has been administered. The process keeps the owner near the patient to monitor the patency of the system. Cows that are recumbent or cows in stanchions usually are not a problem for maintaining the system. This system does not, however, provide for free movement of the patient in a box stall.

(5) When the process is finished, the owner replaces the PRN cap in the catheter and flushes the catheter with a heparinized saline solution. The catheter is left in place and taped over for protection so that it may be used for repeat treatment if required.

I have been impressed by cases where the cow is recumbent, with the eyes deeply sunken, and general severe depression, where after administration of 10 to 15 gallons of fluids, often accompanied by Banamine, we have seen the patient get up a few hours later and start eating and drinking.

We have used this same system for diarrhea calves that are recumbent and/or comatose. In a field situation, I find it most convenient to make a table of square hay or straw bales and to restrain the calf by tying to the bale strings. The period of fluid administration allows time to cover the calf with blankets and to warm the calf with hot water bottles or heat lamps. Fluids warmed higher than body temperature may be indicated. Severe dehydration in calves makes it extremely difficult to place a catheter. Many times a "cut down" is required.

Previously we mentioned cost effectiveness of this procedure. The costs are approximately as follows:

Distilled water and jug	$0.85
Disposable IV set	$1.25
Deseret Catheter	$5.50
Nephrosol Concentrate	$0.15/gallon of IV solution
PRN adapter	$0.30

Summary

A method is described for field or hospital administration of large volumes of intravenous fluids in the bovine, using materials easily transported in a practice vehicle. Cases targeted are toxemias such as toxic coliform mastitis, and calves with neonatal diarrhea. The administration system described is reasonable in cost, is disposable, and after the original set-up, can be left in the care of the owner to supervise the remaining administration. The procedure hinges on the availability of an electrolyte concentrate which can be carried in a practitioner's vehicle, and on using a diluent usually available on the farm. The system is practical for use either in the adult or neonatal bovine.

Sharing the Profits

A.G. Wesselius, *DVM*
1210 South Gold
Centralia, WA 98531

As veterinarians we have a unique and highly important role in determining the future of the dairy industry. Beyond our many professional responsibilities we are in a position to interpret the many factors which are impacting the livestock industry today. In our capacity as herd health consultants we are often asked to advise, educate and guide dairymen on the many factors that have a direct input on the profitability of the dairy enterprise. One of the most challenging aspects of consultation is that of employee/employer salary relationships.

The traditional family labor force on the dairy is being replaced by employees, who no longer consider the goals of management as their primary objective for employment. "The almighty dollar" has become the motivating force in job performance by today's farm employees. Successful dairyman are seeking to compensate employees for their contribution towards the farm's profitability. There are several ways to maximize the return on invested capital and/or labor that can be utilized to help maintain profitability on the dairy farm. This short discussion is a brief overview of one solution to the problem that we may want to review with our clients when salaries and wages for employees are questioned.

Obviously employee profit sharing incentive programs have their limitations when dealing with dairy farms. Financial health varies greatly from farm to farm and today's milk price fluctuations make it very difficult for most dairy farmers to have a good understanding of the financial shape they are in. Cash flow has four components that do not impact the employee's compen-

© Copyright American Association of Bovine Practitioners; open access distribution.

sation for employment. All employees have some appreciation of farm income but have little understanding of farm operating expenses. Purchases and sales of capital assets have little bearing on an employee's compensation for labor even if the purchase is a labor saving piece of machinery. Non-farm income and expenses further the misunderstanding of the employee's impression of the farm's profitability. Finally, borrowing and debt repayment impacts the dairymen's cash flow that is not appreciated by employees. Therefore, dairymen have had to explore other approaches to improve employee confidence and enhance employee performance to maximize profits.

It is critical for dairy producers to understand that their objective is to maximize profits because their long-term survival hinges on their ability to generate profits over time. Employees must be made to realize that producers accomplish profit maximization objectives by first keeping costs at a minimum and secondly on how successful the dairy maximizes total milk sales. This is where the interaction between employee/employer can be evaluated for the introduction of incentive programs that justify financial rewards to the employee.

Today's profitable producer is constantly adjusting his production level as milk prices and input prices vary. This has contributed to variations in milking and feeding times that employees are reluctant to accept unless there is compensation for their added efforts. Every dairy producer must assess their current operation and determine the steps necessary to alleviate this discrepancy in job responsibility.

A review of the job responsibilities by the employer accomplishes several important objectives. For employees, a review of incentive financial rewards provides an opportunity to let the employee know how his or her work benefits the farm. It also allows the employee to realize how well they are fulfilling expected job responsibilities and identifies areas for improvement. By attaching a monetary compensation figure to improvement the employee is more inclined to become part of the farm profit making decisions.

Various systems have been devised to compensate farm employees but one important feature should be to strive to make formulation simple. Using base salaries as a starting point, additional incentive formulation can be worked out for various aspects of the farm's profitability to determine final salary figures. It is advisable to use reproducible base line figures for the formulation to avoid discrepancies and misunderstandings by the employees. Milking cow numbers change constantly but daily bulk tank milk weights are recorded production base line figures that can be used in the formulation. DHIA production summaries such as Average for Milking Cows and Herd Average are also useful for computations, but be aware that the former is a monthly tabulation and the latter is a yearly average. Monthly Somatic Cell Counts, either processor's or DHIA figures, are applicable for incentive compensation formulation since they are monitors of the herd's profitability. Other DHIA herd total figures (Average Calving Interval, Days In Milk At First Breeding, Days Open) can also be used if the dairyman feels that improvement in these specific areas are worthy of emphasis. Processor's milk quality reports or quality milk bonuses are both sets of reproducible information that can be included into determining employees' bonuses.

There are always some important "pitfalls" to be avoided when a new system of compensation is being contemplated. Compensation for detected heats is meaningless unless payments are consistent with resultant pregnancy determinations. Payment for reproductive performances and/or mastitis rates must include the "fail-safe" factor for culling rate figures, otherwise the obvious becomes the modus operandi on the dairy. The DHIA Reproductive Performance Index includes the culling rate in its formulation, however, the interval of change is rather small in the larger dairies and therefore requires more weight for monetary compensation when included in the formulation.

When setting up on a bonus compensation formula always remember to make the intervals consistent with the data for each category. It is also advisable to make these intervals wide enough to reflect a change in the compensation. Somatic Cell Count figures are a perfect example for an illustration of this point. In most instances the formulation pays out on a monetary amount times the hundredweight of milk shipped for a monthly period. This puts the emphasis on all aspects of production and gives the bonus compensation system a team work objective.

Most dairymen have included a "Tilt" factor into their incentive compensation programs. An actual degrade or warnings there of because of milk antibiotic residues, PMO-BTU violations or high bacteria milk counts will nullify all additional bonus compensations until these problems are rectified.

Every dairy is a special case of its own and therefore the exact monetary bonus compensation for each category in the formulation must be worked out for a farm's individual goals. The bonus must be significant enough to inspire an incentive for the employees and yet allow farm increases to be profitable. Producers must be conscious of their production costs, but they should not become so concerned about managing costs that they fail to take advantage of market conditions which allow them to incur higher costs and still earn even higher profits.

Every dairy producer must assess their current operation and determine the steps necessary not to survive, but to succeed in an increasingly competitive dairy industry. The competitiveness in qualified farm labor will only become more acute in tomorrow's job market.

© Copyright American Association of Bovine Practitioners; open access distribution.