

MUW Council on Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE)

September 26, 2025

Meeting Minutes

Present: Tracey Watkins, Brian Anderson, Christi Dickerson, Penny Mansell, Leigh Anne Puckett, Magan Evans, Stephanie Salvaterra, Tina Horton, Aaron Brooks, Barry Smith, Scott Tollison, Jo Shumake, Chanley Rainey, Ethan Wilkins, Xander Hall

Absente: Carla Lowery, Anika Perkins, President Miller, Jennifer Moore, and Clear Moore

- I. Tabled discussion of April Minutes until October because they had not previously been circulated.

- II. MUW Graduation Survey 2024-2025

- a. Survey Representativeness

The general response rate was similar to that for 2023-2024, with about 72% (compared to 71% the previous year) answering the first few questions.

The 24-25 survey also had roughly the same distribution of transfer (69%) and 4-year students, though the proportion of respondents living in the residence halls increased from 10.3% to 11.9%. By comparison, in Fall 2024 (according to the MUW Factbook), students living in the dorms represented 18.2% of students and transfer students represented 73.8% of all new students.

The 24-25 sample' was similar to the 23-24 sample in terms of racial and sex demographics, too. While 83% of respondents (in 24-25 and 23-24) were female, the student body was only 76.9% female in Fall 2024. The 24-25 sample was 64% white (up 1%) and 33.9% black (down 1.3%) as compared to the study body, which was 56.6% white, 35.7% black, and 7.5% percent "other" in Fall 2024.

- b. First Generation

Responses to Q1 indicating first-generation status (parent or guardian's highest level of education being trade, high school diploma, or GED) were slightly up in 24-25, at 31% compared to 23% in 23-24.

- c. Recruitment

Q7 asks "Why did you Choose MUW? {Select all that apply}." Last year, we were concerned with the low number indicating that they were encouraged by the "Advice of high school staff," which was a mere 3.1%. This year, it's only 1.86.

Following discussion, **the council agreed that it would be helpful to see these responses broken down by transfer/4-yr. status and by age and recommend having a companion question that asks about advice of *community college staff* so that we can target recruitment efforts precisely. The council would also like to have a response added for MUW recruiters.**

The top four reasons given for choosing The W were 1) Good academic reputation, selected by 57%; 2) Availability of their preferred academic program, selected by 56%; 3) Low cost, selected by 46.8%; and 4) Online class availability, selected by 41%. While these were the same top reasons listed in 23-24, their ranking was different: program availability was highest (59.6%), followed by cost (51%), academic reputation (48.4%), and online class availability (40.9%).

d. Institutional Quality

The many questions tapping into various aspects of The W's quality look similar to and as good as last year. The council noted that ratings of Academic Support were slightly lower than others, that Facilities Management scores went up from 64% to 70%, that the proportion saying The W provides a safe environment ticked up from 71% to 73%, and that satisfaction with the "overall collegiate experience" is great (93.2% satisfied or very satisfied). The financial aid process had 77% approval.

e. QEP-Related Questions

The W's "effectiveness in providing career services" was rated as good or excellent by 77.5%, up from 71% last year. There was a question about **where this growth came from, whether from declines in the proportion of "fair" or "poor" responses or in the "NA" response**. The Council decided to discuss this with Jennifer Moore at the October meeting.

Only 50% responded to Q12: "While studying for your current degree, did you participate in any of the following?" Yet the response rate was near or at 70% for the questions above and below. **We need a "None of the Above" option.**

Two questions were added to the 24-25 survey to capture the work of the new Career Services and Professional Development Center. Unfortunately, only 42.3% said they would recommend (though only 8 students, 1.5%, said they would *not* recommend) the center; most (56%) simply chose the "NA" response. Many students (78.5%) indicated that they had not visit the Center. However, 50% are already full-time employees, and some of these people may not feel that they need CSPD services. The council discussed the possibility of **adding new questions or adding response options to existing questions that tap into whether students are hoping to obtain a new position with their degree, whether they are hoping to obtain a promotion, etc.**

Because students likely do not know the name of the Center and may not know whether the Center sponsored/planned any particular activity, the council also discussed the **need to add a third question or restructure Q14 to ask students to "select all" that they attended from a list of activities sponsored by the CSPD, such as an employer site visit, an etiquette dinner, a networking event, a mock interview, etc.**

f. Additional Questions to Consider

The council discussed adding a **question specifically asking whether graduates have children/dependents or other care-giving responsibilities at home (parents, siblings, etc.),**

noting that these may be slightly invasive but also that the information is not collected in any other survey and could help us secure grant funding to address student needs.

Additional discussion centered on **adding/reformulating questions to have matrices that allow students to indicate whether they have joined Women's College, Honors College, LLCs, study abroad, SGA and other student organizations, etc.**

- III. At next meeting, PIE will review PS 3538, which governs the PIE Council. Members were asked to review it ahead of the meeting and come with policy proposals. Keep in mind that we do not generally write procedures into the policy; the focus is on purpose and membership. Membership rules are complicated, and Brian suggested we might look at ways to simplify while maintaining adequate representation from across the university.
- IV. Brian is meeting with President Miller in the first week of October to discuss strategic priorities, and the current formulation--five priorities each with a number of subsidiary goals--expires in 2026. In the past, a task force has been appointed to review and reformulate the priorities for 2026-2031.
- V. The Council adjourned at 2:18 pm.

Submitted by Chanley Rainey.

PIE Council will next meet on Oct 24 at 1:30 p.m. in Welty Conference Room.