness with other staff, but this is too important.

(Ok, I want him working with you on this if it moves forward, regardless of conditions. But you really need someone with detailed financial/budget knowledge as part of your team.)

On another issue: I said "float on tuition only is fine." Realize I should have said "Float also on research dollars." Foolish for us to get Fed'l dollars, hold them for a year before expending, and have no gains from it.

Becky

Rebecca M. Blank
Chancellor, University of Wisconsin - Madison
161 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-9946

From: [Rebecca Blank](#)
To: [Raymond Cross](#)
Subject: Following up
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 5:43:36 PM

Ray – We discussed the ‘flexibilities at Madison’ issue earlier today. I’d very much like to follow up with you on that one.

To be blunt, there are a few lines in the sand that I think I have to draw in order to support any agreement.

I know you’ve had a long day. Let me know when a good time to call you might be...or call me on my phone [REDACTED]

Thanks.

Becky

Rebecca M. Blank
Chancellor, University of Wisconsin - Madison
161 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-9946

From: [Schmidt, James C.](#)
To: [Raymond Cross](#)
Subject: RE: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting
Date: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 4:14:20 PM

Ray,

Here is some very **candid** thinking about our conversation yesterday.

I have consulted with my executive team and we want to express our support for your legislative plan to propose greater autonomy System-wide in exchange for a significant biennial budget reduction in 2015-17. We see great opportunity for the UW System and for UW-Eau Claire in addressing these challenges proactively and with a focus on improved effectiveness for our students.

A legislative agreement that would have the greatest impact and benefit for the entire State of Wisconsin should include the following components. We will work with you to advocate for these elements:

1. Locked-in baseline of state appropriation. We propose \$1 billion for the next 10 years, funded from State tax revenue. This offers the legislature the ability to control the growth of government.
2. A tiered level of autonomy & accountability. This will enable those institutions who are able to manage with maximum flexibility to do so. The more autonomy granted, the greater accountability, as illustrated by the University of Virginia model.
3. Smaller, decentralized UW System with enhanced regional collaborations. To manage the transition, UW System will absorb a significant portion of the biennial budget cut, allowing campuses the space and time to reconfigure and integrate new flexibilities. UW System will no longer provide Academic and Student Affairs functions or legal services. We envision the potential for some services to be provided regionally, through campus coalitions, especially legal, audit, purchasing, IT, human resources, risk management, etc.
4. Two-year transition. Implementing the new flexibilities and making the budget adjustments will require a two-year transition period, at minimum.
5. Tuition authority. The UW System Board of Regents would have autonomy to set tuition levels (perhaps with a cap at a percentage over the inflation rate for undergraduate resident students). This includes flexibility to support differential tuition programs at the campus and/or program levels. We advocate for tuition levels set individually by campus and approved by the Regents.
6. Administrative autonomy. This would enable the UW System to oversee personnel and bonding authority for the campuses. We would encourage the ability to continue to do GPR bonding through the non-state agency process. Autonomy would entail the flexibility to work outside the current constraints of the Department of

Administration.

7. Retirement and healthcare programs. We realize that maintaining access to the Wisconsin state retirement and healthcare programs will be important to current faculty and staff, however there may be opportunities for a comparable and more flexible healthcare program under System autonomy.
8. Extension and Colleges. Significant administrative savings can be gained by putting UW Extension under UW Madison and by assigning the 2-year colleges to relevant campuses as direct feeder campuses.
9. Shared Governance. We unreservedly support the role of shared governance and tenure at UW-Eau Claire and throughout the UW System and will advocate on its behalf. There are opportunities to explore moving this mandate from legislative action to Regent oversight.
10. Interest revenue retained. Tuition and program revenue fees will be retained and administered by the university, not the State.

Regardless of the outcomes of the current legislative discussions and the level of flexibility that we are granted, the anticipated budget reductions will have a significant impact on UW-Eau Claire and its future. We recognize that the reductions are inevitable and that employee layoffs will be necessary. To that end, we are taking steps now to address the implications of a significant budget reduction.

We ask for UW System support as UW-Eau Claire pursues the following initiatives:

- Comprehensive restructuring of student services functions into a single service center
- Campus-wide administrative process review and improvement designed to significantly enhance efficiencies
- Regional partnerships with UW-River Falls and UW-Stout (with potential partnerships with UW-Superior as well) around shared services that include: IT, HR, Purchasing, Risk Management, Auditing, Accounting and Library services
- Programmatic prioritization with the goal of streamlining the curriculum, identifying and implementing high-growth programs and enhancing enrollment
- Identifying and implementing academic collaborations with regional partners, including transfer agreements, shared programs, etc.

Jim

From: Raymond Cross [mailto:rcross@uwsa.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, January 06, 2015 3:58 PM

To: Chancellors

Cc: James Villa; Mike Falbo; Regina Millner

Subject: Follow-up to Yesterday's Meeting

Greetings!

Thanks for coming to Madison yesterday – it was a long, cold drive and I certainly appreciate your willingness to provide counsel, advice, and insight. I do apologize for having to exit so quickly. I would have preferred to remain engaged in our conversation much longer.

The meeting with the Faculty Reps went very well. We focused on the “risks” associated with shared governance and tenure being in existing state statutes. I also explained that I no longer felt that we could preserve these critically important values as codified in law. We risk having them re-written by non-academics within the legislature and that risk has been elevated in recent weeks. I told them that I would be supportive, as would Board leadership, of bringing existing language (and practice for that matter) into future Board policy.

Considerable discussion followed. It was engaging, positive, and supportive. They supported the concept of securing a “DEAL” going into the budget as a method of avoiding the “potential” alternative – legislative action.

I asked them to do their best to keep this confidential while negotiations were taking place (at least for another week). However, I told them that I knew that would be impossible so I simply encouraged them to be prudent about what they shared for the next week or so. They seemed very willing to do just that.

I also told them that we were discussing budget cuts and significant flexibilities; however, I advised them to discuss those matters with their respective Chancellors.

At the end of the meeting they expressed appreciation for being brought into the discussion at this juncture and for the opportunity to provide counsel. One individual noted that “...this really is shared governance.”

So what’s next?

The Governor, the Speaker and the Majority Leader want more details What will this look like, what does this mean, etc.?

A meeting to discuss the conceptual framework of the questions and issues surrounding this matter has been scheduled with the budget office, DOA, et. al. tomorrow. This has been scheduled for quite some time. This meeting should help us determine if a future deal is even possible.

After tomorrow, if we believe a deal is possible, we will be pulling together a “work group” (or perhaps several) to develop the details of the deal we wish to propose.

I will do my best to keep you updated on a regular basis.

Again, thanks so much for your counsel, your encouragement and your patience. I appreciate that very much!

Ray