



TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PORTRAIT OF TCC
AS A
STRATEGIC COMMUNITY
COLLEGE

COLLEGE-WIDE FOCUS
FOR
1998-99

January 1999

TIDEWATER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
PORTRAIT OF TCC AS A STRATEGIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE
COLLEGE-WIDE FOCUS FOR 1998-99

Tidewater Community College will become the national model for a comprehensive community college of the twenty-first century--the new millennium's strategic community college.

Framing its comprehensive mission within a two-pronged "mission core" of college transfer and workforce development, the college will embrace as fundamental operating principles partnership, flexibility and proactive responsiveness, entrepreneurship, technological innovation, and heightened public accountability. It will be a proactive player in regional economic development and the Commonwealth's flagship community college in college/university-parallel programming. It will have built-in systems for staying one step ahead of the future in program development and review, as well as in its own administrative operations and processes. The foundation for and context of everything that it does will be the highest academic standards benchmarked against the Commonwealth's most selective four-year institutions in college transfer and the industry standard in occupational/technical training and development. More than the sum of its four campuses, the college will find its strength as a single educational entity serving splendidly distinct geographic constituencies. It will have an internal harmony about it that models shared decision-making, open communication, and communal civility. State-of-the-art physical facilities, a more diversified funding base, and a reengineered management structure will support this strategic vision.

Portrait of TCC as a Strategic Community College: Focus for 1998-99 outlines the initial brush strokes that the college will take to becoming the new millennium's strategic community college. The document begins with a delineation of the college's "immediate and emerging priorities" as the 23 action items that have been identified to date as essential to positioning TCC as a strategic community college. With this frame, it subsequently describes the "working strategy" for addressing the priorities. The working strategy includes five college focus teams to address the college-wide areas of governance, economic development, program coordination and development, internal community building, and college funding--their purposes, assumptions, charges, budgets, report dates, and memberships. It also speaks to the "role of the President's Cabinet" as the collegewide entity for 1999-2000 planning, and it gives the "timetable" for the entire planning process. The document concludes with a listing of the "assumptions and themes" that underlie the priorities.

Immediate and Emerging College-wide Priorities

The college-wide priorities as delineated below evolved largely out of a two-day retreat held June 17-18, 1998. Some seventy college individuals participated in the session on the 17th, which resulted in a thoughtful delineation of issues deemed most pressing for the college over the next few years. Using this compilation as the basis for more focused discussion, the President's Executive Staff convened the following day to sketch out the college's operating goals and strategies for 1998-99. The raw results of both sessions, along with a listing of the retreat participants, is available in the campus libraries.

Subsequent sessions within many venues during the fall 1998 semester brought some refinement to the work of the retreat. These sessions were both formal and informal, spanning the entire spectrum of the college community--from faculty and classified staff, to administrators, to college and foundation board members, and to the community at large.

In the midst of it all, one reality became quite clear--namely, the perception at least that there was much to do to position TCC as the millennium's strategic community college. Interestingly, the results of an earlier college look at issues conducted in early 1998 in preparation for the presidential search affirmed this perception. The President made the decision to divide the collegewide priorities into *immediate* and *emerging*, fully realizing that the emerging priorities were just that--emerging and, as such, would require an especial amount of refinement for and energy in 1999-2000. The lead entity or individual for addressing each priority is noted parenthetically in italics following the priority.

Immediate College-wide Priorities

1. Revise the governance system within the context of shared decision-making. (*Focus Team on Governance, with President*)
2. **Effect a working model for operational and** strategic planning. (*President's Cabinet*)
3. Effect a college-wide focus to workforce training and development which addresses the college's larger role in regional economic development. (*Focus Team on Economic Development, with President*)
4. Work in concert with the VCCS to increase the state's investment in its community colleges and to effect an internal change in the VCCS distribution model. (*President*)
- S. Implement a program for Institutional Advancement which strategically embraces the functional areas of marketing, media relations, grants, alumni affairs, and development. (*President*)

6. Implement a Strategic Development Plan for private fundraising, redirecting the role of the Educational Foundation Board of Directors within the context of the new plan. *(President, with Educational Foundation Board of Directors)*
7. In partnership with Virginia Beach Public Schools, complete the planning for the Advanced Technology Center at the Virginia Beach Campus. *(VBC Provost and Planning Committee, with President)*
8. Define the college's role in the budding "virtual university" in Virginia Beach, resulting in an agreement with the project's three principal partners--namely, Old Dominion University, Norfolk State University, and the City of Virginia Beach--and in a revised master plan for the Virginia Beach Campus. *(President and VBC Provost, with College Board)*
9. Develop working plans for repositioning the Chesapeake and Portsmouth campuses to be more proactive players in their respective service jurisdictions. *(President and CC and PC Provosts, with College Board)*
10. Conduct a study of the college's existing facilities for major renovation and retrofitting. *(Dean of Finance and Administrative Services, with Executive Staff)*
11. Effect a thorough cleaning of the Beazley Building at the Portsmouth Campus as a stop gap measure to securing the funding for a major renovation. *(Dean of Finance and Administrative Services, with PC Provost)*
12. Procure a correction in the appropriations language which specifies the funding for the Loew's Theater at the Moss Campus in Norfolk. *(President, with College Board)*
13. Work with the City of Suffolk and other interested parties in effecting the most positive resolution of the property targeted for environmental clean-up. *(President, with College Board)*
14. Build an internal sense of college community through fellowship events and celebrations, improved communications and information-sharing, and inclusiveness. *(Focus Team on Internal Community Building, with President)*
15. Commence a college-wide dialogue on academic quality. *(Focus Team on Program Coordination and Development, with Dean of Instruction and Student Services)*
16. Engage the faculty in the instructional applications of technology to the teaching-learning process. *(Dean of Instruction and Student Services, with TLTR Coordinator)*

Emerging College-wide Priorities

1. Review administrative structures at both the college and campus levels, making revisions as needed. (*President, with Executive Staff*)
2. Review administrative systems at both the college and campus levels, making revisions as needed. (*President, with Executive Staff*)
3. Establish an internal model for campus funding based on the key variables of "core operational base" and "size." (*Focus Team on College Funding Model*)
4. Effect a greater financial investment in the college from the localities. (*President, with College Board*)
5. Update the campus master site plans in light of new college directions, developing both timetables and strategies for implementing the plans. (*President and Campus Provosts, with Dean of Finance and Administrative Services and College Board*)
6. Develop a college capital outlay plan for the 2000-02 biennium. (*Dean of Finance and Administrative Services, with Executive Staff and College Board*)
7. Create a framework for program coordination and development collegewide. (*Focus Team on Program Coordination and Development, with Dean of Instruction and Student Services*)

Working Strategy--Focus Teams

Five "focus teams" will address the college-wide areas of governance, economic development, program coordination and development, internal community building, and college funding. The purpose and charge for each team, along with its membership, budget, and report date, are delineated below. The focus teams report to the president.

Focus Team on Governance

Purpose: To develop a proposal for a new governance system for the college which will be implemented in 1999-2000.

Assumptions: 1. That the current governance system is ineffective at best.

2. That the faculty and staff want a collegial governance system which embraces the principle of shared decision-making

3. That any new model for collegial governance will be representative of the college's internal constituencies and include clearly defined, sound practices for committee election/appointment and rotation.
4. That committee members whose committees are charged with the competitive distribution of grant monies internally in any form be ineligible to participate in the RFP process.

Charge: 1. To review the college's current governance system, assessing its strengths and weaknesses.

2. To explore national "best practices" in collegial governance in both the two-year and four-year sectors.
3. To present a new governance model which includes (a) a philosophical context and statement of purpose, (b) a standing committee structure with a mechanism for committee appointment and rotation, (c) a "college senate" or other representative college-wide entity for addressing areas of college-wide concern, (d) constituent specific (i.e., teaching/professional faculty versus classified staff versus administrative faculty) vehicles for addressing areas of concern unique to a particular college constituency, (e) a framework for establishing ad hoc committees and task forces, and (f) an accountability component for regular assessment of the model's effectiveness.

Budget: \$5,000

Report Date: May 1, 1999

Membership:

3 Teaching Faculty	Allan T. Crandall (PC)
	E. Phillip Thompke (VBC)
	David S. Wright (VBC)
1 Professional Faculty	Kathleen K. Tilton (NC)
1 Administrative Faculty	Robert L. Hutchinson (VBC)
2 Classified Staff	Marvin H. Radford (DO)
	Linda M. Rhinard (CC)
1 Student	Leo G. Somera (VBC)
Chair, College Faculty Senate	Richard W. Gill, Chair (PC)

Chair, College Classified Staff Association Sarah S. Swager (DO)

NB: The membership should reflect at least one representative from each campus and the District Office.

Focus Team on Economic Development

Purpose: To assist in launching the college's economic development initiative as recently announced by the president.

- Assumptions:*
1. That the college must become a proactive player in regional economic development.
 2. That the college's economic development initiative will be directed collegewide versus campus-specific, under the leadership of a newly established decanal position.
 3. That a national search will be conducted to fill the new position of Dean of Economic Development.
 4. That the college's economic development initiative will be framed via the seven working areas of military, medical care, tourism, technology, small business assistance, major firm recruitment and retention, and general workforce services.
 5. That the college will incorporate "career placement" as an organizational component in its economic development initiative.
 6. That the economic development initiative will be physically housed in Norfolk and report directly to the president as a college-wide operating function.

- Charge:*
1. To explore "best practices" in both the two-year and four-year sectors for economic development as a component of the college's mission.
 2. To draft a "College Position Paper on Economic Development" which (a) offers a working definition of economic development, (b) presents a context and working framework for the college's economic development initiative, and (c) identifies the major operational issues that the college faces in implementing its economic development initiative.

Budget: \$5,000

Membership:

8 Teaching/Professional/Administrative Faculty or Classified Staff	Wanda W. Hare (VBC) Allison Harwell (VBC) Diann S. Holt (VBC) Penny J. Pagona (NC) Linda M. Rice (VBC) C. Gregg Tennefoss (VBC) Albert G. Thompson, Jr. (PC) Richard E. Witte, Chair (PC)
2 At-Large Faculty	Michael Howk (NC) Ann Woolford-Singh (VBC)
1 At-Large Administrator	Peter N. LeRoy (CC)
1 At-Large Classified Staff	June M. Ritchie (VBC)

NB: The eight teaching/professional/administrative faculty or classified staff are drawn from the seven working areas of the economic development initiative as delineated in Assumption #4.

Focus Team on Program Coordination and Development

Purpose: To assist in creating a framework for program coordination and development collegewide.

- Assumptions:*
1. That at least some of the college's programming is better developed and coordinated collegewide.
 2. That there is a general lack of cohesiveness in college programming, a result of the campuses often going their own direction with the development of a particular program without any sense of how this direction might impact upon the program collegewide.
 3. That the college will incorporate specialized accreditation into its development of occupational/technical programs.
 4. That the college will commence a college-wide dialogue on the qualitative issues inherent in the teaching-learning process.

Charge: 1. To identify existing programs and program clusters for immediate coordination collegewide, developing an action plan for the transition of these programs to collegewide.

2. To identify existing programs as candidates for immediate specialized accreditation, developing an action plan for effecting this accreditation.
3. To explore "best practices" in community college programming nationally.
4. To draft a college position paper on program development and coordination which (a) includes a philosophical mind set for college programming, (b) identifies the inherent issues of collegewide versus campus-specific programming, (c) incorporates "best practices" into a model for addressing these issues, and (d) speaks to the larger issues of computing--both academic and administrative--in program development.
5. To draft a college position paper on technology programs which identifies (1) the benchmarks to which the college will set these programs, (2) the issues inherent in doing so, and (3) the best remedies for addressing them.

Budget: \$5,000

Report Date: For parts 1 and 2 of the charge, May 1, 1999; for parts 3 through 5 of the charge, May 1, 2000

Membership:

7 Teaching Faculty	Ann P. Ambrose (PC)
	Roseann J. Carlson (VBC)
	Stephen M. Ezell (VBC)
	John H. Gray (VBC)
	Kathleen D. O'Connor (CC)
	Joseph E. Reish (PC)
	Donna Reiss (VBC)
	David A. Steinhauer (PC)
2 Professional Faculty	Michael A. Barton (CC)
	Valerie J. Evans, Chair (NC)
2 Division Chairs	Judith Gray (CC)
	John L. Skrobiszewski (PC)
Dean of Instruction & Student Services	Terry L. Jones (DO)
1 Classified Staff	Todd Lane (DO)
1 Provost	E. T. Buchanan (VBC)

Focus Team on College Funding Model

Purpose: To assist in the creation of a funding model for the college.

- Assumptions:*
1. That the current funding model no longer works.
 2. That any new model must consider the base operating cost of a campus, regardless of size.
 3. That campus size is a key variable in the development of a new model.
 4. That the mix of college-based operational functions versus campus-based operational functions will impact upon the new model.
 5. That the college's current planning work may impact upon the new model.
- Charge: 1.*
1. To identify the basic functions, services, offices, personnel required to operate a campus and their associated costs for manpower and operations.
 2. To identify the thresholds beyond which additional manpower and operational funding are warranted, along with their ratios for support.
 3. To identify basic levels of operational funding by academic department.
 4. To identify basic levels of operational funding by college-wide entities--i.e., currently the Women's Centers, Learning Disabilities, the ESL centers, international education, and the Open Door Project.

5. To research funding models for similar community colleges in other states, as well as for selected four-year institutions with strategic similarity.

Budget:

\$5 00 For #5 of charge, May 1, 1999; for remaining parts of charge, March 1, 2000

Report Date:

4 Teaching Faculty

Joseph E. Browne (NC)
 Thomas P. Hilton (VBC)
 Larry R. Jenkins (CC)
 William E. Moore (PC)
 Carolyn P. Pulley (VBC)
 Vernon Cramer (VBC)

1 Student Services Faculty
 1 LRC Faculty

1 Classified Staff	Kathy Williamson (DO)
1 Business Manager	Claudia D. Macon, Chair (PC)
1 Division Chair	Gregory P. Frank (VBC)
1 Provost	A. John Massey (NC)
Dean of Finance & Administrative Services	Phyllis F. Milloy (DO)
Dean of Information Technology Systems	Richard F. Andersen (DO)

Focus Team on Internal Community Building

Purpose: To develop a plan for effecting a stronger sense of internal college community and civility.

Assumptions: 1. That the morale of faculty and staff is low.

2. That, as community, the college has a weakened sense of civility and belief in itself.
3. That there is insufficient communication on college-related matters within the college community.
4. That, as community, the college has an inadequate system for recognizing the triumphs and tribulations of individual faculty and staff.

Charge: 1. To develop a system for regularly disseminating information collegewide, giving careful consideration to the role that technology can play in fostering efficient communication.

2. To identify an appropriate means for awarding and recognizing retirements, resignations, promotions, service, and noteworthy accomplishment.
3. To identify an appropriate means for acknowledging deaths and illnesses within the college community.
4. To propose a series of activities which encourages fellowship and comraderie collegewide.

Report Date: May 1, 1999

Membership:

2 Teaching Faculty	Joseph C. Antinarella (CC)
	Mark D. Greer, Chair (VBC)
1 Professional Faculty	Gary R. Medlin (VBC)
1 Administrative Faculty	P. Randall Shannon (PC)
2 Classified Staff	Debra R. DeMills (NC)
	Anita Dial (VBC)
1 Student	Marian Webb (CC)
Chair of Ad Hoc Fellowship Committee	Judith A. Tomovik (DO)
College Coordinator of Student Activities	Patricia Allison (DO)

Working Strategy--President's Cabinet

The President's Cabinet consists of those individuals who report directly to the President --presently, the deans of instruction and student services, **finance and administrative** services, and information technology systems; the four campus provosts; the directors of communications and development; the assistant to the president; and the secretary to the president. It also includes those individuals who have direct operational responsibility for facilities management, human resources, and learning resources, as well as the directors of the Visual Arts Center, the College Women's Center, Grants and International Programs, and Institutional Research. Finally, it includes those who have leadership positions in the college's governance structure--presently, the chairs of the collegewide Faculty Senate and Classified Staff Association, the TLTR coordinator, and the chairs of the focus teams under the 1998-99 planning work. As designated by the President, other individuals who have leadership responsibility for major college-wide initiatives in any given year may also sit on the Cabinet.

The Cabinet is the President's work group. It typically meets monthly for information sharing, issue-oriented discussion, and action. Agendas for the meetings are distributed three working days in advance. The deadline for submitting items for the agenda is four days prior to

For 1998-99 and 1999-2000, the President's Cabinet serves as the overall planning entity for the college and, as such, is the primary vehicle for shaping the college's spending plan and working priorities for 1999-2000.

The Cabinet's current membership is

Richard F. Andersen	Dean - Information Technology Systems
Denise A. Bell	Program Head - Nursing
E. T. Buchanan	Provost - Virginia Beach Campus
William H. Candler	Director - Communications
Mary Ruth Cloudsley	Director - Grants and International Programs
Nancy S. Duncan	Manager - Human Resources
Valerie J. Evans	Chair - Focus Team on Program Coordination and Development
Glenda R. Franklin	Secretary to the President
M. William Gibbons	Acting Director of Facilities Management
Richard W. Gill	Chair - College Faculty Senate and Chair - Focus Team on Governance
Mark D. Greer	Chair - Focus Team on Internal Community Building
Anne S. Iott	Director - Visual Arts Center
Terry L. Jones	Dean - Instruction and Student Services
Timothy H. Kerr	Provost - Chesapeake Campus
Lisa S. Kleiman	Director - Institutional Research
Donna Koch	Assistant to the President
Samuel H. Lamb, II	Provost - Portsmouth Campus
Mary Pat Liggio	Director - College Women's Center
Claudia D. Macon	Chair - Focus Team on College Funding Model
A. John Massey	Provost - Norfolk Campus
Phyllis F. Milloy	Dean - Finance and Administrative Services
Penny J. Pagona	Director - Workforce Services
Peter W. Pierce	Director - Development
Linda M. Rice	Chair - Health Science Technologies Division
James N. Roberts	Coordinator - TLTR
Sarah S. Swager	Chair - College Classified Staff Association
Patricia U. Thomas	Associate Dean - Learning Resources
Richard E. Witte	Chair - Focus Team on Economic Development

Working Strategy--Timetable

December 15
10:00 - 12:00 p.m.
NC, Martin Bldg., Rm. 2502

President convenes President's Cabinet for organizational session on Portrait of TCC as a Strategic Community College.

January 20
session
1:30 - 3:30 p.m.

President convenes focus team chairs for general work (DISS and DFAS to participate).

By January 22

President issues a college update to the faculty and staff, which includes an introduction to Portrait.

President releases Portrait to college community. The document outlines immediate and emerging college-wide priorities; the work of five focus teams on the college-wide areas of governance, economic development, program coordination and development, internal community building, and college funding; the role of the President's Cabinet; a working timetable; and underlying assumptions and strategic themes.

Week of January 25

Focus team chairs have individual telephone sessions with consultants DISS to arrange).

January 28
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
CC, Pass Bldg., Rm. 157

President convenes focus teams for general work session (Executive Staff to participate).

January 29 1:00 - 3:00 p.m.
President's Conference Rm.

Preliminary College Roundtable is held under auspices of The Knight Collaborative.

Week of Febru 1

Focus teams commence their work.

February 3
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
PC, Rm.244

President's Cabinet begins 1999-2000 operational planning (includes a review of current year's budget and enrollment, as well as working assumptions for subsequent year).

February 8
2:00 - 3:15 p.m.
CC, Whitehurst Bldg,
Rm. 2057A & B

President holds first optional meeting of faculty and staff on Portrait and 1999-2000 operational planning to date.

February 11
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
NC, Martin Bldg., Rm. 2610

President's Cabinet engages in general discussion of 1998-99 institutional effectiveness and commences discussion on college-wide working priorities for

February 15-16

Consultants available to work with focus teams and their chairs (arrangements made through DISS).

February 18-19
TBA

First College Roundtable is held under the auspices of The Knight Collaborative.

February 23
2:00 - 3:15 p.m.
NC, Martin Bldg., Rm. 2502

President holds second optional meeting of faculty and staff on Portrait and 1999-2000 operational planning to date.

February 25
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
NC, Martin Bldg., Rm. 2610

President's Cabinet develops potential college-wide working priorities for 1999-2000.

Week of March 1

President issues a college update to faculty and staff, which includes a report on the 1999 General Assembly Session.

President issues draft of potential working priorities for 1999 2000 for review by college community.

March 4
2:00 - 3:15 p.m.
VBC, B-100 (Library)

President holds third optional meeting of faculty and staff on Portrait and 1999-2000 operational planning to date.

March 15
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
VBC, B-211 (Library)

President's Cabinet has a second work session on working priorities for 1999-2000.

March 24-25
TBA

Consultants available to work with focus teams and their chairs (arrangements made through DISS).

March 26
TBA

Second College Roundtable is held under the auspices of The

March 31
on
2:00 - 3:15 p.m.

President holds fourth optional meeting of faculty and staff on Portrait and 1999-2000 operational planning to date.

April 5
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
PC, Rm. 520

President's Cabinet has a final work session on working priorities for 1999-2000. Session includes an assessment of the planning process itself.

By April 15

President issues a college update, primarily to report on the outcome of the Veto Session of the General Assembly.

President issues final version of 1999-2000 planning assumptions and working priorities to college community.

May 10
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
CC, Whitehurst Bldg.
Rm. 2057A & B

President's Cabinet commences regular monthly meetings.

June 7
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
NC, Martin Bldg., Rm. 2502

President's Cabinet holds regular monthly meeting.

June 11
12:00 - 5:00 p.m.
TBA
July 6
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
PC, Rm. 520

Administrative leadership gathers for a work session on emerging college directions and its role with them, both strategically and operationally.

President's Cabinet holds regular monthly meeting.

August 2
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.
VBC, B-211 (Library)
August Convocation

President's Cabinet holds regular monthly meeting.

President releases the 1999-2000 college-wide focus for
Portrait of TCC as a Strategic Community College.

Underlying Assumptions

1. That the college believes fundamentally in "access and excellence" as the philosophical guideposts of the American community college movement.
2. That the college has a first-rate faculty and support staff.
3. That the college must be more than the sum of its four campuses.
4. That the college must plan and deliver quality both in the short term and long term.

5. That the college must diversify its funding base, continuing to expect the state to be its primary investor while cultivating secondary investors to supplement the state's support and provide a strategic advantage for meeting the education and training needs of South Hampton Roads.
6. That the college must continue to incorporate the latest technological advances into its administrative operations and delivery of instruction.
7. That the college will frame its comprehensive mission within a two-pronged "mission core" of *college transfer* and *workforce development*.
8. That the college will become a more proactive player in regional economic development.
9. That the college must communicate better internally.
10. That the college needs to implement a governance system which is rooted in the collegial value of shared decision-making.
11. That the college needs to build a sense of internal community.

Underlying Strategic Themes

Partnership. The strategic community college understands the power of partnership. Partnerships are culturally where the world is headed. They are the right thing to do and, as a matter of shrewd practicality, the smart thing to do. Public or private, corporate or educational, strategic organizations everywhere are looking to collaborate. Partnerships avoid duplication of effort. They are cost effective. They draw on individual strengths to create a hybrid of collective strength that none of the principals could have produced on its own. In the vernacular, partnerships are "win-win."

Flexibility and Proactive Responsiveness. The strategic community college understands the importance of flexibility and proactive responsiveness, particularly in its relationship with business and industry. Its scheduling practices reflect this understanding, as does its commitment

Entrepreneurship. The strategic community college understands the increasingly important role that entrepreneurship plays in society's operational paradigm for the new millennium. It sports its own brand of entrepreneurial spirit, taking calculated risks with new ventures.

Accountability. The strategic community college understands the public's call for heightened accountability. It welcomes the public scrutiny in both its academic and administrative operations, with built-in outcome measures intent on overall institutional refinement and effectiveness.

High Academic Standards. The strategic community college understands the importance of a quality product. It insists on high academic standards as the foundation for and context of everything else that it does or may do.

Technological Innovation. The strategic community college understands the life-altering nature of technology. It sees technological advancement as part of society's changing paradigm, with cultural underpinnings and implications. It assumes responsibility for preparing those it serves to function in (and make sense of) an increasingly technological age. Its instructional processes reflect the best of technological innovation.

Internal Harmony. The strategic community college understands the importance of internal teammanship. Its faculty and staff believe in the larger cause that frames it, and they believe in (and trust) each other. It has internal systems for renewing its own sense of community.

Contradiction. The strategic community college understands ambiguity rooted in an increasing complexity in the budding world of the new millennium. It finds strength in contradiction and is comfortable operating in a paradigm of "opposing imperatives." It embraces contradiction as an