

**PIE Council Minutes  
November 12, 2004  
1:30 p.m.  
EDHS Room 120**

Members Present: Brian Anderson, Maggie McClintock (for Anne Balazs), Mark Bean, Marie Byrne, Sue Coates, Lynne Curtis, John Davis, Bobby Fugitt, Sam Gingerich, Linda Halbert, Larry Jones, Rebecca Kelly, Nora Miller, Jennifer Moore, Sally Pearson, Narem Reddy, Tom Richardson, Jo Spearman, Jane Wenstrom

Members Absent: Mandy Gray, Terri Heath, Jody Kennedy, Cheryl Hubbard, Susan Soblely, Dana Vaughn, Margie Vollenweider

Items Distributed: Minutes for October 8, 2004, Agenda, Subcommittee 5 Minutes, ACT Survey of Student Opinions, ACT Peer Group Sheet

Agenda Items: Approval of October 8, 2004 Minutes, Planning Guide, IER Reviews, W-2009 Review, Surveys, Subcommittee 5 Recommendations

The minutes from the October 8, 2004 meeting were approved with one revision in paragraph four.

Each PIE Council member was given a bound copy of the MUW Comprehensive Planning, Evaluation, and Budgeting Guide. A copy of the Planning Guide will also be mailed to unit managers.

The IER reviews will begin in early December with the academic programs review. The non-academic IER reviews will begin early next semester.

The W-2009 Subcommittee (Subcommittee 4) met twice to review the strategic objectives and make recommendations to the full PIE Council during the October 8, 2004 meeting. The reviews occurred with regard to the criteria approved by PIE Council and suggestions from the campus open meeting on September 20, 2004. The recommendations of the subcommittee will be posted for campus review prior to the December 10, 2004 PIE Council meeting. At the December 10th meeting, PIE Council will review the subcommittee recommendations and make final recommendations to the President. During the December 14th retreat, the President's Cabinet will review and finalize the W- 2009 strategic objectives.

Subcommittee 5, whose charge is to monitor the budget process, met on November 5, 2004 to discuss the budget process recommendations in Dr.

Barbara Jones' report. The Subcommittee 5 minutes are included. The recommendations from Subcommittee 5 were approved.

PIE Council discussed administering the ACT Survey of Student Opinion this spring instead of the MUW Student Satisfaction Survey. The ACT survey allows institutions to compare their results with the results of a peer group. There was concern that the ACT survey was too general. PIE Council agreed to administer the ACT survey this spring on a trial basis.

PIE Council reviewed the 2004 MUW Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Surveys. There was also discussion about administering the survey on-line this year. It was the consensus of PIE Council that on-line administration of the surveys may reduce the response rate. The university will explore the use of on-line surveys in the future. The surveys were approved without changes with the addition of a question regarding on-line administration (e.g., "Would you answer this survey on-line"). Faculty Senate and Staff Council will be asked to review the respective faculty and staff surveys for input. The surveys will be administered early in the spring semester.

The next meeting will be held on December 10, 2004 at 1:30 p.m. in Room 120 of the Education & Human Sciences Building.

**PIE Council Subcommittee 5  
Minutes  
November 5, 2004  
1:30 p.m.  
Parkinson Hall Room 128**

Note: This subcommittee is responsible for monitoring the budget process.

Members Present: Mark Bean, Jody Kennedy, Larry Jones, Tom Richardson,  
Jane Wenstrom

Guest Present: Nora Miller

Items Distributed: Dr. Barbara Jones' Report; Specific Appendices from the  
Report Regarding the Budget Process

Mark Bean called the meeting to order and stated that the primary objective of the meeting was to make recommendations to PIE Council about the budget process recommendations found in Dr. Jones' report. Specifically, Dr Jones recommended the following:

1. Implement an 18 month planning cycle.
2. Designate a budget-planning day early in the spring semester.
3. Use on-line forms to submit budget requests.

The committee discussed Dr. Jones' recommendations and suggested the following:

1. We should not move to an 18 month planning calendar. Our current planning/budget process actually includes a 24 month calendar. Unit heads are asked to submit budget requests for the upcoming two fiscal years. Most unit managers, however, focus budget requests on the next fiscal year. The subcommittee agreed that better education about and more emphasis on the 24 month calendar can address many of the reasons presented for moving to an 18 month calendar. The subcommittee also expressed concerns that the 18 month calendar would be confusing to the university community.
2. We should establish budget-planning activity as opposed to a planning day early in the spring semester. The subcommittee believed that creating a budget-planning day for early spring, at this point, may create difficulties for unit managers who may have already planned spring activities. Nora Miller and Mark Bean will establish planning-budget guidelines that will be distributed to all unit managers in

January. Unit managers will have the flexibility to address the guidelines as they see fit.

3. The subcommittee agreed that we should use on-line budget request forms. The Office of Computing Services will work with Office of Finance and Administration to develop on-line budget request forms.