

Status of Our Profession

Panelists

Jane Eaves, Business Manager, University of Arkansas
Rex E. Janne, C.P.M., Director of Purchasing Services, Texas A&M University
Stephen G. Mack, C.P.M., Director of Procurement and Contracting Services, University of Arizona
Alan A. Philips, Assistant Director of Purchasing, University of Houston
Brian K. Yeoman, Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning and Development, University of Texas
Houston Health Science Center

Moderator

Michael McIntier, CPPO. C.P.M., Director of Strategic Business Operations, Maricopa Community College District

One of the activities of the NAEB Annual Meeting is a series of panel discussions on various topics of interest to the membership. These sessions were recorded and transcribed for publication in the NAEB Journal. The following article is adapted from the panel discussion titled "Status of our Profession," which took place on May 4 during the 2001 Annual Meeting in Nashville, Tennessee.

McIntier: Welcome everyone to the *NAEB Journal* Conversations Panel titled "Status of Our Profession." Thank you for agreeing to spend an hour of your Friday afternoon of the Annual Meeting in this session. I believe that Rex Janne would like to start the discussion for us.

Janne: One issue I would like to bring up is the concept of outsourcing community function. Our administration has successfully outsourced community functions throughout the campus, so it's not unusual that your administration may come to you and ask that question. Why don't we outsource? We need to be prepared to answer are the questions: Why aren't we doing it, or how can we do it? I'm not a proponent of it either way, but I think some of the misconceptions are that it will never happen. We are currently outsourcing a lot of our functions and we are getting away from the process of not forcing the payment process, we are using the procurement card. We are outsourcing if we are using any consortium or cooperative buying. We need to come up with a strategy before the question gets asked.

Yeoman: Rex, I want to commend you for bringing what is probably the most emotional issue before the profession out of the dark and out of the box. And like you, I don't have a preconceived notion in terms of where we should be. I share a deep belief that this is a question that is going to be asked more and more frequently, and I think it is a logical conclusion, as a result of the decentralization of everything. In that process, one of the things I think preparing a strategy will do is to cause all of us to think longer, stronger and deeper about what services we provide. This may, in fact, lead to a better understanding of this notion of "value added." This might be a place for us to launch a deeper conversation in this arena: If there is a strategy to go forward, where is the highest value added for the faculty and staff of our institutions?

Eaves: I agree with Brian, particularly looking at the value that we are adding. There may be components, such as we have in many of our facilities, that would be better served on campus by outsourcing those functions. I think one way that we can embrace and make our jobs a little more secure in any net value is through the use of technology--and really accepting change and seeing ourselves differently. I say ourselves as managers. We can manage our departments differently

and have better outcomes--challenge our departments to do things that they wouldn't normally do. Not be just processors, but really make changes on our campuses, because the end result is really how well are we serving students and their family members.

Janne: The one issue we need to address when talking with our internal staffs and administration is: We need not fear the possibility of outsourcing, because we are already doing it. We don't even think twice about outsourcing a lot of functions. We didn't even think that it *was* outsourcing when we did it. We were thinking about getting rid of part of our payment or bid process by doing some function electronically. I think *that* needs to be sold internally--that it *is being done*. And, you are absolutely right: let's focus on the value. Let's get rid of those functions that are not adding value.

Philips: We have come a long way from just processing orders. Brian and I did a presentation the other day [at the Annual Meeting] about doing departmental visits, doing departmental rotations and finding where we can add value; going to the business administrators and finding out what people really want, as opposed to waiting for a requisition to hit the door. I tell people all the time that, from my perspective, the whole purchasing department would be really easy to outsource. Brian had a conversation a long time ago and told one of the buyers in the office if they had any future plans to open an entrepreneurial business, it might be in purchasing, so we can just outsource to them. This is something that's been talked about and, as Jane says, it is something that's feared--but it doesn't need to be. It needs to be brought out and talked about and discussed. We need to look at the things that are not outsourced, consider how we will outsource them and how we will do them differently, and how we'll raise this thought about ways we can add more value.

Mack: About a year ago we had a software company make a presentation to the University of Oklahoma. Part of the business flow or workflow of their software included the opportunity for you to submit requisitions to a central location to a staff of 20 specialists. They would conduct the bid process to your specifications, terms and conditions, send you their results, and allow you to make an award, all automated. So I think the possibilities and probabilities for outsourcing the purchasing process are already with us. And technology alone is providing the means of eliminating the process as irrelevant. Essentially, not irrelevant, but irrelevant for a person to conduct it and make that happen.

Philips: There were companies at this (NAEB annual) meeting, vendors who, just like Steve says, have a process by which requisitions can be entered electronically and they go into some virtual environment where bids are prepared, received and tabulated and awards are made. All this is done virtually. So, it's how we can add value: we can go out there and hold people's hands and walk them through the process, and what we can we do for our campuses. It's not just sitting behind your desk and saying, well, I have a requisition to do today.

Mack: I disagree, just a little bit, with one thing Alan said earlier: That we can outsource, or completely outsource, purchasing. I think that we might disagree, but the process is only a piece of purchasing and has never really, in my mind, been the major part of our value. It may have been 20 years ago, because purchasing was a different world then. But, the value purchasing has is not in the process, but in the team building and contracting, contract administration, and contract management...all things, I believe, that are functions best handled in-house, at least at the current time.

Yeoman: I want to back up and take us through a bit of a historical perspective. What we have focused on in the last three to five years is this notion that procurement value does not lie in transaction processing; and, in particular, I think there is no broad-based consensus that low-dollar value purchases were, in fact, something that was holding us back from our potential. Some of us tried to suggest that one opportunity to demonstrate added value lies in theory of contract administration. That is the broader notion of protecting university acquisition assets, retention of university assets, maintenance, care and custody and nurturing of those assets. This process of examining the question is in some ways a logical outgrowth of the freeing of the human resource and the fiscal resource that was dedicated to and allocated to transaction processing. Now, one of the consequences, of course, has been that in some ways we have downsized procurement operations and reduced the personnel costs associated with the old

process. We may or may not be able to actualize that, because we don't do a very good job understanding what the costs are of decentralization. But, clearly from the centralized model, there have been very dramatic reductions in cost. The question is, are we beginning to realize some of that "value add potential" through contract administration activities, both in university-issued contracts or in consortium-based contracts or national agreements. That's one of the things I would like to hear us talk about with regard to the profession. Are we making that necessary transition from a focus on "out puts" to something that I'd like to call a focus on "out comes?"

Mack: Brian brings up an interesting point and I wrote the note, "small-dollar process". As Brian said, we made the decision, 10 to 15 years ago, that we couldn't provide value in small-dollar acquisitions. So we completely decentralized that function. Now, because of the ability to capture data, we have come full circle in small dollars in not wanting to control or centralize the process but to understand what we are purchasing in small dollars and then find ways to contract for those items so that we bring more and more value to our university. And so, the whole paradigm that we had started with small dollars has completely changed.

Janne: One issue of value I'd like to bring up and that Brian touched on, is contract administration. Clearly, we are now being asked to be involved in risk assessment of the overall purchase of the goods or service involved. We typically have not been trained in a skill set to assess that risk. We have relied, in the past, for other individuals to assist that risk. That's been my experience. So, that's one area that I think we need to educate ourselves on: making those assessments and adding that value.

Yeoman: Rex has really hit the nail on the head. Risk, in my interpretation, goes well beyond fiduciary risk and now clearly envelops an environmental risk, which is something that, historically, we either took a position of having our head in the sand or regarding that risk as belonging to somebody in environmental sciences or health and human services. We have gone well beyond what is federally required, to now needing to understand what the potential product liability is for long-term exposure to any one of a number of materials. Quite frankly, there is a knowledge base there that many of us don't have. There is a skill set, however, that will marry-up nicely, I think, with our analytical skills. But, we are not there. Another risk perspective has to do with the notion of life-cycle cost assessment as opposed to a first-cost paradigm and, of course, that marries-up very well with best value, when best value is operational zed outside of its current context. I think there's another thing that happens with us with risk assessment. We've all lived with some level of discomfort with regard to the university's role with regard to the community. We have a big economic footprint. We've all kind of understood that. But, we also have a huge environmental footprint that we've not really looked at. I think the third dimension, the one that is going to present some real challenges to us, concerns our social responsibility footprint issues. My own institution has been somewhat aligned to the fact that you could basically draw a dividing line north, south and west of the campus and show the more affluent Caucasian community. With this community we have a good working relationship, we're actively partnered with them and we are rendering all kinds of community services. But, east of that line is the population, primarily African American and Hispanic, in which we have very few meaningful partnerships and in which we render relatively few services. The City of Houston is now more than 55 percent people of color, and the issue is well beyond that of historically underutilized businesses wanting a piece of the pie. The real question now is, are we to any degree reflective of our community in terms of what we are providing as a service? Those are really complex issues. They're not issues that we've traditionally thought about in the requisition-bid-buy paradigm, but they are clearly before us now. They're not going to go away, and they are clearly associated with risk, and our profession is going to have to renew itself and it's going to have to be placed in a position where it can acquire more knowledge very quickly. I am very concerned about this particular issue because we have had the propensity to be resistant in this arena.

Janne: In addressing risk assessment, I think the current process we go through is something that Steve brought up the other day in the open session and this afternoon as well. It is teaming primarily internally but externally as well; teaming with other areas, whether it is from a hazardous risk to an economic or social risk assessment. We need to team from an admissions standpoint more than we ever have. How many times have admissions and purchasing sat together and addressed socio-economic issues? Very seldom, but we are now being pushed in that direction.

We need to be prepared to move in that direction, teaming with those individuals and coming up with solutions. I think Steve made a very good point about how we've got to improve our teaming skills.

Yeoman: Another opportunity for growth and value add comes in the area of supplier development. Supplier development has always been included on any list of skills we have talked about in the profession. The point of the fact is that relatively little of supplier development has taken place. It's time for us to leave the paddock and to get in the shoot and attempt, through a series of creative partnerships, to engage in supplier development that is consistent with the broader perspective of the university.

Eaves: I think one of biggest challenges for the profession that ties in with this is actually knowing which highway to take. Sitting here in this meeting, we agree on the roads that we are going to take, but it's hard to prepare your staff in the skills sets and knowledge sets, mainly because we all see that we need more legal background. There are some areas where we can prepare our staffs, because we are thrown into those arenas. It's hard to manage your staff in any manner because we are so unsure of the right road, especially because it's so costly to take the wrong one. Not just in money, but also in the time spent. If I pick the wrong avenue to take them down, we've got to backtrack and change. So, we are constantly challenged, and a little hesitant to step out there in as timely a manner as we need to, because there are so many options. Sometimes it's hard to pick what we think will be the right one for our institution and how that falls within our institutional mission, because it's different for every one of us.

Mack: Something that Jane said centers around the cost associated with taking the wrong path, or trying to figure out which is the right path. I think it's very true that each one of our institutions is still going to be unique enough that the path will be slightly different. I think the real cost is in *not* making the trip and *not* trying to forecast the future, and then heading down a path where you believe the interception with the future will take place. Some of the skill sets we talked about-- negotiation skills, legal skills, teaming skills, management skills--without a question are all major skills that are going to be critically important for people in this profession. Going back to the things you also talked about, things recycling and changing on us: one of those things is in the supplier and supplier diversity arena, where ten years ago we had affirmative action. We had set-asides and we had preferences in the State of Oklahoma. There were preferences up until this year, when the cognizant Federal Circuit Court struck them down as unconstitutional. I think across the country now those kinds of things are being deemed unconstitutional: to discriminate either *for* small business or against it. To me, that doesn't diminish our social responsibility to be diversified or to do outreach and conduct supplier development with new and diverse businesses. It does change the paradigm about how we can do that and what we can do to bring it along. We've got to be creative in finding ways to overcome the challenges placed before us. In reality, it's in our best interest to develop a diverse business base. I like the fact that we have changed and will continue to change how we view suppliers and our responsibility to those suppliers. We are helping them to better meet our needs. We work with them and give them information about us, rather than having them having guess what it is we want. Supplier development in that role will be critical to working with small businesses. We want to help small business, but in our broad overall vision, we want fewer and fewer contracts with larger and larger companies. So, how do we get the two concepts to work where we want to bring up and support small diverse companies? At the same time, we want to do what's most fiscally responsible for the dollars we have stewardship over or the University's dollars, which means fewer and fewer contracts and larger and larger companies.

Yeoman: I'll go ahead and take a swing at that by returning to Rex's question relative to a strategy for outsourcing. It may be that in the process of outsourcing a portion of the university's annual requirements, the social responsibility component could be structured as specific programmatic goals. It could be an opportunity for supplier development partnerships. It could be an opportunity for better links to the community, by forming some public-private partnerships. It could also be an opportunity for us to engage in more creative ways of facilities management and it might be a way to resolve some of our critical issues relating to housing and feeding students on campus. The plain fact is that urban campuses--those non-land grant college and universities--are running out of space. You all are fortunately blessed with more land than the rest of us, but I suspect that you're beginning to see some of those issues, too. If you think about the modern

college and university as an institution, it really doesn't think in terms of the human scale that we do, which is a lifetime or a career. It sees itself really as a multiple-century institution. How can we continue to provide services for an increasingly diverse student population, with diverse demands, when we have kind of a fixed resource called the Earth? Maybe, just maybe, through outsource activities, one of the things that can happen is a more creative response that begins to address it. I guess I've cited some evidentiary reason for that being a plausible thing to investigate. Think about the rise of University of Phoenix, for example. In a relatively brief period of time, they are now operating in some 22 states, granting degrees, really in our front yard sometimes, and in our backyards. Generally, unless they've changed, they don't own a single building anywhere other than their headquarters. Everything else takes place in leased space. Our paradigm is that if we're going to be involved in a business, we have to make a huge capital investment and long-term operation management investment. It is a paradigm that continues to fuel the late industrial age paradigm of "there are winners and there are losers." If we really are serious about this notion of teams and sharing, maybe one of the things that would be good for us is a network of services and education through an outsource model.

Mack: I will tell you that what is unique for the students in the university setting is the community. It's the development of social skills and living in a micro-community at the university that I believe constitute the greatest value of the university experience. The degree is important and it's critical, but you may get the degree at the University of Phoenix in a number ways, over the internet, or whatever, but the things you can't get with those, is the ability to socialize and develop those skills that you get in the university setting. To me, what a university brings to the table is unique. And that will not go away, because those skills will still be required. The university setting seems to be the best available best place to gain those skills.

Eaves: One of the things I hear from Steve is that people in procurement can be effective and more interactive on the campuses, because we see it differently. We operate more than any department on campus in the actual business world. Most other areas are contained, because they're operating in an academic environment. By being active on campus on committees and different groups, purchasing can share their input. A prime example is that on our campus we're talking about new housing. I'm asking why do you want to do that? We have apartments and kids don't want to live there. Most of the time purchasing can be out there interjecting our opinions and being on committees and being vocal, not just in the procurement arena but in the business environment. I think that's where our profession can add to our campus.

McIntier: I think Jane has summarized a number of points in saying that those of us in the profession lucky enough to have support of the administration have taken on a whole new role. We are finding ourselves involved in risk assessment and in helping to draft ethical codes for a whole institution. Administration is beginning to look to purchasing and to the staff in the business division to help. We are bringing a lot of value and we have the periscope; we are looking outside the boundaries of the campus. We are definitely bringing value. It may not be the value of a purchase order or a pro card, but we are bringing that unique body of knowledge. I also see that it is not just at the level of the director or manager. I see more and more directors delegating the responsibility to their purchasing staff to continuing taking that knowledge outside the department and helping others. So, each one of the staff is valuable. That's what concerns me about possible trends in outsourcing, such as the Chicago system that outsourced their entire business section, including purchasing, to a proprietary company. They lose the organizational memory, they also lose all those individuals in that organization that should have amassed a lot of information about the community. They've lost all that. So, that saddens me.

Eaves: I think the key is we have to lead the charge. If we wait, or are even second on the charge, it's too late. You've got to lead the charge and be out there.

Mack: Myself and others in the profession have been saying that if we stagnate, if we believe that we will be doing tomorrow what we are doing today and we get stuck in the idea that our value comes in the process that we are doing today, then we will be passed by and we will lose what value we bring to the institution. It will be ripe for the institution to outsource those functions, because someone else can do them better on the outside than we can. Our responsibility and our challenge is to continue to look forward five years, ten years down the road to anticipate where we're heading, and to look for things we can do to provide value for our institutions. We

need to push and prod our business organizations at the universities to move there and be prepared for it.

Yeoman: I want to echo and amplify these statements by Jane and Steve, and to reiterate some of Rex's opening comments. I think it's really critical that we, at least one time, answer the question: *What is the status of the profession?* I think the status of the profession is that it stands at the precipice of radical change. What we've been engaged in thus far is a series of evolutionary incremental steps. Across of all of the institutions, because of procurement's unique position, which Jane has identified, we have had the opportunity to witness outsourcing, up close and personal, to participate, to tailor, to coach it, to shape it, to set its boundaries. What that should have begun to teach us is that we can be the leaders on our campuses relative to where outsourcing takes place. Now, that's not to say that we cook the books and cut a corner to make sure that we protect ourselves. I'm going to stand with Rex on that. I don't want to have any preconceived notion, because the answer in any given institution might be radically different. Take a simple example of stores in College Station, Texas versus stores in Houston, Texas. It makes absolutely no sense for me to operate a storeroom operation in the middle of the fourth largest city in America, where delivery of most consumer shelf goods can occur within 12 hours. Now, Rex is in an entirely different situation in a rural setting in a city of 100,000, but he couldn't possibly begin to support an enterprise the size of Texas A&M. So, from the process standpoint, we will have to assess what it is that makes sense in each of these local situations, after appropriate analysis of data and workflow. We can be the people who are directing, rather than have it be either a political response or a downsizing response. The dollars that we're talking about by virtue of process innovation and process reengineering are really valuable dollars for us to negotiate with in terms of the university's bottom line. These are direct dollars. They're not intangible, and they are the kinds of things that purchasing departments should be using to their advantage to gain greater influence in their campus. Now, notice I didn't say direct access working for the president. I know there are people that try to advocate that. I'm supportive, but that's not what this is about. This is about the influence of the purchasing department and the role that you can play can play in critical decisions. I think that with an investment in training and a commitment by purchasing leadership, the status of this profession is alive and well and healthy and can succeed and be absolutely critically important in the 21st century, if we choose to do so.

Janne: One issue that Brian brought up, concerning public/private endeavors in the traditional sense of purchasing goods and services, is that we have not seen that public/private partnership. We see it in the academic or, more importantly, the research aspect, where we are partnering with a private company and taking that resource, that knowledge, developed through research and commercializing the benefits of that research. I view that, in the not-so-distant future, we will need to embrace some aspects of that public/private model in the procurement of goods and services,

Mack: Another thing percolated in my mind when Brian was talking is outsourcing: I think that one of the options for outsourcing purchasing resides in a communal effort. Right now, the market exists to create an outsourcing arm at a major university with a very professional purchasing staff, to provide outsourced purchasing support to the small community colleges and junior colleges in our areas. The first person able to create a marketplace in e-commerce and deliver it to a small college with no professional purchasing staff, a decentralized purchasing, or a single person wearing many hats, will generate both revenue and provide a very valuable service to that institution. And, as we reduce the amount of processing that's done, the logical step, in my opinion--and I wish that they would take up the flag--is E&I providing that type of service to its members. If we're going to outsource purchasing, how much better would it be to do it with a company or with an institution that we own and operate and have some influence over.

Janne: We see, even in a heavy process-laden purchasing model, that cooperation between municipalities, small colleges and community colleges can work. You're absolutely right Steve. If we can provide an enhanced product for them, that would be a revenue-generating proposition. I have been asked, as I'm sure many of you have been, to find new revenue sources.

McIntier: We've gone full circle here in the conversation: from *Where are we at?*--to *Should we be afraid of outsourcing?*--to *Us being the professionals providing services to others.* This shows that we've got quite a range of responsibilities and, as Jane said, we're not sure which road that

future is going to take us down. Any closing remarks or any other topics that we may have missed?

Eaves: One thing I see brewing in Arkansas, because we are trying to take leaps into the 21st century, is actually dealing with legislation and stepping up to that role in dealing with our regulating agencies and our legislature. If there's one thing I've learned this latest session, it's that it's easier to push a bill than to pull it. What does that mean? We're already starting working now on what we predict ahead for two years, because the Legislature only meets every two years. Special interests are pushing bills that we don't want and are out there working today for the next session. I think that's so critical as we change our mindset. Leading the charge is making this playground the way we want it, by our rules and on our terms. We're taking more control over that issue because fear stems from lack of control. So, I see that we really have got to focus and step out there. We're talking about basic skills, communication skills. We have to step up and be professional communicators, because we're playing on a different playing field than we're used to.

Mack: I think one of the things we have to, as a profession, realize and come to grips with is that the perceptions in most of our institutions today is that procurement is a second tier operation. We may have the title of Director of Procurement but we do not share the same status in our universities or perceived value in our universities as the physical plan directors, as the comptroller, as other key directors in areas in our University. We need to come to grips with that because sometimes I see our professional organization here in NAEB sometimes sticking our head a little bit in the sand, thinking and talking about how great a job we do and how much value we bring. We do bring value, but the perception is not making it up the ladder in a majority of the institutions we serve, including mine at the University of Oklahoma when I was there. It was directly told to me that we were basically a second tier. So, if we want to have the kind of influence that we need to really do great things, we've got to do what it takes to move ourselves from being perceived as second tier to first tier. I'd like to see us start having dialogues and admitting and talking about the fact that we are here and we've got to be there and how do we get there? What are our strategies to put us in the view of the president and the vice-presidents of our university as a strategic partner of theirs? Ones that they can't do without, they've got to have us right there asking us to participate in all these things that we want to participate in. We need to talk about it, and we need to strategize about how we're going to move ourselves into that kind of perspective.

Yeoman: Boy, Steve Mack, you must be able to read upside down. This may be longer than you want, Mike, but I'm going to give you a little bit of it anyway. What I've written is something in this arena because I do see this largely as an issue of strategy. That's why I was so excited when Rex opened with it. What I wrote was: We could be working *against* ourselves in spite of our rather boastful talk about progress and our pride in the gadgets of civilization. There is, I think, a growing suspicion, perhaps an uneasy certainty, but we've sometimes been just a little too ingenious for our own good. In spite of the truly inventiveness of the human brain and all the bright people present, maybe some of us are beginning to wonder whether our power to change our institutions should not have been tempered with more wisdom for our own good and with a greater sense of responsibility for the purchasing directors to come. I say that not as a chastisement, but as a challenge. Alan and I made a presentation on the first day of this meeting. It was entitled "Basics for Buyers." We talked about this notion of how to survive in the 21st Century. I made the point that Steve has just made which is: we've got to get over our low self-esteem. I also made the point, I think pretty strongly with those present, that we have got to get on the strategic track. Many of you know that I'm a deep practitioner of Stephen Covey's *Seven Habits* and I truly believe that we have to begin with the end in mind. I think that's one of the problems. We have endless debate and we can never arrive at an end, and our end too frequently is focused on *output*, as opposed to *outcome*. Therefore, we miss our bosses and we miss our customers, but we sure have a lot of pretty data. The other place where I think we're in trouble is that you must be proactive. And I see Steve's admonition in the conversation with Jane, which is that we, as a profession, have tended to be reactive. Most of the initiative from Total Quality Management to where we are today came to us not because any one of us in our profession was out there trying to advocate. It came because the chief business officer got it at a NACUBO seminar or from a big six accounting firm and said, "You need to start thinking about these things." We don't deserve to be at the plate in a lot of our member's minds because we

don't think strategically. I don't believe that we're incapable of thinking strategically any more than the man in the moon, that's why I love this profession and I love all of you. But, I have been advocating for a very long time that we have to begin the process of thinking strategically about where we want this enterprise to go, which is how Rex opened this conversation. There are a number of issues we have not examined strategically. There are many of us who are marching down a blind path to ERP systems and to e-commerce solutions, but not because we have thought about them strategically. The problem of those large-scale implementations, when one has not thought about them strategically, is they become tremendously embedded. By the time you begin to understand the beginnings of the consequences, it's too late for you to shape any of your future. That's why I think Rex's question on outsourcing was absolutely right on. Why don't we have a dialogue and determine what the position of the National Association of Educational Buyers is with regard to the outsourcing of the procurement profession? You see, I'll make my last point because it sounds like a monologue and a diatribe and in some respects it is. What our name is, the National Association of Educational Buyers, and the way that we choose that, routinely is that of the processor of procurement requests. We've got beyond the transaction, we've got a little fancier, but we forgot that a piece of that is *we are educational buyers*. Why is it that this organization, with as much talent as it has, is not in the education business? Why are we going to NIGP, NASBO and NAPM for education on what's going to happen in outsourcing? Don't we have enough experience? Don't we have enough competence to be able to stand up and say that it's okay, that we can have a private sector model, that we can have a small-school model, that we can have a large-school model, but here's what our profession thinks of it? We can't get to a professional perspective if we're going to continue another of our practices that works against us, because the dialogue can't be as rich as it should be because our membership is a member of record, which is affiliated with an institution. I submit to you that there is no other profession that we all accept as a profession that limits its membership to a single member per institution. So, until we have all of the diversity, the men, the women, the people of color that want to be part of the educational enterprise and the conversation, we're going to continue to have some of these struggles--and that's one of the places we've missed it strategically.

Philips: I learned about 20 years ago not to try and follow Brian in the speaker lineup. I appreciate the opportunity to expand on a discussion that Mike and I started via email. I have a whole page of notes. So, if nothing else, I've learned something today.

McIntier: I thank you all very much. This has been an extremely informative and invigorating discussion. I appreciate your sharing with us today.