FCI Strategic Roadmap

last updated: 19 October 2021

WORKSHEET 0.0 **Introduction to the FCI Strategic Roadmap**

The Strategic Roadmap Approach

In the fall of 2018, under the leadership of the new Executive Director and with the support of governance, FCI undertook a strategic planning exercise. The organization had recently undergone a review by external consultants and extensive interviews had been conducted by the firm managing the executive director search. As a result, it was determined that a traditional strategic planning exercise, with months of self assessment and stakeholder review, was neither necessary nor appropriate. In addition, the nature of the Consortium's role in serving and supporting the campuses means that a traditional multi-year plan would limit the organization's ability to respond and adapt to changes on the campuses.

The Strategic Roadmap approach used here follows David LaPiana's model, in which a plan is built by completing a series of worksheets, which collectively make up the plan (or "roadmap"). It is intended as a living document, readily adapted as necessary. In FCI's case, the original 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.

Table of Contents

WORKSHEET 1.0 **Identity Statement for Five Colleges, Incorporated**

The Identity Statement below (originally Worksheet 6.1) summarizes the significant elements of the subsequent pages in a format that can be shared with both internal and external audiences. The version here was last reviewed in Sept and Oct 2020.

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, Enterprise, and Outreach 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 priorties, 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.

In the near-term future, FCI and its member campuses will be operating in the context of several broad trends, most notably the global pandemic and the need to address racial injustice. In addition to these twin challenges, three other trends shape our work: changing demographics (the 2025 Cliff and the need to teach to diverse lived experiences), financial inequities (income disparity and mounting student debt), and the public's perception of the liberal arts and higher education. These challenges will test FCI and our member institutions in new and substantial ways. Nevertheless, we believe that the best future for our campuses will be found through continued active engagement with one another.

The FCI portfolio of activities should continually be assessed based on 8 criteria (laid out in detail in the Strategy Screen). Two criteria focus on costs: the financial and human resources required for implementation. The other six criteria focus on benefits, namely the ability of each program to: add to the strength of the campuses, serve large or critical audiences, further campus missions, enable what cannot be done without the Consortium, nurture collaboration across the campuses, and further racial equity.

WORKSHEET 1.1 **Introduction to Budgeting at FCI**

This worksheet is intended to capture the current business model. This version comes from the on-boarding materials for new Board members and replaces earlier versions.

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 75-80% of the overall budget for the year (that is, roughly $7M of the overall $9M budget). The remainder of the budget comes primarily from grants (~10-12%), revenue from fees paid by outside entities such as Repository affiliates and FCN* customers (~6%), and endowment income (~3-4%).

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.

All FCI budget items are placed into one of six categories: Consortium Administration, Transportation, Library, Academic Programs, Information Technology & Enterprise Initiatives, and 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 two-college police department formerly operated by Smith and Mount Holyoke Colleges was managed outside of the FCI budget.

* 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.

WORKSHEET 1.2 **Five College Interdependencies**

This sheet summarizes the existing financial and non-financial interdependencies among the five member institutions. It was last updated in February 2019.

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:

- <u>FCI Administration</u> – 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
- <u>Libraries</u> – 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
- <u>Transportation</u> – primarily PVTA bus contracts; the campuses contribute equally to the base transportation agreements, but some contract for additional route service and are assessed accordingly
- <u>Academic Programs</u> – 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
- <u>Enterprise Programs</u> – primarily shared back-office functions such as risk and compliance, software systems; and the Five College fiber optic network and service; campus contributions are based on their engagement
- <u>Partnership Programs</u> – 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. Examples include:

- <u>Cross-registration</u> – several decades ago the member campuses decided to allow cross-registration without transfer of funds resulting
- <u>Shared space</u> – each campus provides space for one or more Five College functions, and no rent is charged (e.g., the Five College Dance offices are located at Hampshire College)
- <u>Faculty and staff</u> – some faculty/staff are fully funded by a single campus, but are key players in a joint academic program (e.g., architecture faculty are each hired by a single campus, but contribute to the Five College major)
- <u>MOUs and other agreements</u> – the 5C Emergency Mutual Aid agreement, e.g., is 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 (no exact count of these is yet readily available)
- <u>Non-FCI agreements</u> – note that not all agreements between or among the member campuses are executed through FCI; recent examples include the former three college 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 be more effective, efficient, and experimental 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 Consortium.

*See also Introduction to Five Colleges, Incorporated (updated Summer 2020) as a useful companion document to this Roadmap, particularly for those new to the Consortium.

WORKSHEET 2.0 **Trend Analysis: From Pandemic to Endemic COVID and Coping with Social Upheaval**

This worksheet was added in 2020 and last updated in October 2021.

The trends identified here are those that are top-of-mind for 2021-22 and that not only affect the member institutions, but also can potentially be addressed via collaboration and the services of FCI.

Trends	Comments	FCI Potential
Pandemic to Endemic COVID-19	The pandemic that hit the United States in early 2020 disrupted routines, added financial pressures, and forced rapid change, not only on the campuses, but also around the world and across industries. All five FCI member campuses moved to remote instruction in mid-March 2020, with most students moving off campus at that time. Remote instruction was the dominant mode for 2020-21. With the widespread availability of vaccines,the campuses have reopened for "near normal" operations in Fall 2021, with enrollments returning to pre-pandemic levels and in-person teaching the norm, but some COVID precautions still in place. The 3 trends noted on Worksheet 2.2 continue to be relevant, but within the context of a global shift toward managing COVID as an endemic threat. In addition, campuses are coping with issues driven by the pandemic, including mental health challenges/trauma for students and employees, and the challenge of balancing a return to "normal" in-person activity with ongoing safety precautions.	After experiencing more than a year of largely remote work, campuses are exploring how best to balance the desire to return to in-person operations with the desire for additional flexibility, and the campuses can continue to benefit from the collective wisdom of the broader group. As noted during the height of the pandemic, care must be given to protecting existing collaborative ventures that have been disrupted during the pandemic, to ensure the long-term health of these activities. Cross-registration, for instance, long a bedrock of Five College collaboration, was for a year restricted to remote instruction only, and the Five College Policy on Calendar Alignment was effectively suspended, further disrupting cross-registration. Returning to a robust and healthy interchange system will require intentional efforts and the support of campus leadership. New collaborations may be possible around remote working policies, childcare options, IT systems, and professional develoment around remote teaching, as just a few examples. Whatever specific initiatives are selected, the pandemic and the associated financial challenges provide an opportunity for the member institutions to re-commit to the value of the Consortium they founded.
Social Disruption	The pandemic caused social disruption as states went into various forms of shelter-in-place lockdowns and business restrictions, and racial disparities have been evident in access to care and in COVID-19 patient outcomes. The stress of living under pandemic risk and restrictions for an extended period has also been identified as a critical social issue, with high levels of anxiety, frustration, and anger among the general population. Finally, the climate crisis has been a frequent topic of interest by campuses and students.	These social issues are hardly unique to the member campuses of FCI. The breadth and scale of these issues suggests that no one campus can successfully address or resolve these stressors. Collaboration might take many forms, including sharing professional development programs, curriculum revisions, and student support. The Mellon NAIS grant and the proposed Mellon faculty leadership development project can support some efforts along these lines.
Leadership Transitions	Several key campus leadership positions will be turning over in the year ahead. These changes affect the governance committees of FCI and have the potential to affect the strategies and initiatives of the Consortium.	The Board of Directors has expressed interest in connecting early with these new campus leaders, engaging them in planful orientation to the Consortium and its benefits.

WORKSHEET 2.1 **Trend Analysis: Ongoing Issues**

This sheet was last reviewed by the Deans, PBOs, and Directors in September and October 2020.

The ongoing trends identified here are those that not only affect the member institutions, but also can potentially be addressed via collaboration and the services of FCI. Note that these trends, first identified in 2018-19, are all amplified by the pandemic and its associated social disruptions.

Trends	Comments	FCI Potential
Teaching to Diverse Lived Experiences & 2025 Cliff	As Nathan D. Grawe notes in his influential book Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education, college-aged populations in the Northeast & Midwest are shrinking. Demographic changes will affect recruitment & curriculum needs for all five campuses, as our student bodies become ever more diverse, in age, race/ethnicity, & lived experiences. The pandemic has made enrollment planning and predictions even more challenging and the role of remote instruction in post-pandemic campus operations remains unclear.	The dramatic generational change now underway will tax the resources of individual campuses as schools aim to offer a wider array of courses and co-curricular opportunities. FCI can support shared planning across the campuses to maximize the potential offerings consortium-wide. The campus centers focused on teaching and learning can also leverage their collective capacity as faculty strive to adapt and update course material and methods.
Income Disparity & Student Debt	Inside Higher Ed's compilation on "Key Issues in Student Debt," the Chronicle's special report "Does Higher Education Perpetuate Inequality?" and Akers & Chingos' Game of Loans all highlight aspects of the financial challenges facing prospective and current students and the implications for our campuses. Pandemic-induced staffing shortages and supply chain disruptions are adding to the challenge of ensuring equitable access.	The need to help students afford to access our institutions suggests the importance of keeping costs contained and looking for efficiencies through cross-campus collaboration. In addition, collaborative marketing to prospective students and their families can help ensure they understand the reality of financial support they can expect and the resources available to help them.
Perception of the Liberal Arts and Higher Education	Cooper & Marx's 2018 book Media U: How the Need to Win Audiences Has Shaped Higher Education (like Bowen & McPherson's Lesson Plan before it) addresses the pitfalls of attending to the reputation of our institutions and the public's perception of higher education, but neither can we ignore the trend of declining public support detailed in Lyall & Sell's The True Genius of America at Risk over a decade ago, continued by Policano & Fethke in Public No More, documented by Gallup's 2018 poll showing continued decline in public support for higher ed, and exacerbated by the pandemic.	The public's declining trust in higher education has not been shaped by any one institution and likewise cannot be reversed by a single school acting alone. Collaborative efforts to enhance the perceived value of the liberal arts could focus on issues ranging from ensuring job readiness (a key concern for parents and politicians) to developing effective approaches to discrimination, harassment, and assault on our campuses. The pandemic and its aftermath presents new opportunities for designing creative, appealing programming that the public sees as responsive and responsible.

WORKSHEET 2.2 **The Big Question**

This worksheet is intended to capture the Big Questions that face Five Colleges, Incorporated -- opportunities, competetive challenges, or business model challenges. There may be more than one Big Question, but the focus here should be on the one that should/must be tackled first. The version here has been udpated for FY22, but reflects many of the same focal points as in FY21. It was updated following the PBO meeting on 29 Sept 21.

The Big Question for Near-Term Consideration

In normal years, the goal is to identify a single issue on which to focus our attentions, but the intertwined issues of the pandemic and social disruption cannot be tackled separately or in sequence.

1. **Shifting from Pandemic Survival to Endemic Management:** *After 18 months of online engagement and instruction, there is a strong desire to return to in-person activity, along with a recognition that some virtual interaction can be beneficial. What is the right mix as the campuses return to predominantly in-person operations? How can we use the lessons learned about virtual interactions to supplement (not supplant) our in person work?*
2. **Social Disruption:** *How will the campuses & our communities manage the accumulated stress of more than 18 months of pandemic living and the social disruption emerging from that stress?*

Additional Big Questions for Another Time

1. **Hampshire College Stabilization (identified pre-pandemic):** *What is the future of Hampshire? How will the Consortium adapt/adjust to changes in Hampshire's structure, staffing, and funding?*

Proposed Strategy for Addressing the Most Immediate Big Question

1. **Continued careful fiscal management:** ensure that the FCI reserves are sufficient to permit near-normal operations for a full fiscal year in the event of receiving only 80% of anticipated income, in order to permit orderly planning and transitions (these reserves may also be needed to support pivots in operations and pilots of new collaborations) and manage FCI's budget conservatively, with freezes on hiring and discretionary funding, and continued systematic review of our portfolio to identify opportunities for savings and new strategic investments.
2. **Spotlight community and collaboration:** we must not take 50+ years of collaboration for granted; although the pressures of the current moment may make isolated action and response seem desireable, continued commitment to our shared future holds greater promise for the long-term future of all of our member organizations, and the potential for more powerful responses to both the pandemic and calls for racial justice.
3. **Put on our own masks first:** strive to model responsible, creative, and collaborative actions in our anti-racism work and our pandemic response as an organization.

How does the strategy help us answer our Big Question? Does it align with our values & strategy screen?

The particular events of 2020-21 have been unexpected, but the broad outlines (the possibility of a pandemic or other large-scale disruption and the demands to address racial inequities and violence) were not unforeseeable. Together they remind us of the value of preparing for what we cannot predict, including through careful fiscal management, which can help us weather such blows and provide the ability to make strategic investments even in a time of crisis. Disasters and other crises neither "bring out the best in us" nor revert us to our basest selves; rather, they reveal what already exists, both strengths and weaknesses. In that revelation, we can choose to respond by recommitting to our strengths and addressing our weaknesses.

WORKSHEET 3.0 **Funding Sources**

This worksheet displays sources of revenue to help review trends in funding and diversity of funding to help assess FCI's overall financial stability. It has been updated to reflect FY21 and FY22 budgets as approved by the Board.

Sources of Revenue *(income)*	**Percent of total budget, FY21 (prior) fiscal year**	**Percent of total budget, FY22 (current) fiscal year**	**Comments** *(if applicable)* such as regarding changes in funding from prior to current year	**Comments regarding next fiscal year** such as changes in current funding sources in next fiscal year, new funding anticipated, funding at risk
Assessments	68%	70%	83% of assessments returned directly to campuses or paid on behalf of campuses in FY21 (was 65% in FY20). The FY21 % includes the $1M COVID insurance claim received and returned to campuses	Given the FCI mission of serving the campuses, it seems appropriate that the majority of FCI funding come from our beneficiaries. The pandemic placed new and significant financial burdens on the campuses, which have eased but not resolved, leading FCI to temporarily shift some budget items to other sources of funding for FY21 and FY22 (see Unrestricted Funding).
Foundation grants	14%	12%	Mellon Foundation is major source of grant income	
Earned income, *(including program fees, if applicable)*	6%	6%	Revenue from outside parties to support FCI programs, FCN revenue, bunker affiliates' fees	
Unrestricted funding *(such as endowment, donors, memberships)*	10%	10%	All endowment revenue is restricted by original gift instruments	FCI's prepandemic unrestricted funding averaged 6% and it is expected to return to that for FY23
Government funding-grants	1%	1%	NEH and NSF (as a sub-awardee) primary sources	
Other-reserves	1%	1%		
Corporate grants	0%	0%	FCI does not seek corprate grants	
Total revenue	$ 9,906,763	$ 9,445,517	Note that "surplus/deficit" has been left off of this worksheet, because FCI budget is based on planned and approved expenses.	
Total expenses	$ 9,906,763	$ 9,445,517		

See also "Intro to FCI Budgeting" briefing document included in onboarding materials for new Directors.

WORKSHEET 3.1 **Assessment Allocations**

The information in this worksheet has been updated for the FY22 budget, July 2021.

Five Colleges determines the allocation of annual assessment to members based on a variety of formulas that can be grouped into 3 categories: 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 budget amounts below reflect assessment funding in the approved FY22 budget.

Category	Rationale	Calculation	Budgeted Amount	Notes/Examples
Equal	5 campuses share equally	5ths	$3,166,000	All FCI administration and many program costs
	4 campuses share equally	4ths	30,000	Center for Women and Community- UM excluded
2-Tiered	5 campuses participate with 1 campus paying ½ of other 4	9ths	411,000	FCN LLC- HC pays half share
	4 campuses participate with 1 campus paying ½ of other 3	7ths	270,000	Compliance & Risk Management- UM excluded and HC pays half share
	5 campuses participate with 1 campus paying 2x's other 4	6ths	62,000	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	903,000	Libraries, Bunker and Annex- UM pays double share and HC pays half share
Agreement	By agreement: Joint appointments		1,478,000	Usually proportional to share of teaching
	By agreement: Other		301,000	Examples include: Licensure, Dance musicians, language instruction, EIT Coordinator, America Reads, Art Museums
	Total Assessments		**$6,621,000**	

WORKSHEET 3.2 **Income and Expenses by Program**

This worksheet provides an overview of how revenue (income) is allocated and used by each main program area. It has been updated for FY22 budget and % with comparative dollars for FY21.

	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 (FY22)	$ 1,416,133	95%	$ 637,500	75%	$ 903,554	97%	$ 2,661,994	60%	$ 750,843	80%	$ 250,887	31%
(FY21)	$ 1,368,463		$ 562,500		$ 953,788		$ 2,705,923		$ 900,192		$ 249,001	
Foundation grants (FY22)							$ 974,306	22%			$ 288,616	36%
(FY21)							$ 1,090,655				$ 355,180	
Earned income (FY22)			$ 212,500	25%	$ 25,000	3%			$ 182,101	19%	$ 170,088	21%
(FY21)			$ 187,500		$ 46,700				$ 171,598		$ 168,166	
Unrestricted (incl. endowment) (FY22)	$ 7,000	0%					$ 761,319	17%			$ 51,418	6%
(FY21)	$ 7,000		-				$ 937,643				$ 50,369	
Govt grants (FY22)											$ 30,000	4%
(FY21)											$ 30,000	
Other-reserves (FY22)	$ 73,844	5%	$ 3,200	0%			$ 22,500	1%	$ 1,000	0%	$ 21,713	3%
(FY21)	$ 73,672		$ 3,200				$ 22,500		$ 1,000		$ 21,713	
Total prog. income (FY22)	$ 1,496,977	100%	$ 853,200	100%	$ 928,554	100%	$ 4,420,119	100%	$ 933,943	100%	$ 812,722	100%
Total prog. expenses (FY22)	$ 1,496,977		$ 853,200		$ 928,554		$ 4,420,119		$ 933,943		$ 812,722	

WORKSHEET 3.3 **Competitor Analysis**

This worksheet was last reviewed by the Deans, PBOs, and Directors on 9/9/20, 9/11/20, and 9/29/20.

FCI does not have "competitors" in the ordinary sense of the term - other consortia do exist (as indicated in the Benchmark analysis on the following sheet), but are generally not available as alternatives for the campuses. Instead, we have opted to think about when the campuses choose to collaborate without FCI or choose not to collaborate at all.

The 2017 Parthenon report and other sources make clear that the campuses benefit from and value collaboration. **The two critical questions are about what specific collaborations bring benefit and when those collaborations are better done with FCI engagement.** Collaboration should occur when it can support the campuses in being more EFFECTIVE, EFFICIENT, and/or EXPERIMENTAL than they could be alone. Collaborations involving just 2 campuses are typically easier for campuses to do without FCI involvement, except where that collaboration is one piece of a broader partnership structure (e.g., a 2-way joint faculty appointment that is part of the overall joint faculty structure). Additional information appears in subsequent sheets on criteria, models, & timelines (or time limits) for FCI engagement.

	Member campuses collaborating via FCI	Member campuses collaborating w/o FCI engagement	Member campuses not collaborating	Notes
Customers	Collaborating (with or without FCI) enables campuses to serve students and stakeholders across campus boundaries		Campuses primarily serve own students & stakeholders	Collaboration typically broadens access w/ or w/o FCI engagement.
Media attention/ publicity	FCI can at times gain media attention as an unusual organization doing atypical work	Media attention may be drawn to well-known campuses partnering.	Each campus gains media attention through a strong reputation and name recognition.	No strong or universal benefit to be gained through one mechanism vs another, tho collab itself can draw media attention if it is unusual or unexpected. Media often do not distinguish between collaboration with FCI engagement vs. without.
Human Resources (staff, board, volunteers)	~40 staff on FCI payroll; primary job responsibility is to support collaboration	Campuses can opt to fund addl staff to dedicate to shared programs (needn't hire via FCI)	Each campus relies solely on its own staff	FCI staff bring cross-campus knowledge & familarity w/ how to work across campuses.
Funding (diversity, availability, amount, types of funding)	Limited diversity of funding, but all funds are dedicated to collaboration	Greater diversity of funds, but also more competition for use of them	No need to dedicate funding to collaboration	Some funders (e.g., Mellon) prefer or restrict funding to consortia. Majority of FCI funding comes from campuses, so they can opt to dedicate funding to collaborating without FCI.
Programs or Services	As a small and independent organization, FCI has more flexibility but less infrastructure than campuses; can be more nimble in adapting or piloting.	As est'd & larger orgs, the campuses have significant infrastructure to bring to collab efforts, but can be less nimble & flexible.	Each campus offers its own programs and services (in this scenario)	FCI staff bring cross-campus knowledge and familarity with how to work across campus systems/policies. With or without FCI, campuses would engage in academic, enterprise, and outreach activities.
Mission-related Impact	FCI's sole mission is to support collaboration. FCI staff attention is dedicated to collaborative and cross-campus opportunities and performance.	Collaboration can interrupt a campus' efforts to pursue its own priorities, but can also make it possible to address more significant issues & trends facing higher ed generally.	Each campus is free to focus on and fund its own priorities that serve its mission, but may be challenged to address more significant issues and trends.	

WORKSHEET 3.4 **Benchmark Analysis**

Although this worksheet is not in the original LaPiana design, FCI's structure suggests that tracking what other consortia do and how they do it is a valuable exercise. It was last updated on 8/29/20.

	FCI	Claremont Colleges Services*	Big 10 Academic Alliance**	Colleges of the Fenway	***"If you've seen 1 consortium, you've seen 1 consortium."*** ~70 higher ed consortia operate in the U.S. w/ variety of models & purposes. The 3 here = closest "peers" of FCI.
Mbrs	5 member campuses	7 member campuses	14 members of the Big10 Athletic Conference	5 member campuses	FCI & Claremont operate as **alliances** (members defined in founding documents); Big10AA & CoF operate as **affiliations** (membership evolves as insts. 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 of (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 instns and the alignment with Div I athletics draws far more media attention than all others combined.
Size	~40 employees, governed by member presdnt/chanclr	~10 core employees (~400 total), governed by 18-member bd of dirs	~22 employees (incl dirs of Libraries, Progs, & Ops), governed by mbr provosts	~12 employees, governed by member presidents	As noted in Parthenon report, each of these consortia is governed by a board, with addll governance/leadership groups + committees for particular purposes
Budget	~$9M budget, 75-80% from "assessments", remainder from endowment, grants, revenue	~$38M budget, with funding almost exclusively from the members, which pay for shared services via a formula.	~$2M central operating budget, almost all from members. Annl mmbrshp fees, plus addl fees assessed for specific progs.	~$2.5M budget, almost exclusively from mbrs. 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/ co-curricular, administrative/ enterprise, and outreach/ partnership programs.	Primarily shared admin/support servs, but w/ some acad progs & ctrs shared by subset of mbrs. The schls 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.	Big10AA is the outlier, defined by inst type rather than geog proxmimity, & thus focuses on activities such as leadership development 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 opps. 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 mission of whole.

WORKSHEET 4.0 **Strategy Screen**

This sheet was last reviewed by the Deans, PBOs, and Directors in September and October 2020.

All initiatives and programs in the Five Colleges portfolio should be of high quality: well-managed, professional, and with documented outcomes. This tool is intended to support the assessment of new and existing FCI initiatives and programs. Note that scores should be used to foster the necessary discussion to come to recommendations, rather than being seen as strict cut-offs.

Strategy Screen Criteria

		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

WORKSHEET 4.2 **Implementation Checklist**

This worksheet was last reviewed by the Deans, PBOs, and Directors on 9/9/20, 9/11/20, and 9/29/20.

Once an initiative or program has been approved, FCI staff should ensure that the items on the Implementation Checklist have been addressed, and should involve campus leadership where appropriate.

Elements to Include	
√	Brief statement of the nature and purpose of the program
√	Names of initial/current program leaders, and a succession plan if appropriate
√	Name and role of key contact/liaison on FCI staff (is FCI the Strategic Leader, Partner, Incubator, Convenor, or Administrator?) [*See Parthenon Report Appendix, p. 30.]*
√	Is the program intended as a one-time or short-term activity? A pilot to be handed to campuses if successful? An on-going, long-term activity?
√	Budget summary/narrative, including sources of funds and planned uses, and when funds expire
√	Description of any additional resources needed (e.g., in-kind office space provided by a campus).
√	Planned date of next program review, plus key criteria to be used in evaluation, noting who is responsible for initiating review
√	Risk assessment and contingency (continuity of operations) plan
√	Other elements, including any as determined by Board of Directors at point of approval.

See also "Five College Committee Taxonomy" briefing document included in onboarding materials for new Directors.

WORKSHEET 4.3 **Next Steps Work Plan**

This action list was last updated on 10/20/21 and will be updated throughout FY22.

1. Continue to convene key Five College committees addressing pandemic response and supporting cross-campus collaboration.
2. Continue to convene Five College meetings with local legislative, business, and community leaders, with particular attention to mutual understanding and potential collaborations around pandemic response and managing associated social disruption.
3. Attend to implementation of Mellon NAIS grant, including curriculum development, faculty hiring, & establishment of an FCI land acknowledgment.
4. Continue actively seeking external funding to defray pandemic-related expenses and to support new strategic initiatives and innovations.
5. Continue to deploy FCI endowment funds (e.g., Neill) to support campuses during recovery from the 2020-21 disruptions.
6. Return to review of academic programs, albeit scaled back to accommodate on-going workloads of the pandemic recovery period.
7. Explore, consider, and establish recommendations to guide the future of flex and hybrid learning in a post-pandemic setting. How can virtual and other flexible options supplement the campuses' in-person work and instruction while preserving their commitment to face-to-face engagement?
8. Develop strategies for onboarding new senior leaders on the campuses and welcoming them to Consortial collaboration and community.
9. Continue to support robust cross-registration, such as through efforts to coordinate academic calendars.
10. Engage in active renegotiation of the PVTA contract to ensure reliable, convenient, affordable transportation for Five College students and employees as well as community members.