FCI STRATEGIC ROADMAP

_____

_____

Five Colleges, Incorporated

FIVE COLLEGE CONSORTIUM

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 2025 captures ideas and priorities from the retreat with Directors, Provosts, and PBOs on August 14th, 2025, and 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, FY25 (prior) fiscal year	Percent of total budget, FY26 (current) fiscal year	Comments *(if applicable)* such as changes in funding from prior to current year
Assessments	70%	79%	64% of assessments returned directly to campuses or were paid on behalf of campuses in FY25 (was 65% in FY24)
Foundation grants	12%	6%	Mellon Foundation grants have been reduced with other smaller grants replacing those large Mellon grants
Government funding/grants	1%	1%	FCI managed 2 federal grants in FY25: 2-yr NEH grant to support museums' collection management ended June '25 and 3-yr IMLS grant to support Museum staff development awarded August '24.
Earned income	7%	6%	Revenue from outside parties to support FCI programs, FCN revenue, library repository affiliates' and ACL fees
Endowment	9%	7%	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. Higher in FY25 to support NAIS expansion hires (still within FCI's 4.5% spending policy).
Other (reserves)	1%	1%	
Total revenue	$10,436,042	$9,722,636	
Total expenses	$10,436,042	$9,722,636	

INCOME AND EXPENSES BY PROGRAM FY26

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.

Sources of Revenue (income)	Consortium Admin		Transportation		Library		Academic Programs		IT/Enterprise Programs		Ext. Progs/Partnerships	
	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	$ 1,714,371	94%	$ 675,000	75%	$ 870,289	98%	$ 3,368,199	83%	$ 732,707	83%	$ 336,812	29%
Foundation grants	--		--		--		$ 26,399	1%	--		$ 407,128	35%
Government funding/grants	--		--		--		--				$ 90,599	8%
Earned income	$ 65,000	4%	$ 225,000	25%	$5,000	1%	--		$ 146,169	17%	$ 186,924	16%
Endowment	$ 7,000	0%	--		--		$ 646,164	15%			$ 69,442	6%
Other (reserves)	$ 36,922	2%	$ 3,200		$16,000	1%	$ 28,500	1%	$ 1,000	0%	$ 64,812	6%
Total program income	$ 1,823,293	100%	$ 903,200	100%	$ 891,289	100%	$ 4,069,261	100%	$ 879,876	100%	$ 1,155,716	100%
Total program expenses	$ 1,823,293		$ 903,200		$ 891,289		$ 4,069,261		$ 879,876		$ 1,155,716	

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	18 members + 1 affiliate (U Chicago)	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 (800K students, 75K 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 (~300 total), governed by 18-member bd of dirs	~30 employees (incl dirs of Libraries, Progs, & Ops), governed by mbr provosts	10 FT + 9 PT 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	~$40M budget, with funding almost exclusively from the members, which pay for shared services via a formula.	~$5.3M central operating budget, almost all from members. Annl mbrshp fees, plus addl fees for specific progs.	~$2.6M 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.

TRENDS SHAPING OUR WORK in FY25

Plausible Futures & Their Effect on Collaboration

Strategic Foresight is a data-based and trend-informed tool for envisioning "plausible futures." The table below is derived from a study of such plausible futures in higher education (see scup.org), and highlights two ends of the spectrum of plausible futures, noting that the most likely outlook is somewhere in the middle ground. Strategic Foresight emphasizes that the future is never entirely outside of our control, even when limits exist on our power to shape what comes our way. As the August 14th FCI Leadership Retreat made clear, the leaders of the Five College Consortium (and at our peer consortia) are committed to leaning into collaboration as a powerful mechanism for shaping and surviving the trends to come.

	DIMMEST FUTURE		BRIGHTEST FUTURE
Generative AI	Significant job losses, degradation of authority, deepening questions about the value of higher ed		Vastly increased productivity and creativity, higher ed seen as a leader in developing new uses for AI tools & in preparing students for work in this setting
Research Funding	Federal research funds disappear altogether and no corporate, foundation, or private donors emerge to fill the gap		Creative new models for investing in research emerge, injecting funding and energy into campus-based research activity
Public Policy	Aggressively anti-higher ed policies & attacks continue to emerge, distracting campus leaders' attention & drawing resources away from core work	F U T U R E	Higher ed's reputation rebounds and effective advocacy leads to policies aimed at strengthening campuses
HE Budget Model	Higher ed funding model continues to degrade, with fewer students willing or able to pay tuition rates and fewer options available for subsidizing costs; campus closures grow	L I K E L Y	With support from stakeholders, higher ed designs a more sustainable budget model that minimizes student debt and enables investment in curricula, personnel, and facilities
Climate Change	Global climate degradation increases extreme weather events and raises costs of energy consumption and disaster recovery		New global consensus emerges on the urgency of addressing climate change collaboratively, reducing risks and expenses
Social Unrest	Students, employees, and community members are deeply upset with institutions and leaders, both on campus and off; higher education faces significant and repeated disruptions to operations		Economic health and social well-being are strong and protests are generally limited in scale and duration. Strong stakeholder support exists for most campus operations
International Students & Scholars	Political and economic pressures prevent campuses from attracting international students and scholars, causing significant changes to campus communities and funding		International relations strengthen, enabling campuses to attract students, scholars, and funding from overseas

PROJECTS TO EXPLORE & THEMES TO EMPHASIZE

During and after the August 14th retreat, campus leaders reviewed <u>15 broadly described potential areas of collaboration</u>: crisis, emergency, and safety functions; galleries, libraries, archives, and museums; benefits & professional development; off-site storage; shared staffing; accounting systems; facilities contracts; specialized services; IT and information management; course catalog and cross-registration; generative AI; card services and credentialing; business practices that encourage collaboration; budget modeling; and life in the Valley. In addition to these 15, seven projects were mentioned or highlighted during the retreat, but have not been fully discussed: shared events calendar, enhancing transportation, shared ombuds, shared project manager, assessment of land holdings, evaluation of small departments and units, and future-proofing the humanities.

Throughout the discussion of the potential collaborative projects, <u>four overarching themes</u> came up time and again. The first is that <u>a new collaborative project must save the campuses money or improve the quality or efficiency of services and processes central to the missions of the institutions or both</u>. Cost-savings in one area could be redirected toward adding value in another. The second theme is that it is important to <u>find several "easy wins"</u> that can serve as models of cross-campus collaboration and build momentum toward others.

A third theme is to find opportunities to <u>invest in collaborative projects that have the potential to lay the foundation for other collaborations</u>. The Five College Calendar Alignment Guidelines, for instance, note that not only do such guidelines support cross-registration, but also that "having a communal flow of the academic year facilitates other collaborative activities and programming, including joint appointments of faculty and staff, coordinated faculty development programming, cross-campus auditions and other co-curricular events, the shared bus service, FCI committee schedules, and more." As a forward-looking example, a unified card services and credentialing system would similarly not only facilitate cross-registration, but also support other collaborations such as cross-campus dining and library access, sharing faculty and staff positions, and so on.

A final theme is to <u>be proactive and not reactive</u> by looking ahead at changes on the horizon on the individual campuses—e.g., expiring contracts, upcoming reviews of programs or services, or anticipated retirements or vacancies—that could provide opportunities for new cross-campus collaborations. As with existing cross-campus collaborations (such as risk management and jointly appointed faculty), not all five campuses need to be involved in every collaborative project. Some projects might be more suitable to a subset of campuses at any given time.

These four themes are reflected in the updated Strategy Screen, which will be used to gauge, in a phrase from the retreat, "is the juice worth the squeeze?" for any given project. Specific initiatives will be presented to and approved by the PBOs, Provosts, and Board throughout the year.

THE FCI STRATEGY SCREEN
("Is the juice worth the squeeze?")

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*
C O S T S	financial	___ Saves campuses significant expense or investment.	___ Is cost-neutral (e.g., covered by gift or grant) or requires minimal expense.	___ Requires substantial new/add'l campus investment.	___ *Requires substantial new investment &/or has no identified source of funding.*
	human	___ Reduces necessary staffing vs. alternatives or current state.	___ 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.*
	effort	___ Implementation simple & speedy or incremental steps would make quick wins possible, with little pushback.	___ Path to implementation clear and manageable, though sustained effort and attention required.	___ Long timeline, major obstacles, significant pushback expected with extensive political capital required.	___ *Would be extremely risky to implement, with little chance of success.*
B E N E F I T S	strength	___ Adds to an existing strength or establishes a new strength area.	___ Enables maintenance of an existing strength or prevents loss of 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 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., legal/eligibility issues require FCI).	___ Campuses would struggle to do this or FCI can do it more efficiently/better.	___ Campuses could readily 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.*
	equity	___ Actively nurtures or furthers equity on or across the campuses.	___ Enables improvements in equity on or across the campuses.	___ Maintains existing levels of equity on or across the campuses.	___ *Works against equity on or across the campuses.*
		Total strong score: _____	Total moderate score: _____	Total weak scores: _____	Total negative score: _____

TOTAL SCORE: _____   **Highest possible score: 45**   **Lowest possible score: -45**   **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 75% of the overall budget for the year (that is, roughly $7.5M of the overall $10M budget). The remainder of the budget comes primarily from grants (~10%), 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.