

CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC
Form DEF 14A
October 06, 2011

[QuickLinks](#) -- Click here to rapidly navigate through this document

UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549

SCHEDULE 14A

Proxy Statement Pursuant to Section 14(a) of
the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Amendment No.)

Filed by the Registrant

Filed by a Party other than the Registrant

Check the appropriate box:

- Preliminary Proxy Statement
- Confidential, for Use of the Commission Only (as permitted by Rule 14a-6(e)(2))**
- Definitive Proxy Statement
- Definitive Additional Materials
- Soliciting Material under §240.14a-12

CORINTHIAN COLLEGES, INC.

(Name of Registrant as Specified In Its Charter)

(Name of Person(s) Filing Proxy Statement, if other than the Registrant)

Payment of Filing Fee (Check the appropriate box):

- No fee required.
- Fee computed on table below per Exchange Act Rules 14a-6(i)(1) and 0-11.
 - (1) Title of each class of securities to which transaction applies:
 - (2) Aggregate number of securities to which transaction applies:
 - (3) Per unit price or other underlying value of transaction computed pursuant to Exchange Act Rule 0-11 (set forth the amount on which the filing fee is calculated and state how it was determined):
 - (4) Proposed maximum aggregate value of transaction:
 - (5) Total fee paid:

Edgar Filing: CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC - Form DEF 14A

- o Fee paid previously with preliminary materials.
 - o Check box if any part of the fee is offset as provided by Exchange Act Rule 0-11(a)(2) and identify the filing for which the offsetting fee was paid previously. Identify the previous filing by registration statement number, or the Form or Schedule and the date of its filing.
 - (1) Amount Previously Paid:
 - (2) Form, Schedule or Registration Statement No.:
 - (3) Filing Party:
 - (4) Date Filed:
-

October 6, 2011

Dear Fellow Stockholder:

On behalf of the Board of Directors, you are cordially invited to attend the Annual Meeting of Stockholders of Corinthian Colleges, Inc. for its fiscal year ended June 30, 2011 to be held at the DoubleTree Hotel located at 201 East MacArthur Boulevard, Santa Ana, California 92707, on November 15, 2011 at 9:30 a.m., California time. The formal notice of the Annual Meeting appears on the following page. The attached Notice of Annual Meeting and Proxy Statement describe the matters that we expect to be acted upon at the Annual Meeting.

This year, we are pleased to be using the Securities and Exchange Commission rule that allows companies to furnish their proxy materials over the Internet. As a result, we are mailing to most of our stockholders a "Notice of Internet Availability of Proxy Materials" instead of a printed copy of the Proxy Statement and our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. The Notice of Internet Availability contains instructions on how stockholders can access those documents over the Internet and vote their shares. The Notice of Internet Availability also contains instructions on how stockholders can receive a printed copy of our proxy materials, including the Proxy Statement and our 2011 Annual Report. All stockholders who do not receive a Notice of Internet Availability will receive a printed copy of the proxy materials by mail. We believe this process will expedite stockholders' receipt of proxy materials, lower the costs of our Annual Meeting and reduce the environmental impact of our Annual Meeting.

During the Annual Meeting, stockholders will view a presentation by Corinthian's senior management and vote on the matters set forth in the Notice of Annual Meeting on the following page. Whether or not you plan to attend the Annual Meeting, it is important that your shares be represented.

You may submit your proxy or voting instructions over the Internet or (if you receive a printed copy of the proxy materials) by telephone or by marking, signing, dating and mailing the proxy card or voting instruction form you received in the pre-addressed return envelope provided. Regardless of the number of shares you own, we urge you to promptly submit your proxy or voting instructions in order to ensure your representation and the presence of a quorum at the Annual Meeting. If you properly submit a proxy or voting instructions without specifying your choices, your shares will be voted in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Directors contained in the Proxy Statement.

We look forward to seeing you on November 15, 2011 and urge you to submit your proxy or voting instructions as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Jack D. Massimino
*Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executive Officer*

CORINTHIAN COLLEGES, INC.

6 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 400
Santa Ana, CA 92707
(714) 427-3000

NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS TO BE HELD ON NOVEMBER 15, 2011

TO THE STOCKHOLDERS OF CORINTHIAN COLLEGES, INC.:

The Annual Meeting of Stockholders of Corinthian Colleges, Inc. ("Corinthian" or the "Company") will be held at 9:30 a.m., California time, on November 15, 2011, at the DoubleTree Hotel located at 201 East MacArthur Boulevard, Santa Ana, California 92707, for the following purposes:

1. To elect the ten director nominees named in this Proxy Statement to the Company's Board of Directors for a one-year term expiring at the Annual Meeting of Stockholders in 2012;
2. To approve the amendment and restatement of the Corinthian Colleges, Inc. 2003 Performance Award Plan (the "2003 Plan"), which authorizes the issuance of an additional 4,250,000 shares under the 2003 Plan, and certain other amendments described elsewhere herein;
3. To ratify the appointment by the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors of Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's independent auditors for its fiscal year ending June 30, 2012;
4. To approve, by a nonbinding advisory vote, executive compensation paid by the Company to its named executive officers;
5. To recommend, by a nonbinding advisory vote, the frequency of holding future nonbinding stockholder advisory votes on executive compensation; and
6. To transact such other business as may properly come before the meeting or any postponements or adjournments thereof.

The Board of Directors has fixed the close of business on September 20, 2011 as the record date for determining stockholders entitled to notice of, and to vote at, the meeting.

By order of the Board of Directors,

Stan A. Mortensen
Corporate Secretary

Santa Ana, California
October 6, 2011

ALL STOCKHOLDERS ARE URGED TO ATTEND THE MEETING IN PERSON OR BY PROXY. WHETHER OR NOT YOU EXPECT TO BE PRESENT AT THE MEETING, PLEASE VOTE YOUR SHARES PROMPTLY. TO VOTE YOUR SHARES, SUBMIT YOUR PROXY OR VOTING INSTRUCTIONS OVER THE INTERNET OR (IF YOU RECEIVE A PRINTED COPY OF THE PROXY MATERIALS) CALL THE TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN THE INSTRUCTIONS ON YOUR PROXY CARD OR VOTING INSTRUCTION FORM, OR SIGN, DATE AND RETURN THE PROXY CARD OR VOTING INSTRUCTION FORM YOU RECEIVED IN THE PRE-ADDRESSED POSTAGE-PAID ENVELOPE PROVIDED FOR THAT PURPOSE. THIS WILL NOT LIMIT YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE IN PERSON IF YOU ATTEND THE ANNUAL MEETING (AND, IF

YOU ARE NOT A STOCKHOLDER OF RECORD, YOU HAVE OBTAINED A LEGAL PROXY FROM THE BROKER, BANK OR OTHER NOMINEE THAT HOLDS YOUR SHARES GIVING YOU THE RIGHT TO VOTE THE SHARES IN PERSON AT THE ANNUAL MEETING).

PROXY STATEMENT

The accompanying proxy is solicited by the Board of Directors of Corinthian Colleges, Inc., a Delaware corporation (the "Company" or "Corinthian"), for use at the Annual Meeting of Stockholders to be held at 9:30 a.m., California time, on November 15, 2011, at the DoubleTree Hotel located at 201 East MacArthur Boulevard, Santa Ana, California 92707, and any postponements or adjournments thereof.

Important Notice Regarding the Availability of Proxy Materials for the Annual Meeting of Stockholders to Be Held on November 15, 2011. This Proxy Statement and 2011 Annual Report are available electronically on the Company's website at www.cci.edu under the heading "Investors Financial Information." In addition, you may access these materials at www.edocumentview.com/COCO.

General

This year, we are pleased to be using the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") rule that allows companies to furnish their proxy materials over the Internet. As a result, we are mailing to most of our stockholders a Notice of Internet Availability of Proxy Materials ("Notice of Internet Availability") instead of a printed copy of this Proxy Statement and our Annual Report on Form 10-K (our "2011 Annual Report") for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. The Notice of Internet Availability contains instructions on how stockholders can access a copy of this Proxy Statement and our 2011 Annual Report over the Internet and vote their shares. The Notice of Internet Availability also contains instructions on how stockholders can receive a printed copy of our proxy materials, including this Proxy Statement and our 2011 Annual Report. All stockholders who do not receive a Notice of Internet Availability will receive a printed copy of the proxy materials by mail. We believe this process will expedite stockholders' receipt of proxy materials, lower the costs of the Annual Meeting and reduce the environmental impact of the Annual Meeting.

We are first mailing the Notice of Internet Availability to our stockholders on or about October 6, 2011. For stockholders receiving a printed copy of our proxy materials, this Proxy Statement, the accompanying form of proxy or voting instructions and our 2011 Annual Report were first sent to stockholders on or about October 6, 2011. Our 2011 Annual Report is not incorporated into this Proxy Statement and is not considered proxy soliciting material.

Record Date and Outstanding Shares

The Board of Directors has fixed the close of business on September 20, 2011, as the record date (the "Record Date") for the determination of stockholders entitled to notice of, and to vote at, the Annual Meeting and any postponements or adjournments thereof. As of the Record Date, Corinthian had approximately 84,843,281 shares of Common Stock outstanding. Each of the outstanding shares of Common Stock is entitled to one vote on all matters to come before the Annual Meeting.

Voting of Record Holders

Beth Wilson and Kenneth S. Ord, the persons named as proxies to vote the shares represented by each properly submitted proxy, were selected by the Board of Directors to serve in such capacity. Ms. Wilson and Mr. Ord are both executive officers of Corinthian. The shares represented by each properly submitted proxy will be voted in accordance with the directions indicated thereon, or if no direction is indicated, such proxy will be voted in accordance with the recommendations of the Board of Directors contained in this Proxy Statement.

Each stockholder giving a proxy has the power to revoke it at any time before the shares it represents are voted. Revocation of a proxy is effective if, before voting begins at the Annual Meeting, either (i) the Secretary of Corinthian receives from the stockholder an instrument bearing a later date

than the proxy, revoking the proxy or (ii) the stockholder properly submits another proxy bearing a later date. Additionally, a stockholder may change or revoke a previously submitted proxy by voting in person at the Annual Meeting. For shares you hold beneficially in "street name," you may change your vote by submitting new voting instructions to your broker, trustee or nominee, or, if you have obtained a "legal proxy" from your broker, trustee or nominee giving you the right to vote your shares, by attending the Annual Meeting and voting in person. Please note that attendance at the Annual Meeting will not by itself constitute revocation of a proxy.

Required Vote

Directors. A plurality of the votes represented by shares of Common Stock present in person or represented by proxy at the Annual Meeting and entitled to vote on the election of directors is required for the election of directors. This means that the ten director nominees receiving the most votes "for" election will be elected. You may vote "for" or "withhold" with respect to the election of directors. Because directors are elected by plurality, withheld votes will have no effect on the outcome of the election of directors. Additionally, the Company's Corporate Governance Principles, which are available on the Company's website at www.cci.edu under the heading "Investors," set forth our procedures if a director-nominee is elected, but receives a majority of "withhold" votes. Under these principles, in an uncontested election any nominee for director who receives a greater number of votes "withheld" from his or her election than votes "for" such election is required to tender his or her resignation following certification of the stockholder vote. The Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee is then required to make recommendations to the Board with respect to any such letter of resignation. The Board is required to take action with respect to this recommendation and to disclose its decision and the reasons therefor.

Amendment and Restatement of the 2003 Performance Award Plan. The affirmative vote of a majority of the shares of Common Stock represented in person or by proxy and entitled to vote on the proposal is required to approve the amendment and restatement of the Corinthian Colleges, Inc. 2003 Performance Award Plan (the "2003 Plan"). Abstentions with respect to the proposal to approve the amendment and restatement of the 2003 Plan are treated as shares present or represented and entitled to vote and, therefore, will have the same effect as a vote against this proposal.

Ratification of Auditors. The affirmative vote of a majority of the shares of Common Stock represented in person or by proxy and entitled to vote on the proposal is required to ratify the appointment by the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors of Ernst & Young LLP as Corinthian's independent auditors. Abstentions with respect to the proposal to ratify Ernst & Young LLP as the Company's independent auditor are treated as shares present or represented and entitled to vote on the proposal and, therefore, will have the same effect as a vote against this proposal.

Advisory Vote on Executive Compensation. The affirmative vote of a majority of the shares of Common Stock represented in person or by proxy and entitled to vote on the proposal is required to approve, by a nonbinding advisory vote, the compensation paid by the Company to its named executive officers. Abstentions with respect to this nonbinding advisory vote are treated as shares present or represented and entitled to vote and, therefore, will have the same effect as a vote against this proposal.

Advisory Vote on Frequency of Future Advisory Votes on Executive Compensation. Generally, approval of any matter presented to stockholders requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the shares of Common Stock represented in person or by proxy and entitled to vote on the proposal. However, because this vote is advisory and nonbinding, if none of the frequency options (every one, two or three years) receive such affirmative majority approval, the option receiving the greatest number of votes will be considered the frequency recommended by the stockholders. Abstentions will not be counted in determining the frequency option receiving the greatest number of votes.

Edgar Filing: CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC - Form DEF 14A

Notwithstanding the vote standards described above, Proposal 3 (the ratification of auditors), Proposal 4 (advisory vote on executive compensation) and Proposal 5 (advisory vote on frequency of future advisory votes on executive compensation) are advisory only and are not binding on the Company. The Board of Directors will consider the outcome of the vote on each of these items in considering what action, if any, should be taken in response to the vote by stockholders.

See "Quorum and Broker Non-Votes" below for a discussion concerning the impact of broker non-votes on determining the outcome of the proposals.

Voting by Street Name Holders

If you are the beneficial owner of shares held in "street name" by a broker, bank or nominee, the broker, bank or nominee, as the record holder of the shares, is required to vote those shares in accordance with your instructions. If your shares are held in a brokerage account and you do not give instructions, the broker will nevertheless be entitled to vote the shares with respect to "discretionary" items but will not be permitted to vote the shares with respect to "non-discretionary" items (in which case, the shares will be treated as "broker non-votes"). See "Quorum and Broker Non-Votes" below. As a beneficial owner of shares, you are also entitled to attend the Annual Meeting; however, you may not vote your shares in person at the Annual Meeting unless you obtain from the broker, bank or nominee that holds your shares a "legal proxy" giving you the right to vote the shares in person at the Annual Meeting.

Quorum and Broker Non-Votes

The required quorum for transaction of business at the Annual Meeting will be a majority of the shares present in person or by proxy and entitled to vote at the Annual Meeting that are outstanding as of the Record Date. The election inspectors appointed for the meeting will determine whether or not a quorum is present. If you properly submit a proxy or voting instructions, even if you abstain from voting, then your shares will be counted for purposes of determining the presence of a quorum.

As described above, if your shares are held in a brokerage account and you do not give instructions, the broker will nevertheless be entitled to vote the shares with respect to "discretionary" items but will not be permitted to vote the shares with respect to "non-discretionary" items. We believe that brokers have "discretionary" voting authority with respect to Proposal 3 to be voted on at the Annual Meeting but do not have "discretionary" voting authority with respect to Proposals 1, 2, 4 and 5 to be voted on at the Annual Meeting. Accordingly, if you hold your shares in street name through a brokerage account and you do not submit voting instructions to your broker, your broker may exercise its discretion to vote your shares on Proposal 3 but will not be permitted to vote your shares on any of the other items at the Annual Meeting. If your broker exercises this discretion, your shares will be counted as present for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum at the Annual Meeting and will be voted on Proposal 3 in the discretion of your broker, but your shares will constitute "broker non-votes" on each of the other items at the Annual Meeting. Broker non-votes will be treated as not present and not entitled to vote with respect to each of the other items at the Annual Meeting (even though those shares are considered entitled to vote for quorum purposes and will be entitled to vote on Proposal 3) and, therefore, will not be counted in determining the outcome of the vote on those items.

2011 Summary Annual Report

Our 2011 Annual Report contains financial and other information pertaining to the Company and is being furnished to stockholders simultaneously with this Proxy Statement.

PROPOSAL 1

ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

Corinthian's Board of Directors is currently comprised of ten members. The Company's Certificate of Incorporation provides that elections of directors are for one-year terms only. Accordingly, all ten directors will be elected at this Annual Meeting, each for a term of one year expiring at Corinthian's Annual Meeting of Stockholders in 2012 and until their respective successors are elected and qualified. Each of these ten director nominees, Terry Hartshorn, Paul St. Pierre, Linda Arey Skladany, Robert Lee, Jack Massimino, Alice Kane, Hank Adler, Sharon Robinson, Tim Sullivan and John Dionisio, are presently serving as directors of Corinthian and each of the nominees, other than Dr. Robinson who joined the Board in January 2011, was previously elected to the Board by our stockholders. Dr. Robinson was initially identified as a potential nominee by a third party who is not a director, officer or, to the Company's knowledge, a stockholder of the Company and, following the unanimous recommendation of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee (the "Nominating Committee"), was elected to the Board of Directors effective January 27, 2011.

The Board of Directors, following the unanimous recommendation of its Nominating Committee recommends that the stockholders vote in favor of the election of the nominees named in this Proxy Statement to serve as directors of Corinthian. See "Nominees for Election for a One-Year Term Expiring at the 2012 Annual Meeting" below.

Peter Waller, who served as a member of the Board of Directors starting in August 2008 and as the Company's Chief Executive Officer starting July 1, 2009, resigned from both positions on November 29, 2010. Additionally, the Board elected Sharon P. Robinson, Ed.D, as a director on January 27, 2011. Dr. Robinson's business experience and qualifications are provided below.

Each of the director nominees has consented to be named in this Proxy Statement and to serve as a director if elected. If at the time of the Annual Meeting any of the nominees should be unable or decline to serve, the persons named as proxies to vote the shares represented by each properly submitted proxy will vote for such substitute nominee or nominees as the Board of Directors recommends, or vote to allow the vacancy created thereby to remain open until filled by the Board of Directors, as the Board of Directors recommends. The Board of Directors has no reason to believe that any nominee will be unable or decline to serve as a director if elected.

The Nominating Committee believes that the continuing service of qualified incumbents promotes stability and continuity in the boardroom, contributing to the Board's ability to work as a collective body while giving the Company the benefit of the familiarity and insight into the Company's affairs that its directors have accumulated during their tenure. Accordingly, the Nominating Committee has often re-nominated incumbent directors who continue to satisfy the Nominating Committee's criteria for membership on the Board, who the Nominating Committee believes continue to make important contributions to the Board, and who consent to continue their service on the Board. The nominees standing for re-election at the 2011 Annual Meeting were chosen based upon their records of professional integrity, dedication, collegial approaches to board deliberation and decision-making, strong work ethics and diverse professional backgrounds. The specific experience, qualifications, attributes and skills of each nominee that led to the Board's conclusion that the nominees should serve on the Board of Directors of the Company are described in each nominee's biographical information below.

Nominees for Election for a One-Year Term Expiring at the 2012 Annual Meeting

The names of the nominees for the office of director and certain information concerning such nominees are set forth below:

Paul R. St. Pierre, age 66, served as Corinthian's Executive Vice President, Marketing & Admissions until his retirement in June 2003. Mr. St. Pierre has been a member of the Board of Directors since the Company's inception in July 1995, and was elected Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors in January 2003. Mr. St. Pierre is a member of the Compliance and the Nominating Committees of the Board of Directors. Prior to the Company's founding in 1995, he was employed by a subsidiary of National Education Corporation ("NEC") from 1991 to 1995. His first assignment at NEC was as School President for its San Bernardino, California campus. Subsequently, he held corporate assignments as Director of Special Projects, Vice President of Operations for the Learning Institutes Group (the largest colleges owned by NEC) and as Vice President, Marketing & Admissions for NEC. With decades of operational and marketing experience in private sector education and more than fifteen years as a director of the Company, Mr. St. Pierre brings to the Board in-depth knowledge of the Company and the industry that is important to the Board's oversight of the Company's business and assistance in helping develop, implement and assess the Company's operating plan and long-term strategy.

Linda Arey Skladany, Esq., age 66, became a member of the Board of Directors effective upon the completion of Corinthian's initial public offering in February 1999. She is the Chairperson of the Nominating Committee of the Board. Ms. Skladany retired in April 2003 from her position as Senior Associate Commissioner for External Relations at the United States Food and Drug Administration, a position she had held since June 2002. Prior to that time, she was Vice President for Congressional Relations at Parry, Romani, DeConcini & Symms, a Washington D.C. lobbying firm, from 1995 to June 2002. She was appointed to senior policy positions within the Departments of Education, Justice and Transportation from 1981 to 1985, and served as Commissioner and Acting Chair of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission from 1988 to 1989. Ms. Skladany served as Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Director for Public Liaison in the White House from 1985 to 1987. Earlier, she had worked as a teacher in public education and a university administrator. Ms. Skladany has previously served a four-year term on the Board of the College of William and Mary, her alma mater, where she chaired the Student Affairs Committee. Ms. Skladany has extensive regulatory and legislative experience gained through more than twenty years of work in federal agencies and in Congressional relations, all of which allows her to provide the Company with valuable insight into government affairs, regulatory compliance and Congressional relations. In addition, her twelve years of service on the Board provide her with an in-depth understanding of the Company's business.

Robert Lee, age 63, became a member of the Board of Directors in October 2006. Mr. Lee is a member of the Audit Committee and is the Chairperson of the Compliance Committee of the Board. Mr. Lee retired from Pacific Bell ("PacBell") in 1998 after a 26-year distinguished career. At the time of his retirement, Mr. Lee was a Corporate Executive Vice President and President of the Business Communications Services Division. In that role, he was responsible for an operation that generated \$3 billion in annual revenue, served one million customers and had 15,000 employees. During his career at PacBell, Mr. Lee served in a variety of senior marketing and general management positions, including Executive Vice President, California markets group and Executive Vice President, Marketing and Sales. Mr. Lee has been a director of Broadvision, Inc. since 2004 and serves as its compensation committee chair and a member of its nominating and audit committees. He serves as a director of Blue Shield of California, and is a member of its nominating and audit committees and chair of its compensation committee. From 1999 to 2007, Mr. Lee served on the board of directors of Web.com and as the chair of its compensation committee, and from 2001 to 2007 he served on the board of Netopia, Inc. and as a member of its audit committee. Mr. Lee is a seasoned executive with more than 25 years leading large organizations, including through service on the boards of several other public

and private companies. His experience as a senior executive and director bring important knowledge to the Board's oversight of the Company's business and operations, strategy and corporate governance practices.

Jack D. Massimino, age 62, is the Company's Chairman of the Board and its Chief Executive Officer, a position he held from November 2004 through June 2009, and again beginning November 29, 2010 following Peter Waller's resignation from that position. He was appointed Chairman of the Board in August 2008. Mr. Massimino initially joined the Board of Directors immediately upon the completion of Corinthian's initial public offering in February 1999. He was President and Chief Executive Officer of Talbert Medical Management Corporation, a publicly-traded physician practice management company, from 1995 through late 1997. Prior to his employment with Talbert, Mr. Massimino was Executive Vice President and Chief Operations Officer of FHP International Corporation, a multi-state, publicly-traded HMO, with revenues of approximately \$4 billion at the time of his service. Mr. Massimino currently sits on the board of Jobs for America's Graduates. With experience as the chief executive officer of two publicly-traded corporations, including the Company for an aggregate of more than five years, Mr. Massimino brings to the Board in-depth knowledge of the Company's operations and strategy that is important to the Board's role of overseeing long-term strategy development, implementation and assessment, enterprise risk management and corporate governance practices. He also possesses a strong ability to motivate and manage others, develop leaders and drive change and growth.

Hank Adler, age 65, has served on the Board of Directors since August 2004. He is the Chairperson of the Board's Audit Committee and a member of the Compliance Committee. Mr. Adler is currently an assistant professor of accounting at Chapman University. He was previously a partner with Deloitte & Touche, LLP, from which he retired in 2003 after 30 years with that firm. He specialized in tax accounting and served as client service and tax partner for a variety of public and private companies. Mr. Adler is a certified public accountant, licensed in the State of California, and is a member of the Audit Committee Roundtable. Mr. Adler has been a director of KBS REIT since 2005 and serves as its audit committee chair and a member of its conflicts committees. He also serves as a director of KBS REIT II and KBS REIT III and serves as the audit committee chair and a member of the conflicts committee of each. Mr. Adler was previously a board member of Hoag Hospital Memorial Presbyterian. Mr. Adler has over a quarter-century of experience in public accounting, giving him an expertise in finance and financial reporting processes that enables him to understand the impact of business decisions on the Company's financial statements and results. His experience serving on the Company's Board and on other boards has provided him with a deep understanding of the Company's business and operations that is important to the Board's oversight of the Company's corporate governance, risk management and strategy development and implementation.

John M. Dionisio, age 63, was appointed to the Board in April 2008. Mr. Dionisio is a member of the Audit Committee and the Compensation Committee of the Company's Board of Directors. He is currently president and chief executive officer of AECOM Technology Corp., a NYSE-listed company, and has served on its board of directors since 2003. During his 36-year career with AECOM and its predecessor companies, Mr. Dionisio has held a number of senior management positions, including executive vice president and chief operating officer, as well as president and chief executive officer of its DMJM Harris business. Mr. Dionisio earned a master's of science degree in civil engineering from Polytechnic Institute of New York and a bachelor's of science degree in civil engineering from The City College of New York. Mr. Dionisio's experience as the chief executive officer and director of another public company provides him with important insight into the Board's role in strategy development, risk management, compensation matters and corporate governance.

Alice T. Kane, age 63, was appointed to the Board of Directors in July 2005. She is a member of the Compliance Committee and is the Chairperson of the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors. Ms. Kane has more than 30 years of experience in the financial services industry. Ms. Kane

recently joined the law firm Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP as a partner, and she was previously the General Counsel of North America for the Zurich Financial Services Group, a position she held from 2005 to 2011. Prior to joining Zurich, she co-founded Q-Cubed Alternative Advisor LLC, a quantitative equity hedge fund, where she was Chair and Managing Director from September 2004 to October 2005. From September 2002 to March 2004, Ms. Kane was Chairman of Blaylock Asset Management, a start-up minority- and women-owned institutional manager. Starting in 1998, Ms. Kane served as Chairman and President of three mutual fund and variable annuity businesses with combined assets of over \$30 billion with American General Financial Group. She began her career at New York Life Insurance Company in 1972, where she ultimately served as Executive Vice President of its \$40 billion asset management business and as a member of the executive management committee. She also served as Executive Vice President and General Counsel of New York Life from 1986 to 1995. Ms. Kane also serves on three not-for-profit boards: the Tourette Syndrome Association (on which she has served on the Finance Committee and the Government Relations Committee), the Keck Graduate School of Applied Life Sciences (on which she has served on the Investment Committee, the Advancement Committee, the Budget and Finance Committee and the Audit / Risk Management Committee), and the Devereux Glenholme School. Ms. Kane was formerly a member of the National Association of Securities Dealers (NASD) Board of Governors. Ms. Kane was also previously a director of Guess?, Inc. from 1998 to 2010, where she was a member of the Audit Committee and chair of the Nominating and Governance Committee. Ms. Kane's executive management experience and legal career over the course of more than 30 years brings to the Board an invaluable perspective on various corporate and financial matters impacting the Company.

Terry O. Hartshorn, age 66, was appointed to the Board of Directors in September 2005, and is currently the lead independent director of the Board. Mr. Hartshorn is a member of the Audit Committee and the Nominating Committee of the Company's Board of Directors. Mr. Hartshorn was a member of the Board of Directors of PacifiCare Health Systems, Inc. from March 1985 until PacifiCare was purchased by UnitedHealth Group in December 2005. He was Chairman of the Board of PacifiCare from 1993 to 1998. He was President and Chief Executive Officer of UniHealth from 1994 to 1997. Mr. Hartshorn also served as President and Chief Executive Officer of PacifiCare from 1976 to 1993 and Secretary of PacifiCare from 1977 to 1981. Since 1997, Mr. Hartshorn has been an investor, advisor and personal coach for start-up and early stage companies in a variety of industries and serves as a director of LifeScript. He also served as a member of the board of St. Joseph's Ballet from 2000 through 2008, and as a board member of Mariner's Church from 2007 to 2008. Mr. Hartshorn's decades of experience in the roles of chairman of the board, president and chief executive officer of publicly-traded companies, and his advisory role in a variety of industries, provide valued leadership on the Board and insight into its role in strategy development and corporate governance.

Timothy J. Sullivan, age 67, was appointed to the Board of Directors in January 2008. Mr. Sullivan is a member of the Nominating Committee and the Compensation Committee of the Company's Board of Directors. Mr. Sullivan is president emeritus of the College of William and Mary. His career at the College of William and Mary spans more than 35 years and includes serving for 12 years as its president and, earlier, as dean and as executive director of its law school. Mr. Sullivan earned a bachelor's degree from the College of William and Mary and a juris doctorate degree from Harvard University. He served as chair of the Council of Presidents of the Association of Governing Boards from 2002 to 2005. Mr. Sullivan became a member of the board of Mariner's Museum in 2009 and serves on the finance and the programs committees. Mr. Sullivan was also a member of the board of directors of Towne Bank from 2000 to 2009. Mr. Sullivan's distinguished career at the College of William and Mary gives him a comprehensive understanding of post-secondary education and makes him a valuable resource to the Board. His experience serving on a publicly-traded company's board has provided him with a deep understanding of the Board's oversight of the Company's corporate governance and risk management.

Sharon P. Robinson, Ed.D., age 67, was appointed to the Board of Directors on January 27, 2011 and is a member of the Compensation Committee of the Company's Board of Directors. Dr. Robinson currently serves as President and Chief Executive Officer of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education a position she has held since 2005. Previously, she held a number of senior management positions at Educational Testing Service beginning in 1997, most recently as Executive Vice President and President of its Educational Policy Leadership Institute. From 1993 to 1997, Dr. Robinson was Assistant Secretary of Education with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Education Research and Improvement, and before that, she was Director of the National Center for Innovation for the National Education Association. Dr. Robinson earned a doctorate degree in educational administration and supervision, a master of arts degree in education curriculum and instruction and a bachelor's degree in English and education from the University of Kentucky. She has served, or currently serves, on the Board of Trustees of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Program, Southern Education Foundation, National Education Association Foundation for the Improvement of Education, and the Management and Training Corp., for which she serves as compensation committee chair, and she serves as a director for Jobs for America's Graduates. Dr. Robinson brings to the Board invaluable experience in understanding regulatory oversight and how it affects academics and operations. She can assist the Board in identifying trends that may impact the Company's operations, services or business model, in developing regulatory compliance models, and in delivering high-quality academic services.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS RECOMMENDS THAT STOCKHOLDERS VOTE FOR ALL OF THE NOMINEES FOR ELECTION AS DIRECTORS.

Director Compensation

Prior to August 17, 2010, the following compensation arrangements applied to members of the Board of Directors of the Company who were not employed by the Company (referred to herein as "non-employee directors"):

Each non-employee director was paid an annual retainer of \$40,000 for his or her services as a director, and \$1,500 for each Board of Directors meeting attended. Each member of the Compensation Committee (other than the Chairperson) received \$1,500 for each Compensation Committee meeting attended; and the Chairperson of the Compensation Committee received \$4,000 for each Compensation Committee meeting attended. Each member of the Audit Committee (other than the Chairperson) received \$2,000 for each Audit Committee meeting attended; and the Chairperson of the Audit Committee received \$5,000 for each Audit Committee meeting attended. Each member of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee (other than the Chairperson) received \$1,500 for each Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee meeting attended; and the Chairperson of the Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee received \$3,000 for each Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee meeting attended. Each member of the Compliance Committee (other than the Chairperson) received \$2,000 for each Compliance Committee meeting attended; and the Chairperson of the Compliance Committee received \$5,000 for each Compliance Committee meeting attended. All non-employee directors were also reimbursed for their reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in attending Board of Directors meetings and committee meetings.

Each non-employee director also received an annual option to purchase 10,500 shares of Common Stock following the August Board meeting in that year, and the lead independent director of the Board received an additional annual grant of an option to purchase 5,000 shares of Common Stock. All options were granted at a per share exercise price equal to the closing market price of a share of Common Stock on the date of grant of the option and vested immediately, but were not exercisable until the one-year anniversary of the grant date; provided, however, such one-year exercise limitation did not apply in the event of a dissolution or certain change-in-control events affecting the Company. Each non-employee director also received an annual grant of 1,500 deferred stock units ("DSUs")

following the August Board meeting in that year, which vested upon grant but could not be sold, and remain tax deferred, until the earlier to occur of (i) five years after the date of grant, (ii) the director's separation from service on the Board, (iii) the director's death or disability, or (iv) a change-in-control of the Company. New non-employee directors received an initial grant of 5,000 options to purchase Common Stock, which vested immediately but was not exercisable until the one-year anniversary of the grant date. Additionally, each new non-employee director elected or appointed at any time other than at the August Board meeting in that year also received (A) a pro-rated stock option grant in an amount equal to the product of (1) the percentage of the year remaining until the next regularly scheduled August Board meeting, and (2) 10,500, and (B) a pro-rated grant of DSUs in an amount equal to the product of (1) the percentage of the year remaining until the next regularly scheduled August Board meeting, and (2) 1,500.

Under the Nominating Committee's charter, it is responsible for (among other things) reviewing the compensation and benefits of non-employee directors and recommending to the Board for approval of any changes to such director compensation and benefits. During fiscal 2010, the Compensation Committee and the Nominating Committee jointly retained Exequity LLP ("Exequity") to serve as those committees' independent compensation consultant. In this capacity, Exequity reviewed the compensation for non-employee directors at the Company's peers and general industry trends, and provided observations and input to the Nominating Committee with respect to the program value and structure. The Nominating Committee reviewed such data and observations and made recommendations to the Board regarding proposed revisions to non-employee director compensation, which the Board approved on August 17, 2010. Beginning on August 17, 2010, the following compensation arrangements applied to the Company's non-employee directors:

Each non-employee director is paid an annual retainer of \$60,000 for his or her services as a director. Each member of the Compensation Committee (other than the Chairperson) receives an additional annual retainer of \$10,000; the Chairperson of the Compensation Committee receives an additional annual retainer of \$25,000. Each member of the Audit Committee (other than the Chairperson) receives an additional annual retainer of \$10,000; the Chairperson of the Audit Committee receives an additional annual retainer of \$25,000. Each member of the Nominating Committee (other than the Chairperson) receives an additional annual retainer of \$10,000; the Chairperson of the Nominating Committee receives an additional annual retainer of \$15,000. Each member of the Compliance Committee (other than the Chairperson) receives an additional annual retainer of \$10,000; the Chairperson of the Compliance Committee receives an additional annual retainer of \$20,000. Non-employee directors will also receive \$1,500 for each Board meeting attended in excess of six Board meetings in a fiscal year, and each Committee member will receive \$1,500 for each Committee meeting attended in excess of six meetings in a year. All non-employee directors are reimbursed for their reasonable out-of-pocket expenses incurred in attending Board of Directors meetings and committee meetings.

Each non-employee director will also receive an annual grant of DSUs with a target value of \$90,000, calculated based upon the average closing market price of the Common Stock during the month prior to the month in which the grant is made, but in no event to exceed 15,000 DSUs. The lead independent director will also receive an additional annual grant of DSUs with a target value of \$30,000, calculated in the same manner. With respect to grants made prior to October 28, 2010, these DSUs would vest upon grant but could not be sold, and would remain tax-deferred, until the earlier to occur of (i) five years after the date of grant, (ii) the director's separation from service on the Board, (iii) the director's death or disability, or (iv) a change-in-control of Corinthian. On October 27, 2010, the Board, upon the recommendation of the Nominating Committee made after reviewing and considering the input of Exequity, its independent compensation consultant, approved certain changes to the vesting and delivery schedule of DSUs. With respect to grants made after October 27, 2010, DSUs vest in four equal quarterly installments during the year following the grant date, but may not be

sold, and remain tax-deferred, until the earlier to occur of (i) three years after the date of grant, (ii) the director's separation from service on the Board, (iii) the director's death or disability, or (iv) a change-in-control of Corinthian. Directors also may voluntarily elect to receive their annual retainer in an equivalent amount of additional DSUs in lieu of cash. It is contemplated that these annual DSU grants will occur at the time of the Annual Stockholders' Meeting.

Directors are subject to a share ownership guideline under which they should hold, for as long as they continue to serve on the Board, Company Common Stock with a value equal to three times the annual cash retainer for the Company's non-employee directors, with no time limit to meet the ownership guideline, but with a requirement to hold 100% of net after-tax profit in shares acquired on option exercise or following DSU distribution until the guideline is met. The Board expects to periodically re-evaluate this ownership guideline in connection with changes in Board compensation.

Director Compensation Table Fiscal 2011

The following table presents information regarding the compensation paid during fiscal 2011 to individuals who were members of the Company's Board of Directors at any time during fiscal 2011 and who were not also employees of the Company during such period. The compensation paid to Jack D. Massimino and Peter C. Waller, both of whom were directors and employed by the Company during at least a portion of fiscal 2011, is presented below in the Summary Compensation Table and the related explanatory tables.

Name	Fees	Stock	Option	Total
	Earned or Paid in Cash	Awards	Awards	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(h)
Linda Arey Skladany	79,250	64,500	-0-	143,750
Paul R. St. Pierre	76,500	64,500	-0-	141,000
Hank Adler	91,250	64,500	-0-	155,750
Terry O. Hartshorn	76,500	86,000	-0-	163,000
Alice Kane	98,250	64,500	-0-	162,750
Robert Lee	87,500	64,500	-0-	152,000
Timothy Sullivan	79,000	64,500	-0-	143,500
John Dionisio	79,500	64,500	-0-	144,000
Sharon P. Robinson(4)	30,000	72,300	-0-	102,300

(1) In accordance with the Securities and Exchange Commission's (the "SEC") disclosure rules, the amounts reported in Column (c) of the table above reflect the fair value on the grant date of the stock awards granted to the Company's non-employee directors during fiscal year 2011. These values have been determined under the principles used to calculate the grant date fair value of equity awards for purposes of the Company's financial statements. For a discussion of the assumptions and methodologies used to calculate the amounts reported in Column (c), please see the discussions contained in Note 7 (Common Stockholders' Equity) to the Company's Consolidated Financial Statements included as part of the Company's 2011 Annual Report, which note is incorporated herein by reference.

(2) As described above, during fiscal year 2011 each of our continuing non-employee directors received an annual award of 15,000 DSUs. In addition, the lead independent director of the Board, Mr. Hartshorn, received an additional 5,000 DSUs (for a total annual award of 20,000 DSUs). In accordance with the Board-approved director

compensation arrangement described above, directors were not granted options to purchase the Company's Common Stock in fiscal year 2011.

- (3) As of June 30, 2011, the end of the Company's fiscal year 2011, the Company's non-employee directors held the following aggregate numbers of outstanding unexercised equity awards: (i) Linda Arey Skladany, 109,000 options and 18,000 DSUs; (ii) Paul R. St. Pierre, 274,400 options and 18,000 DSUs (of which 185,400 stock options were granted to Mr. St. Pierre while he was an employee of the Company prior to his retirement on June 30, 2003, and the remaining 89,000 stock options were granted to Mr. St. Pierre after his retirement solely for his services as a director); (iii) Hank Adler, 69,000 options and 18,000 DSUs; (iv) Terry O. Hartshorn, 106,000 options and 23,000 DSUs; (v) Alice Kane, 59,000 options and 18,000 DSUs; (vi) Robert Lee, 43,000 options and 18,000 DSUs; (vii) Timothy Sullivan, 32,125 options and 18,875 DSUs; (viii) John Dionisio, 29,500 options and 18,500 DSUs; and (ix) Sharon P. Robinson, 15,000 DSUs.
- (4) Dr. Robinson was appointed to the Board on January 27, 2011.

Attendance at Meetings

The Board of Directors met in person or conducted telephonic meetings a total of ten times during fiscal year 2011. During that same period, the Board acted three times by unanimous written consent. Each director who was a member of the Board at the time of the applicable meetings attended more than 75% of all Board meetings and applicable committee meetings held during the fiscal year. In addition, regular executive sessions of non-employee directors are held at least twice during each fiscal year.

Board members are encouraged to attend the Annual Meeting of Stockholders. Seven Board members who were on the Board of Directors at the time of last year's Annual Meeting of Stockholders attended the Annual Meeting, and three Board members were unable to attend.

Board Leadership Structure

The Board believes there is no single, generally accepted approach to providing Board leadership, and that leadership structure may vary as circumstances warrant. In the past, the Board has, at times, separated the positions of Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board to facilitate management succession and leadership development. Prior to Peter Waller's resignation as Chief Executive Officer in November 2010, the positions of Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer were separated. When Mr. Waller resigned as Chief Executive Officer and the Board re-appointed Jack Massimino to that position, it determined that he should maintain his position as Chairman of the Board as well. The Board of Directors believes this is the appropriate leadership structure for the Company at this time because it capitalizes on Mr. Massimino's experience as both a director of the Company for over ten years and as the Company's former Chief Executive Officer for more than an aggregate of five years. This dual role also promotes focused leadership and clarity in the overall direction of the Company's business strategy, and direct accountability between the Board and executive management. The Board of Directors acknowledges that the best leadership model for the Company may change based on the Company's needs at any given point in time, particularly with regard to management development and succession. Accordingly, the Board of Directors may, depending on the circumstances, determine that a different leadership structure would be in the best interests of the Company in the future.

Additionally, the Board of Directors has chosen Mr. Hartshorn to serve as the lead independent director to promote the independence of the Board and appropriate oversight of management. The lead independent director acts as a liaison between the independent directors and management and is responsible for assisting the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer in establishing the agenda for Board meetings and for performing such other duties as may be specified by the Board from time to time.

Risk Oversight

The Board has an active role, as a whole and through its committees, in overseeing management of the Company's risks. Management is responsible for identifying the material risks facing the Company and implementing appropriate risk management strategies. The Board's role includes oversight of management's day-to-day risk management activities and consideration of long-range strategic issues and risks to the Company. At regular Board meetings, the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board, in consultation with other members of management, proposes agenda items for the Board's approval of key issues of strategy, risk and integrity to be scheduled and discussed during the course of the fiscal year. In addition, the Board and its committees are periodically updated throughout the year on potential areas of risk exposure and processes to mitigate risks in the course of its review of the Company's strategy and business plan and through reports to the Board and its committees by senior members of management.

The Board's committees, all comprised solely of independent directors, assist the Board in fulfilling its oversight responsibilities in certain areas of risk. The Audit Committee oversees the Company's risk assessment and risk management policies, particularly the management of financial risks. The Compensation Committee oversees the management of risks relating to the structure of the Company's compensation plans, policies and overall philosophy. See "Risk Assessment and Mitigation." The Compliance Committee assists the Board in fulfilling its corporate governance and oversight responsibilities in relation to the Company's regulatory compliance obligations, and coordinates its activities with other committees of the Board. In addition, the Nominating Committee monitors risks associated with the effectiveness of the Board and the implementation of the Company's corporate governance principles. While each committee is responsible for evaluating certain risks and overseeing the management of such risks, each committee regularly reports to the entire Board regarding such risks, which allows the Board and its committees to coordinate the risk oversight role, particularly with respect to risk interrelationships.

The Board of Directors believes that the processes it has established to administer the Board's risk oversight function would be effective under a variety of leadership frameworks and therefore do not have a material effect on the Company's leadership structure described above under "Board Leadership Structure."

Committees of the Board of Directors

The Board of Directors has established an Audit Committee, a Compensation Committee, a Nominating Committee and a Compliance Committee.

The Board of Directors has determined that Mr. Adler, Ms. Skladany, Ms. Kane, Mr. Hartshorn, Mr. St. Pierre, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Dionisio, Mr. Lee and Dr. Robinson are "independent" under applicable Nasdaq listing standards, including that each such director is free of any relationship that would interfere with his or her individual exercise of independent judgment in carrying out the responsibilities of a director. Due to their positions with the Company, Mr. Massimino does not qualify, and, during the period of his service on the Board, Mr. Waller did not qualify, as independent directors. During fiscal 2011, Mr. Adler, Mr. St. Pierre, Mr. Hartshorn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Dionisio, Ms. Skladany, and Ms. Kane served on committees of the Board.

Audit Committee. The Audit Committee is currently comprised of Mr. Adler (chairperson), Mr. Hartshorn, Mr. Lee and Mr. Dionisio. Each of these directors is an "independent director" as defined in the Nasdaq listing standards and in Rule 10A-3 promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. The Board of Directors has determined that Mr. Adler is an "audit committee financial expert," as such term is defined in Regulation S-K, Item 407(d)(5) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. The Audit Committee operates under a written charter adopted by the Board of Directors. A copy of the Audit Committee's Charter can be

viewed under the heading "Investors" on the Company's website at www.cci.edu. The Audit Committee is responsible for, among other things, reviewing the results and scope of the audit and other services provided by the Company's independent auditors, consulting with the Company's independent auditors and retaining the Company's independent auditors. The Audit Committee met four times during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

Compensation Committee. The Compensation Committee was comprised of Ms. Kane (chairperson), Mr. Dionisio, Ms. Skladany and Mr. Sullivan from July 1, 2010 to January 27, 2011. On January 27, 2011, Ms. Skladany resigned from the Compensation Committee. In August 2011, after the end of fiscal 2011, Dr. Robinson was appointed to the Compensation Committee. Each of these directors is an "independent director" as defined in applicable Nasdaq rules. The Compensation Committee operates under a written charter adopted by our Board of Directors, a copy of which is available on the Company's website at www.cci.edu under the heading "Investors." The Compensation Committee has the authority to supervise all of the matters related to the compensation of executive officers of the Company, including determining policies and practices, changes in compensation and benefits for management, and all other matters relating to executive compensation. The Compensation Committee also administers the Company's 1998 Performance Award Plan, as amended, the 2003 Plan, the Company's 2004 New-Hire Award Plan, and the Employee Stock Purchase Plan.

The Compensation Committee may form subcommittees and delegate to its subcommittees such power and authority as it deems appropriate. The Compensation Committee currently has no such subcommittees and has no current intention to delegate any of its authority to any subcommittee. The Company's executive officers, including the Named Executive Officers (as identified below), do not have any role in setting the form or amount of compensation paid to the Named Executive Officers and other senior executive officers. However, the Company's Chief Executive Officer does make recommendations to the Compensation Committee with respect to compensation paid to the other executive officers, in some instances after receiving input from other executive officers.

Pursuant to its charter, the Compensation Committee is authorized to retain such independent compensation consultants and other outside experts or advisors as it believes to be necessary or appropriate to carry out its duties. During fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee retained the services of Exequity as its independent compensation consultant to provide advice in determining certain compensation matters for the Company's senior executive officers.

The Compensation Committee met eleven times during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

Nominating and Corporate Governance Committee. The Nominating Committee of the Board is currently comprised of Ms. Skladany (chairperson), Mr. Hartshorn, Mr. St. Pierre and Mr. Sullivan. Each of these directors is an "independent director" as defined in applicable Nasdaq rules. The Nominating Committee operates under a written charter adopted by our Board of Directors, a copy of which is available on the Company's website at www.cci.edu under the heading "Investors." The Nominating Committee's functions include identifying qualified individuals to become Board members, recommending the composition of the Board of Directors' committees, monitoring a process to assess Board effectiveness, and reviewing and making recommendations regarding director compensation. The Nominating Committee met five times during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

Compliance Committee. The Compliance Committee is currently comprised of Mr. Lee (chairperson), Mr. Adler, Ms. Kane and Mr. St. Pierre. Each of these directors is an "independent director" as defined in the applicable Nasdaq rules. The Compliance Committee operates under a written charter adopted by our Board of Directors. A copy of the Compliance Committee Charter can be viewed under the heading "Investors" on the Company's website at www.cci.edu. The Compliance Committee is responsible for, among other things, reviewing the Company's processes to ensure that an appropriate framework of policies, procedures, reporting, ethical standards and employee accountability

is established and functioning to achieve regulatory compliance. This includes reviewing with management the appropriate allocation of resources to achieve the desired results and reviewing the Company's efforts to nurture a culture of compliance and embed compliance awareness and accountability throughout the Company. The Compliance Committee met five times during the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.

Director Nomination Process

The Nominating Committee does not apply any specific, minimum qualifications in considering potential board members. Instead, in its assessment of potential board member candidates, the Nominating Committee reviews the nominees' experience and independence, the current needs of the Board, and such other factors as the Nominating Committee may determine are pertinent at the time. The Nominating Committee does not have a formal policy regarding the consideration of diversity in identifying director nominees, but from time to time looks for individuals with specific qualifications so that the Board as a whole may maintain an appropriate diversity of backgrounds. The Nominating Committee will also take into account the ability of a person to devote the time and effort necessary to fulfill his or her responsibilities. Nominees may be suggested to the Nominating Committee by other directors, members of management and Company stockholders. The Nominating Committee also has in the past engaged third-party consultants to help identify and evaluate potential director nominees. In considering nominees to the Board, the Nominating Committee will select individuals who have the highest personal and professional integrity and who have demonstrated exceptional ability and judgment to be most effective, in conjunction with the other members of the Board, in collectively serving the long-term interests of the stockholders.

The Nominating Committee will consider stockholder recommendations for candidates to serve on the Board. The Nominating Committee's evaluation does not vary based on whether or not a candidate is recommended by a stockholder. In order to provide the Nominating Committee time to evaluate candidates prior to submission to the stockholders for vote at the 2012 Annual Meeting, stockholders desiring to recommend a candidate must submit a recommendation to the Secretary of the Company at the Company's corporate office no later than the close of business on July 15, 2012. The recommendation must contain the following: the name, residence and business address of the nominating stockholder; a representation that the stockholder is a record holder of Company stock or holds Company stock through a broker and the number of shares held; a representation as to whether or not the stockholder holds any derivative positions or has engaged in any hedging or other transactions that impacts voting power or economic interest with respect to the Company's securities; information regarding each nominee which would be required to be included in a proxy statement, including a statement of the qualifications of the recommended person; a description of any arrangements or understandings between and among the stockholder and each nominee; and the written consent of each nominee to serve as a director, if elected.

Stockholder Communications

Any stockholder wishing to communicate with the Board, or any individual director, may write to the Board of Directors or such individual director, as applicable, c/o the Corporate Secretary of the Company, at 6 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 400, Santa Ana, California 92707. The Corporate Secretary will forward these communications directly to the individual director specified, or if none, to the Chairman of the Board.

Code of Ethics

The Board of Directors has adopted a Code of Business Conduct and Ethics that is applicable to all Corinthian employees, including the Company's principal executive officer, principal financial officer, principal accounting officer or controller and all other persons performing similar functions, which

meets the requirements of Item 406 of Regulation S-K promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended. A copy of the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics can be viewed under the heading "Investors" on the Company's website at www.cci.edu. Waivers from, and amendments to, the Code of Business Conduct and Ethics that apply to directors, executive officers, other principal financial officers or persons performing similar functions may be timely posted in the "Investors" section of the Company's website at www.cci.edu, or a Report on Form 8-K will be filed with the SEC with respect to such items.

Review and Approval of Transactions with Related Persons

The Audit Committee's Charter requires that the Audit Committee conduct an appropriate review of all proposed related person transactions (which term refers to transactions that would be required to be disclosed pursuant to Regulation S-K, Item 404(a) promulgated under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended) and that management shall not cause the Company to enter into any new related person transaction unless the Audit Committee approves such transactions. In addition, the Company's Code of Business Conduct and Ethics requires that all employees discuss any material transaction or relationship that could reasonably be expected to give rise to a conflict of interest with the Company's General Counsel, except in the case of the Company's Chief Executive Officer, in which case such matter should be discussed with the chair of the Audit Committee. Additionally, executive officers and directors of the Company must not engage in any transaction with the Company unless it has been previously approved by the Audit Committee of the Board of Directors. For purposes of this requirement, the term "transaction" does not include compensation which is approved by the Compensation Committee of the Board for services to the Company.

Transactions with Related Persons

Ms. Skladany's husband is a partner at the law firm of Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP ("Akin Gump"), and in February 2011, the Company retained Mr. Skladany and other attorneys and advisors in that firm to provide it with legal advice and other services related to legislative and regulatory matters. Akin Gump is an international law firm with approximately 700 lawyers, 170 equity partners, and more than \$700 million in annual gross revenue in 2010, according to *The American Lawyer*. The Company expects that total payments to Akin Gump during any given fiscal year will not exceed approximately \$350,000. The engagement by the Company of Akin Gump has been approved by the Audit Committee. The Company and its subsidiaries had no other transactions, nor are there any currently proposed transactions, in which the Company or its subsidiaries was or is to be a participant, where the amount involved exceeded \$120,000, and where any director, executive officer or beneficial holder of more than 5% of the outstanding shares of Common Stock, or any of their immediate family members, had a material direct or indirect interest reportable under applicable SEC rules.

Corporate Governance Principles

The Board of Directors, on the recommendation of the Nominating Committee, has adopted Corporate Governance Principles to assist the Board in the discharge of its duties and to serve the interest of the Company and its stockholders. The Corporate Governance Principles can be viewed under the heading "Investors" on the Company's website at www.cci.edu.

Compensation Committee Interlocks and Insider Participation

The Compensation Committee was comprised of Ms. Kane (chairperson), Mr. Sullivan, Ms. Skladany and Mr. Dionisio from July 1, 2010 to January 27, 2011. After January 27, 2011 through the end of fiscal year 2011, the Compensation Committee was comprised of Ms. Kane (chairperson), Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Dionisio. Dr. Robinson was appointed to the Compensation Committee in August 2011, after the end of fiscal 2011. No one during the period of his or her service on the Compensation

Committee is a past or present officer or employee of the Company or had any relationship with the Company requiring disclosure under the SEC rules with respect to transactions with related persons. In addition, no executive officer of the Company serves or has served as a member of the Compensation Committee (or other committee serving an equivalent function) or board of directors of any entity, an executive officer of which served as a director or member of the Compensation Committee of the Company during fiscal 2011.

Adverse Interests

On October 19, 2010, a shareholder derivative complaint captioned *David Realty Company, derivatively on behalf of Corinthian Colleges, Inc., v. Jack Massimino, et al.*, was filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California against all of the then-current members of the Company's Board of Directors, plus Kenneth Ord and Matt Ouimet, both of whom are current or former officers of the Company, and against the Company as a nominal defendant. On October 22, 2010, a second shareholder derivative complaint captioned *Jake Vale, derivatively on behalf of Corinthian Colleges, Inc., v. Paul St. Pierre, et al.*, was filed in the United States District Court for the Central District of California against all of the current members of the Company's Board of Directors, plus Kenneth Ord, and against the Company as a nominal defendant. The *David Realty Company* complaint asserts causes of action for breach of fiduciary duty, unjust enrichment, and breach of fiduciary duty for insider selling and misappropriation of information; the *Vale* complaint asserts causes of action for violation of Section 14(a) of the 1934 Exchange Act, breach of fiduciary duty, unjust enrichment, and indemnification and contribution. These matters have now been consolidated in the United States District Court for the Central District of California in a matter captioned *In re: Corinthian Colleges, Inc. Shareholder Derivative Litigation*, and the Company and the individual defendants have filed a motion to dismiss the consolidated action. The Company and the individual defendants believe the complaint is without merit, and the Company intends to defend this matter vigorously.

Section 16(a) Beneficial Ownership Reporting Compliance

Section 16 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, requires the Company's officers (as defined under Section 16), directors and persons who beneficially own greater than 10% of a registered class of the Company's equity securities to file reports of ownership and changes in ownership with the SEC. Based solely on a review of the forms it has received and those it has prepared on behalf of officers of the Company, the Company believes that all Section 16 filing requirements applicable to its officers, directors and 10% beneficial owners during or with respect to fiscal 2011 were complied with by such persons.

COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Corinthian is one of the leading post-secondary education companies in North America. Corinthian focuses on delivering value to students while steadily improving the Company's operational and financial results. In doing so, the Company believes it is serving students, employees, and shareholders alike. During fiscal 2011, the post-secondary industry continued to face challenges and uncertainty due to the regulatory and economic environment in general. In particular, new U.S. Department of Education ("ED") regulations regarding compensation for employees engaged in certain enrollment activities and regulations regarding "gainful employment" resulted in substantial industry disruption. Despite these challenges, the Company made progress on several fronts and implemented new programs and procedures in response to changing regulations. Managing Corinthian's business during this time of change requires a team of talented and experienced executives, and, accordingly, Corinthian's executive compensation philosophy is designed to attract and retain top talent, align pay and performance, and encourage value creation for investors and students.

The following contains a discussion of the material elements of compensation for the Company's current and former principal executive officers, principal financial officer, and the three other most-highly compensated individuals who served as executive officers of the Company during its 2011 fiscal year. These six individuals are referred to as the "Named Executive Officers" in this Proxy Statement. The Company's Named Executive Officers for fiscal 2011 were as follows:

Name	Title
Jack Massimino	Chairman of the Board and, as of November 29, 2010, Chief Executive Officer
Peter Waller	Former Chief Executive Officer
Kenneth Ord	Executive Vice President, Chief Administrative Officer and Chief Financial Officer
Beth Wilson	Executive Vice President
Bill Buchanan	Executive Vice President, Marketing and Admissions
Stan Mortensen	Executive Vice President and General Counsel

During fiscal 2011, Corinthian experienced several executive leadership changes. In October 2010, Matt Ouimet resigned from his position as Chief Operating Officer, and in November 2010, Peter Waller resigned from his position as the Company's Chief Executive Officer and as a member of the Board of Directors. Upon Mr. Waller's resignation, the Board appointed Jack Massimino as the Chief Executive Officer in addition to his existing role as Chairman of the Board. Mr. Massimino previously served as Chief Executive Officer of the Company from November 2004 until July 2009. He has served on the Board since 1999.

The executive compensation structure in place for fiscal year 2010 did not substantially change in fiscal 2011. For fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee was concerned with retaining its key executives given anticipated regulatory changes, a difficult economic environment, and the resulting industry uncertainty. Regulatory changes that took place in fiscal 2011 led to some changes for fiscal 2012. For fiscal 2012, the Company is maintaining the key elements of its executive compensation structure, but has made changes to the annual bonus program and long-term incentive program to better reflect the Company's strategic goals and adapt to the industry environment.

Edgar Filing: CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC - Form DEF 14A

For fiscal 2011, the primary compensation actions taken by the Compensation Committee for our executive officers are summarized below:

Base Salary: In July 2010, the Compensation Committee approved modest base salary increases for the Company's executives. Most executives received increases of approximately 3%, though a few of the Named Executive Officers received more substantial increases to reflect performance, competitive market practices, and desired pay positioning. The Compensation Committee also approved select additional salary increases during fiscal 2011 to reflect promotions.

Bonus Payouts: For fiscal 2011, target bonus opportunities remained constant for all Named Executive Officers as compared to fiscal 2010. As in prior years, bonus payouts for fiscal 2011 were determined based on the achievement of an operating income goal and a regulatory compliance gate established at the beginning of the fiscal year. The Company achieved 91.7% of its operating income target and achieved its compliance objective for fiscal 2011. This resulted in payouts of 50% of the target bonus opportunities for executive officers.

Long-Term Equity Incentive Awards: The Compensation Committee approved annual equity awards to the Company's executives in August and November 2010 in the form of stock options and restricted stock units ("RSUs"). Consistent with prior years, the exercise price of all stock option grants equaled the closing price of the Company's stock on the date of grant. The Company utilized its equity grant guidelines, expressed as a percentage of the executive's annual base salary, to determine the number of stock options and RSUs to award. The Compensation Committee also applied a premium to its standard equity grant guidelines for executives in fiscal 2011 to encourage retention through the uncertain regulatory environment. However, the actual grant date value of the equity awards, including the impact of the retention premium, were materially below the equity grant guidelines as the grant date stock price was substantially below the stock price used to determine the number of shares to award. For purposes of converting the target equity value for executives into a number of RSUs and stock options, the Committee used the 30-day average closing price of the Company's common equity in July 2010 (\$9.69 per share). However, on the grant dates of August 25, 2010 and November 17, 2010, the actual grant date stock prices were substantially lower, at \$4.73 per share and \$4.30 per share, respectively, than the conversion price to determine the number of shares granted, resulting in a lower grant date value than the target equity values would have delivered. The Compensation Committee also considered implementing performance-based long-term incentives for executives to further align pay with performance. However, given the difficulty of setting appropriate performance goals in light of continued regulatory and economic uncertainty, the Compensation Committee decided to maintain its existing equity incentive program with time-based vesting requirements and to not implement such performance-based long-term incentives at this time.

Chief Executive Officer Compensation: In November 2010, the Compensation Committee approved the compensation package for Jack Massimino in connection with his appointment as the Company's Chief Executive Officer. Mr. Massimino was already serving as the Company's Executive Chairman when appointed as Chief Executive Officer. The Compensation Committee set Mr. Massimino's annual base salary at \$900,000, his target bonus opportunity at 115% of his annual base salary, and his target long-term incentive ("LTI") opportunity at 350% of his annual base salary.

The Compensation Committee also took certain actions in June 2011 related to the Company's executive compensation for fiscal 2012:

Base Salary: At the end of fiscal 2011, the Company made additional compensation adjustments intended to be carried through fiscal 2012. Base salaries for most executives increased by 3%. The Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer received no salary increase while some Named Executive Officers received larger salary increases to reflect competitive market levels, desired external and internal pay positioning, and promotions.

Annual Cash Bonus Plan Design: For fiscal 2012, the Compensation Committee also approved a revised bonus plan design. 75% percent of the annual bonus opportunity for executives will continue to be based on operating profit performance. 25% will be based on other strategic corporate objectives. The strategic objectives are intended to align with strategic objectives for other bonus eligible employees, including those whose activities may be deemed to be covered by new ED regulations. These additional strategic objectives serve to balance the continued emphasis on key financial objectives with important non-financial strategic initiatives aligned throughout the organization.

Long-Term Equity Incentive Plan Design: For fiscal 2012, the Compensation Committee approved changes to the long-term equity incentive plan. In fiscal 2011, the equity value for executives was delivered 70% in stock options and 30% in RSUs. For fiscal 2012, the equity value was delivered 50% in stock options and 50% in RSUs. Consistent with prior years, the exercise price of all stock option grants equaled the Company's closing stock price on the date of grant. Once again, the actual grant date value of the equity awards was below the equity grant guidelines and market as the grant date stock price was substantially below the stock price used to determine the number of shares to award.

Role of the Compensation Committee and Compensation Consultants

The Company's executive compensation programs are determined and approved by the Compensation Committee. As contemplated by its Charter, the Compensation Committee annually evaluates the Chief Executive Officer's compensation in light of corporate performance and the competitive labor market environment in which the Company competes for executive talent, and bases the Chief Executive Officer's compensation, including salary, bonus, grants of equity compensation, perquisites and severance arrangements, upon such evaluations. The Compensation Committee also annually reviews and approves the compensation structure for the Company's other executive officers, including the other Named Executive Officers, by assessing the Company's general performance and the competitive labor market, and sets the annual compensation, including salary, bonus, and equity compensation grants, for such executive officers. None of the Named Executive Officers are members of the Compensation Committee or otherwise had any role in making decisions regarding the compensation of other Named Executive Officers, although the Compensation Committee does consider the recommendations of the Chief Executive Officer in setting the compensation levels for other executive officers.

Under its Charter, the Compensation Committee has the authority to hire independent consultants to advise it on executive compensation matters. During fiscal 2010, the Compensation Committee first retained Exequity as its independent compensation consultant. In this role, Exequity has advised the Compensation Committee regarding fiscal 2011 compensation decisions, as well as 2012 program design and executive compensation levels, including advising the Compensation Committee as it determined the compensation structure for the Company's Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer. Exequity has not, at any time, provided any services to the Company other than (i) consulting services provided in fiscal 2010, 2011 and 2012 to the Compensation Committee regarding executive compensation, and (ii) consulting services provided to the Nominating Committee regarding Director compensation.

Since fiscal 2008, the Company's management has retained Mercer LLC ("Mercer") to provide consulting services regarding the Company's overall compensation strategy. As part of its overall services to the Company, Mercer has provided observations and input regarding the compensation of executive officers, other than Mr. Massimino in his role as Chief Executive Officer in fiscal 2011 and his role as Executive Chairman in fiscal 2010 and 2011 and Mr. Waller in his role as Chief Executive Officer in fiscal 2010 and 2011. Mercer also provides management with other non-executive compensation and benefit consulting services. Mercer has not been retained by the Compensation Committee, and all data, observations and advice provided by Mercer to the Compensation Committee

with respect to executive compensation have been reviewed and commented on by the Compensation Committee's independent consultant, Exequity. In preparation for both fiscal 2011 and fiscal 2012, Mercer conducted an assessment of the compensation practices of the Company's peers and advised the Company's management regarding salaries, short-and long-term incentives, internal pay equity considerations and stock ownership guidelines.

Executive Compensation Program Objectives and Elements

The Company's current executive compensation programs are intended to help the Company achieve three fundamental objectives: (1) recruit and retain superior talent; (2) create a significant direct relationship between pay and performance; and (3) reinforce the alignment between executive officers' and stockholders' interests.

As described in more detail below, the material elements of our current executive compensation programs for Named Executive Officers consist of the following: a base salary, an annual cash bonus opportunity (referred to in the Summary Compensation Table below as "Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation"), a long-term equity incentive opportunity in the form of stock options and RSUs, perquisites, and severance and other benefits payable in connection with a termination of employment or change in control. We believe that each element of our executive compensation program helps us to achieve one or more of our compensation objectives, as summarized in the table below.

Compensation Element	Principal Compensation Objectives
Base Salary	Provide competitive salary to recruit and retain superior talent and to reward for day-to-day job performance
Annual Cash Bonus Opportunity	Drive annual corporate financial results, create organizational alignment through other strategic corporate objectives, and maintain high standards of regulatory compliance
Long-Term Equity Incentives	Create alignment with stockholders, drive stockholder value, and provide retention
Perquisites	Provide modest supplemental benefits to attract and retain key talent
Severance and Other Benefits	Ensure unbiased assessment of mergers and acquisitions activity and fair treatment in the event of termination

The Compensation Committee believes that the Company's most senior executives should have a majority of their total direct compensation delivered in variable or performance-based pay, and/or tied to stockholder returns. Although the Compensation Committee has not defined specific targets for allocating between long-term and currently-paid compensation, or between cash and non-cash compensation, the Compensation Committee believes the current mix between these compensation elements appropriately achieves the Company's compensation objectives. The overall mix of the aggregate current compensation structure at target for the Named Executive Officers is approximately 25% base salary, 25% annual cash bonus, and 50% long-term equity incentives. As discussed in more detail below under the heading, "Executive Compensation Elements Long-Term Equity Incentive Awards," the actual mix in fiscal 2011 and 2012 differed from this structure as the actual grant date value of long-term equity incentives was substantially lower than the equity grant guidelines.

Market Assessment

In setting compensation for fiscal 2011 and fiscal 2012, the Company's management engaged Mercer to perform a market compensation assessment. For both years, Mercer assisted the Company in identifying peer groups of other publicly-traded companies to serve as reference points for competitive pay practices, while Exequity provided the Compensation Committee with guidance on final peer group selection with respect to executive compensation decisions. In addition to peer company data, survey data was collected from both specialized for-profit education compensation surveys as well as general industry compensation surveys, which consisted of Mercer's US Global Premium Executive Remuneration Suite, Watson Wyatt Data Services' Survey Report on Top Management Compensation, and Mercer's US HRPEN Compensation Survey: A For-Profit Post-Secondary Education Study. These surveys were considered generally, and no one company's data within the survey received particular focus. Where possible, data was selected based on Corinthian's revenue in order to reflect the compensation of executives at similarly sized companies. In both years, Mercer gathered peer and survey data for base salary, short-term incentive compensation, long-term incentive compensation and total direct compensation (consisting of annual base salary and short-and long-term incentive compensation) for each Named Executive Officer.

Mercer provided market data for the Chief Executive Officer position to the Compensation Committee's independent advisor, Exequity, in fiscal years 2011 and 2012. Exequity advised the Compensation Committee to make decisions regarding the compensation of the Company's former Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Waller, for fiscal 2011 and for the current Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Massimino, upon his appointment in November 2010 and for fiscal 2012. For fiscal 2011, Exequity also analyzed market data and provided recommendations to the Compensation Committee for the Executive Chairman of the Board position, which Mr. Massimino held prior to his appointment to the position of Chief Executive Officer in November 2010. The determination of both Mr. Massimino's and Mr. Waller's compensation structure at these times was the result of a combination of benchmarking and the Compensation Committee's subjective judgment after reviewing competitive market data, and was consistent with the Compensation Committee's stated compensation philosophy of setting executive total compensation levels between the 50th and the 75th percentiles of the market.

To complete the compensation assessment for fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee refined the Company's peer groups with Exequity's input. While the peer groups were refined in fiscal 2011, as described below the general philosophical approach to selecting peers was consistent with the approach taken in fiscal 2010. As in previous years, the fiscal 2011 peer group was comprised of both for-profit education and general industry peers. The Company believes that, while it is important to understand the compensation levels and practices of direct industry peers, the majority of Corinthian's executive talent has been recruited from general industry companies with similar operating characteristics and, therefore, general industry market data is highly relevant. Select changes to both the direct and general industry peer groups were made primarily to more closely reflect the revenue size of Corinthian. Specifically, the Company removed four peers in the Education Services industry with revenue less than 1/2 of the Company's (Lincoln Educational Services, Strayer Education, Universal Technical Institute,

and Capella Education), so that its fiscal 2011 peer group included the following for-profit education companies:

Company	Industry	Location	Revenue as of June 30, 2010 (millions)(1)
Apollo Group, Inc.	Education Services	Phoenix, Arizona	\$ 4,742
Career Education Corporation	Education Services	Schaumburg, Illinois	\$ 2,016
DeVry Inc.	Education Services	Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois	\$ 1,915
Education Management Corporation	Education Services	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	\$ 2,509
ITT Educational Services, Inc.	Education Services	Carmel, Indiana	\$ 1,500
Median of Fiscal 2011 For-Profit Education Peers			\$ 2,016
Corinthian			\$ 1,764

(1)

Represents most recent four quarters ending on or prior to June 30, 2010.

In choosing general industry peers for fiscal 2011, the Company first excluded those fiscal 2010 peers with revenue less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the Company's (Skilled Healthcare Group and Hot Topic). The Company also excluded fiscal 2010 peers that were no longer public companies (Carl Karcher Restaurants). Using the same screening criteria as in fiscal 2010, revenue size, business model, and operating characteristics, the Company decided to add six companies to its general industry peer group (Hyatt Hotels, Select Medical Holdings, Service Corp International, Quiksilver, Williams-Sonoma, and Wyndham Hotels) in order to further balance the industry composition of the group and more closely align the median revenue with that of the Company. As noted below, two of the six companies added are within the hospitality industry, an industry whose operational model the Company has long considered relevant. Prior to fiscal 2011, the Company was unable to find hospitality companies with comparable revenue. As in fiscal 2010, where possible, peers located in the same geographic region were included, but, in selecting fiscal 2011 peers, geography continued to be a secondary consideration. Ultimately, the following general industry peers were selected for purposes of assessing fiscal 2011 executive compensation levels:

Company	Industry	Location	Revenue as of June 30, 2010 (millions)(1)
The Cheesecake Factory Incorporated	Restaurants	Calabasas Hills, California	\$ 1,626
The Gymboree Corporation	Retail	San Francisco, California	\$ 1,044
Hyatt Hotels Corporation	Hospitality	Chicago, Illinois	\$ 3,425
LifePoint Hospitals, Inc.	Healthcare Facilities	Brentwood, Tennessee	\$ 3,068
P.F. Chang's China Bistro, Inc.	Restaurants	Scottsdale, Arizona	\$ 1,240
Quiksilver, Inc.	Retail	Huntington Beach, California	\$ 1,941
Sun Healthcare Group, Inc.	Healthcare Facilities	Irvine, California	\$ 1,893
Select Medical Holdings Corporation	Healthcare Facilities	Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania	\$ 2,284
Service Corporation International	Healthcare Facilities	Houston, Texas	\$ 2,115
VCA Antech, Inc.	Healthcare Facilities	Los Angeles, California	\$ 1,338
Williams-Sonoma, Inc.	Retail	San Francisco, California	\$ 3,209
Wyndham Worldwide Corporation	Hospitality	Parsippany, New Jersey	\$ 3,778
Median of Fiscal 2011 General Industry Peers			\$ 2,028
Corinthian			\$ 1,764

(1)

Represents most recent four quarters ending on or prior to June 30, 2010.

Edgar Filing: CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC - Form DEF 14A

In setting fiscal 2012 compensation, the Company updated its peer groups with Mercer's and Exequity's input. The Compensation Committee and its advisor believe that the peer groups utilized for fiscal 2011 are still appropriate and accurately reflect the competitive landscape for executive talent. As such, the only change made for fiscal 2012 was the removal of Gymboree as it is no longer a publicly traded company.

The fiscal 2012 peer group included the following for-profit education companies:

Company	Industry	Location	Revenue as of June 30, 2011 (millions)(1)
Apollo Group, Inc.	Education Services	Phoenix, Arizona	\$ 4,870
Career Education Corporation	Education Services	Schaumburg, Illinois	\$ 2,108
DeVry Inc.	Education Services	Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois	\$ 2,182
Education Management Corporation	Education Services	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	\$ 2,888
ITT Educational Services, Inc.	Education Services	Carmel, Indiana	\$ 1,582
Median of Fiscal 2012 For-Profit Education Peers			\$ 2,182
Corinthian			\$ 1,869

(1)

Represents most recent four quarters ending on or prior to June 30, 2011.

The fiscal 2012 peer group included the following general industry companies:

Company	Industry	Location	Revenue as of June 30, 2011 (millions)(1)
The Cheesecake Factory Incorporated	Restaurants	Calabasas Hills, California	\$ 1,685
Hyatt Hotels Corporation	Hospitality	Chicago, Illinois	\$ 3,608
LifePoint Hospitals, Inc.	Healthcare Facilities	Brentwood, Tennessee	\$ 3,432
P.F. Chang's China Bistro, Inc.	Restaurants	Scottsdale, Arizona	\$ 1,248
Quiksilver, Inc.	Retail	Huntington Beach, California	\$ 1,841
Sun Healthcare Group, Inc.	Healthcare Facilities	Irvine, California	\$ 1,931
Select Medical Holdings Corporation	Healthcare Facilities	Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania	\$ 2,618
Service Corporation International	Healthcare Facilities	Houston, Texas	\$ 2,261
VCA Antech, Inc.	Healthcare Facilities	Los Angeles, California	\$ 1,428
Williams-Sonoma, Inc.	Retail	San Francisco, California	\$ 3,597
Wyndham Worldwide Corporation	Hospitality	Parsippany, New Jersey	\$ 4,043
Median of Fiscal 2012 General Industry Peers			\$ 2,261
Corinthian			\$ 1,869

(1)

Represents most recent four quarters ending on or prior to June 30, 2011.

The compensation data derived from the peer groups and surveys is intended to inform the Compensation Committee's decision-making process within the context of the Company's defined compensation philosophy and desired market pay positioning. However, the Compensation Committee does not use the compensation data to set specific compensation levels based on formulaic benchmarking. Rather, the Compensation Committee determined that it would generally target total direct compensation for its executives at a level it determined to be between the 50th and 75th percentiles of the market based on the information considered by the Compensation Committee, with specific compensation levels for each executive officer based on the subjective judgment of the

Compensation Committee. In aggregate, current structural compensation for the Company's Named Executive Officers is aligned with the Compensation Committee's articulated philosophy.

Overview of Company Performance, Decisions for Fiscal Year 2011, and Changes for Fiscal 2012

Fiscal 2011 Company Performance

During fiscal 2011, the Company navigated a number of challenges and made progress on several fronts within a difficult economic and regulatory environment. The Company assisted a record number of graduates find jobs in their fields of study, better aligned expenses with revenue, implemented programs and procedures in response to several new regulations, and improved efficiency in default prevention and financial aid processing. New student enrollments slowed in fiscal 2011 primarily due to the Company's decision to stop enrolling ability-to-benefit (ATB) students as well as general economic conditions and tuition increases. The Company has since begun to permit ATB enrollments at select campuses on a limited basis. While the slowdown in enrollments impacted revenue and margins, the Company achieved 91.7% of the operating income goals approved by the Compensation Committee at the beginning of the year (which excluded the impact of any one-time charges).

Fiscal 2011 and 2012 Compensation Decisions and Changes

The executive compensation structure in place for fiscal year 2010 did not substantially change in fiscal 2011. However, there were several changes to the composition of the Company's executive team during the first half of the fiscal year. In October 2010, Matt Ouimet resigned as Chief Operating Officer, and in November 2010 Peter Waller resigned as the Company's Chief Executive Officer and as a member of the Board of Directors. Upon Mr. Waller's resignation, the Board appointed Jack Massimino as the Chief Executive Officer in addition to his existing role as Chairman of the Board. Mr. Massimino previously served as Chief Executive Officer of the Company from November 2004 until July 2009. He has served on the Board since 1999.

For fiscal 2011, changes to the executive compensation program were limited and executive compensation was comprised of three key elements: base salary, short-term cash incentives, and long-term equity incentives. The Company is constantly evaluating and refining its executive compensation programs to help ensure optimal support of its compensation objectives. To this end, the Company completed a thorough review of its executive compensation program design prior to fiscal 2011 and, following advice and input from both Mercer and Exequity, made select changes to its compensation programs for fiscal year 2011 as outlined below.

For fiscal 2012, the Company is maintaining the key elements of its executive compensation structure, but has made changes to the annual bonus program and long-term incentive program to better reflect the Company's strategic goals and the industry environment. Details regarding the approach the Compensation Committee took with respect to establishing targets for fiscal 2012 annual bonuses and equity grants are included below in the "Annual Cash Bonuses" and "Long-Term Equity Incentive Awards" sections, respectively.

Executive Compensation Elements

Base Salaries

At the start of fiscal 2011, most executives received a modest 3% increase in annual base salary consistent with general industry practices and the Compensation Committee's articulated compensation philosophy. In November 2010, Mr. Massimino's base salary increased from \$832,000 to \$900,000 in connection with his appointment to the Chief Executive Officer position. In December 2010, Mr. Ord received a salary increase in connection with his promotion to Chief Administrative Officer (while also continuing to serve as Chief Financial Officer) from \$455,000 to \$500,000. Mr. Ord also then received

an additional 3% merit increase in June 2011 to increase his base salary for fiscal 2012 from \$500,000 to \$515,000. Messrs. Waller, Buchanan, and Mortensen received more substantial increases in their base salaries for fiscal 2011 in recognition of their performance and in order to align their pay with the Compensation Committee's stated compensation philosophy and to better align with overall compensation levels for similar positions at peer companies. In June 2011, the Company made additional base salary adjustments intended to carry through fiscal 2012. Most executives received an increase of 3%. Mr. Mortensen received a more substantial increase in recognition of his performance and his pay positioning relative to market levels and the Compensation Committee's stated compensation philosophy.

Base salary changes during fiscal 2011 and for fiscal 2012 were as follows:

Named Executive Officer	Base Salary as of 7/1/2010	Percentage Increase Over Fiscal 2010 Salary	Fiscal 2012 Base Salary	Percentage Increase Over Fiscal 2011 Ending Salary
Jack Massimino	\$ 832,000(1)	0%	\$ 900,000	0%
Peter Waller	\$ 775,000	19%		
Kenneth Ord	\$ 455,000(2)	3%	\$ 515,000	3%
Beth Wilson	\$ 425,000	3%	\$ 438,000	3%
Bill Buchanan	\$ 370,000	15%	\$ 385,000	4%
Stan Mortensen	\$ 350,000	12%	\$ 385,000	10%

(1) In November 2010, Mr. Massimino's annual base salary was increased to \$900,000.

(2) In December 2010, Mr. Ord's annual base salary was increased to \$500,000.

Annual Cash Bonus

None of the Company's executive officers, including the Named Executive Officers, are entitled to a guaranteed or minimum annual bonus. Instead, bonuses for the executive officers are based upon the Company's performance relative to Company financial, compliance, and other corporate goals. The Compensation Committee annually approves a target bonus opportunity for each executive that is expressed as a percentage of the executive's base salary. In addition, the Compensation Committee retains the right to reduce or eliminate bonus payments at its discretion.

For fiscal 2011, consistent with prior years, the Compensation Committee used an operating income measure and a regulatory compliance "gate" for the Company for purposes of calculating the executive officers' bonuses. The Compensation Committee believes that operating income is the most appropriate measure to align the Company's business strategies and financial objectives with those of the stockholders, while a regulatory compliance gate encourages management to mitigate risk and exercise careful oversight of the Company's complex regulatory environment. The regulatory compliance "gate" is a condition that requires the Company's schools, on average, to achieve a specified internally-tracked compliance score, as determined by the Company's internal audit department. The compliance "gate" must be achieved for any annual incentive to be paid to key executives. Because the regulatory compliance "gate" does not (in and of itself) result in bonus payments being triggered, the Company considers the compliance "gate" to be reasonably likely to be achieved but nevertheless an important safeguard to help mitigate risk.

At the time the Company's performance objectives were set for fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee believed that the target for operating income would be met only if the Company performed at a high level throughout the year. The operating income target for the Company was \$149.4 million. The Company achieved 91.7% of this performance goal or operating income of \$137.0 million (before an unplanned impairment charge and severance expenses of an aggregate of \$220.1 million; GAAP operating income was (\$83 million)).

Edgar Filing: CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC - Form DEF 14A

For fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee set the Named Executive Officers' target bonus opportunities as follows, which reflects the Compensation Committee's belief that the Chief Executive Officer should have a greater percentage of his compensation linked to Company performance and is consistent with the Compensation Committee's review of peer company data:

Named Executive Officer	Threshold Bonus (%)	Threshold Bonus (\$)	Target Bonus (%)	Target Bonus (\$)	Max Bonus (%)	Max Bonus (\$)
Jack Massimino	46%	\$ 414,000	115%	\$ 1,035,000	230%	\$ 2,070,000
Peter Waller	46%	\$ 356,500	115%	\$ 891,250	230%	\$ 1,782,500
Kenneth Ord	30%	\$ 154,500	75%	\$ 386,250	150%	\$ 772,500
Beth Wilson	30%	\$ 131,400	75%	\$ 328,500	150%	\$ 657,000
Bill Buchanan	30%	\$ 115,500	75%	\$ 288,750	150%	\$ 577,500
Stan Mortensen	30%	\$ 115,500	75%	\$ 288,750	150%	\$ 577,500

In order for each Named Executive Officer to receive 100% of his or her target bonus for fiscal 2011, the Company had to meet its regulatory compliance gate and achieve 100% of the Company's adjusted operating profit goal of \$149.4 million. If the Company met the regulatory compliance gate, bonus payouts would be made at the following percentages of each executive's bonus target, based upon the Company's fiscal 2011 operating income achievement (with interpolation between expressed points):

Company 2011 Operating Income Achievement (\$, in millions)	Percent of Targeted Operating Income Achievement (%)	Percent of Executive's Bonus Target Payout Level (%)
< \$134.5	< 90%	0%
\$134.5	90%	40%
\$149.4	100%	100%
\$194.2	130%	200%
> \$194.2	> 130%	200%

As stated above, at the end of fiscal year 2011, the Compensation Committee determined that the Company met its regulatory compliance gate and achieved operating income of \$137.0 million (adjusted as described above), or 91.7% of its target goal. Payouts under the annual incentive program were 50% of the target bonus amount, as follows:

Name	Base Salary as of 6/30/2011 (\$)	Fiscal 2011 Bonus Target, as a % of Salary (%)	Target Bonus (\$)	Payout Level Based on Achievement (%)	Fiscal 2011 Bonus (\$)
Jack Massimino	\$ 900,000	115%	\$ 1,035,000	50%	\$ 517,500
Peter Waller	\$ 775,000	115%	\$ 891,250	20.4%(1)	\$ 181,913
Kenneth S. Ord	\$ 515,000	75%	\$ 386,250	50%	\$ 193,125
Beth Wilson	\$ 438,000	75%	\$ 328,500	50%	\$ 164,250
Bill Buchanan	\$ 385,000	75%	\$ 288,750	50%	\$ 144,375
Stan Mortensen	\$ 385,000	75%	\$ 288,750	50%	\$ 144,375

(1) Mr. Waller's payout was pro-rated by 40.82%, based on the 149 out of 365 days he was Chief Executive Officer during the year.

For fiscal 2012, the Named Executive Officers' bonus opportunities as a percentage of salary will remain the same. For 2012, annual bonuses for executive officers will continue to be based primarily on operating income performance with a weighting of 75%. However, the Company will also utilize other strategic corporate objectives in determining 25% of the annual bonus payouts. The strategic objectives are intended to align with strategic objectives for other bonus eligible employees, including those whose activities may be deemed to be covered by new ED regulations. These additional strategic objectives

serve to balance the continued emphasis on key financial objectives with important non-financial strategic initiatives aligned throughout the organization. A threshold operating profit "gate" must be achieved for *any* annual incentive to be paid to key executives. The fiscal 2012 bonus plan for executive officers will include the following metrics and weightings:

Performance Measure	Weighting
Operating Income	75%
Compliance	6.25%
Student Satisfaction	6.25%
Employee Turnover	6.25%
Admissions & Student Finance Assessment Program	6.25%

Compliance will be assessed based on the percentage of campuses that achieve a specified internally-tracked compliance score as determined by the Company's internal audit department. Student satisfaction will be assessed based on the results of a bi-annual student satisfaction survey administered at all campuses. Employee turnover will be assessed based on overall Company annual turnover, excluding reductions in force. The annual incentive program will also consider the successful execution of the Company's new performance assessment program for frontline Admissions and Student Finance employees. This new performance assessment program was instituted in response to recent ED regulations regarding the compensation of employees engaged in certain admissions and financial aid activities.

In developing the performance goals for the corporate objectives outlined above, the Company, with the assistance of Mercer, conducted a robust analysis including past performance data, scenario testing, cost modeling, and prospective forecasts. Based on this information, the Compensation Committee believes that the goals set for both the operating profit and corporate objectives components are quantitative, challenging and require strong performance during fiscal 2012 to achieve. Consistent with prior years, potential payouts under the fiscal 2012 annual bonus program will continue to range from 0% to 200% of target based on actual performance relative to goals.

Long-Term Equity Incentive Awards

The Compensation Committee believes that long-term equity incentive awards should be a significant component of the Named Executive Officers' total compensation. Additionally, the Compensation Committee believes that awarding a combination of stock options and RSUs appropriately aligns executive interests with shareholders and balances emphasis on performance and retention. In the case of executives, annual equity awards have been historically heavily weighted towards options so that the majority of executives' equity compensation is earned only if the stock price rises. At the same time, RSUs have been used to provide a modest amount of retention value during periods of market volatility, while also tying executives' compensation to stockholder returns. This design supports the Compensation Committee's objectives of alignment with stockholders' interests, retention of key talent, and pay for performance.

Long-Term Equity Incentive Mix

Consistent with prior years, for fiscal 2011, equity grants for the Named Executive Officers were comprised of 70% options and 30% RSUs determined on a grant date value basis under the principles used to determine the grant date value of the award for financial reporting purposes. For fiscal 2012, the equity grants for Named Executive Officers will shift to 50% options and 50% RSUs. The Company made this shift in order to reduce share usage, better align the risk profile of executive equity awards with the equity holdings of investors, and to create somewhat more stable long-term incentive opportunities for executives in light of the current volatility and uncertainty in private sector education. The Company believes that this mixture provides an appropriate balance between the goals of

increasing the price of the Company's Common Stock (as options only have value if the stock price increases after the option is granted) and avoiding risks that could threaten the Company's growth and stability (as RSUs are exposed to decreases in the Company's stock price). Under grant date valuation principles, the grant date value of a stock option is generally less than the grant date value of a RSU covering an equal number of shares. Thus, fewer RSUs can be awarded (when compared with stock options) to convey the same grant date value for these purposes. The Compensation Committee considers these distinctions to help minimize the dilutive effects of the awards on the Company's stockholders generally.

Equity Grant Guidelines

In determining annual equity awards, the Company uses a "value-based," or dollar-denominated approach, which provides guidelines for establishing the target annual value of equity awards expressed as a percentage of base salary. Value-based or dollar-denominated long-term incentive compensation increases the transparency of the actual amount of equity granted, and allows the Company greater control of its long-term incentive compensation expense. As in the Company's annual incentive plan, the value of long-term incentive awards is denominated as a percentage of base salary and is determined by the employees' level within the organization. By setting individual equity opportunity levels as a percentage of base salary, the Company is able to more effectively manage pay mix year-to-year and drive desired performance focus and award outcomes. One effect of this policy, which the Compensation Committee takes into account, is that increases in base salary result in an equal percentage increase in the value of equity grants that follow any base salary increase in order to maintain the pay mix relationship. Also, the value-based guidelines are sufficiently broad so that individual awards for eligible employees can be differentiated based on such factors as individual performance, potential and retention. The Compensation Committee also exercises its subjective judgment in increasing or decreasing the total equity pool size from year to year based upon any factors it may consider appropriate, including the Company's operational performance compared to its previously-determined objectives and compared to the performance of its education industry peers, program cost and overall share usage.

Individual Equity Grant Guidelines

The Compensation Committee has developed a value-based grant target for each executive officer. The value-based grant target for each executive is expressed as a dollar value or percentage of the executive's base salary then in effect and represents the target level of equity-based awards (converted to a number of RSUs and stock options based on the average share price in the month prior to grant, or, in fiscal 2012, \$7.00 per share for RSUs and a fair value of \$3.50 for options, whichever was higher) to be awarded to the executive during the year, subject to the Compensation Committee's discretion to determine the actual number, type and terms of the awards to be granted.

For fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee determined that equity awards should include a 30% premium on the standard equity grant guidelines. The 30% premium to the equity award guidelines was intended to provide additional performance and retention incentives during a period of uncertainty and the current volatile nature of the private sector education industry given the regulatory environment. However, the equity grant guidelines were restored to standard levels for fiscal 2012. Additionally, due to share constraints under the shareholder-approved plan, the Compensation Committee determined that executive's fiscal 2011 equity awards would be delivered in two installments. Whereas historically the full equity award has been delivered in August of the applicable fiscal year, in fiscal 2011 a portion of the executive equity awards were delivered in August 2010, with the remainder delivered in November after shareholder approval of the Company's request for additional shares. The full number of options and shares granted to executives through both the August and November grants was determined and approved by the Compensation Committee based on the

Company's average stock price in July 2010. For Mr. Massimino's fiscal 2011 grant, the Compensation Committee used the approximate value of his fiscal 2010 target annual bonus award opportunity and converted it into an award of RSUs given the longer-term, strategic focus of his position as Executive Chairman at that time.

For fiscal 2011 equity awards, the share price used to determine the number of shares delivered to executives was based on the average share price for the month preceding the actual grant of equity awards. This was to mitigate the potential volatility of the number of shares granted to executives based on the stock price on a single date. For fiscal 2012, the Company decided to use the *greater of* the average stock price for the month prior to the grant of equity awards *or* a stock price of \$7.00 for RSUs and a fair value of \$3.50 for options. Based on this policy, the Company used a stock price of \$7.00 for RSUs and a fair value of \$3.50 for options to determine the number of shares for fiscal 2012. The Company instituted this new policy to reduce the maximum number of shares that could be granted in light of recent industry volatility and depressed stock values. These mechanisms are only used to determine the number of shares and not to determine the value of equity awards as of the grant dates, since the reported value of the RSUs and the exercise price of all options are based on the actual grant date closing stock price.

The actual grant value of the fiscal 2011 and 2012 awards was significantly less than the target equity guidelines. This is because the grant date closing stock price was considerably less than the 30-day average stock price and the \$7.00 stock price for RSUs and a fair value of \$3.50 for options used to determine the number of shares delivered to executives in fiscal 2011 and 2012, respectively. The equity grant targets for the Named Executive Officers, as well as the actual grant date values, were as follows for fiscal 2011 and 2012:

Name	Fiscal 2011 Equity Target, as a % of Salary (%)	Actual Fiscal 2011 Equity grant date values, as a % of Salary (%)	Fiscal 2012 Equity Target, as a % of Salary (%)	Actual Fiscal 2012 Equity grant date values, as a % of Salary (%)
Jack Massimino	455%(1)	217%(1)	350%	101%
Peter Waller	455%	211%		
Kenneth S. Ord	150%	70%	115%	33%
Beth Wilson	150%	70%	115%	33%
Bill Buchanan	150%	70%	115%	33%
Stan Mortensen	150%	70%	115%	33%

(1)

As Executive Chairman at the start of fiscal 2011, Mr. Massimino's annual equity grant was comprised entirely of RSUs and was intended to approximate the value of his fiscal 2010 target annual bonus award opportunity. After he was reappointed to the position of Chief Executive Officer, the Compensation Committee increased his annual base salary to \$900,000 and determined to make an additional equity grant to Mr. Massimino in the form of stock options which would have a value, when combined with the value of the RSU grant previously made, approximately equal to 350% of his base salary, plus a 30% premium, which was the guideline applied by the Compensation Committee with respect to Mr. Waller's fiscal 2011 equity grant when he was CEO. The Compensation Committee also applied the same July 2010 30-day average stock price valuation methodology to Mr. Massimino's option grant as had been applied to Mr. Waller's fiscal 2011 grant.

Perquisites and Retirement Benefits

The Company provides certain limited perquisites and retirement benefits to the Named Executive Officers in order to assist in retention and enhance the competitiveness of its overall compensation program. Perquisites provided to the Named Executive Officers consist of an automobile allowance and

Company-paid premiums for health insurance coverage under the Company's executive health plan. The Company also provides retirement benefits consistent with the benefit formulas for other broad-based managerial-level employees in the form of matching contributions to the executives' accounts under the Company's 401(k) plan and deferred compensation plan. The Company believes that these perquisites and retirement benefits are a way to provide the Named Executive Officers with a relatively modest level of additional compensation that supplements their other compensation opportunities and is consistent with general industry practice. These modest benefits were considered by the Compensation Committee in its subjective judgment, and specific benchmarking of perquisites and retirement benefits at peer companies was not undertaken. The perquisites and retirement benefits provided to each Named Executive Officer in fiscal 2011 are reported in the table below entitled "Summary Compensation Table," and are explained in more detail in the footnotes thereto.

Additionally, when Mr. Waller became Chief Executive Officer and Mr. Massimino became Executive Chairman in July 2009, the Company considered Mr. Massimino's principal place of business to be his home office in Utah, and all travel, including to and from the Company's Campus Support Center in Santa Ana, California, was considered to be Company business and reimbursable by the Company. When Mr. Waller resigned in November 2010 and Mr. Massimino reassumed the position of Chief Executive Officer, his principal place of business again became the Company's Campus Support Center. Under the circumstances, the Compensation Committee determined that it was appropriate to continue reimbursing Mr. Massimino for these travel expenses. Since Santa Ana is now his principal place of business, Mr. Massimino's travel to Santa Ana may be deemed to be part of a commute under applicable tax rules and therefore not a reimbursable business expense. We have included the amounts of such reimbursement under the heading "All Other Compensation" in the Summary Compensation Table below.

Severance and Other Benefits

The Company believes that severance protections can play a valuable role in recruiting and retaining superior executive talent. In the labor market for executive talent and the post-secondary education industry in which the Company competes, executives are commonly being recruited by more established companies and by start-up ventures. The Compensation Committee believes that severance and other termination benefits are an effective way to encourage its executives to forego opportunities with other companies. Outside of the change in control context, severance benefits are payable to the Named Executive Officers under their employment agreements if employment is involuntarily terminated by the Company without cause, or if the Named Executive Officers terminate their own employment for a "good reason" (as defined in each of their employment agreements). The good reason definition in each Named Executive Officer's employment agreement generally would entitle the officer to severance benefits only if the Company materially reduces or diminishes the officer's compensation, position or work location in a manner that would result in a constructive termination of that Named Executive Officer's employment. The level of each Named Executive Officer's severance is generally expressed as a specified multiple of his or her respective targeted annual cash compensation. Each Named Executive Officer's level of potential severance benefits is determined by the Compensation Committee in its discretion and at a level the Compensation Committee believes is within competitive market practices.

Additionally, the Named Executive Officers would receive enhanced severance and other benefits if their employment is terminated under certain circumstances in connection with a change in control of the Company, which benefits are described in detail under the heading "Employment, Severance, and Potential Change in Control Payments" below. The Company believes these enhanced severance benefits are appropriate because the occurrence, or potential occurrence, of a change in control transaction would likely create uncertainty regarding the continued employment of each Named Executive Officer, and these enhanced severance protections encourage the Named Executive Officers

to remain employed with the Company through the change in control process and to focus on stockholders' interests during the change in control. Additionally, these protections are intended to put the Named Executive Officers in a position to evaluate possible business combination transactions that would benefit the Company and stockholders even though the possibility exists that such a combination might result in the loss of the executive's job.

In addition to the enhanced severance benefits described above, upon the occurrence of a change in control in which the Company does not survive or the Common Stock ceases to be publicly traded, all outstanding equity awards, including 100% of each Named Executive Officer's outstanding unvested stock options and RSU awards, would become fully vested, unless the Administrator (as defined below in Proposal 2) under the 2003 Plan has made a provision for the substitution, assumption, exchange or other continuation or settlement of the applicable award. Additionally, even if the Company were the surviving entity and its stock continued to be publicly traded, the Named Executive Officers' unvested stock options and RSUs would vest if their employment is involuntarily terminated by the Company without cause, or if the Named Executive Officer terminated his or her own employment for good reason, in anticipation of, or within twelve months after such change in control, as described below under the heading "Employment, Severance, and Potential Change in Control Payments". The Company believes this accelerated vesting is appropriate given the importance of long-term equity awards in its executive compensation program and the uncertainty regarding the continued employment of the Named Executive Officers that typically occurs in a change in control context. The Company's view is that this vesting protection helps assure the Named Executive Officers that they will not lose the expected value of their past option grants and RSU awards because of a change in control of the Company.

Chief Executive Officer Compensation

The Company's former Chief Executive Officer, Peter Waller, resigned from the Company in November 2010. In setting Mr. Waller's compensation levels for fiscal 2011, the Compensation Committee took into account his fiscal 2010 compensation package and his performance as CEO during fiscal 2010. With guidance from Exequity, the Compensation Committee set Mr. Waller's fiscal 2011 base salary at \$775,000, his target bonus opportunity at 115%, and his target LTI opportunity at 350% of salary. The resulting structural compensation package was aligned with the Compensation Committee's stated compensation philosophy and was positioned between the market median and 75th percentiles.

In November 2010, Jack Massimino was reappointed as Chief Executive Officer, in addition to continuing his duties as Chairman of the Board. Prior to this appointment, Mr. Massimino had been serving as Executive Chairman of the Board and had served as Chief Executive Officer of the Company from November 2004 until July 2009. He has served on the Board since 1999. In setting Mr. Massimino's compensation as Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, the Compensation Committee considered competitive market data, the compensation structure of the former CEO, Mr. Massimino's compensation as Executive Chairman, and his past experience and performance at the Company. Based on these factors and with the advice of Exequity, the Compensation Committee set Mr. Massimino's base salary at \$900,000, his target bonus opportunity at 115%, and his target LTI opportunity at 350% of salary. The resulting structural compensation package is aligned with the Compensation Committee's stated compensation philosophy and is positioned between the market median and 75th percentiles.

For fiscal 2012, Mr. Massimino requested that he not receive any increase in base salary, target bonus opportunity, or target LTI opportunity. As a result, Mr. Massimino's compensation structure will remain unchanged for fiscal 2012.

Executive Stock Ownership Guidelines

The Company first implemented executive stock ownership guidelines at the start of fiscal 2010 in order to further align executive and stockholder interests. These guidelines have been refined from time to time. Consistent with market practices and the Company's compensation objectives, the ownership guidelines currently apply to all Senior Vice Presidents and Division Presidents, Executive Vice Presidents and the Chief Executive Officer. Only fully-owned shares of Common Stock will count for purposes of complying with the ownership guideline, which have been established as follows:

The target share ownership guideline for the Chief Executive Officer is three times (3x) base salary;

The target share ownership guideline for all Executive Vice Presidents and certain Senior Vice Presidents is two times (2x) base salary; and

The target share ownership guideline for all other Senior Vice Presidents and Division Presidents is one times (1x) base salary.

The guidelines establish no minimum time in which to achieve the targeted ownership levels, but restrict the amount of equity compensation which can be sold by covered officers until the guideline is achieved. The restrictions apply to all equity awards which vest after September 1, 2009, and prohibit an officer from selling more than 50% of any net shares received, after the payment of taxes, and, in the case of options, the payment of the exercise price for the options, until the ownership guideline is reached. None of the Named Executive Officers has yet achieved the ownership guidelines, but all are complying with the restrictions on sale until the guidelines are met. The Board retains the discretion to modify the guidelines from time to time.

Section 162(m) Policy

Section 162(m) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the "Code") generally disallows a tax deduction to public corporations for compensation over \$1,000,000 paid for any fiscal year to the corporation's chief executive officer and certain of its other executive officers. However, Section 162(m) exempts qualifying performance-based compensation from the deduction limit if certain other requirements are met.

Current base salary, vesting of RSUs and other non-performance-related compensation, if any, for fiscal 2011 are not expected to materially exceed the Section 162(m) limit. The Company has generally intended to structure stock option grants and annual cash bonus opportunity incentives (referred to in the tables below as "non-equity incentive plan compensation") to the Company's executive officers as qualifying performance-based compensation for Section 162(m) purposes, although certain elements of the Company's Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation in fiscal 2012 may not be deductible. Moreover, because of timing and other technical requirements, ambiguities, uncertainties and complexities as to the application and interpretation of Section 162(m) and the regulations issued thereunder, no assurance can be given, notwithstanding the Company's efforts, that compensation intended by the Company to satisfy the requirements for deductibility under Section 162(m) will in fact be deductible. Additionally, the Company's RSU awards are not qualifying performance-based compensation for Section 162(m) purposes. In granting RSUs, the Company has and will continue to consider the possibility that all or a portion of the grants may not be deductible by the Company to the extent that the income realized by the recipient of the grant in connection with the vesting of the award, when combined with other compensation paid to the executive officer in that year that does not satisfy the performance-based rules of Section 162(m), would exceed the \$1,000,000 limit under Section 162(m). The Company reserves the authority to award non-deductible compensation in such circumstances as it deems appropriate.

COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT

The Compensation Committee has reviewed and discussed with management the Compensation Discussion and Analysis included in this Proxy Statement. Based on its review and discussions with management, the Compensation Committee recommended to the Board of Directors that the Compensation Discussion and Analysis be included in the Company's Proxy Statement for its 2011 Annual Meeting of Stockholders. This report is provided by the following independent directors who comprise the Compensation Committee:

COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

Alice T. Kane (Chair)
Tim Sullivan
John Dionisio
Sharon P. Robinson

NOTWITHSTANDING ANYTHING TO THE CONTRARY SET FORTH IN THE COMPANY'S PREVIOUS FILINGS UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED, OR THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, THAT MIGHT INCORPORATE BY REFERENCE PREVIOUS OR FUTURE FILINGS, INCLUDING THIS PROXY STATEMENT, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, THE FOREGOING COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT SHALL NOT BE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO ANY SUCH FILINGS.

Risk Assessment and Mitigation

In August 2010 and 2011, management, with the assistance of Mercer, reviewed the structure of the Company's compensation plans to identify elements that could create material risk to the Company. Subsequently, the Compensation Committee reviewed the outcomes of management's assessment. The Company focused on key risk factors such as any use of uncapped awards, single performance measures in incentive programs, magnitude of aggregate and individual award values, the balance of fixed versus variable pay, the balance of short versus long term pay, and Compensation Committee and executive oversight of plans. During fiscal 2011, the Company increased its focus on the legal, business and financial risks arising out of the new ED regulations regarding compensation for employees engaged in certain admissions and financial aid activities.

With respect to executive compensation, management noted that the Compensation Committee had structured the overall compensation program to include features that subject officers to the long-term financial risks and opportunities that align with those faced by the Company's stockholders. Base salaries are fixed in amount and thus do not encourage risk taking. A substantial portion of the compensation provided to our executive officers is in the form of equity awards tied to the Company's stock, which rewards executives for long-term business results and helps to further align executives' interests with those of our stockholders. The Company believes that these awards do not encourage unnecessary risk-taking because the ultimate value of these awards is tied to our stock price, and because grants are generally awarded on an annual basis and subject to long-term vesting schedules to help ensure that executives always have significant value tied to long-term stock price performance. The Company's current practice is to grant executives a mixture of options and RSUs. The Company believes that this mixture provides an appropriate balance between the goals of increasing the price of the Company's Common Stock (as options only have value if the stock price increases after the option is granted) and avoiding risks that could threaten the Company's growth and stability (as RSUs are exposed to decreases in the Company's stock price). Alignment with stockholders' interests is further achieved by stock ownership guidelines that help tie a substantial amount of an executive's wealth to the Company's long-term share value. While our annual incentive program focuses on achievement of

short-term or annual goals, and short-term goals may encourage the taking of short-term risks at the expense of long-term results, the primary metric used to measure performance for purposes of determining annual incentive awards to executive officers' operating income is intended to reflect the Company's overall business results without undue emphasis on one particular metric. Furthermore, annual incentive awards are not guaranteed irrespective of performance, and in all cases the Compensation Committee retains authority to reduce annual incentive amounts (or to pay no annual incentive) based on any factors the Compensation Committee may consider.

Additionally, management identified compliance with the incentive compensation prohibitions in the Higher Education Act, as amended (the "HEA"), to be a feature of the industry in which the Company operates that potentially exposes the Company to compensation-related risks. The HEA prohibits the Company's educational institutions from providing any commission, bonus or other incentive payment based directly or indirectly on success in securing enrollments or financial aid to any person or entity engaged in any student recruitment, admission or financial aid awarding activity for programs eligible for federal student financial aid funds. A school participating in Federal Title IV student financial aid programs may not pay any commission, bonus or other incentive payments to any person involved in student recruitment or admissions or awarding of Title IV program funds, if such payments are based directly or indirectly on success in enrolling students or obtaining student financial aid. The statutory language of this prohibition does not establish clear criteria for compliance in all circumstances, but between 2002 and June 30, 2011 there were twelve "safe harbors" that defined specific types of compensation that were deemed not to constitute impermissible incentive compensation. Until June 30, 2011, the Company relied on several of these safe harbors to ensure that its compensation and recruitment practices complied with the statutory prohibition. On October 29, 2010, ED issued final regulations, which became effective as of July 1, 2011, that eliminated all twelve safe harbors, and in lieu of the safe harbors, took the position that any adjustment to compensation based directly or indirectly on securing enrollments or awarding financial aid is inconsistent with the incentive payment prohibition in the HEA.

The rule further expands the prohibition to individuals who have "responsibility for" recruitment or admission of students or making decisions about awarding Title IV program funds. ED stated that an institution still will be able to make merit-based adjustments to employee compensation, but will not be permitted to consider nor base compensation directly or indirectly, in any part, on success in securing student enrollments, the award of financial aid or institutional goals based on that success. As a result of the final regulations, which took effect July 1, 2011, the Company has redesigned the compensation programs for a substantial portion of the organization. The Company has interpreted the ED regulations to preclude the use of financial measures, including operating income, for employees who engage in covered activities under the regulations. It is not entirely clear, however, which employees in the Company are covered by the regulations, except that the ED has stated that employees who engage only in "policy making" functions are not covered. For employees who arguably engage in covered activities, the Company's compensation programs have been redesigned to exclude metrics that are directly or indirectly related to enrollments, including operating income. For executive officers and other senior employees who oversee admissions and financial aid personnel at a senior level, and whose activities consist of "policy making" functions, operating income continues to be a performance measure for annual incentive awards, and a minimum level of operating income performance must be achieved for any annual incentive to be paid to these employees. Nevertheless, the ED regulations weaken the Company's overall pay for performance relationship, as fewer employees can have compensation tied to financial performance, which introduces additional financial risk. The Company believes it has mitigated this risk to the extent reasonably possible within a difficult and uncertain regulatory environment. The Company maintains a strong pay for performance relationship where permissible and utilizes other allowable key performance drivers where financial metrics are disallowed. The revised compensation programs for fiscal 2012 also create alignment throughout the organization and set challenging goals to help ensure affordability of such programs.

All of these changes to the Company's compensation practices could adversely affect the Company's ability to compensate many of its employees in a manner that appropriately reflects their job performance, which in turn could reduce their effectiveness and make it more difficult to attract and retain qualified and competent personnel. The Company has retained regulatory counsel to review its compensation practices for employees who engage in covered activities under the regulations, and we believe that our current compensation plans are in compliance with current HEA standards and the ED's regulations. We cannot, however, provide assurance that the ED will not find deficiencies in our compensation plans. In addition, the application of the new ED compensation regulations is unclear in a number of respects, and a lack of certainty could increase the risk of future Federal False Claims Act *qui tam* lawsuits in which private plaintiffs assert that the Company's compensation practices violate the incentive compensation rules and, therefore, that its receipt of Title IV funds constitutes a false claim. The Company has been the subject of three such *qui tam* lawsuits relating to its compensation practices, all of which have been dismissed at the district court level. The relator in one of the dismissed cases appealed to the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which reversed the district court's dismissal on August 8, 2011, and remanded the case to the district court to permit the relator to amend its complaint.

In conducting its review of the Company's overall compensation plans with an eye towards risk, management also identified and confirmed the following design features of our compensation policies and practices that mitigate risks: Compensation Committee review and approval of plans and discretion with respect to payment of awards, senior executive oversight of lower-level employee plans, mixture of cash and equity opportunities, mixture of performance time horizons, avoidance of uncapped awards, compliance gating requirements for all incentive payments, internal controls and compliance programs to discourage inappropriate conduct, individual awards that are limited in size such that they do not create a material financial risk, aggregate value of all short-term incentive payments that is less than 10% of the total wages for the Company, and regulatory counsel review of plans to ensure governmental compliance. In light of the foregoing, the Company concluded that the established design features of the compensation programs mitigate inappropriate risk-taking and that its compensation policies and practices are not reasonably likely to have a material adverse effect on the Company. However, there can be no assurances that the Company's compensation policies will never have a material adverse effect on the Company, particularly with respect to the Company's efforts to comply with the incentive compensation prohibitions in the HEA.

SUMMARY COMPENSATION TABLE

The following table presents information regarding the compensation of our Named Executive Officers for services rendered during fiscal years ended June 30, 2011, June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2009.

Name and Principal Position (a)	Year (b)	Salary (\$) (c)	Bonus (\$) (d)	Stock Awards (\$)(1) (e)	Option Awards (\$)(1) (f)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation (\$)(2) (g)	All Other Compensation (\$)(3) (i)	Total (\$) (j)
Jack Massimino(4) Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board	2011	871,291	-0-	443,756	1,516,524	517,500	64,372	3,413,443
	2010	832,000	-0-	81,447	172,682	1,913,600	32,974	3,032,703
	2009	832,000	-0-	-0-	565,696	1,913,600	32,138	3,343,434
Peter Waller(5) Former Chief Executive Officer	2011	350,961	-0-	469,435	1,166,603	181,913(7)	1,698,605	3,867,517
	2010	650,000	-0-	719,989	1,526,449	1,495,000	72,444	4,463,882
	2009	494,000	-0-	-0-	452,557	988,000	50,062	1,984,619
Kenneth S. Ord(6) Executive Vice President, Chief Administrative Officer and Former Chief Financial Officer	2011	479,934	-0-	90,859	225,793	193,125	25,538	1,015,249
	2010	442,000	-0-	152,479	323,286	663,000	24,764	1,605,529
	2009	442,000	-0-	-0-	339,418	663,000	28,210	1,472,628
Beth Wilson Executive Vice President	2011	425,000	-0-	84,865	210,905	164,250	40,931	925,951
	2010	413,051	-0-	142,484	302,114	619,577	39,450	1,516,676
	2009	413,051	-0-	-0-	339,418	619,577	37,167	1,409,213
William Buchanan Executive Vice President, Marketing and Admissions	2011	370,000	-0-	73,883	183,611	144,375	42,052	813,921
	2010	322,410	-0-	140,248	297,336	483,615	39,756	1,283,365
	2009	322,410	-0-	-0-	339,418	483,615	47,166	1,192,609
Stan A. Mortensen Executive Vice President and General Counsel	2011	350,000	-0-	69,888	173,686	144,375	52,554	790,503
	2010	312,000	-0-	140,382	297,652	468,000	50,516	1,268,550
	2009	312,000	-0-	-0-	339,418	468,000	39,212	1,158,630

(1)

In accordance with SEC rules, the amounts reported in Columns (e) and (f) of the table above reflect the fair value on the grant date of the stock awards and option awards, respectively, granted to our Named Executive Officers. These values have been determined under the principles used to calculate the grant date fair value of equity awards for purposes of the Company's financial statements. For a discussion of the assumptions and methodologies used to calculate the amounts reported in Columns (e) and (f), please see (i) the discussions contained in Note 7 (Common Stockholders' Equity) to the Company's Consolidated Financial Statements included as part of the Company's 2011 Annual Report, which note is incorporated herein by reference, and (ii) similar Common Stockholders' Equity notes contained in the Company's Consolidated Financial Statements filed on Forms 10-K for prior fiscal years as to the option and RSU awards granted in those years. Under general accounting principles, compensation expense with respect to stock awards and option awards granted to our employees and directors is generally recognized over the vesting periods applicable to the awards. The SEC's disclosure rules previously required that we present stock award and option award information for fiscal 2009 and prior years based on the amount recognized during the corresponding year for financial statement reporting purposes with respect to these awards (which meant, in effect, that in any given year we could recognize for financial statement reporting purposes amounts with respect to grants made in that year as well as with respect to grants from past years that vested in or were still vesting during that year). However, changes in the SEC's disclosure rules now require that we present the stock award and option award amounts in the applicable columns

Edgar Filing: CORINTHIAN COLLEGES INC - Form DEF 14A

of the table above with respect to fiscal 2009 on a similar basis as the fiscal 2011 and 2010 presentation using the grant date fair value of the awards granted during the corresponding year (regardless of the period over which the awards are scheduled to vest). Since this requirement differs from the SEC's past disclosure rules, the amounts reported in the table above for stock award and option awards in fiscal 2009 differ from the amounts previously reported in our Summary Compensation Table for that year. As a result, each Named Executive Officer's total compensation amount

for fiscal 2009 also differ from the amount previously reported in our Summary Compensation Table for that year.

- (2) For a description of our bonus program for fiscal 2011 identified in the table above under the heading, "Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation," please see the discussion in the "Compensation Discussion and Analysis" above under the heading, "Executive Compensation Elements Annual Cash Bonus."
- (3) For fiscal year 2011, the amount reported in Column (i) for Mr. Massimino consists of an automobile allowance of \$12,220, Company-paid medical, dental and vision premiums and cost reimbursement under an executive medical plan of \$22,366 and Company reimbursement of Mr. Massimino's travel between his home in Utah and our Campus Support Center in Santa Ana, California of \$29,786 following his re-appointment as Chief Executive Officer in November 2010. The amount reported for Mr. Waller consists of an automobile allowance of \$5,640, Company-paid deferred compensation plan match contributions of \$41,883, Company-paid medical, dental and vision premiums and cost reimbursement under an executive medical plan of \$11,659, a severance payment of \$1,550,000, and accrued vacation payments of \$89,428. The amount reported for Mr. Ord consists of an automobile allowance of \$12,220 and Company-paid medical, dental and vision premiums and cost reimbursement under an executive medical plan of \$13,818. The amount reported for Ms. Wilson consists of an automobile allowance of \$12,220, Company-paid 401(k) matching contributions of \$10,021, and Company-paid medical, dental and vision premiums and cost reimbursement under an executive medical plan of \$18,690. The amount reported for Mr. Buchanan consists of an automobile allowance of \$12,220 and Company-paid medical, dental and vision premiums and cost reimbursement under an executive medical plan of \$29,832. The amount reported for Mr. Mortensen consists of an automobile allowance of \$12,220, Company-paid 401(k) matching contributions of \$10,502, and Company-paid medical, dental and vision premiums and cost reimbursement under an executive medical plan of \$29,832.
- (4) Mr. Massimino was the Company's Executive Chairman of the Board at the beginning of fiscal year 2011. On November 29, 2010, the Board reappointed Mr. Massimino as Chief Executive Officer of the Company, upon Mr. Waller's resignation from that position. Mr. Massimino continues to serve as Chairman of the Board.
- (5) Mr. Waller resigned as the Company's Chief Executive Officer effective November 29, 2010, and thus worked for the Company for only a portion of fiscal 2011.
- (6) Mr. Ord served as the Company's Chief Financial Officer for all of fiscal 2011. He ceased performing that function effective September 1, 2011, but continues to serve as the Company's Executive Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer.
- (7) Mr. Waller resigned as the Company's Chief Executive Officer on November 29, 2010. In accordance with the terms of Mr. Waller's General Release Agreement with the Company, the Compensation Committee determined to pay Mr. Waller a pro-rata bonus for fiscal 2011, based on the bonus Mr. Waller would have received from the Company had Mr. Waller remained employed by the Company for the entire fiscal year, multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the number of days Mr. Waller was employed by the Company in fiscal year 2011 and the denominator of which is 365.

Compensation of Named Executive Officers

The Summary Compensation Table above quantifies the value of the different forms of compensation earned by or awarded to our Named Executive Officers during our 2011 fiscal year. The primary elements of each Named Executive Officer's total compensation reported in the table are base salary, non-equity incentive compensation and long-term equity incentives consisting of options to purchase Common Stock and RSUs. Named Executive Officers also earned the other benefits listed in Column (i) of the Summary Compensation Table, as further described in footnote (3) to the table.

The Summary Compensation Table should be read in conjunction with the tables and narrative descriptions that follow. The table entitled "Grants of Plan-Based Awards in Fiscal 2011," and the description of the material terms of the stock options and RSUs granted in fiscal 2011 that follows it, provides information regarding the stock options and RSUs awarded to Named Executive Officers during our 2011 fiscal year. The tables entitled "Outstanding Equity Awards at Fiscal 2011 Year-End" and "Option Exercises and Stock Vested in Fiscal 2011" provide further information on the Named

Executive Officers' potential realizable value and actual value realized with respect to their equity awards. The Company has employment agreements with each of its current Named Executive Officers. These agreements are described in detail in the Section below entitled "Employment, Severance, and Potential Change in Control Payments."

GRANTS OF PLAN-BASED AWARDS IN FISCAL 2011

The following table presents information regarding non-equity incentive plans and grants of equity awards made during the Company's fiscal year ended June 30, 2011 to each of the Named Executive Officers. The material terms of each equity grant are described below under the heading "Description of Plan-Based Awards."

Name	Grant Date	Estimated Future Payouts Under Non-Equity Incentive Plan Awards(1)			All Other Stock Awards: Number of Shares of Stock or Units	All Other Option Awards: Number of Securities or Underlying Options	Exercise Price (\$/Sh)	Grant Date Fair Value of Stock and Option Awards (\$)(2)
		Threshold (\$)	Target (\$)	Maximum (\$)				
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)
Jack Massimino	1/28/2011 11/17/2010	414,000	1,035,000	2,070,000				