FCI STRATEGIC ROADMAP

Proposed by FCI:	1 Sep 2023
Reviewed by Board:	12 Sep 2023
Reviewed by Provosts:	11 Oct 2023
Reviewed by PBOs:	14 Nov 2023
Approved by Board:	5 Dec 2023

Five Colleges, Incorporated

FCI Strategic Roadmap

INTRODUCTION

Five Colleges, Incorporated exists to serve and support the Member campuses, and the Strategic Roadmap approach used here is intended to facilitate this role. Unlike a traditional strategic plan, which sets specific goals, targets, and timelines, the Roadmap is intended to be a living document, readily adapted as necessary. The Roadmap establishes a shared understanding of context and sets agreed-upon procedures for assessing new and existing initiatives and programming. Its focus, as the name implies, is to guide FCI through the current landscape rather than to identify a destination.

The Strategic Roadmap approach used here originated with David LaPiana's Real-Time Strategic Planning model, in which a strategy is built by completing a series of worksheets, which collectively make up the plan (or "roadmap"). In FCI's case, the original FCI Roadmap was built over the 2018-19 academic year and officially adopted by the Board of Directors in September 2019, with the intent that it be revisited at the start of each academic year. The Roadmap for Fall 2023 is organized in four sections, to facilitate review and discussion.

1. relatively stable information on **FCI's mission and principles**
2. an annually updated snapshot of **key data, benchmarks, and trends**
3. **tools to guide decisions** about the organization and the portfolio
4. appendices with **supplemental context**

MISSION AND IDENTITY STATEMENT

Our **mission and identity statement** are at the center of what we do and remain relatively stable over time. The language of the mission – "maintaining and enhancing the value of our member institutions" – is derived from our articles of organization, which were last reviewed and updated in April 2020. In times of disruption, and during changes in campus leadership, it is important to come together to reaffirm this core purpose and then return anew to the cycle of selecting, funding, doing, and reviewing.

FCI Identity Statement

*We advance our mission of **maintaining and enhancing the value of our member institutions** and seek to make them more effective, more efficient, and more experimental by serving our member institutions and their stakeholders in the Kwinitekw (Connecticut River) Valley and beyond through Academic, Administrative, and Partnership programs. Collectively, these programs help support and maintain a thriving academic community across the Valley.*

The strategic future of FCI is largely set by the member campuses as they identify and approve collaborative initiatives and activities. In order to support those campus priorities, FCI strives to be a nimble organization, able to adapt quickly to the ever-changing needs and demands of the member campuses, providing expertise in collaboration, facility working with cross-campus policies, and engagement in national conversations on higher education trends and best practices.

Derived from FCI Articles of Organization, April 2020

FCI CORE PRINCIPLES

As a service organization established to benefit our Member institutions, FCI is driven by five Core Principles that support and enable our work:

1. **Collaboration**
   Consortial work depends on collaboration, and that principle is evident in our daily work with one another as well as in the cooperative programming we administer. This principle is reflected in our Board Expectations document, which calls on FCI Directors to "bring a commitment to collaboration and a sense of humor" to their work with FCI. Collaboration also undergirds the range of governance, administrative, and collegial groups described in our Committee Taxonomy.

2. **Trust**
   Trust is an essential element to successful collaboration, and is built over time and with experience. Our committees, communal events, and shared governance structures all aim to nurture and sustain the interpersonal relationships and transparent communication that enable the work of the Consortium. Many of our signature programs function without detailed MOUs or agreements, with the FCI Budget (approved annually by the Board) serving as a contract demonstrating the Member campuses' shared commitment.

3. **Equity**
   FCI's campuses vary in scale, mission, and resources, but are equal partners in the Consortium and deserve equitable benefits from their participation. Our Tiered Allocation Models provide a mechanism for scaling contributions to meet the campuses' distinct needs and benefits, and our consensus-driven budgetary decision-making helps ensure costs and benefits are shared fairly.

4. **Interdependence**
   FCI is unusual among consortia for the number and scale of collaborations that involve the use of mutual aid and non-monetary contributions rather than direct financial support. While the campuses remain independent entities, the collaborative programs that make up the FCI portfolio are highly interdependent. As a result, access to the non-funded benefits of participation in the Consortium is dependent upon engagement in the funded portion – a campus cannot opt out of the funded portions of the portfolio but retain access to the unfunded programming. The Five College Interdependencies document summarizes the three types of collaborations in use by FCI.

5. **Adaptability**
   The work of the Consortium occurs in the ever-changing intersection of the five Member institutions' interests and priorities. The nature of this Strategic Roadmap reflects our commitment to adapting nimbly to respond to the opportunities and needs of the moment. Our Reserves Policy ensures that FCI has the resources to support deliberative and thoughtful adaptation, even in moments of crisis.

FUNDING SOURCES

Given the FCI mission of serving the campuses, it is appropriate that the majority of FCI funding comes from our beneficiaries. Grant funding, revenue, and our endowment help to offset and extend the campus assessments.

Sources of Revenue *(income)*	**Percent of total budget, FY23 (prior) fiscal year**	**Percent of total budget, FY24 (current) fiscal year**	**Comments** *(if applicable)* such as changes in funding from prior to current year
Assessments	70%	68%	64% of assessments returned directly to campuses or paid on behalf of campuses in FY23 (was 77% in FY22) The completion of two long-term projects in FY23 is providing cost savings to the campuses going forward: Library FOLIO and FCN revised operational model.
Foundation grants	16%	16%	Mellon Foundation is major source of grant income
Government funding/grants	0%	1%	For FY24 FCI received a 2-year NEH grant to support the museums' collection management project
Earned income	7%	6%	Revenue from outside parties to support FCI programs, FCN revenue, library repository affiliates' fees
Endowment	6%	8%	All endowment revenue is restricted by original gift instruments. FCI generally does not solicit individual donations. FCI's endowment contributes 6% of operating expenses, on average; additional resources allocated for FY24 to support NAIS expansion hires (still within FCI's endowment spending policy).
Other (reserves)	1%	1%	
Total revenue	$9,478,576	$10,254,639	
Total expenses	$9,478,576	$10,254,639	

INCOME AND EXPENSES BY PROGRAM FY24

This table shows the source of funding for each of FCI's six budget categories. Assessments provide particularly critical support for Libraries and Consortium Administration, and Grant funding is focused in Academic and Partnership programming. FCI Endowment funding continues to defray costs and extend capacity, particularly in Academic Programs.

	Consortium Admin		**Transportation**		**Library**		**Academic Programs**		**IT/Enterprise Programs**		**Ext. Progs/Partnerships**	
Sources of Revenue (income)	Income by funding source	% from this source	Income by funding source	% from this source	Income by funding source	% from this source	Income by funding source	% from this source	Income by funding source	% from this source	Income by funding source	% from this source
Assessments	$ 1,615,349	94%	$ 675,000	75%	$ 828,960	98%	$ 2,933,430	60%	$ 601,158	77%	$ 259,425	23%
Foundation grants	--		--		--		$ 1,271,147	26%	--		$ 416,675	36%
Government funding/grants	--		--		--		--				$ 154,000	13%
Earned income	$ 25,000	1%	$ 225,000	25%	$5,000	1%	--		$ 184,296	23%	$ 172,314	15%
Endowment	$ 7,000	0%	--		--		$ 633,901	13%			$ 122,098	11%
Other (reserves)	$ 66,474	5%	$ 3,200		$10,000	1%	$ 22,500	1%	$ 1,000	0%	$ 21,713	2%
Total program income	$ 1,713,823	100%	$ 903,200	100%	$ 843,960	100%	$ 4,860,978	100%	$ 786,454	100%	$ 1,146,225	100%
Total program expenses	$ 1,713,823		$ 903,200		$ 843,960		$ 4,860,978		$ 786,454		$ 1,146,225	

BENCHMARKING OTHER KEY CONSORTIA

Approximately 70 higher education consortia operate in the U.S. with a variety of models and purposes, thus the saying, "If you've seen one consortium, you've seen one consortium." The three described here are the closest "peers" of FCI.

	Five Colleges, Incorporated	The Claremont Colleges Services*	Big Ten Academic Alliance**	Colleges of the Fenway	Notes
Mbrs	5 member campuses	7 member campuses	14 members + 1 affiliate (18+1 > 8/2/24)	5 member campuses	FCI & Claremont operate as **alliances** (members defined in founding documents); BTAA & COF operate as **affiliations** (membership evolves as institutions. opt in/out)
Reputation	Known as the consortium with the most comprehensive portfolio of activities.	Among the most widely recognized consortia and one of the oldest.	Probably best-known consortium, through sheer scale (100Ks of students, 1000s of faculty, 100s of admins)	Known regionally and among consortia, but no strong media presence.	To extent higher ed consortia are known at all, these are among the most well-known. The scale of the Big10 institutions and the alignment with Div I athletics draw far more media attention than all others combined.
Size	40+ employees, governed by member presidents/chancellor	~10 core employees (~400 total), governed by 18-member bd of dirs	~22 employees (incl dirs of Libraries, Progs, & Ops), governed by mbr provosts	~11 employees, governed by member presidents	As noted in Parthenon report, each of these consortia is governed by a board, with additional governance/leadership groups + committees for particular purposes.
Budget	~$10M budget ~ 75% from assessments, remainder from endowment, grants, revenue	~$38M budget, with funding almost exclusively from the members, which pay for shared services via a formula.	~$4.1M central operating budget ($5.2M > 8/2/24), almost all from members. Annl mbrshp fees, plus addl fees for specific progs.	~$2.5M budget, almost exclusively from members; 50% split evenly among schls, 50% on formula driven by enrollments, FTEs, etc.	In all cases, budget is determined (by one mechanism or another) according to services provided, and the array of programming is determined by governance groups. All but COF bring in grant funding to supplement budgets and activity.
Scope	Comprehensive array of academic, administrative, and community partnership programs.	Primarily shared admin & support servs, but w/ some acad progs & ctrs shared by subset of mbrs. The schools wouldn't exist in current form w/o the consortium*	Best known for its shared professional development and networking programs, though shared services and some academic sharing are also included.	Emphasis on cross-campus student engagement (e.g. through cross-registration and shared extracurricular activities), with some shared admin services (e.g., fiber optic network) & joint contracts.	BTAA is the outlier, defined by inst type rather than geographic proximity, & thus focuses on activities such as leadership dev where there is strong natural alignment across campuses. Claremont & COF campuses are closer together (i.e. walkable) than 5C. Claremont thus emphasizes shared admin functions; COF has opted to emphasize shared student opportunities. FCI, Claremont, & COF all offer cross-registration.

*The Claremont Colleges Services (formerly the Claremont Consortium) is built on the Oxbridge model, in which the Consortium functions as the overarching administrative structure for otherwise separate colleges. The colleges are more independent than colleges within a typical US university, but less independent than the colleges of FCI.

**The Big10 campuses share a public higher ed (& often Land Grant) mission that provides strong commonality, & their state-college identities help mitigate cross-school competition for students. Note too that campus leaders' careers often span multiple Big10 programs, so leadership development programs for chairs, deans, etc. support the mission of the whole.

TREND REPORT: PROGRESS IN FY23

For 2022-23, the key trends setting the context for the work of FCI and our Member campuses were ripples and side effects of the pandemic, whose arrival in the U.S. in early 2000 was abrupt and dramatic, but whose departure has been slow and uneven. Although the pandemic was still with us in measurable ways in FY23, it was no longer the sole issue demanding attention by the campuses.

From Physical Health Risk to Mental Health Fragility

In the height of the pandemic, particularly prior to the availability of vaccines, FCI and the campuses were concerned primarily with addressing and mitigating the physical health risks of COVID-19. As we entered late 2022, with widely available vaccinations and boosters, and the predominance of variants that were more transmissible but less deadly, attention focused more on the psychological effects of nearly three years of disruptions to pre-pandemic structures, habits, and norms.

Campuses faced questions such as:

- After 2+ years of encouraging flexibility and adjusting expectations for classroom work, how do we support students in returning to an appropriate level of rigor in their academic work while acknowledging the continuing pain of the pandemic?
- After 2+ years of allowing or even requiring remote work for faculty and other employees, how do we (and to what extent should we) facilitate a return to in-person meetings, events, classes, and other work?
- How do we acknowledge the deep exhaustion of faculty and students (as well as other staff and administrators) and help our people re-energize, often while coping with staffing shortages and backlogged work that has been accumulating over 2+ years?
- How do we recruit and retain faculty and staff in this climate?
- How do we rebuild a sense of community (within and among campuses, and with the towns and others) and nurture renewed comfort with togetherness, while recognizing the disparate effect of the pandemic, the economy, and the political landscape on various communities?

Underlying all of these questions was the broad challenge of how to move away from engaging in crisis management, with all of its urgency and momentousness, toward more deliberative and planful leadership, with a slower pace and greater opportunity for shared governance. These questions have not been fully resolved, but FCI and the campuses have managed through the uncertainties and continue to adapt as we all find our way back to stasis.

<u>Consortial Engagement amid Leadership Transitions</u>

A healthy Consortium requires continual (re)engagement and (re)commitment. The daily demands of each campus and its stakeholders tend to pull the Members of FCI away from collaboration. Intentional communication and coordination are required to sustain the network of relationships that undergird FCI's portfolio. The misaligned academic calendar for 2022-23 is one example of how the crisis operations of recent years distracted attention from coordinated action. A common calendar results in a shared rhythm of activity for the Five College community over the course of the year, supporting an array of partnerships that go far beyond cross-registration. In FY23, with support and engagement of the Provosts Council and the Registrars, as well as FCI staff, the FCI Board unanimously approved an updated set of Calendar Alignment Guidelines, which reaffirmed the campuses' commitment to coordination and laid out standards for alignment.

The Consortium began AY23 with two new presidents, three new provosts, and a new PBO, with additional changes on the horizon for the summer of 2023: two new presidents and a new chancellor, plus two new provosts, and three new PBOs. These changes affect campus plans and priorities, and also shape the governance and strategy committees of FCI, with the potential to affect the strategies and initiatives of the Consortium. These and other staffing turnovers also represent a loss of institutional memory about the value and practices of the Consortium.

The work of calendar realignment and attending to leadership changes called for intentional focus on building relationships in order to sustain the Consortium that relies on them.

TRENDS SHAPING OUR WORK in FY24

One of the pieces of advice offered to higher education leaders in the wake of the Supreme Court decision striking down affirmative action is to reaffirm and recommit to campus mission first, using that focus to guide decision-making and strategy. That advice could apply to many of the trends facing FCI and our Member campuses in FY24. FCI's mission of maintaining and enhancing the value of our Member institutions, and our core principles of Collaboration, Interdependence, Equity, Trust, and Adaptability, demand that we engage meaningfully with each of these trends:

- Rethinking Race and Admissions in a Post-Affirmative Action Era
- Maintaining Anti-Racism & Belonging Efforts in a Challenging Political Landscape
- Resetting Shared Community Standards in a Post-Pandemic Era
- Responding to Rapidly Increasing Climate Change
- Preparing Our Students and Campuses for a World with Generative AI
- Ensuring Access to Affordable Housing for All Members of Our Community
- Providing Robust Access to Mental Health Support and Services
- Sustaining Commitment to Collaboration through Campus Leadership Turnovers

The post-pandemic turnover in many senior leadership positions across our campuses presents a challenge in sustaining attention to key projects and priorities, even as it opens new opportunities for collaborative engagement and shared exploration. Despite the transitions, there is strong alignment across our campuses in commitment to addressing these trends. FCI's Member campuses have all reaffirmed their commitment to diversity and inclusion since the SCOTUS decisions on race and admissions and LGBTQ rights. Our campuses have all been engaged in conversations about community standards, such as establishing appropriate flexibility in work and classroom settings and providing reasonable accommodations to students and employees, as well as responding to the evolution of generative AI. Geothermal and solar projects are underway across the campuses, with all having made commitments to carbon neutrality in the near future. Affordable housing is a challenge across western Massachusetts, and affects employees, students, and our communities more generally. The pandemic exacerbated already existing shortfalls in mental health resources, both in the region, and nationwide.

THE BIG QUESTION

Although the Strategic Roadmap approach generally does not identify specific projects or targets, it does encourage focus by drawing attention to a topic for the year known as "The Big Question." Given the context of campus priorities, societal and higher education trends, peer benchmarks, funding agency plans, and other significant factors, what is "The Big Question" facing FCI and its Member institutions and what strategies should be deployed in the near term to address it? There may be more than one Big Question, but the focus here should generally be on the one that should/must be tackled first. In recent years, the Big Questions have focused on the financial well-being of Hampshire (FY20), responding to the pandemic (FY21-FY22), and supporting the mental, emotional, and physical wellbeing of our campus communities and the Consortium itself (FY23).

The Big Question for Near-Term Consideration

As the campuses develop and implement their strategic plans, what is the role of the Consortium in the current social, political, and environmental landscape, and specifically what new and/or expanded collaborations will best position the campuses to provide leadership in addressing the key trends noted above?

Proposed Strategy for Addressing the Most Immediate Big Question

FCI staff will help campus leaders actively explore and assess new opportunities for collaboration, both within the Consortium and with local communities, and campus leaders will capture the value and potential of the Consortium in their developing strategic plans. The most promising opportunities will be those that, in addition to addressing key trends, further the health of the Consortium by fostering community.

- The Board of Directors will pay particular attention to collaborations that enhance the quality of life in the region, such as those focused on housing, infrastructure, and health care.
- The Provosts Council will pay particular attention to academic collaborations that extend the value of residential liberal arts education and enhance the student experience.
- The Principal Business Officers will pay particular attention to administrative and enterprise collaborations that provide operational savings and/or new revenue streams.

THE FCI STRATEGY SCREEN

This tool is intended to support the assessment of new and existing FCI initiatives and programs by gauging **which specific collaborations bring benefit** and **when those collaborations are better done with FCI engagement**. All initiatives and programs in the Five Colleges portfolio should be of high quality: well-managed, professional, and with documented outcomes. Because these elements of quality are taken as essential, they are not included below, but should nonetheless be included in discussion. Note that scores should be used to foster the necessary discussion to come to recommendations, rather than being seen as strict cut-offs.

		Strong Contributor ***score 5 points***	Moderate Contributor ***score 3 points***	Weak Contributor ***score 1 point***	*Non-Contributor* ***subtract 5 points***
COSTS	financial	___ Saves campuses money or is cost-neutral (e.g., 1-time expense covered by grant/gift).	___ Requires minimal to modest expense.	___ Requires substantial new/add'l campus investment.	*___ Requires substantial new investment &/or has no identified source of funding.*
	human	___ Reduces necessary staffing compared to alternatives (or predecessors).	___ Relies on existing staff (i.e., no changes needed).	___ Requires new/add'l staff hiring or substantial (re)training or is redundant with campus staffing.	*___ Requires extensive skills not found in or desired by FCI or member campuses.*
BENEFITS	strength	___ Adds to an existing strength or establishes a new strength area.	___ Enables maintenance of an existing strength or prevents loss of existing strength.	___ Supports a non-core project; not tied to an existing or desired strength.	*___ Would be detrimental to existing strengths.*
	audience	___ Serves a large or critical community across all 5 campuses.	___ Serves a significant or important community at 3 or more campuses.	___ Serves a primarily external or supplemental audience.	*___ Does not have an identified audience with interest in this area.*
	mission	___ Mission critical to campuses (they would find a way to do this even if FCI didn't exist.)	___ Aligns with campus missions/priorities.	___ Supplemental to campus missions/priorities.	*___ Orthogonal to campus missions/priorities.*
	viability	___ Campuses could not do this alone (e.g., funder requires submission via a Consortium).	___ Campuses would struggle to do this alone or FCI can do it more efficiently or better.	___ Campuses could do this without FCI support/involvement.	*___ Campuses already do this without FCI assistance.*
	collaboration	___ Actively nurtures or furthers collaboration across the campuses.	___ Maintains existing collaboration across the campuses.	___ Allows collaboration.	*___ Works against collaboration.*
	racial equity	___ Actively nurtures or furthers racial equity.	___ Enables improvements in racial equity.	___ Maintains existing levels of racial equity.	*___ Works against racial equity.*
		Total strong score: _____	Total moderate score: _____	Total weak scores: _____	Total negative score: _____

TOTAL SCORE: _____ **Highest possible score: 40** **Lowest possible score: -40** **Ideal cutoff score for inclusion: 30**

THE FCI ORGANIZATIONAL VITAL SIGNS

This tool is intended to support the assessment of FCI as an organization and the Consortium as a set of relationships. These "vital signs" are markers of the overall health of the organization; they don't diagnose or treat conditions, but they do serve as indicators of when additional analysis or care may be needed. In each of these four areas the organization has a written standard or formal process against which to compare performance. Note that the academic calendar supports not just cross-registration, but cross-campus collaboration more broadly.

	Exemplary Performance *The organization is excelling but the effort required may be unsustainable over extended periods.*	**Optimal Performance** *The organization is healthy and should be able to achieve and sustain this level of performance.*	**Suboptimal Performance** *The organization can survive for some time at this level, but action is needed to get healthy.*	**Unacceptable Performance** *The organization is at existential risk. Action is urgently required and overdue.*
Board Relations	The Board members are deeply engaged with the work of the organization, attend all meetings, and exceed the Board Expectations. They communicate frequently with one another and the ED, even when not required or expected.	All Board members are routinely engaged with the work of the organization, fulfill Board Expectations, and communicate with one another and with FCI when/as necessary.	Most members attend most meetings and are striving to fulfill the Board Expectations, but with some departures. Communication gaps exist but are generally minor.	One or more board members are significantly departing from the Board Expectations and/or are actively hiding information or sabotaging the health of the organization.
Exec Director & Senior Staff Performance	The ED and senior staff routinely exceed expectations as laid out in their job descriptions and performance reviews. They are recognized as experts in collaboration and are sought out as consultants and contributors.	The ED and senior staff understand and execute their jobs well and faithfully, serving the best interests of the organization and the campuses. They are engaged with peers outside the Consortium.	The ED and senior staff mostly perform well, but there are some minor gaps in performance or weaknesses evident in some skills or judgment. They are minimally engaged outside of FCI.	One or more members of the senior staff are performing significantly below expectations to such an extent that the organization is experiencing pain. Campus colleagues and peers may avoid working with them or the organization.
Academic Calendar Alignment	The campuses exceed the expectations of the Calendar Guidelines, with all 5 calendars in perfect alignment, and effectively acting as a single calendar. Campus leaders communicate frequently to ensure alignment continues.	The campuses are in full compliance with the Calendar Guidelines, though key dates are not entirely aligned. Campus leaders communicate routinely and actively encourage their staff to mitigate gaps and their consequences.	The campuses are in compliance with some but not all Calendar Guidelines. Campus leaders communicate occasionally. Staff strive to manage gaps and their consequences, though perhaps with minimal support from leadership.	One or more campuses depart significantly on key dates and the value of alignment is not recognized. Leaders and staff rarely communicate about the misalignment. Students are left responsible for managing any gaps.
Portfolio Vitality (Perceived ROI)	Campus leaders view the effort and investment required to feed Consortial activity (reflected in the annual proposed portfolio and budget) as highly beneficial. Campuses actively propose and seek new collaborations to extend this success.	Campus leaders view & can articulate the effort and investment required to sustain and build Consortial activity as worthwhile and actively support new collaborations as appropriate and necessary.	Campus leaders continue to approve FCI budgets and to pay their assessments, but with some significant questions about the value of one or more major FCI activities or collaboration generally. The portfolio is stagnant or shrinking.	Campus leaders view the Consortium as requiring far more effort and funding than the portfolio is worth. Leaders frequently question project expenditures and administration & are actively disengaging.

APPENDIX: FCI ALLOCATION MODELS

For programs that will be funded with dollars (as opposed to in-kind or non-monetary contributions), the cost will be split among Member institutions based on one of the available allocation formulas, often referred to in FCI parlance by the fractional share ("on the 7ths," e.g.). These formulas are grouped into three broad models:

1. all participants share equally,
2. a 2-tiered scale, and
3. a 3-tiered scale.

The 2- and 3-tiered allocations allow for institution size and/or level of participation to be recognized in the assessment allocation in varying ways. In addition to assessments determined by these three categories, other items are "by agreement"— that is, allocated on an ad-hoc basis primarily driven by Member participation. The formula to be used should be chosen at the time the program is approved, but may be adjusted if circumstances change.

Category	Rationale	Calculation	Notes/Examples
Equal	5 campuses share equally	5ths	All FCI administration and many program costs
	4 campuses share equally	4ths	Center for Women and Community-UM excluded
2-Tiered	5 campuses participate with 1 campus paying ½ of other 4	9ths	FCN LLC- HC pays half share
	4 campuses participate with 1 campus paying ½ of other 3	7ths	Risk Management-UM excluded and HC pays half share
	5 campuses participate with 1 campus paying 2x's other 4	6ths	Massachusetts Review-UM pays double share
3-Tiered	5 campuses participate with 1 campus paying ½ and another paying 2x's the other 3	11ths	Libraries, Bunker, and Annex-UM pays double share and HC pays half share
Agreement	By agreement: Joint appointments		Usually proportional to share of teaching
	By agreement: Other		Examples include: Licensure, Dance musicians, language instruction, EIT Coordinator, America Reads, Art Museums

APPENDIX: Introduction to FCI Budgeting

FCI is an independent 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation and operates on a July 1- June 30 fiscal year. The budget is typically approved by the Board of Directors in late spring. The largest portion of the budget for FCI comes from campus contributions, which account for some 70% of the overall budget for the year (that is, roughly $7M of the overall $10M budget). The remainder of the budget comes primarily from grants (~16-17%), revenue from fees paid by outside entities such as library repository affiliates and FCN* customers (~6%), and endowment income (~6-8%).

Unless otherwise specified, when we refer to the FCI budget, we are most often referring to the campus-funded portion, which consists of two parts – “assessments” and project-specific funding:

- Each year, the Principal Business Officers (i.e., the chief financial officers on the campuses) recommend a budget to the Board of Directors to cover a specific list of initiatives and expenses, most of which are on-going activities, such as the PVTA bus contract, joint faculty salaries, course interchange, and FCI administration – these on-going expenses roll up into a category called assessments, which are then invoiced to the campuses as one comprehensive bill (though it might be paid in installments).

- In addition to these assessment-funded activities, some groups that operate through the Consortium also take on additional projects that do not require specific PBO review or Board approval. For example, the Libraries portion of the FCI budget includes both assessment-funded activity (salaries for shared library staff at the Bunker/Annex, the messenger and van service, migration expenses for FOLIO software, Exlibris maintenance, operating expenses for the Annex, and so forth), as well as project-specific funding (typically subscriptions and contracts that the library directors who make up the Five College Librarians Council agree to pay out of their library budgets). These expenses are invoiced to the specific units on the campuses that have agreed to undertake them.

Each budgeted activity, regardless of funding source, is placed into one of six categories: 1) Consortium Administration, 2) Transportation, 3) Library, 4) Academic Programs, 5) Information Technology & Enterprise Initiatives, or 6) External Programs & Partnerships. All six categories receive at least some of their funding from assessments, but no category is funded solely through assessments.

It is worth noting two further items related to the FCI budget structure and process. First, in addition to managing the operating budget, FCI also serves as the “bank” for several activities that benefit the five institutions, but that are not directly managed by the Consortium staff (e.g., dues paid by Learning in Retirement members), though this portion of the budget is modest relative to the overall budget. Second, campuses can and do partner with each other independently of FCI; for instance, the New England College Renewable Partnership (aka the Solar Agreement) is a collaboration among Amherst, Bowdoin, Hampshire, Smith, and Williams Colleges and was established outside of the FCI budget and without FCI participation.

* FCI operates an LLC known as Five College Net (FCN), which owns and manages a 53-mile loop of fiber-optic cables and associated network connectivity. This resource is available to the campuses as part of their participation in the Consortium, and available to off-campus customers for a fee.

APPENDIX: Five College Interdependencies

The FCI Portfolio is "funded" through both financial and non-financial support and the individual elements of the full portfolio are highly intertwined and interdependent.

Financially Supported Programs

Easiest to identify and document are those programs and agreements that involve a financial obligation where funding moves through FCI. The major budget categories are:

FCI Administration – staff and supplies that serve the consortium generally and cannot be attached to a single budget category or project; the campuses contribute equally to this function
Libraries – including funding for the Annex, for shared subscriptions and services, Annex/Bunker and messenger staff, and for support of the Five College Repository Collection, which as the name implies is owned by FCI; the campus contributions depend on their involvement in and reliance on each function
Transportation – primarily PVTA bus contracts; the campuses contribute equally to the base transportation agreements, but some contract for additional route service (e.g., MHC-to-SC) and are assessed accordingly
Academic Programs – including faculty and others who are on multi-year appointments, ad hoc instructor hires, programmatic expenses, and more; campus contributions are based on their engagement
Enterprise Programs – primarily shared back-office functions such as risk management, software, and the Five College fiber optic network and service; campus contributions are based on their engagement
Partnership Programs – a diverse array of activities distinguished by the involvement of one or more partners from outside of the member campuses, such as Museums 10, NEPM, and Learning in Retirement; some of these programs are self-supporting, campuses contribute to others differentially

Non-Financial Collaborations

In addition to the programs above, which are all reflected in budget documents and financial reports, the schools participate in the Consortium in ways that do not appear on our financial records, such as:

Cross-registration – several decades ago the member campuses decided to allow cross-registration without transfer of funds resulting
Shared space – each campus provides space for one or more Five College functions, and no rent is charged
Faculty and staff – some employees are fully funded by one campus, but are key players in a joint program
MOUs and other agreements – the former 5C Emergency Mutual Aid agreement, e.g., was not reflected on financial documents, but each campus may still make decisions about resource allocation based on their expectation of resources being available from another member campus
Non-FCI agreements –not all agreements between or among Member campuses are executed through FCI; recent examples include the (now sunsetted) shared police department and the solar agreement

Reputational Interdependencies

Hardest of all to capture and valuate are the reputational contributions of each campus to the Consortium, and of the Consortium to each campus. The very founding and naming of Five Colleges, Incorporated was based on the premise that the member schools could thrive better together than individually. Campuses report enhanced ability to attract students and faculty, for instance, based on the value of the opportunities and community available through the Consortium.

APPENDIX: Five College Committee Taxonomy

The Five College Consortium manages a diverse array of committees, but in broad terms these groups can be classified as falling into one of three main categories: Governance & Strategy; Program & Project Management; and Community Building. The lines between the categories are not always clean, and each group may engage in work outside its primary focus area, but the descriptions below are intended to provide guidelines and common terminology across Five College activities.

Governance & Strategy Committees

Committees, councils, and boards within this category have clear authority over the direction of Five Colleges, Incorporated (FCI) – the not-for-profit corporation that administers the consortium – or some well-defined and substantial subset of Five College activity. The Consortium's existence is highly dependent on the regular engagement of these committees, and the service provided to them by Five Colleges is accordingly high. Three governance bodies are required by the Five College by-laws: the Board of Directors, and two Board committees – the Investment Committee, and the Audit Committee. Two additional committees provide key leadership to Five Colleges and advise the Board in its actions: the Provosts Council (formerly Deans Council) and the Principal Business Officers (PBOs). Other leadership committees oversee specific areas of collaboration across the five campuses. These committees are typically composed of senior leaders on the campuses, who serve on a Five College committee ex officio (e.g., Library Directors).

Program and Project Management Committees

Committees in this category have been given responsibility by one or more Governance groups for a specific program, task, project, or event (either one-time or recurring), typically with a set deadline and clearly articulated outcome, and/or a defined scope of work. These groups may be ongoing or ad hoc, but typically their scope and scale of responsibility is more focused than that of Governance and Strategy groups. These workgroups are responsible for activities and initiatives that have been identified as important to the mission of the Consortium, and their charters or charge letters should thus include a detailed description of the (financial and human) resources required to accomplish their assigned task, including what support (if any) is expected from Five College resources. Examples of Program and Project Management Committees include the Admissions Officers, chairs of Five College majors, and grant-funded project teams.

Community Building Committees

Committees in this category serve primarily as "affinity groups" or "communities of practice" – gathering together colleagues from across the campuses to share expertise and build collegiality. Typically, these groups consist of individuals filling similar roles on their respective campuses. In some cases, these groups include individuals from outside the consortium. Community and collaboration are central to the mission of Five Colleges, and these groups can help to build networks and relationships that serve the broader aims and activities of the Consortium. Their informal nature means they can often be self-guided and/or can convene with minimal use of Five College resources. When these groups meet during work hours, members/attendees should seek supervisor approval prior to participation. Groups that wish to be formally recognized as Five College committees (to be able to refer to themselves as a "Five College" group, be identified on the Five College website, be eligible to apply for funding, etc.) are expected to do so in collaboration with Five College staff, and commit to adhering to Five College standards of conduct and inclusion. Affinity groups may, from time to time, be called upon to undertake a specific project and thus temporarily move into the category of Program & Project Management. Examples of Community Building Committees include the Sexual Assault Prevention and Intervention Committee (SAPIC), the Human Resources Directors, the Controllers, and the Disability Services Directors.

External Groups

Some groups are largely external to or independent of Five Colleges, but have an affiliation agreement for specific engagement or services, and/or provide an ex officio role for a member of the FCI staff. Examples include New England Public Media (NEPM) and the *Massachusetts Review*.

Inactive Groups

Some groups existed at one time but are currently inactive (or meet so sporadically that no schedule can be discerned) and will no longer be listed on the Five College website or in annual reports.