

**PIE Council Minutes**  
**October 8, 2004**  
**1:30 p.m.**  
**EDHS Room 120**

Members Present: Brian Anderson, Mark Bean, Anne Balazs, Marie Byrne, Sue Coates, Lynne Curtis, John Davis, Bobby Fugitt, Sam Gingerich, Terri Heath, Larry Jones, Rebecca Kelly, Jody Kennedy, Claudia A. Limbert, Nora Miller, Jennifer Moore, Sally Pearson, Narem Reddy, Tom Richardson, Jo Spearman, Dana Vaughn, Jane Wenstrom

Members Absent: Mandy Gray, Linda Halbert, Cheryl Hubbard, Susan Soblely, Margie Vollenweider

Items Distributed: Minutes for September 10, 2004, Agenda, PIE Council 2004-2005 Resource Book, Budget Process Survey Comparison Table

Agenda Items: Approval of September 10, 2004 Minutes; Welcome of New Member; Resource Book; SACS Response; Budget Process Survey Results; IER Updates; Planning Calendar; Criteria for Evaluating W-2009

The minutes from the September 10, 2004 meeting were approved. Mark Bean welcomed John Davis, the new PIE Council member representing the Columbus community. Mark Bean also noted that Lynne Curtis will remain as the Alumni Board representative until 2006.

Each PIE Council member was given a 2004-2005 Resource Book. The resource book contains pertinent policies, campus survey results, IHL information, a 2003 – 2004 Factbook, as well as other information.

Mark Bean reported that the Follow-up Report to SACS was submitted on time. We should expect a response in January.

Each member was given a 2003 vs. 2004 Budget Process Survey comparison table. Mark Bean pointed out the improvement in the budget process as demonstrated by the survey results. He noted that two tables are presented. One table includes the NA responses in the total. The other table does not.

Departments have been turning in their 2004-2005 IERs. Most IERs have been submitted. The IER reviews will begin after all are submitted. Mark Bean will be in contact with the different subcommittees to set up times for the reviews.

The 2004-2005 Planning Calendar was approved by PIE Council. The calendar does not currently include a budget planning day in January as discussed in the previous PIE Council meeting. The reason is that we have not come to a

conclusion that this will occur. If we decide to implement a budget planning day in January, it can be added to the calendar. The planning calendar was approved.

There was discussion about going to an 18 month planning calendar as Recommended by Dr. Barbara Jones. Advantages and concerns were briefly discussed. It was determined that the best course of action would be for the budget process subcommittee (Subcommittee 5) to investigate the feasibility of this and other budget process recommendations.

On September 20th, there was an open campus meeting in Hogarth auditorium to discuss the W-2009 Strategic Plan. Feedback on the current draft of the document was obtained. A copy of the current draft of W-2009 with the comments from the open meeting is included in the resource book.

In a subsequent meeting the W-2009 subcommittee (Subcommittee 4) drafted a set of criteria for reviewing the W-2009 strategic objectives. PIE Council approved these criteria. The criteria were approved. The subcommittee will proceed with the review process.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 12, 2004 at 1:30 p.m. in Room 120 of the Education & Human Sciences Building.

2004 – 2005 Planning Calendar (*Proposed*)

August	September	October
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-IHL announces system initiatives for '05-'06</li> <li>-Budget presentation</li> <li>-Budget process survey administered</li> <li>- '04 -'05 IERs developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- '04-'05 CPD distributed to university community</li> <li>-SACS Follow-up Report submitted</li> <li>-Campus reviews W-2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue implementation of '04 -'05 IERs</li> <li>-PIE Council reviews campus IERs (by subcommittee)</li> <li>-W 2009 review continues</li> </ul>
November	December	January
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue implementation of '04-'05 IERs</li> <li>-PIE Council continues review of campus IERs</li> <li>- PIE Council reviews and modifies campus survey instruments (e.g., student, faculty, staff satisfaction surveys)</li> <li>-PIE Council recommends W-2009 objectives to the President</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue implementation of '04-'05 IERs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue implementation of '04 -'05 IERs</li> <li>-Annual performance appraisals begin</li> <li>-President reviews W-2009 objectives</li> <li>-President assigns responsible personnel for the W-2009 objectives</li> </ul>
February	March	April
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue implementation of '04 -'05 IERs</li> <li>-campus surveys administered</li> <li>-PIE Council reviews survey results and other info. and recommends University priorities for the '05 -'06 cycle*</li> <li><i>*recommends to the President</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue implementation of '04 -'05 IERs</li> <li>-campus survey results compiled and distributed</li> <li>-President reviews University priorities for the '05-'06 cycle</li> <li>-President announces '05-'06 University priorities</li> <li>-05 – '06 Budget calendar distributed</li> <li>-Budget workshops held</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Unit heads complete '05 – '06, '06-07 BRFs</li> <li>- '05-'06 Budget hearings are held between unit heads and Cabinet members</li> <li>-President's Cabinet reviews budget requests</li> </ul>
May	June	July
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-End-of-year retreats</li> <li>-'04-'05 IERs completed with actual results and use of results</li> <li>-Budget appropriations received from IHL</li> <li>-Final 05 – 06 Budget established</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5-year plan submitted to IHL</li> <li>- Campus '05 – '06 budget presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Cabinet members complete '04- 05 SIERs</li> <li>'05 – '06 Budgets distributed and implemented</li> </ul>

BRF = Budget Request Forms; CPD = Comprehensive Planning Document; IER = Institutional Effectiveness Report IR; SIER = Summary of Institutional Effectiveness Reports

PIE Council Subcommittee 4  
Meeting  
October 6, 2004, 3:00 p.m.  
Admissions Conference Room

Minutes

Note: This subcommittee is responsible for the development of *W-2009: A Strategic Plan for MUW*.

Members Present: Mark Bean, Sam Gingerich, Terri Heath, Nora Miller, Tom Richardson, Dana Vaughn

Members Absent: Susan Soblely

The primary purpose of the meeting was to establish criteria by which the strategic objectives in *W-2009* would be evaluated. The following questions were developed for use in evaluation of the strategic objectives.

1. Does the strategic objective support the MUW Vision, Mission, and Guiding Principles?
2. Does the strategic objective support one or more of the MUW Goals?
3. Does the strategic objective have university-wide implications?
4. Is the strategic objective measurable, and can specific action steps be developed for its implementation?
5. What is the expected length of time for successful implementation of the strategic objective?
6. Is the strategic objective covered elsewhere in the document?
7. Does the strategic objective address an ongoing operational issue?
8. Is the strategic objective written in a manner consistent with a quality strategic objective?

These questions, to serve as criteria for evaluation of the *W-2009* objectives, will be recommended to PIE Council at the October 8, 2004 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Budget Process Survey  
 FY04 (81 responses) – FY05 (112 responses) Comparison

Survey Item	FY '04	FY '05
1. Budget preparation and implementation at MUW reflect MUW's mission.	36.7	47.6
2. I understand the MUW budget process.	45.0	50.9
3. The budget forms are easy to understand.	29.5	39.6
4. MUW budget process is linked to University planning.	32.9	53.4
5. Budget preparation and implementation are preceded by sound planning.	27.8	37.7
6. I am aware of how budget planning is related to short and long-term goals of my unit.	49.4	55.2
7. I am aware of how final budget decisions are made.	21.5	34.0
8. My unit's budget allocations were based on my unit's budget request.	31.6	37.1
9. The University allocates resources in a fair and unbiased manner.	17.1	25.5
10. I have input into decisions that affect the instruction budget (answer only if you are faculty).	36.0	33.3
11. I received feedback about my budget requests.	NA	32.7

This table presents the percentage of respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with the item.

Survey Item	FY '04	FY '05
1. Budget preparation and implementation at MUW reflect MUW's mission.	53.7	61.7
2. I understand the MUW budget process.	52.9	57.4
3. The budget forms are easy to understand.	54.8	66.7
4. MUW budget process is linked to University planning.	47.3	70.5
5. Budget preparation and implementation are preceded by sound planning.	38.6	52.6
6. I am aware of how budget planning is related to short and long-term goals of my unit.	58.2	70.7
7. I am aware of how final budget decisions are made.	25.4	38.7
8. My unit's budget allocations were based on my unit's budget request.	52.1	56.5
9. The University allocates resources in a fair and unbiased manner.	24.1	31.0
10. I have input into decisions that affect the instruction budget (answer only if you are faculty).	69.2	56.3
11. I received feedback about my budget requests.	NA	56.7

This table presents the percentage of respondents that agreed or strongly agreed with the item. NA responses not included in total responses.