

2010 Faculty Concerns MSU Leadership Report

Department Conditions, Departmental Leadership, and College Leadership

In 2007 and 2008, the Faculty Concerns Committee coordinated its leadership assessment procedures with the formal assessment activities occurring on campus. Those procedures included standardized evaluations of Department Heads and College Deans conducted by the IDEA Center at Kansas State, and a Departmental Conditions Evaluation (DCE), which was originally developed by the Faculty Concerns Committee and expanded to include input from Deans, Department Heads, and the Provost Office. This report introduces the purposes of these assessments and summarizes the results at the university-level.

The Department Head and College Dean IDEA Center Assessments were administered at the beginning of the Spring 2010 Semester and were made available to faculty until 2/5/2010. At the conclusion of the IDEA Center Assessments, the DCE was conducted and made available to faculty from 2/16/2010 until 3/1/2010. Both the IDEA assessments and the DCE are part of the formal procedures used by the Provost Office to conduct performance appraisals and structure the professional development of academic leaders. In addition, individual Departmental Condition Reports are to be made available to faculty members in each department for discussion during a department meeting. Summaries of the discussion of departmental strengths, challenges, and concerns are to be recorded. Overall, this process was developed to coordinate the efforts of faculty, department head, and college-level leadership to strengthen departmental conditions that support productivity.

Department Conditions Evaluation

Table 1 reports mean responses and frequencies of 312 (43.7%) faculty members to 71 questions contained in the DCE. In addition, the mean faculty responses collected in 2008 also appear in Table 1 for comparison purposes. As shown, the strength of departmental conditions improved substantially (approximately 1/3rd of a scale-point) for virtually every question contained in the assessment, including faculty evaluations of department cohesion, commitment to the university, job satisfaction, and departmental effectiveness. Conditions were evaluated particularly strongly for faculty evaluations of departmental administrative support staff, faculty evaluations of their colleagues, and evaluations of how well departments served students.

Department Head Evaluation

Table 2 reports mean responses, ranges, and standard deviations for 546 faculty (77%) responses to the IDEA Center Department Head Evaluation. As shown, means on a five-point scale (5 being 'high') ranged from 3.39 (*Facilitates external funding*) to 4.52 (*Department Head accessibility*). Overall, means fell above the neutral point of the scale (3), and every evaluation in 2010 improved when compared to evaluations made in 2008. In 2008, the many of the 'lowest' evaluations of department heads on campus fell below the value of (2); while in 2010, none of the lowest evaluations fell below the value of (2). Response rates to the IDEA Department Head Assessment, by department, appear in Appendix A.

College Dean Evaluation

Table 3 reports mean responses, ranges, and standard deviations for 560 faculty responses (71%) to the IDEA Center College Dean Evaluation. For evaluations of dean behaviors, average faculty responses to all questions fell above the scale midpoint of (3). Most favorably evaluated by faculty were questions about keeping faculty informed (4.10), appropriate tenure and promotion recommendations/decisions (4.09), and implementing affirmative action policies (4.09). Among items the receiving lowest evaluations were arbitrating disputes between faculty and department heads (3.43), actions related to the improved quality of teaching (3.56), and efforts to retain outstanding faculty (3.59). The majority of the ‘lowest’ evaluations of college deans also fell above the scale midpoint of three for items. Response rates to the IDEA College Dean Assessment, by department, appear in Appendix A.

Summary and use of the Data

In general, faculty perceptions of department conditions, department head leadership, and college dean leadership have improved from 2007/8 to 2009/10. The similar patterns of improvement found for each of the three different evaluations adds credibility to the conclusion that faculty believe that conditions at Missouri State have improved. This assessment does not provide information about why perceived conditions have improved. Possibilities include: improved effectiveness of departmental, college or university-level leadership; changes to personnel who fill academic leadership positions; the effectiveness of change initiatives implemented at the University; elements of the external educational, political, or economic environments; responsiveness to faculty perceptions of leadership behavior, and other possible factors.

The IDEA College Dean Evaluations are used by the provost as a tool for supporting professional development, and the IDEA Department Head Evaluations are used by college deans for performance reviews and for the professional development of department heads. It is the hope of the Faculty Concerns Committee (FCC) that supervising administrators will find a venue to praise the collective efforts of the department heads and college deans for strengthening functional conditions reported in departments. After all, the most consistently occurring trend in this report is that faculty has more favorably evaluated campus work-conditions and campus leadership in 2009/10 than they did in 2007/8. It should be encouraging at Missouri State that improved evaluations of academic leaders and departmental conditions have occurred during extremely trying fiscal times for higher education and the state of Missouri.

The FCC encourages administrators to attend to and provide professional development support to department heads who consistently fall well below University and/or nationally normed standards. The FCC also encourages Deans and the Provost Office to use the *Department Conditions Evaluation* as a diagnostic: to learn more about departments for which leadership evaluations are particularly low. In circumstances where the faculty evaluates departmental conditions or departmental leadership as severely problematic, successfully improving those conditions benefits faculty, the supervising administrator, students, and an array of university outcomes. Special encouragement might be given to department heads, especially in struggling units, for engaging faculty as partners for diagnosing and addressing concerns. Finally, we encourage University-level administrators to continue their support of using climate assessments and leadership evaluations, provided by faculty, as both a diagnostic tool for addressing concerns and as criteria for improving the university.

Table 1**2009 Department Conditions Evaluation: Means, frequencies & comparison to 2008**

Question	2008 MSU mean	2010 MSU mean	Extent to which the following characterizes department				
			1 Not at all	2 Somewhat	3 Average	4 Well	5 Extremely Well
1. Effective Teaching is valued and supported.	3.78						
2. Effective scholarship is valued and supported.	3.70						
3. Dept, College, & Univ service activities are valued & supported.	3.44						
4. Externally funded activities are valued and supported.	3.61						
5. Effective leadership is valued and supported		3.89	27	20	39	92	127
6. Dept goals are aligned with the priorities of the coll & university.	3.78	4.01	16	17	28	133	112
7. Faculty share high levels of commitment to departmental goals.	3.49	3.84	22	15	54	115	101
8. Faculty share high levels of commitment to university priorities.	3.31	3.71	12	26	65	137	64
9. Faculty strive to advance core departmental objectives.	3.61	4.03	14	14	44	113	123
10. Sound plans exist to accomplish department goals.	3.30	3.64	33	25	57	96	95
11. Challenges associated with moving toward dept. goals are identified and addressed.	3.24	3.63	35	29	53	90	102
12. Collaborative decision making is effectively managed to set direction/resolve problems	3.25	3.57	47	27	36	95	100
13. Quality ideas for strengthening the dept. get support in the dept	3.44	3.7	37	24	44	93	111
14. Quality ideas for strengthening the dept get support from higher admin.	2.88	3.18	41	35	103	75	48
15. Job satisfaction is strong.	3.16	3.38	39	36	61	117	57
16. Faculty work hard.	4.11	4.46	3	7	17	100	182
17. Faculty members' productive efforts are recognized and rewarded.	3.31	3.61	23	36	58	113	79
18. Appropriate autonomy & choice for workload assignments exist.	3.44	3.76	24	32	49	95	110
19. An equitable & just policy guides the workload assigned to faculty.	3.24	3.66	34	26	53	92	102
20. Shared engagement exists for strengthening productivity.	3.06	*					
21. Evaluation & merit procedures are aligned w high quality work.	3.24	3.58	29	30	72	87	89
22. Tolerance and appreciation for diversity are supported values.	3.89	4.14	17	16	29	89	154
23. Diversity and inclusion are strategic imperatives.	3.60	3.87	19	26	47	93	117
24. Favoritism & discrimination do NOT guide personnel decisions	3.52	3.91	33	20	30	84	140
25. Faculty members freely express a wide range of ideas & beliefs.	3.72	4.02	26	18	31	84	151
26. The climate promotes fairness and equity.	3.42	3.79	35	25	36	85	126
27. Faculty members know rationale underlying important decisions made in the dept.	3.37	3.70	38	22	42	100	107
28. Faculty members understand the rationale underlying important decisions at the college and university levels.	2.85	3.28	29	50	83	96	49
29. Disputes are resolved professionally, directly, and openly; not covertly.	3.21	3.53	41	32	48	95	91
30. Personal attacks are rare among faculty staff & administrators.	3.56	3.90	27	22	35	95	129

31. Faculty members freely express views that differ from the views of other faculty members.	3.58	3.94	24	22	21	116	120
32. Faculty members freely express views that differ from the views of academic leaders.	3.48	3.87	24	21	37	111	112
33. Conflict situations are resolved according to the best interests of the department and university.	3.26	3.70	31	23	47	106	96
34. The physical classroom environment supports effective student learning.	3.09	3.54	21	43	74	91	80
35. Quality majors are effectively recruited.	3.36	3.83	14	18	60	127	87
36. Majors are effectively retained.	3.72	4.07	10	8	34	150	102
37. Students appear satisfied with the quality of their academic experiences.	3.86	4.14	3	11	35	149	109
38. Effective relations with alumni exist.	3.40	3.71	12	31	66	110	77
39. Students receive quality advisement.	4.02	4.26	4	4	33	132	133
40. Faculty work hard to support student success.	4.23	4.44	4	6	18	101	179
41. Student issues and complaints are well-managed.	3.85	4.11	11	14	32	120	126
42. Student events are well supported.	3.71	3.93	12	17	55	118	103
43. The administrative functions of the dept run efficiently.	3.57	3.96	24	17	37	101	130
44. Faculty meetings effectively advance dept interests and resolve problems.	3.30	3.61	34	27	58	93	94
45. Departmental monies are spent wisely.	3.65	4.02	19	11	46	96	130
46. Faculty receives accurate & timely info about MSU deadlines, policies, events, & issues.	3.77	4.08	19	15	23	116	135
47. Transparency characterizes departmental budgeting and allocation of resources.	3.26	3.56	42	27	53	88	98
48. The administrative support staff is strong.	3.98	4.32	8	12	28	86	176
49. The technology support staff is strong.	3.92	4.10	10	20	39	100	140
50. Sufficient time & resources exist to support faculty professional development.	2.97	3.10	42	54	80	92	39
51. Tenure, promotion, and merit processes are well-understood.	3.41	3.75	20	24	61	108	93
52. Those with extensive administrative duties are supported with appropriate resources and workload adjustments.	3.10	3.48	24	43	73	86	74
53. Untenured faculty receive mentoring, guidance, & support.	3.24	3.61	18	38	66	110	75
54. Tenure, promotion, and merit processes are well-conceived and managed.	3.29	3.69	26	22	62	106	90
55. Participation in substantial professional dev. activities is recognized and rewarded.	3.13	3.46	31	35	75	90	74
56. Faculty evaluation procedures produce explicit feedback in support of professional development.	3.03	3.38	40	36	72	80	76

Question	2008 MSU Mean	2009 MSU Mean	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
57. We are a cohesive unit.	3.36	3.55	34	40	42	109	85
58. A climate of collegiality and respect operates.	3.64	3.81	27	28	31	114	109
59. Strong leadership skills exist among faculty in this dept.	3.73	3.99	11	20	39	129	109
60. Faculty members actively support the productivity of one another.	3.59	3.81	13	31	52	119	94
61. I really feel that the issues faced by Missouri State are my own.	3.21	3.50	19	32	86	115	54
62. Missouri State has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	3.55	3.56	25	31	79	93	80
63. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career at Missouri State.	3.55	3.65	27	27	74	80	101
64. I enjoy discussing Missouri State with people outside of it.	3.64	3.69	17	27	75	104	85
65. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging at Missouri state *	2.40	2.52	84	84	64	51	26
66. I do not feel like part of the family at Missouri State *	2.68	2.66	72	84	63	55	34
67. I consistently feel that my job is worthwhile.	3.97	4.01	14	18	38	120	120
68. I love my present job.	3.75	3.85	12	29	56	106	105
69. I don't mind taking on extra duties & responsibilities in my work.	3.68	3.81	13	32	44	132	89
70. I work hard and try to do as good a job as possible.	4.67	4.67	2		2	90	217
71. I look forward to coming to work every day.	3.78	3.84	10	33	52	116	99
72. Overall, my department is effective.	3.71	3.84	28	22	33	114	112
73. This department keeps getting better and better.	3.32	3.51	40	32	62	77	96
74. Faculty members believe that this department is effective.	3.42	3.52	29	32	64	110	70
75. I plan to retire within the next three years.	1.85	2.01	163	51	46	18	28
76. I often think about leaving Missouri State.	2.75	2.63	86	61	77	48	35
77. I plan on leaving Missouri State in the next year or two.	2.20	2.12	128	68	71	20	18
78. I am actively looking for other academic position.	2.17	2.03	144	65	57	20	19
	<p>2008 N = 442. , approximately 63% Reporting gender: 238 men, 186 women. Reporting tenure: 142 non-tenured, 286 tenured. Reporting rank: 66 instructors, 90 assistant professors, 90 associate professors, and 160 full professors.</p> <p>2010 N = 312 No response for questions ranged from 1 to 12.</p>						

Table 2: IDEA Spring 2009/10 Report - Dept Heads

Question	Average 2007/08	Average 2009/10	Minimum 2009/10	Maximum 2009/10	Std. Dev. 2009/10
1 Guides faculty evaluation process	3.78	3.90	2.60	4.80	0.53
2 Leads faculty recruiting	3.89	4.02	2.90	4.80	0.53
3 Attends to administrative detail	4.13	4.29	2.80	5.00	0.57
4 Fosters good teaching	3.90	4.11	3.20	5.00	0.43
5 Facilitates external funding	3.51	3.59	2.40	4.80	0.65
6 Leads department planning	3.82	4.00	2.70	4.80	0.61
7 Communicates department's needs	4.15	4.34	3.30	5.00	0.47
8 Fosters collegiality	3.76	3.93	2.80	4.90	0.54
9 Encourages balanced faculty	3.82	4.06	2.90	5.00	0.51
10 Stimulates research/scholarly work	3.72	3.86	2.70	4.80	0.54
11 Guides organizational plans	3.78	4.03	2.90	5.00	0.57
12 Improves on-campus image	3.92	4.06	2.90	5.00	0.59
13 Fosters faculty development	3.79	3.94	2.60	4.80	0.48
14 Orients new faculty/staff	3.90	4.10	2.90	5.00	0.51
15 Communicates administrative expectations	3.99	4.16	3.20	5.00	0.47
16 Stimulates faculty vitality	3.45	3.62	2.40	4.80	0.58
17 Guides curriculum development	3.66	3.91	2.70	5.00	0.58
18 Establishes trust	3.82	3.95	2.40	4.80	0.67
19 Improves off-campus image	3.81	4.05	2.70	5.00	0.63
20 Rewards faculty appropriately	3.80	3.86	2.70	4.60	0.49
21 Interpersonal skill	3.88	3.92	2.50	4.80	0.64
22 Problem solving ability	3.99	4.13	2.70	4.80	0.54
23 Appreciation for department's history	3.97	4.13	2.40	4.90	0.53
24 Patience in implementing change	4.00	4.07	2.40	5.00	0.56
25 Honesty	4.21	4.34	2.60	5.00	0.56
26 Practical judgment	4.05	4.20	2.80	5.00	0.54
27 Listening	4.17	4.28	2.80	5.00	0.54
28 Flexibility/adaptability	4.06	4.10	2.80	4.80	0.56
29 Accessibility	4.36	4.52	3.20	5.00	0.43
30 Fairness	4.10	4.25	2.80	5.00	0.50
31 Allocates faculty duties wisely	3.99	4.17	3.00	4.80	0.43
32 Supports academic freedom	4.36	4.46	3.10	5.00	0.42
33 Reduces conflicts	3.76	3.90	2.40	5.00	0.63
34 Helps faculty develop goals/priorities	3.80	3.97	2.60	4.80	0.50

35	Suggests sound priorities	3.83	4.04	2.80	5.00	0.55
36	Defends department well	3.83	3.92	2.40	5.00	0.68
37	Steady in crisis	4.06	4.21	2.90	5.00	0.49
38	Stresses faculty morale	3.83	3.94	2.80	4.80	0.56
39	Easy to understand	4.10	4.21	2.80	5.00	0.56
40	Tries out new ideas with faculty	3.87	4.11	2.80	4.80	0.53
41	Does little things	3.76	3.91	2.40	4.80	0.58
42	Sees that faculty work to capacity	3.75	3.89	2.80	4.80	0.47
43	More a reactor than initiator* (coded so higher # implies dept strength)	3.15	3.39	2.20	5.00	0.64
44	Works without a plan* (coded so higher # implies dept strength)	3.80	3.86	2.40	5.00	0.60
45	Looks out for faculty welfare	3.89	4.09	3.00	5.00	0.45
46	Communicates faculty expectations	4.04	4.13	3.40	4.80	0.38
47	Treats faculty as equals	4.08	4.21	2.90	5.00	0.54
48	Gains faculty input on important matters	4.10	4.27	3.20	5.00	0.48
49	Sees that work is coordinated	3.83	4.00	2.80	4.80	0.47
50	Explains basis for decisions	3.96	4.16	2.90	4.90	0.54
51	Tells faculty when a good job is done	3.93	4.05	2.70	4.80	0.50
52	Ensures own role is clear	3.87	4.02	2.90	4.80	0.46
53	Stresses departmental accomplishments	4.02	4.18	3.00	4.80	0.49
54	Maintains definite performance standards	3.96	4.08	2.90	5.00	0.51
55	Puts suggestions into action	3.89	4.00	2.70	4.70	0.48
56	Facilitates good faculty/staff relations	4.11	4.21	2.30	5.00	0.57
57	Encourages faculty teamwork	3.94	4.02	3.00	4.80	0.46
58	Encourages faculty ownership of department vision	3.87	4.02	3.00	4.80	0.49
59	Provides faculty feedback	3.87	4.05	3.00	4.60	0.42
60	Knows/understands faculty	3.70	3.95	2.50	5.00	0.56

Questions 1-20: ratings were made on a 5-point scale: 1=poor; 5=outstanding

Questions 21-30: ratings were made on a 5-point scale: 1=definite weakness; 5=definite strength

Questions 31-60: ratings were made on a 5-point scale: 1=hardly ever; 5=almost always

*reversed score

Table 3: IDEA Spring 2009/10 Report - Deans

Questions	Average 2007/08	Average 2009/10	Minimum 2009/10	Maximum 2009/10	Std. Dev. 2009/10
1 Providing balance among teaching, research, and service	3.61	3.87	3.40	4.40	0.32
2 Improving undergraduate program	3.54	3.67	3.20	4.20	0.36
3 Improving graduate program	3.49	3.67	3.00	4.30	0.40
4 Improving college's research and scholarly contributions	3.67	3.79	3.10	4.40	0.42
5 Improving the quality of teaching	3.37	3.56	3.00	4.20	0.39
6 Improving service to the public, profession, and/or discipline	3.70	3.99	3.70	4.30	0.22
7 Gaining an appropriate share of the institution's resources	3.50	3.77	3.50	4.20	0.22
8 Representing needs to those who control resources	3.67	3.93	3.50	4.30	0.25
9 Assisting in the securing of gifts and/or grants	3.56	3.69	3.10	4.00	0.32
10 Keeping faculty informed of important developments	3.74	4.10	3.00	4.70	0.57
11 Obtaining faculty opinion on relevant issues or concerns	3.40	3.74	2.90	4.10	0.43
12 Providing support services to the faculty	3.49	3.80	3.10	4.40	0.39
13 Maintaining an appropriate sized staff in the Dean's Office	3.80	4.00	3.20	4.50	0.41
14 Providing opportunities for departments to explain needs	3.61	3.94	3.20	4.70	0.45
15 Leading in developing goals, expectations, and priorities	3.53	3.90	3.40	4.40	0.39
16 Developing plans and strategies for achieving college goals	3.50	3.83	3.30	4.30	0.38
17 Communicating goals and expectations to departments/divisions	3.41	3.77	3.10	4.40	0.42
18 Keeping informed about status of each department/division	3.57	3.99	3.30	4.60	0.38
19 Conducting regular, credible reviews of departments/divisions	3.30	3.77	3.10	4.40	0.39
20 Allocating resources consistently with college's goals/priorities	3.50	3.74	3.10	4.50	0.41
21 Selecting and retaining department or division heads	3.37	3.77	2.90	4.40	0.45
22 Arbitrating disputes between faculty and department heads	2.96	3.43	2.80	4.10	0.48

23	Assisting in recruiting new faculty members	3.53	3.83	2.90	4.50	0.49
24	Making promotion and tenure recommendations/decisions	3.66	4.09	3.60	4.60	0.30
25	Making appropriate efforts to retain outstanding faculty	3.29	3.59	2.80	4.30	0.44
26	Implementing Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity policies	3.84	4.09	3.40	4.40	0.35
27	Indecisive (1) vs. Decisive (7)	5.23	5.60	5.00	6.20	0.47
28	Disorganized (1) vs. Organized (7)	5.47	5.83	4.90	6.20	0.43
29	Remote (1) vs. Approachable (7)	4.60	5.07	3.90	5.90	0.62
30	Untruthful (1) vs. Honest (7)	5.13	5.69	4.80	6.30	0.46
31	Unfair (1) vs. Fair (7)	4.85	5.34	4.50	6.20	0.61
32	Autocratic (1) vs. Democratic (7)	4.13	4.53	3.70	5.20	0.61
33	Unfeeling (1) vs. Caring (7)	4.78	5.34	4.80	5.80	0.32
34	Manipulative (1) vs. Straightforward (7)	4.97	5.53	4.50	6.30	0.59
35	Inconsistent (1) vs. Consistent (7)	5.05	5.43	4.80	6.10	0.43
36	Lethargic (1) vs. Vigorous (7)	5.63	5.84	5.10	6.50	0.48
37	Ambiguous (1) vs. Clear (7)	4.98	5.36	4.70	6.10	0.48
38	Self-centered (1) vs. Institution-centered (7)	4.98	5.41	4.60	6.20	0.54
39	Insensitive (1) vs. Understanding (7)	4.95	5.34	4.60	6.00	0.52
40	Opinionated (1) vs. Receptive to ideas (7)	4.83	5.13	3.90	6.00	0.67
41	Untrustworthy (1) vs. Trustworthy (7)	5.32	5.79	4.90	6.50	0.49
42	Passive (1) vs. Aggressive (7)	5.50	5.70	4.80	6.30	0.48
43	Aloof (1) vs. Warm (7)	4.57	5.06	4.00	5.80	0.59
44	Erratic (1) vs. Predictable (7)	5.17	5.44	5.00	5.80	0.25

Questions 1-26: ratings were made on a 5-point scale: 1=definite weakness; 5=definite strength

Questions 27-44: ratings were made on a 7-point scale: 1=low anchor; 7=high anchor

Response Rates: Appendix A

IDEA Response Rates for Deans

	% Responding	# Asked to provide ratings	# Responding
College of Arts & Letters	68.5%	168	115
College of Business Administration	75.2%	113	85
College of Education	78.9%	90	71
College of Health & Human Services	70.8%	137	97
College of Humanities & Public Affairs	67.7%	99	67
College of Natural & Applied Sciences	66.3%	163	108
Library Services	70.8%	24	17
University, total	71%	794	560

IDEA Response Rates for Department Heads

	% Responding	# Asked to provide ratings	# Responding
College of Arts & Letters			
Art and Design	78.6%	28	22
Communication	66.7%	18	12
English	69.2%	39	27
Media, Journalism & Film	91.7%	12	11
Modern & Classical Languages	73.7%	19	14
Music	56.7%	30	17
Theatre and Dance	92.9%	14	13
College of Business Administration			
Accountancy	68.4%	19	13
Computer Information Systems	76.5%	17	13
Finance and General Business	94.4%	18	17
Management	69.6%	23	16
Marketing	76.2%	21	16
Technology & Construction Management	100.0%	9	9
College of Education			
Childhood Education & Family Studies	90.0%	20	18
Counseling, Leadership & Special Education	85.0%	20	17

Greenwood Laboratory School	68.2%	22	15
Reading, Foundations & Technology	94.1%	17	16
College of Health & Human Services			
Biomedical Sciences	73.7%	19	14
Communication Sciences & Disorders	73.7%	19	14
Health, Physical Education & Recreation	80.0%	20	16
Nursing	76.9%	13	10
Physical Therapy	100.0%	8	8
Physician Assistant Studies	100.0%	4	4
Psychology	87.5%	32	28
Social Work	80.0%	10	8
Sports Medicine & Athletic Training	100.0%	3	3
College of Humanities & Public Affairs			
Defense & Strategic Studies	N/A	N/A	N/A
Economics	54.5%	11	6
History	87.5%	16	14
Military Science	71.4%	7	5
Philosophy	66.7%	6	4
Political Science	73.3%	15	11
Religious Studies	76.9%	13	10
Sociology, Anthropology & Criminology	81.0%	21	17
College of Natural & Applied Sciences			
Agriculture	82.4%	17	14
Biology	71.4%	21	15
Chemistry	83.3%	18	15
Computer Science	55.6%	9	5
Fashion & Interior Design	77.8%	9	7
Geography, Geology & Planning	78.3%	23	18
Hospitality & Restaurant Administration	80.0%	5	4
Mathematics	62.9%	35	22
Physics, Astronomy & Materials Science	61.5%	13	8
University, total	77%	713	546