



ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Academic Program | Marine Transportation |
| Reporting for Academic Year | 2017-2018 |
| Department Chair | Steve Browne |
| Date Submitted | 12/6/2018 |

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

The last department program review was completed in the Fall of 2016. The 2016 program review included the following specific recommendations:

Faculty:

- Rebuild the department tenure density in response to past and projected retirements. The department should hire at least three new tenure track faculty in the coming years.
- The department recommends that faculty starting salaries be increased and that the Marine Vocational Instructor track be reopened.
- A policy should be developed concerning the conversion from the MVI to the professor track.

Academic Advising Training and Manual: The MT department should produce an Academic Advising Manual, including Frequently Asked Questions, as a resource for advising guidelines and information. In addition, formal training should be conducted for new and current Academic Advisors in the department.

Assessment Plan: The department should complete its revision of a formal internal assessment review program, including the adoption of any changes and needed modifications for emerging new assessment criteria or new elements of the program to include.

STCW Program: The department should complete its revision of the STCW assessment program.

Simulation Program Review: The department should complete its review of the simulation courses and ensure that the scenarios and course material are up to date and appropriate for meeting the learning outcomes of the courses and the program.

Simulation Equipment Refresh: The department should work with the Director of Simulation to update the simulation equipment in the Simulation Center and aboard the training ship. The

Navigation Lab on the ship should include a Class A simulator with at least 225 degrees of visibility and surround sound. A Dynamic Positioning (DP) simulator should be obtained and installed.

Master's Program: The department should develop a master's degree with a license option to attract the large number of potential students who have previously completed bachelor degrees.

Maritime Management Program: The department should develop a non-license bachelor's program in Maritime Management.

School of MT/IBL/NS: The department should work closely with the International Business and Logistics and Naval Science departments to ensure a smooth transition to the new school.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

Faculty:

- An assistant professor was hired in Fall 2018 and another tenure-track position has been approved for Fall 2019. However, since the last report, an associate professor has resigned and another has retired. As a result, no progress has been made in this area.
- The Marine Vocational Instructor track was not reopened. However, the minimum requirements for an assistant professor were changed to broaden the pool of eligible candidates.

Academic Advising Training and Manual:

- The MT department Academic Advising Manual, including Frequently Asked Questions, has been regularly updated this year.

Assessment Plan:

- The assessment plan is in place.

STCW Program:

- The STCW assessment program is in place and is under contiguous review and revision.

Simulation Equipment Refresh:

- Extensive simulation upgrades are ongoing in the Simulation Center.
- A proposal for funding for a Dynamic Positioning (DP) simulator has been submitted to the Dean and the Director of Simulation.

Maritime Management Program:

- The department has been working with the Department of International Business and Logistics to develop a joint program. The findings will be submitted to the Provost at the end of this year.

School of MT/IBL/NS: Completed. The school is in place.

C. Program Changes and Needs

The curriculum was altered this year to come into compliance with the revised CSU Executive Order 1100 on general education requirements.

The university recently decided to conduct only one training cruise per year instead of two. This has resulted in a significant reduction in our enrollment.

Due to recent retirements and resignations, the hiring of replacement tenure-track faculty should be accelerated.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

MT PLO 1: Discipline-Specific Knowledge: Graduates will demonstrate competence in the concepts and technologies of international marine transportation.

MT PLO 2: Leadership and Teamwork: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to work effectively as a leader and member in professional teams.

MT PLO 3: Communication: Graduates will demonstrate effective communication skills.

MT PLO 4: Ethical Awareness: Graduates will use ethical reasoning to make decisions related to the maritime industry.

MT PLO 5: Quantitative Reasoning: Graduates will demonstrate the ability to analyze numerical data.

MT PLO 6: Information Fluency: Graduates will define a specific need for information; then locate, evaluate, and apply the needed information.

MT PLO 7: Critical and Creative Thinking: Graduates will analyze problems in new and different ways.

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

All seven PLO's are assessed every year as they align with the assessment requirements for maintaining the program's Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW) certification.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

The assessment process is dictated by the United States Coast Guard in accordance with the International Maritime Organization's Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW).

The rubrics for assessment are standard for all certified programs in the US. The assessments selected represent only a handful of those which are required to be assessed each year in

accordance with STCW for every graduate from the MT program. They were selected based on their specific alignment with the PLOs.

There is no sampling strategy needed, as instructors maintain documentation of every student's completion of the assessment and the date on which that student achieved successful completion.

Due to the nature of the STCW requirements, the success with students achieving the PLO's will be nearly 100 percent every year. During the course there may be multiple opportunities to demonstrate competence but if the minimum standard is not achieved by the end of the semester, the student must retake the associated course. As a result, in order to graduate, each student in the MT program must have achieved the standards in all of the PLO's.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

As predicted, the assessment results for all PLOs over the 2017-2018 assessment period show 100 percent of students successfully met the PLOs.

In the last few years, course content has been adapted to allow for individual assessment of each student with room in the curriculum for additional training and reassessment as needed to achieve 100 percent success for all rubrics. The STCW assessment process will be continually adapted to new requirements when required by regulatory bodies, but the STCW rubrics used for PLO assessment are not expected to be revised in the coming years. The use of STCW assessments to assess PLOs will allow for annual assessment of all PLOs with consistent rubrics.

In the coming year we will again assess all seven PLOs. This year marks the first year of program level assessment alignment with STCW assessment, so there is limited ability to mark direct trends in student achievement. The 100 percent standard may not allow for growth in future years, but it does ensure that all outcomes are being achieved by our graduates.

The next step in advancing the assessment data for our program is to identify STCW rubrics for when PLOs are introduced and reinforced. We will also request feedback from the individual instructors, who are the assessors, about the difficulty in achieving successful completion. The analysis will provide information on which of the PLOs may need additional reinforcement in earlier courses. Feedback on the difficulty of achieving successful assessment from each student may be our most useful assessment data moving forward. At this time, quantitative data on number of attempts students are provided is not being tracked. Depending on qualitative data from instructors, it may be a long-term goal to collect this information for program improvement.

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.

| | |
|---|--------|
| <i>Program</i> | 2017 |
| <i>A. Students</i> | |
| 1. Undergraduate | 298 |
| 2. Postbaccalaureate | 12 |
| | |
| <i>B. Degrees Awarded</i> | 75 |
| | |
| <i>C. Faculty</i> | |
| Tenured/Track Headcount | |
| 1. Full-Time | 11 |
| 2. Part-Time | 0 |
| 3a. Total Tenure Track | 11 |
| 3b. % Tenure Track | 53% |
| Lecturer Headcount | |
| 4. Full-Time | 3 |
| 5. Part-Time | 7 |
| 6a. Total Non-Tenure Track | 10 |
| 6b. % Non-Tenure Track | 48% |
| 7. Grand Total All Faculty | 21 |
| Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF) | |
| 8. Tenured/Track FTEF | 8.09 |
| 9. Lecturer FTEF | 6.30 |
| 10. Total Instructional FTEF | 14.39 |
| Lecturer Teaching | |
| 11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track | 104.80 |
| 11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track | 49.2% |
| 12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer | 108.4 |
| 12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer | 50.8% |
| 13. Total FTES taught | 213.2 |
| 14. Total SCU taught | 3,198 |
| <i>D. Student Faculty Ratios</i> | |
| 1. Tenured/Track | 13.0 |
| 2. Lecturer | 17.2 |
| 3. SFR By Level (All Faculty) | 14.8 |
| 4. Lower Division | 21.4 |
| 5. Upper Division | 12.3 |
| <i>E. Section Size</i> | |
| 1. Number of Sections Offered | 115 |
| 2. Average Section Size | 16.9 |
| 3. Average Section Size for LD | 21.7 |
| 4. Average Section Size for UD | 14.9 |
| 6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track | 13 |
| 7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track | 41 |
| 8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track | 0 |
| 9. LD Section taught by Lecturer | 22 |
| 10. UD Section taught by Lecturer | 39 |