

**Undergraduate Program Review  
International Business Management  
2004-2005**

The program review committee has reviewed the self-study and documentation of the International Business Management program.

**I. Strengths**

1. Courses spread across several disciplines builds diversity of skills and knowledge needed for a career in international business.
2. Enrollment fairly constant.
3. Sufficient highly qualified faculty.
4. Professional full-time staff advisor.
5. Program has great potential because of TAMUK's proximity to Mexico and the increasing growing global economy.

**II. Weaknesses**

1. Program lacks assessment of specific objectives/student learner outcomes.
2. Assessment used, although not specific to this program, shows results below national average.
3. Have not sought external funding.
4. Program review does not fully address II-04 and VII-02.

**III. Recommendations**

1. Identify and implement specific objectives/student learner outcomes for International Business Management.
2. Determine method to measure specific objectives for International Business Management (if MFAT is used, identify specific parts of this assessment that would measure the specific objectives for this program).
3. II-04 needs narrative to fully discuss the strengths and weaknesses of International Business Management based on assessment measures.
4. More explanation is needed to address the specific points of VII-02.

5. Some issues are not addressed in table provided (why does the table include only fall semesters? A narrative is needed to fully address VII-02 and explain the table.).

### ***One-Year Follow-Up***

#### **IV. Dean's Comments**

1. The response to VII-03 (Weaknesses) should probably have been stated differently. While the IBMN program has not received external funding directly, faculty who teach in the program have benefited from external funding available to them in their major discipline. Remember that there is no IBMN department, some of the MGMT, MKTG, ACCT, and FINC faculty all teach in the program and in many cases they have external funding available to them that ultimately benefits the IBMN program.

2. III-01 (Recommendations)

There are three groups of student learner outcomes associated with the IBMN program: (1) Those that are general enough to apply to all business degrees. These are among the objectives listed in Table II-01.1. (2) Those that are evaluated by the MFAT exam related to the following topics: balance of trade and payments, international monetary system, exchange rates, trade policy, comparative advantage, international management, international markets and marketing, and environmental and international law. (3) In-house developed SLOs specific to the IBMN major. These are under development.

3. III-02 (Recommendations)

See previous response.

4. III-03 (Recommendations)

With respect to II-04, it is correct that the discussion of the strengths and weaknesses was not included. The average MFAT score for IBMN majors taken as a group is below the national average and below the average of the college as a whole. (Table II-04.1) While Table II-04.2 indicates improved performance on the MFAT IBMN assessment indicator, the table applies to all business majors and not just IBMN majors. It may be possible to obtain assessment indicator data from ETS for only the IBMN majors in the future. Job placement success for IBMN majors has been good. As mentioned in the report, a new alumni survey is currently being conducted.

One new faculty member with international business expertise was hired for the 2004-05 academic year and another has been hired for the 2005-06 academic year. We believe that these two faculty members, in conjunction with certain curriculum revisions, will improve performance on the MFAT exam.

5. III-04 (Recommendations)

Table D included only Fall semesters because most of the IBMN-related courses are taught in the Fall semesters as shown in Table B. Table D indicates zero reassigned time. Similarly, all sections are taught by full time faculty, hence there must be compliance with the SACS 20% rule. All of the faculty listed in Table C are full-time and tenured/tenure-track. Consequently, the result would have been the same even if the Spring and Summer semesters had been included. We will include the entire academic year in future reports.