



ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

Academic Program	International Business and Logistics
Reporting for Academic Year	AY 2016-17
Department Chair	Nipoli Kamdar
Date Submitted	January 2, 2018
*Forms are submitted in fall term following the academic year under review	

1. SELF-STUDY (Approx. 500 words)

Please present any planning goals from the last comprehensive Program Review, and report on progress toward achieving these goals.

Our last comprehensive review was completed in AY 2013-14 in preparation for our application for reaffirmation of accreditation by the IACBE. We are pleased to report that we were accredited with 0 notes and 0 comments which the IACBE characterized as a rare occurrence. The IBL program made great strides in creating and executing an outcomes assessment plan that had a stable set of program learning outcomes and operational outcomes, a clear plan of assessment with associated rubrics and target achievement rates. Planned student learning outcomes are currently being updated in accordance with WASC guidelines. to ensure that we can assess information literacy at the mastery level.

One planning goal that we have not made much headway with is the development of a formal strategic plan for the IBL program. The department is in flux due to the reorganization of the Academy into three different schools. The IBL program used to be housed in the Department of Maritime Policy and Management (MPM) along with the program in Global Studies and Maritime Affairs (GSMA). The Department of International Business and Logistics was created in AY 2017-18 and this department will be grouped with the Department of Marine Transportation and the Department of Naval Sciences to form the School of Maritime Transportation, Logistics and Management in AY 2018-19. The mission and vision statements of the school have recently been completed clearing the way for IBL to develop a strategic plan that is aligned with not just its own mission but also with the mission of the new school.

B. Program Changes and Needs

Report on changes and emerging needs with relation to a) curriculum and b) resources (including faculty, staff, space, equipment).

The IBL program has been growing rapidly and **enrollment growth has long outstripped resource growth.** From 2011 to 2016, enrollment increased 42% with **no** accompanying increase in the number of full-time faculty. In 2017 total enrollment grew slightly and we hired an additional tenure-track faculty member. However additional resources are urgently needed if we are to continue growing.

Class size for most business classes has been steadily increasing.

The Student faculty ratio in Fall 2016 was 33:1, which was almost twice the student faculty ratio of other departments (average SFR was 17:1 for non-MPM programs). **In Fall 2017 the student faculty ratio for IBL increased further to 34.3.** The average class size in Fall 2016 was 37 students, which was again almost twice the non-MPM average class size of 19.67 and in **Fall 2017 the average class size increased to 38 students.**

As the MPM programs are not impacted we get a much a larger share of students needing remediation. Anecdotal evidence suggests that we are seeing **an increasing number of students in IBL that need remediation** in either Math or English or sadly, both. This means that we are dealing with larger and larger classes that have an ever increasing percentage of underprepared students.

Faculty workload

Not only are the faculty teaching larger classes, but they are also teaching a large variety of courses because we are spread so thin. It is not unusual for business faculty to have **four different course preparations** every semester. AY 2017-18 is the first year in a long time where all of the faculty have had less than four course preparations in a single semester.

Advising loads have also grown alongside class sizes. **Advising is mandatory and on average, each of us has approximately 50 advisees, many of whom are URM, first generation, or not college ready** –in other words populations that *need*, and *benefit from*, extra attention. We also have many more transfer students than any of the other majors. Advising these groups effectively is time-consuming work.

Declining student performance and student satisfaction

Last year we pointed out that although we had more than doubled the number of graduates between 2011 and 2016, our workload was unsustainable and that our program would suffer without additional resources. Those fears were unfortunately realized.

We did not meet our targets in a number of disciplinary areas on the annual exit exam. And the senior survey data show that student satisfaction with advising is below target levels, despite the addition of an excellent University Advisor. A five-year analysis of the results from the exit exam and the senior survey reveal a downward trend in both student learning and student satisfaction.

IBL Seniors complain that are not receiving the kind of individual attention they expected to get at a small school because their classes are so big and the teachers are overworked. Upper division classes are typically smaller in most majors but not in IBL. The average upper-division section has 41.4 students –a number that is higher than the ‘class cap’ for most IBL classes. That is 222.6% of the average upper-division section at CMA (an average that includes IBL)!

For the last two years we have requested a reduction in the maximum class size for our capstone classes and while the Curriculum Committee approved our request, it was denied further up the approval process. We hope that in light of the evidence described above our request for smaller capstone courses will be granted.

In AY 2017-18 we were finally able to make one addition to the ranks of our tenure-track faculty. We have also been granted an additional tenure-track line for 2018-19, which we really appreciate. However, the program urgently needs additional resources.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (Approx 500 words)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

PLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of core business principles in the areas of Accounting, Business Law, Business Leadership, Economics, Ethics, Finance, Information Management Systems, International Business, Marketing, Management and Quantitative Research Techniques.

PLO 2: Students will demonstrate teamwork and leadership skills.
--

PLO 3: Students will demonstrate effective professional communication skills.

PLO 4: Students will be able to use technological tools and demonstrate critical thinking and quantitative reasoning skills to make effective and consistent business decisions.
--

PLO 5: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the global business environment and develop intercultural competencies necessary to conduct business in a global context.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

PLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of core business principles in the areas of Accounting, Business Law, Business Leadership, Economics, Ethics, Finance, Information Management Systems, International Business, Marketing, Management and Quantitative Research Techniques.

PLO 2: Students will demonstrate teamwork and leadership skills.
--

PLO 3: Students will demonstrate effective professional communication skills.

PLO 4: Students will be able to use technological tools and demonstrate critical thinking and quantitative reasoning skills to make effective and consistent business decisions.
--

PLO 5: Students will demonstrate knowledge of the global business environment and develop intercultural competencies necessary to conduct business in a global context.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Please see the attached document which lists the PLOs, assessment instruments (at least one direct and one indirect instrument for each PLO), associated rubrics and targets. All PLOs are assessed every year.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Please see attachment for assessment results.

Last year our primary challenge was to ensure that a much larger percentage of graduating students actually completed the exit exam and student survey. We were successful in realizing that goal.

Our assessment plans for the coming year involve:

1. Updating our student learning outcomes to allow for mastery-level assessment of information fluency
2. Development of student learning outcomes for the International Experience
3. Revisions to the Senior Student Survey
4. Re-examination of course sequence and course content in light of the evidence collected

3. STATISTICAL DATA

Statistical data is meant to enhance and support program development decisions. These statistics will be attached to the Annual Report of the Program Unit. This statistical document will contain the same data as required for the five-year review including student demographics of majors, faculty and academic allocation, and course data.

Program	Fall 2016
A. Students	
1. Undergraduate	195
2. Postbaccalaureate	1
B. Degrees Awarded	
	36
C. Faculty	
Tenured/Track Headcount	
1. Full-Time	3
2. Part-Time	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	
3b. % Tenure Track	43%
Lecturer Headcount	
4. Full-Time	2
5. Part-Time	2
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	4
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	57%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	7
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)	
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	2.25
9. Lecturer FTEF	2.67
10. Total Instructional FTEF	4.92
Lecturer Teaching	
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	65.2
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	38.7%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	103.47
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	61.3%
13. Total FTES taught	168.67
14. Total SCU taught	2530
D. Student Faculty Ratios	
1. Tenured/Track	29
2. Lecturer	39
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	34.3
4. Lower Division	32.8
5. Upper Division	36.4
E. Section Size	
1. Number of Sections Offered	23
2. Average Section Size	37.7
3. Average Section Size for LD	35.2
4. Average Section Size for UD	41.4
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	4
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	5
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	9
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	10
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	4

