



ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| Academic Program | International Business and Logistics |
| Reporting for Academic Year | AY 2017-18 |
| Department Chair | Nipoli Kamdar |
| Date Submitted | December 19, 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.

The student learning outcomes were updated in 2017-18 in accordance with WASC guidelines, ie.to ensure that we are able to assess information literacy at the mastery level.

One goal that we hope to finally accomplish by the end of this year is the creation of a strategic plan for the department, as per IACBE guidelines. AY 2018-19 is the year of our IACBE accreditation self-study, with the site visit to follow in Spring 2020. IACBE guidelines for assessment changed in 2017 and our immediate task is to ensure that our new outcomes assessment plan is aligned with the new guidelines.

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 grew rapidly from 2011 to 2016. Enrollment increased 42% with **no** accompanying increase in the number of full-time faculty. In 2017 total enrollment grew slightly but the number of incoming students declined. We believe that years of resource-constrained growth and ever increasing class sizes have had an adverse impact on the quality of education we are able to provide our students and this in turn has led to enrollment growth tapering off.

We appreciate the opportunity to add two tenure-track faculty in the last two years and we hope to be able to add to the ranks of tenured/tenure-track faculty in AY 2019-2020. We are optimistic that increases in the number of

tenured/tenure-track faculty will have beneficial effects on the service obligations and teaching loads of all IBL faculty.

Student Faculty Ratios and Class Size

In Fall 2017 the student faculty ratio(SFR) for IBL increased further to 34.3. According to the Common Data Set the student faculty ratio for the campus as a whole was 14:1. So the IBL SFR was more than double the institutional SFR. In April 2018, IBL SFR was 30.3 as compared to an institutional average of 17.4.

Average class sizes are also approximately double the institutional average (33.6 vs 18.6) with upper division classes in IBL being *more than double* the average upper division class at Cal Maritime. Further the average upper division class size was in the teens for all but one other program (GSMA with an average of 24.2).

Admissions standards are higher for impacted programs than they are for IBL and GSMA. Anecdotal evidence suggests that an increasing number of our students are not adequately prepared for college. This means that we are dealing with larger and larger classes that have an ever increasing percentage of underprepared students. If we wish to improve retention and graduation rates, eliminate equity gaps, and ensure that we graduate students who are well-prepared for employment or graduate school, it is imperative that we reconsider class caps for critical path courses.

Faculty Workloads and Advising

AY 2017-18 was the first year in over five years where every member of the faculty had fewer than four different preparations.

The average advising load dipped below 50 for the first time in a couple of years but continue to be unreasonably high and much higher than that of all other programs. The survey of 2018 Seniors shows rising levels of dissatisfaction with the quality of advising in IBL. Only 58% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their academic advisor. This is particularly worrisome for a school and program that stresses small class sizes and individual attention from faculty mentors.

Further many IBL advisees 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, yet imperative to meet GI 2025 goals.

Declining student performance and student satisfaction

A five-year analysis of the results from the exit exam and the senior survey revealed a downward trend in both student learning and student satisfaction. In Spring 2018 we were able to halt the decline in performance on the exit exam. While it is not clear why, we speculate that two actions we took might have helped:

- a. Students were informed at the beginning of the semester of the importance of the exit exam
- b. They were given a list of the *categories* of questions that were likely to be covered on the exit exam

Perhaps due to these measures, in part, students met the target level of performance in all but one area—Accounting.

On the Senior exit survey, IBL seniors continued to complain that are not receiving the kind of individual attention they expected to get at a small school because their classes are large and the teachers are overworked. At a focus group with some of these seniors their two major complaints were:

1. a lack of rigor in the IBL program with students claiming that their workloads was fairly light and some asserting that IBL courses were less challenging than those at their junior college

2. IBL students being treated like second class citizens with fewer resources and experiential learning opportunities than other majors. In light of these comments we are:

1. Reexamining the curriculum to boost student learning, career-relevance, experiential and problem-based learning

2. Incorporating technology like classroom response systems to hold students more accountable for their work

In addition, we will be seeking reduced class sizes in critical path courses and in those with significant equity gaps.

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 apply business-related quantitative methods and tools to make effective business decisions.

PLO 5: Students will be able to identify, evaluate, and appropriately share information resources in support of their business decisions.

PLO 6: 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 6: 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

PLO 1 and 6 are assessed by means of one direct and one indirect measure.

The direct measure is an exit exam administered by Peregrine Academic Services. Students are expected to score an average of 40% in each of the areas listed above.

The indirect measures include the annual Senior exit survey and a 2018 Senior Focus Group comprising of approximately 10-12 students (25% of the graduating class).

Since the exit exam began being administered in the classroom, we've seen a sizeable increase in the number of students completing the exam and student survey and we hope to continue this practice.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Exit Exam:

The target performance level was met for all areas except for Accounting. This information has been shared with the instructor for the course and he is currently working on making a few 'tweaks' enhanced to promote better understanding and retention of Accounting-related concepts.

Senior Survey

Students expressed rising dissatisfaction with various aspects of the business program including the lack of maritime focus, the lack of rigor, large class sizes and the lack of experiential learning opportunities.

Please see attached Public Disclosure of Student Learning Results as required by the IACBE