Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: Bachelor of Science in Business Administration
Department Chair: Joseph McAloon
Department Assessment Committee Contact: Audrey Pereira

Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NEASC requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by May 31 each academic year.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I.   **List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.**

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
	Program Intended Student Learning Outcomes	Annual	May 2017
1.	Students will be able to explain the major concepts in the functional areas of accounting, marketing, finance, and management.	Annual	May 2017
2.	Students will be able to evaluate the legal, social and economic environments of business.	Annual	May 2017
3.	Students will be able to describe the global environment of business.	Annual	May 2017
4.	Students will be able to describe and explain the ethical obligations and responsibilities of business.	Annual	May 2017
5.	Students will be able to apply decision-support tools to business decision making.	Annual	May 2017

6.	Students will be able to construct and present effective oral and written forms of professional communications.	Annual	May 2017
7.	Students will be able to apply knowledge of business concepts and functions in an integrated manner.	Annual	May 2017
	Intended Student Learning Outcomes: Concentration in Management	Annual	May 2017
8.	Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of and competencies in performing the basic activities of managers in an organizational setting.	Annual	May 2017
9.	Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of team effectiveness and apply the principles of effective leadership in an organizational setting.	Annual	May 2017
	Intended Student Learning Outcomes: Concentration in Marketing	Annual	May 2017
10.	Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge and competencies in fundamental marketing concepts, theories, and principles in areas of marketing policy, market and consumer behavior, product distribution, promotion, and pricing.	Annual	May 2017
11.	Students will be able to identify types of business strategies that contribute to establishing brands in a global setting.	Annual	May 2017
	Intended Student Learning Outcomes: Concentration in Accounting	Annual	May 2017
12.	Students will be able to understand how to calculate, record, and provide financial information about the reporting entity that is useful to its present and potential equity investors, its lenders, and other creditors to assist them in making decisions about providing resources to the entity.	Annual	May 2017
13.	Students will be able to identify types of taxes used by federal and state governments to raise revenue, differentiate between tax avoidance and tax evasion; apply the tax tables and tax rate schedules to determine taxable income or refund.	Annual	May 2017
14.	Students will be able to understand the functions of managerial and cost accounting in the areas of planning with the use of budgets; controlling, by assessing the entity's financial performance, and decision-making where the entity uses results of its financial performance to make current and future decisions.	Annual	May 2017

PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4th year, 1st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the "loop closed"?
PLO's 1 – 7 and SLO's 8 - 14	Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) Capstone Business Simulation Project with rubric (direct measure of learning outcomes)	Senior year	Sample	On the BSBA capstone business simulation evaluation rubric, the overall mean rating of graduating students on each core-outcome-related evaluation criterion will be 3 or higher and on the concentration specific-outcome-related evaluation criterion will be	Please see the following section for how loop was closed for previous year's below target results.

				4 or higher (out of a possible 5 representing "exemplary").	
PLO's 1 – 7 and SLO's 8 - 14	BSBA Capstone Integrated Case with rubric (direct measure of learning outcomes)	Senior year	Sample	On the BSBA capstone integrated case evaluation rubric, the overall mean rating of graduating students on each core-outcome-related evaluation criterion will be 3 or higher and on the concentration specific-outcome-related evaluation criterion will be 4 or higher (out of a possible 5 representing "exemplary")	Students performed on or above targets for this measure during the prior year's assessment.
PLO's 1 – 7 and	BSBA Internship Survey (indirect measure of learning outcomes)	Junior and Senior year	Sample	On the BSBA internship survey instrument, at	Please see the following section for how loop was closed for previous

				least 80% of graduating students will indicate that to a "moderate extent" or "great extent" learning in their internship contributed to the successful achievement of each core-outcome-related evaluation and the concentration specific outcome-related evaluation criterion.	year's below target results.
SLO's 8 - 14					
PLO's 1 – 7 and SLO's 8 - 14	BSBA Senior Exit Survey (indirect measure of learning outcomes)	Senior year	Sample	On the BSBA exit survey instrument, at least 80% of graduating students will indicate that to a "moderate extent" or	Students performed on or above targets for this measure during the prior year's assessment.

			"great extent" learning in their program contributed to the successful achievement of each core-outcome-related evaluation and the concentration specific-outcome-related evaluation criterion.	

II.   **Summary of Findings:** Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you "closing the loop"?

Other than GPA, what data/ evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)
BSBA Capstone Business Simulation Project and rubric BSBA Capstone Integrated Case and rubric BSBA Internship Survey	Department chair, BSAD department assessment coordinator, and faculty reviewed with particular emphasis on results bellow desired thresholds	After the previous year's assessment, BSAD faculty who teach accounting students were advised that only 71% of accounting students indicated they

BSBA Senior Exit Survey		were able to describe the global environment of business (LO 3) to a moderate or great extent (below the 80% threshold) within the internship survey. This year's data suggests this loop has been closed as the percentage for accounting concentration students increased to 84% this year in the internship survey. (And, was above threshold for all other measures.)
BSBA Capstone Business Simulation Project and rubric BSBA Capstone Integrated Case and rubric BSBA Internship Survey BSBA Senior Exit Survey	Department chair, BSAD department assessment coordinator, and faculty reviewed with particular emphasis on results bellow desired thresholds	After the previous year's assessment, marketing instructors were advised that the learning outcome result was a 3.8 (below 4.0 threshold) for ability to demonstrate knowledge and competencies in fundamental marketing concepts, theories, and principles in areas of marketing policy, market and consumer behavior, produce distribution, promotion, and pricing (LO 10) within the simulation project. This year's data suggests this loop has been closed as the percentage for marketing students increased to 5.0 this year in the simulation project. (And, was above threshold for all other measures.)

BSBA Capstone Business Simulation Project and rubric BSBA Capstone Integrated Case and rubric BSBA Internship Survey BSBA Senior Exit Survey	Department chair, BSAD department assessment coordinator, and faculty reviewed with particular emphasis on results bellow desired thresholds	During this assessment period, all targets were met.

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

I.   Insert the program or department Assessment Plan

The latest Business Administration Department assessment plan will be provided with this report.

II.   Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success.

No changes were made to the department's assessment plan.

III.   If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?

☐   Yes

University Data

I.   SSC Data
Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.
Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention

(data point from SSC)		(i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
Graduation Rate by 1st Year GPA Note: We selected this measure because the previous year's data indicated that the BSAD has a higher than average FSU institution graduation rate for students with mid-range GPAs, but lower than average graduation rates for some of the higher end GPA ranges.	The BSAD chair reached out to 1st year students with GPA's 3.6 and higher and informed them about the new business honor society and business department club opportunities.	This is last year's data: -8.5% 4.0+, -3.4% 3.8-3.99, and 6.4% 3.6-3.79. Target scores: at least 0% (the same as the institution) We are waiting for 2017-2018 SSC Data to see if there has been an improvement.

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?*

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Graduation Rate by 1st Year GPA	We will monitor the same data point as the previous year and continue efforts to improve retention of higher GPA students. We will also focus on lowering the rate of transfer students.	Continue to reach out to 1st year students with GPA's 3.6 and higher and inform them about the honor society, business club, and other opportunities.		No

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

II.   Trend Data

Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement. Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a.   What was the focus this year?

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
Increase FT faculty in department	Administration approved searches for two new tenure track BSAD faculty members. These searches were originally scheduled to begin Fall 2017.	Management and department chair decided to wait for the new dean before conducting searches.
Increase number of Entrepreneurship Minor students	Offered Introduction to Entrepreneurship course during fall semester, and attempted to recruit students to the minor. Also tried to recruit through Entrepreneurship Club.	Will continue as there was no change (increase) in number of minors.

b.   What will be the focus next year?*

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Increase FT tenure and tenure-track faculty in department	While there has been increasingly fewer FT tenure and tenure-track BSAD faculty each year,	Conduct faculty searches.	9/12	No

	the number of BSAD major and minors has increased.			
Increase number of Entrepreneurship Minor students	The number of minor students did not change from previous year	Consider AUC proposal to allow business students to obtain this minor (currently only nonbusiness majors have this opportunity). Continue utilizing Entrepreneurship Club and Introduction to Entrepreneurship as recruitment vessels.	3/20	No

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I.   **Programs that fall under Program Review:**
    i.   Date of most recent Review:
    ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year

    iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

☐   Yes

II. **Programs with external Accreditation:**
    i.   Accreditor: IACBE
    ii. Date of last review:
    iii. Date of next review and type of review: Fall 2018 through Spring 2019 self-study; Final report to be submitted to IACBE by October 15, 2019; January 2020 Site visit, April 2020 IACBE Board of Commissioners Meeting
    iv. List key performance indicators:

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.
No key issues		

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
Expected Timing of Assessment	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
Assessment Tool Quality	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
PLO Assessment	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
Criteria for Success	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but not clearly stated or is not appropriate.	Criteria for student success not provided.	
Summary of Findings	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment	Used evidence other than PLO	No summary utilizing	

	incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	assessment data is evident.	

Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Department or Program Assessment Plan	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	

University Data					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
SSC Data for Current Review Period	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/ department for at least one SSC data point. No plan implemented.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided,	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment,	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

	targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	
Trend Data for Current Review Period	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/ department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	

Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Only for those under Program Review *Annual Reflection on Program Review*	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for progress discussed.	
Only for those under External Accreditation	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not	

Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.		discussion of on-going progress stated.	regarding on-going progress plans stated.	provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.