

Citrus College Faculty Newsletter

A Forum for Faculty Voices and Thoughts

A Few Notes from the CCFA President, Jim Lancaster

So here it is; the return of the faculty newsletter. As I mentioned before, we wanted to make a few tweaks. Our newsletter is now a joint publication of the Academic Senate and CCFA. Our desire is to include information about working relations, bargaining, professional issues, academic issues, vocational issues, upcoming events, social activities, retirement, general campus activities and concerns, and so forth. It is another venue for you to share your thoughts with your colleagues. I strongly encourage you all to share your thoughts and voice. All Faculty, tenured or not, have the authority to submit an editorial for inclusion in our newsletter. Please remember not to use this medium as a means to wage personal attacks on a colleague or colleagues. This newsletter exists to

inform, help, and provoke questions not to destroy each other. Let me share just a few CCFA bullets.

1.) In article 19.2 of the Compressed Calendar MOU there is a provision for the CCFA negotiating team to meet with the district to discuss and make recommendations regarding the compressed calendar MOU. If you are aware of anything that has slipped through the cracks or was not addressed in the MOU and needs attention, please contact our Chief Negotiator, Dave Brown, with your concerns.

2.) We are looking for someone to serve as the ethnic minority liaison to CCA. This person would essentially become the



The door is open!

link to CCA and be responsible for the bi-directional communication of ethnic and minority matters between CCFA and CCA. Please let me know if you would like more information or are interested in serving our organization in this capacity.

(continued on page 3)

Thoughts from the Academic Senate President, Dana Hester

Dear Colleagues,

In contributing a first article to our revived faculty newsletter, I thought that it would be helpful to first talk about our empowerment. I wanted to then follow up with what is new for Citrus in two very important areas of primacy.

Warm regards,

Dana Hester

Academic Senate President

Self-evaluation: Accreditation and Program Review at Citrus College

How are we empowered?

Education Code grants academic senates of California community colleges the right to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards. Our local Board of Trustees has adopted a policy (P-1010)

and regulation (R-1010) to support this relationship. This is known as the 10 + 1 with the first 10 areas recognized as primary responsibilities:

1. Curriculum
2. Degree and Certificate Requirements
3. Grading Policies
4. Educational Program Development

Volume 1, Issue 1
November 2007

Soliciting future articles (500 words or less) on:

- *Improving Student Engagement in the classroom*
- *Navigating a Sabbatical*
- *Tackling Program Review*
- *Shifting to the Compressed Calendar*

Inside this issue:

Higher Education and the Corporate Model, by Terry Miles 2

Faculty Blurbs 3

Profitability, Productivity and Efficiency in the Non-Profit Community College, by Jim Lancaster 5

Soliciting your anecdotes! 6

Higher Education and the Corporate Model: A Treatise on Governance Structure at Citrus College, by Terry Miles

Once, not so long ago, there existed a group of faculty leaders on this campus collectively known as department chairs. Their duties included leadership, mentorship, evaluation of full and part-time faculty, stewardship of department curriculum, and a host of other endeavors designed to improve the instructional environment at Citrus College. In principle, the department chair still exists in select departments on campus. He/she is the one you turn to when you need assistance with understanding department policy, how to approach teaching a struggling class of students, or perhaps some advice on writing curriculum for a new course. They are the ones the members of your department rely on for leadership when challenges like those we are facing with SLO implementation occur. Believe it or not, department chairs still technically exist on paper too. A complete description of their terms of office, duties, appointment, and responsibilities are revealed in Board Policy 2440. The pay schedule for department chairs is outlined in Article 8.4 of our contract. You might ask why you don't have one of these mythical creatures in your department. In what follows answers to this and other questions concerning the issue of governance at Citrus will be addressed.

History of Governance

Prior to 1997 most departments at Citrus had department chairs. Sometime in the mid-1990s, a series of events led to the fateful decision to replace department chairs with "associate deans." Apparently, the Board of Trustees felt that a system of governance including department chairs was not functional and at the January 21, 1997 Board meeting decided to "throw the baby out with the bath water" and adopt a precursor to our current governance structure by the employment of two associate deans. To my knowledge, this is the only Board meeting where this topic was openly discussed amongst the Board members. This mandate led to the slow replacement of department chairs by associate deans over the course of the next several years.

It is interesting to note that of the three members of our current Board that were Board members at the time of this meeting, only Mr. Bevilacqua publicly opposed the replacement of department chairs by associate deans. His argument at the time was that the new system was "too complex, too difficult to maintain, and too expensive," (quote taken directly from

the Board minutes, p. 9). He further went on to state that he felt that the "organizational structure using department chairs is a better system." Unfortunately, Mr. Bevilacqua's wisdom was lost on Drs. Ortell and Woods, who are still members of our current Board as well. The vote went 4 in favor, 1 against (Bevilacqua) to approve the hiring of these associate deans. It is also unfortunate that Mr. Bevilacqua is serving his last term; he was truly a champion for the faculty.

The Associate Dean Structure may have been viewed by some as a better system than our current one. Each associate dean was required to teach a 40% load, and in doing so was very involved in departmental decision making concerning scheduling, curriculum, and other academic matters. The fact that they were still in contact with students as teachers probably gave them a better sense of the day-to-day department issues and some of the more recent challenges that we have had to endure as instructors. In short, the associate deans still had a better feeling for the "pulse" of the departments which they oversaw because they were still in the trenches with the rest of the faculty and had the advantage of a more global view of the direction of their areas as administrators.

This system of associate deans was replaced by the current Area Dean Structure, mandated some time after Dr. Viera accepted the role of Superintendent/President (or CEO as is cliché among administrators in the community college system today) in the fall of 2003. Although there may be some differences between what was and what is in terms of governance on campus, dysfunctionality certainly has not lessened. In fact, many feel that in areas of communication (between Management and Faculty), direction, and day-to-day operations, we are worse off than ever before. To begin, the deans are no longer in the classroom. Fortunately, the District has been wise enough to try to hire deans from amongst the ranks of the faculty, but there are a couple of deans who have either never taught a class at Citrus or haven't for quite some time. In addition, we currently employ 12 deans, all of whom command a price tag of at least \$120,000 for their services. When you toss in the numerous directors (lowest starting salary: ~\$88K; highest starting salary:



~\$125K), VPs (two are among the highest-paid in the state at greater than \$180K), and a CEO that clears \$200K a year, it's not a wonder that the District worries about finances. Also, the issue of accessibility is an ongoing problem. I have spoken with many faculty who have trouble even finding their deans. The deans are often at meetings, away at conferences, or off doing whatever it is that deans do.

At least with department chairs and associate deans you knew exactly when they were in the classroom and could at least attempt to flag them down before, between, or after their classes. Finally,

if there is no system in place to educate and prepare existing faculty members for administrative positions in the future, where will our new administrators come from?

In principle, the department chair still exists in select departments on campus.

What events led the Board of Trustees to replace what was once a functioning system under department chairs and replace it with one that is arguably not functioning well? My understanding of this is based upon the testimonies of a few senior faculty members and administrators, some of whom are now retired, so you will have to take that for what it's worth. If you look at the language in Board Policy 2440 (Department Chair), you will see a number of weaknesses in the language. In particular you will see that the "tenure of office" for chairs calls for an appointment by the College President with an "indefinite" duration. As it were, this language created a situation for chairs that made them very difficult to remove, once appointed. Presumably, the chairs were evaluated by their supervisors (Vice Presidents and/or Deans of the Faculty), but it has been suggested that these evaluations didn't hold much leverage over the chairs to maintain high performance standards.

(Con't. on page 4)

Thoughts from the Senate President, con't. from page 1

5. Standards and Policies regarding Student Preparation and Success
6. College governance structures, as related to faculty roles
7. Faculty roles and involvement in accreditation process
8. Policies for faculty professional development activities
9. Processes for Program Review
10. Processes for institutional planning and budget development and the 11th as a mutually agreed upon responsibility:
11. Faculty hiring procedures.

Now that I am empowered, what can I do?

With our next accreditation quickly approaching and some exciting modifications to our program review process, this is an opportune time to revisit these two areas of the 10 + 1. We have two new

leaders who are an important addition to our self-evaluation process.

Our new Program Review coordinator, Gloria Ramos, and our new Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment (SLOA) coordinator, Roberta Eisel hope to interact with all areas of campus to help make clear the links between program review and outcomes/assessment. Roberta has already begun the overview with her "Connecting the Dots" sessions. The outcomes/assessment process gives us evidence that drives the discussions in program review. In order to give our program review process more immediate relevance, we will begin to have informal annual reporting and more regular discussions of how the recommendations are achieved. The six year program review process will yield the formal, college-wide report. Both SLOA and program review have a link on the Academic Senate webpage (<http://www.citruscollege.edu/as>). Please visit the links and get back to Roberta, Gloria or any senate leader or

representative with any questions that you might have about the new processes.

In the spring, we will begin to write our self-study for our next accreditation visit. It is a great time to be able to claim credit for all of the work that faculty have done to improve instruction and student success. We now also have the opportunity to talk and think about how we can improve. Shared reflection and reaction to evidence can bring our campus together with the common mission of student success. The Academic Senate will soon be looking for faculty volunteers to serve as either team members or co-chairs for our accreditation committees. Please give serious consideration to donating some of your energy and time to this very important process. As we are empowered by Title 5 and our own board policy, it is important to recognize that we all share the responsibility in contributing to the improvement and success of our students. Your enthusiastic participation in outcomes/assessment, program review and accreditation plays a key role in the success of Citrus College and our students. Please contact me (Dana Hester X8055 or X8877) to volunteer.

- Dana Hester

From the CCFA President, con't. from pg. 1

- 3.) The CCFA Representative Council and Academic Senate Executive Board voted to endorse the Community College Initiative (Proposition 92). We hope to raise a significant amount of money to contribute to the campaign. All donations are due by November 16th.
- 4.) The Rep Council voted to have all electronic agendas and meeting minutes disseminated in the following manner: Executive Board → Representative → Department Faculty. Please contact your department representative if you are not receiving this information.
- 5.) There are Representative vacancies in Language Arts and Physical Science that need to be filled.
- 6.) Our CCA staff person, Robin Devitt, and the president of CCA, Ron Reel, will be attending our December 5th meeting.
- 7.) We are working on cleaning up our

website. If you can't find your copy of the contract or need to read the minutes from a meeting please go to www.citrus-ccfa.com.

There is always more happening. Just check the meeting minutes or give an Exec board member or your Rep a call. Lastly, I want you to consider the following question for our winter newsletter: How has the compressed calendar affected instruction in your department and what strategies are you using to maintain/increase your students' and your own success? Let's hear your voice! The deadline for submission will be the last week of classes in December.

- Jim Lancaster

Faculty Blurbs

Do you have news to share, such as important milestones, awards, community involvement? Let us know what you are up to so we can share the news with your colleagues!



Higher Education and the Corporate Model, con't. from page 2

standards. Testimony to this can be made by way of analogy to evaluation of our deans in the current governance structure; namely, the fact that there has not been a dean that has been fired for unsatisfactory performance at Citrus in at least the last 10 years. With an evaluation process having no "teeth" and an indefinite appointment, it is not too surprising why the Board might have sought change. I have also heard that the Board was upset with the scheduling practices of certain chairs. One account of this involved a "rogue" chair who denied a subordinate faculty member an overload class and as a result, the faculty member grieved the District. The reason the said faculty member had to grieve the District and not the chair is because the chair, being a unit member in the Faculty's collective bargaining unit, cannot be grieved by another unit member. The District had to "bite the bullet" on this one and consequently lost the grievance. This among other issues involving availability of chairs on Fridays and over the summer sessions swayed the Board enough to be convinced to replace the Chair Structure with the Associate Dean Structure.

It is important to note that the Faculty Leadership under Presidents Jim Shannon, Joe Harvey, and Jack Wood did put up some resistance to the implementation of the Associate Dean Structure. A number of public addresses to the Board were made, grievances were filed, and many CCFA Newsletter pages were devoted to this subject. Their efforts should not go unnoticed. In one of his best works that I have seen during my tenure here, Mr. Harvey drafted and presented to the Board a model of governance structure that included Chairs as well as took care of many of the language issues with Board Policy 2440. Unfortunately, the die had been cast and these efforts were ignored by Management and the Board.

Corporation versus the Academy: Which is better for Citrus College?

In the spring of 2004 the Statewide Academic Senate adopted a paper titled *Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty Academic Chairs: An Academic Senate Perspective*. In the conclusions of this very comprehensive and detailed treatise on shared governance in the California Community College system, the authors stress that there is "no single solution" to finding the best governance structure for a community college. They also go on to say, however, that "such institutional philosophy

and structure must be reached through extensive collegial discussion that certainly includes the academic senate and other faculty leaders and is finally agreed to by all constituencies." The paper goes on to make a series of recommendations encouraging the academic senates to recognize 1.) the importance of academic chairs, 2.) that local discussions about structure and philosophy must consider the institutional role of the faculty, 3.) that there are considerable advantages to the use of faculty academic chairs, 4.) the need to develop training opportunities for existing and potential academic chairs in leadership skills, and 5.) that the communication between faculty leaders respects the roles of the academic senate and the collective bargaining unit in governance of the institution.

Now, the individuals who drafted and accepted this paper as the position of the Statewide Academic Senate were clearly not "union hacks." They were, and in many cases still are, respected members of an academic community. A community that was founded on and is grounded in informed, open discussion of issues and how they impact education. To my knowledge the dean structure (either current or the associate dean) never underwent the process of collective discussion. The Academic Senate at Citrus College was not involved in, nor even invited to the "closed-door" operations that took place in the 1990s and after concerning governance. The structure was just foisted on us in a "here it is, like it or not" manner with wanton disregard for our input and/or opinions. If you have trouble swallowing that this is what actually took place, I challenge you to find any Board Policy where the current governance structure is outlined with description of duties of the "Area Dean." You won't, because if you did, that would mean that the Academic Senate, our Academic Senate, approved the structure. The actions of our Board and upper-level Management concerning governance over the last 10 years or so more closely resemble those found in a corporation than in an academic institution. But is this really what's best for Citrus College?

To help answer this, perhaps a look at an example that is found in both the business world and pure academia might do, namely, performance evaluation. In a corporation, your survival as an employee depends entirely on your performance. In other words, if you don't make the "bottom line" result expected by your boss(es), you might find

yourself looking for another job. Now, I admit this is an extreme view, but some businesses do operate in this manner. In academia, we take a more nurturing approach. We have a peer review process that looks at a poor performance and makes suggestions for improvement; the philosophy being that we recognize that there can be a myriad of reasons for a substandard performance, some of which can be fixed with simple suggestions. The evaluatee is expected to take these suggestions to heart and work to improve on his/her weaknesses as a faculty member. Sometimes things don't work out, but there is a process in place.

At Citrus, we have a process in place that a hybrid of the aforementioned paradigms. We have both peer and supervisory review as part of the evaluation process. This process has weaknesses on both sides of the fence. One the one hand, as a tenured faculty member I am free to select two peers and one administrator of my choosing to serve on my review committee. If I wanted, I could select my "buddies" and get glowing reviews every time, regardless of my performance. I choose not to do it this way, but that's my personal choice. Such a system could and has, allowed for some poor instructors to get overlooked and slip through the cracks. On the other hand we now have the "Dean's Evaluation Statement" as part of the contract. Neither the deans nor the administrators on an evaluation team are currently instructors, unless of course they are either moonlighting elsewhere or given some extra duty assignment like supervising a field trip. For them to deliver a credible, academic evaluation of an instructor is impractical if they have never been in the classroom themselves or haven't for some reasonable length of time. Further, we have deans that do not even have FSAs in the departments over which they directly supervise. For them to serve on a subordinate's evaluation team would be absolutely absurd. I can't imagine the poor dupe that would receive his/her walking papers due to the evaluation by a dean who had never taught a day in his/her life in that faculty service area.

A corporation demands productivity (see Mr. Lancaster's article in this issue of the Newsletter). An academic institution demands excellence. Can both be achieved by a shift in structural paradigm?

Answers to this question will be addressed in a future CCFA Newsletter article.

- Terry Miles

Profitability, Productivity and Efficiency in the Non-Profit Community College, by Jim Lancaster

By now, I'm sure most of you have heard the term "profitable" used somewhere on campus. I'm not talking about hearing it as you walk past a business lecture on the second floor of the LB building. Instead, I'm guessing you have heard it used when there is talk of a class cancellation due to low enrollment. Or it was tossed out during animated dialog with your dean over the course seat maximums. Or perhaps, you have been on a program review committee and charted data for department productivity, weekly student contact hours (WSCH), full-time equivalent students (FTES), full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) and all the other acronyms which generate the shiny nickel. Profit at a non-profit institution? I didn't see the ticker CITCol at the bottom of CNN this morning. Have you? Did I miss the IPO? Do I now need to worry about shareholder demands as well as SLO's, student success and meeting the needs of the industry I serve? No, not yet. But allow me to share some of my concerns.

At the October 1st Educational Programs Committee meeting it became very clear that we, the faculty, are being subconsciously programmed to think about the bottom line. Of the four programs being presented, two began the introduction of their reviews with how the program produced income for the college. One was even referred to as a "cash cow". In the other two reviews, although not leading with the financial windfall they generate for the college, the faculty didn't miss out on reporting the financial security of the program. It was as if the faculty felt they needed to first establish their programs' existence and benefit to the institution on the basis of being in the black over the quality and significance the program has with the students and community.

Please don't misunderstand. I am not attacking our colleagues. With all the recent discussion over the last few years about the drop in enrollment, the loss of FTES, being put on stabilization, the need to market the college, outreach and recruitment, and this year's move to a compressed calendar for the purpose of FTES growth; it's on everyone's mind. Should I have been delivering a program review to EPC, I would have lead with the same.

I'm not going to go as far and call it academic capitalism, corporate governance, management by objective, or any of the other terms often referred to when "business-like" models are contrasted with the typical shared

governance practices in higher education. That's a completely different article. And perhaps one I'll share in another newsletter. Instead, I'll try and keep this to the point by leaving out references to profit generation through contract education and briefly discuss whether or not the terms productivity, profitability and efficiency, which may seem oxymoronic to a non-profit community college, belong in our institution.

The Citrus Productivity Studies

Cambridge West Partnership (2007) recently published the results of a *2006 Curriculum Output and Enrollment Efficiency Study* for Citrus College. This is the third study of "efficiency" Citrus College has completed in the last six years (your dean should have a copy if you'd like some additional late night reading). The 2006 study is an update to the *2003 Productivity & Efficiency Analysis* published by MAAS Companies and the *2000 Analysis of Current and Projected Faculty Ratios* (publisher unknown).

The 2006 study was directed to assess the key elements that affected growth or decline of operational efficiency as well as provide a guideline to suggest a means to maximize future capacity. Objectives of the study included: providing departments and programs with perspectives for curriculum and enrollment performance; providing an action plan to improve capacity for increased WSCH per FTEF; identifying obstacles to achieving maximum operational efficiency; providing objective third party recommendations; and lastly, maximizing the potential for receiving and utilizing state funding.

The 2003 report had multiple objectives, they included: evaluating the overall condition of the program of instruction vis-à-vis the faculty resources available (this is not the resources you may be thinking about—such as classified support, equipment, and instructional supplies. It is more or less referring to FTEF); providing an instructional level perspective that assessed performance against key productivity/efficiency indicators; and the identification of strengths and weaknesses of the college relative to the productivity/efficiency measures of the state.

I haven't seen the results of the 2000 study. However, some of the 2000 data is in the later versions. In short, the productivity of

Citrus College has increased over the six years. I have even heard the VP of finance say, "productivity is up". But this study only shows how the productivity increase is in the area of instruction. Why? It's because "Instruction makes the money". So why should the college examine the productivity and efficiency of any other area on campus? I'll come back to that. First, let me take a stab at discussing how productivity should theoretically lead to profitability. Remember, I'm not an MBA from Harvard.

How Instructional Productivity Leads to Profitability at the Community College

It was as if the faculty felt they needed to first establish their programs' existence and benefit to the institution on the basis of being in the black over the quality and significance the program has with the students and community.

The increase in profitability through increased productivity, regardless of the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) can be attributed to increasing the weekly student contact hours (WSCH) per faculty. In California's community colleges, the magic number for per faculty WSCH is 525. This goal number is calculated by assuming one full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) teaches five, 3 unit or contact hour courses, each with 35 enrolled students. Each class has a WSCH of 105 (35 students X 3 contact hours = 105). Therefore, a teaching load of 5 courses yields 525 WSCH. To increase the productivity of each faculty member two possibilities exist; either increase the number of students in each class or increase the number or contact hours for each faculty member. Class maximums/minimums and faculty load—all play into this equation.

As stated before, The Citrus College *2006 Curriculum Output and Enrollment Efficiency Study* showed a steady increase in productivity over the six year span. For Citrus, the increase in productivity was attributed to four significant trends. These trends were: 1) Fewer FTEF but greater FTEF productivity; 2) fewer class sections but greater class section productivity; 3) overall increases in class sizes; (continued on page 6)

A Forum for Faculty Voices and Thoughts

Co Editors:

Senya Lubisich & Lisa Telesca

Ext. 4106 (Senya) and Ext. 8774 (Lisa)

slubisich@citruscollege.edu and ltelesca@citruscollege.edu

Please electronically submit your contribution by 12/14/2007 to slubisich@citruscollege.edu

Please provide the following information:

1. Your name
2. Your phone extension
3. The type of submission: anecdote, "blurb", letter, or article.

In future newsletters we hope to include three anecdotal features: the Meeting Demands of the Challenging Student, Successful Teaching Tips, and Sometimes You Just Have to Laugh. These will be places to share our struggles, successes, and "in betweens" with our colleagues. If you have an experience to share, please send it to us (slubisich@citruscollege.edu). We are looking for submissions that are about 50 words in length — if you can do it in less, you might get a medal! Our goal is to create a light-hearted forum for our shared experiences in the classroom.



Profitability and the Non-Profit, con't. from page 5

and 4) gains in WSCH per FTEF efficiency.

Wow! Each of the trends stated in the study are dependent on the faculty. Give yourselves a pat on the back. But how did you accomplish such a task? Was it an increase in instructional support, better technology in the classroom, did your equipment and supply budget receive a significant increase, did the department hire more classified support staff, or were there facility improvements? Maybe you're just more organized than before, or are you grading more papers, seeing more students, and working harder than you were six years ago. It's hard to say, it wasn't looked at in the study. And this is when I become perplexed. Now keep reading, this is when a few might start looking for a dogwood tree.

The Challenge

Let's face it; because of the inadequate funding for community colleges, these "business-like" terms are not going to disappear from our vocabulary anytime soon. And although I would like to find campus alternatives for profit or profitability; I am not opposed to them being used along with productivity and efficiency on campus. I have over my career become very comfortable with them. I worked in an industry that fed off of these three terms.

As an automotive technician, my paycheck was directly tied to productivity and efficiency every week. I was paid on a flat-rate pay system. Essentially, the more vehicles I serviced and repaired, the greater my income. My paycheck was based upon how quickly I could diagnose and repair the vehicle, my up-selling skill, my customer service index, and

my ability to keep cars from coming back misdiagnosed. Trust me; in an automotive service and repair facility, it's all about the "dead presidents". Additionally, automotive service is very competitive and there is often a "me against everyone else in the shop" mentality. That being said, there were more variables than just the technicians when it came to the shop generating a profit. There are operating costs, advertising, other personnel such as management and service advisors, equipment, supplies and parts, etc. There wasn't one thing or group of people responsible for profitability. Not in an automotive repair facility, nor a Fortune 500 company and certainly not at a community college.

Instructional efficiency, productivity and —if we must use the word— profitability at a community college is dependent upon so many factors; including, the deans, counseling, admissions, facilities, the finance office, equipment, purchasing, MIS, classified, instructional support, and technology. Basically, everything has an impact on instruction and its efficiency. Therefore, everything on the campus should be measured. And as we all know from writing SLO's, nothing is ineffable; everything can be measured.

Based on the current pattern, I assume in 2009 there will be another efficiency study performed. If that happens, I strongly urge the governing board and administration to examine the efficiency and productivity of all areas on campus not just the instructional faculty and their individual academic departments. For one, a complete campus efficiency study would show just what areas or variables are responsible for the increase in instructional productivity (assuming there is another increase in 2009). Additionally, it would show

areas on campus that are hampering instructional productivity or just cutting into the overall "profit" of the institution because of their complete inefficiency and counter-productivity. Who knows, a study like this could show that the move to academic deans instead of department chairs is not only more profitable for the institution but it also increases instructional productivity.

If instruction and the faculty remain the only focus of efficiency, productivity and profitability; perhaps it won't be long before our collective bargaining agreement includes bonuses based upon meeting target growth, profit-sharing, and a variable salary schedule based upon individual performance indicators. For me, it would be nothing more than Déjà vu. And you?

Conclusion—Always End With the Warm and Fuzzy

The purpose of this article was not to inflame but to inform. I intended it to raise awareness and provoke questions. I think changing institutions grow stronger if they are able to take the best of varying models and weave them together. Our college, like any successful business, creates value and because of that we need some sort of business model. And although funding is vital for our operation, our model must ultimately focus on enhancing society and not on the generation of revenue. Additionally, our model must rely on our institution's mission and not on income. Because a mission driven organization focusing on income will soon find itself so far out of touch that it has nothing meaningful to spend its profit on.

- Jim Lancaster