

Annual Report

Institution:

Point Park University School of Business

International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education P.O. Box 3960 Olathe, Kansas 66063 USA

This annual report should be completed for your academic business unit and submitted to the IACBE by November 1 of each year.

General Information

| Institution's Name: | | | Point Park University | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------|------|--------------------|---|------------|
| Institution's Address: | | | 201Wood Street | | | | |
| City: Pittsburgh | | | State or Country: | PA | ZIP/Postal Code: 1 | | 15222-1984 |
| Name of Submitter: | | Angela H. Isaac | | | | | |
| Title: Dean, | | School of Business Your Email: aisaac@pointpark.e | | | @pointpark.edu | | |
| Telephone (with country code if outside of the United States): | | | 1.412.392.8 | 3011 | Date Submitted: | (| 03-18-11 |

Membership Status and Accreditation Information

A. Your membership status with the IACBE (mark one):

| X | Accredited Member | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| | Candidate for Accreditation | |
| | Educational Member | |

| B. | If applicable, when is your next institutional accreditation site visit? | | | Year |
|----|--|--|---------------|---------|
| | If applicable, when is your next reaffirmation of | IACBE accreditation site visit? | 2011- 2012 | Year |
| C. | If you are an accredited member of the IACBE: | | | |
| | Provide the website address for the location of your public notification of accreditation by the IACBE: | http://www.pointpark.edu/Acadsiness/IACBEAccreditation | demics/Sch | ools/Bu |
| | Provide the website address for the location of your public disclosure of student achievement information: | http://www.pointpark.edu/Acadsiness/AcademicExcellence | demics/Sch | ools/Bu |

Both sites can also be accessed from the main landing page for the School of Business within the Point Park University website: http://www.pointpark.edu/Academics/Schools/Business.

D. If you have received an accreditation letter from the IACBE Board of Commissioners with "notes" that identified areas needing corrective action, please list the number of the IACBE's Accreditation Principle for each note in the table below. Indicate whether corrective action has already been taken or that you have made plans to do so. (Add additional rows if necessary.)

| Commissioners' Notes | Action Already Taken | Action Planned |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Principle 1: Outcomes Assessment | School of Business has implemented university-wide program and course assessment process (policy and procedure documents included in 2008-2009 annual report, and are available upon request). | University Faculty Assembly implemented new comprehensive program review process in 2009-2010. The MBA program is under program review in 2010-2011, with results to be reported in our self-study (under construction). |

Outcomes Assessment

E. Has your outcomes assessment plan been submitted to the IACBE?

| X | Yes | |
|---|--|--|
| | No. If no, when will the plan be submitted to IACBE? | |

F. Is the original or revised outcomes assessment plan you submitted to the IACBE still current or have you made changes?

| X | The outcomes assessment plan we submitted is still current. | |
|---|---|--|
| | Changes have been made and the revised plan is attached. | |
| We have made changes and the revised plan will be sent to the IACBE by: | | |

G. Complete the Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form in Exhibit A and include it with this annual report to the IACBE. An example of a completed form can be found in Exhibit B.

Remember that your outcomes assessment plan needs to include two or more direct and two or more indirect measures of student learning. These measures should be used at the program level.

Examples of both direct and indirect student learning outcome measures are shown in the example of a completed form in Exhibit B. You will need to insert your own direct and indirect student learning outcome measures when completing the form.

At the bottom of the form, space is provided to identify changes and improvements that you plan to make as a result of your assessment activity.

Programmatic Information

- H. Identify any significant changes that have taken place in your business programs during the reporting period.
 - 1. Did you terminate any business programs during the reporting year?

| X | No | |
|---|---|--|
| | Yes. If yes, please identify terminated programs. | |
| | | |

2. Were changes made in any of your business majors, concentrations, or emphases?

| | No |
|---|---|
| X | Yes. If yes, please identify the changes by adding an additional page to this document. |

3. Were any new business programs (including new majors, concentrations, and/or emphases) established during the academic year?

| No (skip to item I below) | |
|---------------------------|---|
| X | Yes. If yes, please identify the new programs on a separate sheet; answer item H-4 below. |

4. If applicable, was approval of your institutional accrediting body required for any of these programs?

| | No |
|---|---|
| X | Yes. If yes, please fax, mail, or attach a copy of the material you sent to your institutional accrediting body to obtain approval. |

Administrative Changes

I. In the table below, identify any administrative changes that directly affect your academic business unit, including changes in your academic business unit's primary representative to the IACBE, your designated alternate to IACBE, your institution's chief executive officer and chief academic officer, and the head of your academic business unit (if different from the primary representative to the IACBE). If the incumbent in any of these administrative positions has changed, include the new incumbent's name, his or her title, telephone and fax numbers (with country code for institutions outside of the United States), and email address.

| Position | Name | | Title | |
|--|---|-----------------------|--------|--|
| Telephone | Fax Email | | | |
| Acting Assistant Dean (one year, one-time appointment) | Elaine Luther | | Dr. | |
| 1.412.392.3947 | .412.392.3947 | | rk.edu | |
| Senior Vice President, Academic & Student Affairs (formerly Vice Provost – Dean of Faculty) | Student Affairs e Provost – Karen McIntyre | | Dr. | |
| 1.412.392.3914 1.412.392.4720 kmci | | kmcintyre@pointpark.e | edu | |
| Effective August 2010, Dr. Charles Perkins stepped down as Provost of Point Park University. Dr. Perkins | | | | |

Other Issues

J. Briefly comment on other issues pertaining to your academic business unit that you would like to share with the IACBE.

A. Outcomes Assessment Planning Process

now serves as a professor within the School of Business.

[Also reported within the 2008-2009 Annual Report]

Over the past several years, the School of Business has been working on the Outcomes Assessment Planning Process, as part of Point Park University's overall program for student learning and outcomes assessment. The Outcomes Assessment Process is in compliance with Middle States Commission on Higher Education accreditation, Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) requirements, and IACBE requirements.

In 2007, the School of Business assessed the Communication Goal, a common goal in each of the following programs: BS in Accounting, Business, Business Management, Information Technology, and Management Services, as well as the Master of Business Administration degree. Faculty reviewed all appropriate course syllabi in order to ensure that each syllabus included a measurable learning outcome related to the communication goal that specifically states, "Students will clearly communicate thoughts and ideas both verbally and in writing." A review of all syllabi revealed that not only communication objectives but all course learning outcomes for every syllabus in the School of Business needed to be revised for consistency and measurability. Therefore, in fall of 2008, faculty members in the School of Business jointly revised all course outcomes: the revisions were originally provided in our 2007-2008 report. In Spring 2009, these learning outcomes were fully utilized by all full-time and adjunct faculty, and serve as the foundation for ongoing assessment in academic year 2009-2010.

In academic year 2008-2009, the School of Business identified five learning objectives for outcomes assessment in line with IACBE guidance, namely: (1) Teamwork, (2) Communication, (3) Information Technology, (4) Decision Making / Problem Solving, and (5) Theory and Practice. Goals as well as direct and indirect assessment methods for each program were established at the program level in 2008-2009 (see 2008 Outcomes Assessment Matrix - School of Business_all programs.xls).

In Fall 2009, the School of Business successfully completed the identification of goals, learning objectives and appropriate direct and indirect assessment methods of these objectives for all courses offered in our undergraduate and MBA programs. Testing plans were established and executed at the program level during Spring 2010. Assessment of testing results and identification of necessary remediation was completed at the end of the spring term, with inclusion in the 2010-2011 annual operating plan and budget as appropriate. This effort is a critical component of the university's multi-year plan to strengthen outcomes assessment, and has been included in the university's self study report submission for Middle States in fall 2010.

Please note that these 2009-2010 outcomes assessment results were reported as part of our late submission for the 2008-2009 annual report to IACBE in May 2010, and are now resubmitted with this report to correspond with the annual report's period of coverage for reporting [see documentation for course objectives and assessment plans as outlined in Exhibit A's for each accredited program and further detail in attached files]. During the 2010-21011 academic year, we have implemented a correction plan to address findings from last year's assessment. The effectiveness of our remediation will be re-assessed during this academic year, in addition to assessing effectiveness against the "teamwork" objective for each of our programs. The results of outcomes assessment for the 2010-2011 academic year as well as follow up actions to those identified deficiencies from 2009-2010 will be included in the self study we are submitting to IACBE in support of re-affirmation of our accreditation.

Finally, the School of Business continues to review the results of our outcomes assessment plans for current academic programs, including monitoring of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results, particularly as it pertains to communications goals. Please see the most recent NSSE results attached – which are also available on our website as identified earlier.

We are pleased with the progress we are making, particularly given the impact these reviews have made to strengthen our curriculum and program delivery. We however acknowledge that our assessment program is early in its development, and will continue to demonstrate a strong commitment to the growth and internalization of this process, as well as to the remediation of identified issues to further strengthen our programs.

B. Program Review Process

In Spring 2010, the Faculty Assembly of the university initiated a comprehensive program review process. An overview of this new process as well as the distributed procedures are attached to this report (see Point Park University_Faculty Assembly_Program

Review Process_Rev.doc). The School of Business participated in this pilot through a review of two non-IACBE accredited program – the associates and bachelors degrees in organizational leadership. Based on the outcomes of this initial effort, the program review process has been revised and updated for execution in the 2010-2011 academic year. We are currently completing the review of the Masters in Business Administration program as well as the Bachelor of Science degree program in Sport, Arts and Entertainment Management (SAEM). We intend to submit the SAEM program for IACBE accreditation after we have completed our re-affirmation of accreditation for current programs.

C. <u>Strategic Planning for the School of Business</u>

Point Park University conducts an annual long term strategic planning process, involving the Board of Trustees, University administration, academic deans, and faculty. The university plan includes individual school plans – one of which is for the School of Business. All school plans examine strategic initiatives under the following areas: Academic Excellence (including assessment and faculty development), Quality Student Experience, Managed Growth, and Community Engagement. The Board reviews and approves the plan for the School of Business, which is regularly updated for status of proposed actions and resource requirements. With the 2009-2010 Operating Plan, the strategic planning process began the integration of the operating plan with the operating budget process. The 2010-2011 Operating Plan is available upon request.

We have submitted a proposed draft of the 2011-2012 Operating Plan and Budget to university administration. Final Board review is scheduled at its July 2011 meeting.

D. Point Park University Reaffirmation of MSCHE Accreditation

After conducting an extensive review of academic and administrative policies and programs, Point Park University filed a comprehensive self-study and certificate seeking reaffirmation of accreditation with the Middles States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) in January 2011. The self-study report represents significant involvement of the Board of Trustees, university administration, faculty, staff, students, alumni and the university's community in candidly and completely addressing the MSCHE standards. Additional information on the self study process, university engagement, and the timetable for reaffirmation of MSCHE accreditation is available to IACBE upon request.

The Evaluation Team visit is scheduled for March 27-30, 2011. The self-study report will be published on the university's website following the site team visit – a link to this document will be forwarded to IACBE when available.

E. Point Park University Reaffirmation of IACBE Accreditation

Point Park University received accreditation from IACBE for selected business programs in 2001. In May 2010, Point Park University requested and was granted a one-year extension to complete the self study and conduct the site visit for re-affirmation of our IACBE

accreditation. The School of Business is currently completing its self-study report, covering the 2010-2011 academic year. We look forward to your review of the report upon submission this summer, with a scheduled site visit occurring during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form

| St | Student Learning Information for A.S. & B.S. (Business Management) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| traditional and enterprising ed practices that is desired by em Business will be the regional l | | al of students from various academic and societal backgrounds through a fucation that provides the applied career skills and knowledge of best aployers in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. The School of leader in developing and adapting programs that prepare students with the ethrough excellence in management programs and business discipline | | | |
| Intended Student Learning Outcomes for | A.S. & B.S. (Business Manageme | (nt) (detailed definition of learning objectives attached): | | | |
| 1. Work well with others and with a de | monstrated appreciation of individ | lual differences and a sensitivity to diversity. (Teamwork) | | | |
| 2. Clearly communicate thoughts and id | deas both verbally and in writing. | (Communication) – Assessment Target in 2009/2010 | | | |
| 3. Apply information technology tools | and techniques to meet the needs a | and expectations of the workplace. (Information Technology) | | | |
| 4. Analyze, integrate and communicate Thinking) | | | | | |
| 5. Apply theory and practice in solving | 5. Apply theory and practice in solving organizational problems. (Theory and Practice) | | | | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Direct Measures of Student Learning | Student Learning Outcomes— | Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures: | | | |
| 1. APA Research Report with PowerPo | int presentation and handout | 60% of the students have an assessment value of 3.0 (B grade) or higher | | | |
| 2. 2 nd Annual Business Plan Contest - F Measure for Intro to Business core co | | Participants achieve "above average" or better based on rubric | | | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning | | Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures: | | | |
| Self-Assessment of Performance on Report (report as defined in Direct Measure above) | | Lessons learned – establish baseline | | | |
| 2. NSSE Bi-Annual Survey of freshmar respondents for total School of Busin | C | 85% or higher of Survey Responses are equal to or better than Point Park University, Middle States, Carnegie class and/or NSSE respondent pool - | | | |

| unavailable at this time) | measured for freshman and senior respondents respectively | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|---------|
| Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning: | | Performance Target Was | |
| | | Met | Not Met |
| 1. Only 52% of target students met or exceeded expectations of minimum 3.0. 17% of students did not meet expectations (i.e. scored below 2.0) | | | X |
| 2. Judges assessed all contest groups as having done a great job, wir accommodate 3 group submissions who were all deemed as exce | | X | |
| | | Performance Target Was. | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Studer | it Learning: | Met | Not Met |
| Because this report was not given points in the course, most studresolved in future assessment activities. Content analysis of com Learned more about research. Did not know about APA. Interesting topics. Learned new features about PowerPoint. Learned about formal reports. Saw the value of the course. Learned a lot. | | | X |
| 2. School of Business Result: Freshman respondents on 2009 surve or more peers for 96% of metrics, with 6% of metrics evaluated a peers and 4% of metrics statistically significantly lower than peer on par or above one or more peers for 94% of metrics, with 2% of higher than one or more peers and 6% of metrics statistically sign opportunity for both student populations include increased engage classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working | as statistically significantly higher than one or more rs. Senior respondents rated the School of Business of metrics evaluated as statistically significantly nificantly lower than peers. Main areas of gement with faculty and programming outside of the | X | |

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

- 1. Follow up on students not meeting expectations in the Student Success Center (dedicated student advisory and support center in the School of Business), treating them as "Students at Risk". Other considerations include requiring these students to submit an assignment from one of their next classes if the assessment does not improve, they could be required to take additional tutoring in writing/communications.
- 2. In the future, Student Self-Assessment of report performance should be a more structured exercise. And perhaps it should be anonymous to get a complete assessment.

3. School of Business Action Plan for NSSE Results: Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population.

NOTE:

- 1. Direct Measure and Indirect Measure (Student Self-Assessment of Report) covered students in Business Management, Human Resources (not part of IACBE accredited programs), and Management Services. Results for these measures are reported in both Business Management and Management Services program reports.
- 2. Direct Measure (2nd Annual Business Plan Contest Presentation and Report) was applied to all business programs that require the BMGT 101 Introduction to Business core course. Results were assessed for the total participant pool, and are reported as such for each program.

Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form

| Student Learning Information for B.S. (Management Services) | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Mission of the School of Business: To enhance the career potential of students from various academic and societal backgrounds through a traditional and enterprising education that provides the applied career skills and knowledge of best practices that is desired by employers in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. The School of Business will be the regional leader in developing and adapting programs that prepare students with the skills desired in the workforce through excellence in management programs and business discipline programs. | | | |
| Intended Student Learning Outcomes for | B.S. (Management Services) (deta | ailed definition of learning objectives attached): | |
| 1. Work well with others and with a dea | monstrated appreciation of individ | ual differences and a sensitivity to diversity. (Teamwork) | |
| 2. Clearly communicate thoughts and ic | leas both verbally and in writing. (| (Communication) – Assessment Target in 2009/2010 | |
| 3. Apply information technology tools a | and techniques to meet the needs a | and expectations of the workplace. (Information Technology) | |
| 4. Analyze, integrate and communicate Thinking) | complex information to facilitate | management decision-making. (Decision Making/Problem Solving/ Critical | |
| 5. Apply theory and practice in solving | organizational problems. (Theory | and Practice) | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Direct Measures of Student Learning | Student Learning Outcomes— | Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures: | |
| 1. APA Research Report with PowerPo | int presentation and handout | 60% of the students have an assessment value of 3.0 (B grade) or higher | |
| 2 nd Annual Business Plan Contest - P Measure for Intro to Business core co | | Participants achieve "above average" or better based on rubric | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Indirect Measures of Student Learning | Student Learning Outcomes— | Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures: | |
| Self-Assessment of Performance on I Direct Measure above) | Report (report as defined in | Lessons learned – establish baseline | |
| NSSE Bi-Annual Survey of freshmar respondents for total School of Busin | C | 85% or higher of Survey Responses are equal to or better than Point Park University, Middle States, Carnegie class and/or NSSE respondent pool - | |

| unavailable at this time) | measured for freshman and senior respondents respectively | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---------|
| Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning: | | Performance Target Was | |
| | | Met | Not Met |
| 1. Only 52% of target students met or exceeded expectations of minimum 3.0. 17% of students did not meet expectations (i.e. scored below 2.0) | | | X |
| 2. Judges assessed all contest groups as having done a great job, w accommodate 3 group submissions who were all deemed as exce | | X | |
| Cummons of Decults from Implementing Indiagst Massures of Stude | nt I comin a | Performance Target Was | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Stude | an Leanning. | Met | Not Met |
| Because this report was not given points in the course, most study resolved in future assessment activities. Content analysis of confidence in Learned more about research. Did not know about APA. Interesting topics. Learned new features about PowerPoint. Learned about formal reports. Saw the value of the course. Learned a lot. | | | X |
| 2. School of Business Result: Freshman respondents on 2009 surv or more peers for 96% of metrics, with 6% of metrics evaluated peers and 4% of metrics statistically significantly lower than peer on par or above one or more peers for 94% of metrics, with 2% higher than one or more peers and 6% of metrics statistically significant number of working classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working | as statistically significantly higher than one or more ers. Senior respondents rated the School of Business of metrics evaluated as statistically significantly enificantly lower than peers. Main areas of gement with faculty and programming outside of the | X | |

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

- 1. Follow up on students not meeting expectations in the Student Success Center (dedicated student advisory and support center in the School of Business), treating them as "Students at Risk". Other considerations include requiring these students to submit an assignment from one of their next classes if the assessment does not improve, they could be required to take additional tutoring in writing/communications.
- 2. In the future, Student Self-Assessment of report performance should be a more structured exercise. And perhaps it should be anonymous to get a complete assessment.

3. School of Business Action Plan for NSSE Results: Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population.

NOTE:

- 1. Direct Measure and Indirect Measure (Student Self-Assessment of Report) covered students in Business Management, Human Resources (not part of IACBE accredited programs), and Management Services. Results for these measures are reported in both Business Management and Management Services program reports.
- 2. Direct Measure (2nd Annual Business Plan Contest Presentation and Report) was applied to all business programs that require the BMGT 101 Introduction to Business core course. Results were assessed for the total participant pool, and are reported as such for each program.

Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form

| | Student Learning Information for A.S. & B.S. (Accounting) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mission of the School of Business: | To enhance the career potential of students from various academic and societal backgrounds through a traditional and enterprising education that provides the applied career skills and knowledge of best practices that is desired by employers in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. The School of Business will be the regional leader in developing and adapting programs that prepare students with the skills desired in the workforce through excellence in management programs and business discipline programs. | | | |
| Intended Student Learning Outcomes fo | r A.S. & B.S. (Accounting) (detailed | d definition of learning objectives attached): | | |
| 1. Work well with others and with a de | emonstrated appreciation of individ | ual differences and a sensitivity to diversity. (Teamwork) | | |
| 2. Clearly communicate thoughts and i | deas both verbally and in writing. (| Communication) – Assessment Target in 2009/2010 | | |
| 3. Apply information technology tools | and techniques to meet the needs a | nd expectations of the workplace. (Information Technology) | | |
| 4. Analyze, integrate and communicate Thinking) | | | | |
| 5. Apply theory and practice in solving | g organizational problems. (Theory | and Practice) | | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Direct Measures of Student Learning | Student Learning Outcomes— | Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures: | | |
| 1. Given an auditing case problem as a students will research and identify A professional literature, interpret the guidelines, accurately and concisely and explain its appropriateness and study in proper written form. | AICPA and/or PCAOB applicable professional paraphrase the audit objective | The standard for achievement is that 70% of students will score 75% or higher on the rubric. This standard was exceeded. | | |
| 2. 2 nd Annual Business Plan Contest - Measure for Intro to Business core of | * ' | Participants achieve "above average" or better based on rubric | | |

| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning | Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect | Measures: | |
|---|---|------------------------|------------|
| Students will be asked for a written reflection to the following two survey questions upon conclusion of the course: How has your understanding of auditing objectives changed over the course of the semester? What do you feel is the most important function of the AICPA and the PCAOB in the auditing profession? | Content of Course evaluations – establish bas | eline. | |
| 2. NSSE Bi-Annual Survey of freshman and senior undergraduate respondents for total School of Business (breakdown by program is unavailable at this time) | 85% or higher of Survey Responses are equal to or better than Point F University, Middle States, Carnegie class and/or NSSE respondent po measured for freshman and senior respondents respectively | | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning: | | Performance Target Was | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Wedsures of Student Learns | 5. | Met | Not Met |
| 1. The final exam for ACCT 305 was used for the direct measure. The other two accounting faculty graded the final exams using the rubric and these grades were compared to the original grade. The standard for achievement is that 70% of students will score 75% or higher on the rubric. This standard was exceeded. The net average variance was (3.3)%. In particular, student learning weaknesses were identified in both the technical content and communication components of the exam; specifically, that organization and development of the solutions hindered the goal of the accounting information being useful and relevant. The identified strengths centered primarily on the technical accuracy of the solutions. | | X | |
| 2. Judges assessed all contest groups as having done a great job, with expansion of the second place award to accommodate 3 group submissions who were all deemed as excellent. | | X | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning: | | Performance 7 | Target Was |
| Summary of Results from implementing muneet weasures of Student Lear | ming. | Met | Not Met |
| 1. Student comments addressed their surprise that this was not a typical accounting course; rather, reading and written essay assignments were required. Students felt less comfortable within the verbal context of this course. They expect only technical content and seem less confident when writing skills are the main form of communication. | | X | |
| 2. School of Business Result: Freshman respondents on 2009 survey reone or more peers for 96% of metrics, with 6% of metrics evaluated or more peers and 4% of metrics statistically significantly lower than of Business on par or above one or more peers for 94% of metrics, we significantly higher than one or more peers and 6% of metrics statistically higher than one or more peers and 6% of metrics. | as statistically significantly higher than one peers. Senior respondents rated the School with 2% of metrics evaluated as statistically | X | |

areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population.

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

- 1. The communication component of the course will be more clearly identified and integrated within the course objectives. These objectives, in turn, will be more apparent within the course materials and integrated within the course content and delivery.
- 2. We need to stress throughout the accounting curriculum that communication within the accounting world is defined by its usefulness and relevancy to the reader, and that communication refers both to the numbers within the financial statements and to the words.
- 3. School of Business Action Plan for NSSE Results: Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population.

NOTE:

1. Direct Measure (2nd Annual Business Plan Contest - Presentation and Report) was applied to all business programs that require the BMGT 101 - Introduction to Business core course. Results were assessed for the total participant pool, and are reported as such for each program.

Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form

| Student Learning Information for B.S. (Business – Saturday FAST) | | |
|---|--|--|
| traditional and enterprising ed practices that is desired by em Business will be the regional l | al of students from various academic and societal backgrounds through a ucation that provides the applied career skills and knowledge of best ployers in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. The School of eader in developing and adapting programs that prepare students with the through excellence in management programs and business discipline | |
| Intended Student Learning Outcomes for B.S. (Business – Saturday FAST) | (detailed definition of learning objectives attached): | |
| 1. Work well with others and with a demonstrated appreciation of individ | ual differences and a sensitivity to diversity. (Teamwork) | |
| 2. Clearly communicate thoughts and ideas both verbally and in writing. | (Communication) – Assessment Target in 2009/2010 | |
| 3. Apply information technology tools and techniques to meet the needs a | and expectations of the workplace. (Information Technology) | |
| 4. Analyze, integrate and communicate complex information to facilitate Thinking) | management decision-making. (Decision Making/Problem Solving/ Critical | |
| 5. Apply theory and practice into solving organizational problems. (Theo | ry and Practice) | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Direct Measures of Student Learning | Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures: | |
| Research paper on student-selected topic (rubric attached) | Establish baseline | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Learning Outcomes— Indirect Measures of Student Learning | Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures: | |
| Student reflection paper (based on direct measure experience) | Establish baseline | |
| 2. Instructor reflection paper (based on direct measure experience) | Establish baseline | |
| 3. NSSE Bi-Annual Survey of freshman and senior undergraduate respondents for total School of Business (breakdown by program is unavailable at this time) | 85% or higher of Survey Responses are equal to or better than Point Park University, Middle States, Carnegie class and/or NSSE respondent pool - measured for freshman and senior respondents respectively | |

| Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning: | | Performance Target Was | |
|--|-----|------------------------|--|
| | | Not Met | |
| Review "how to document sources", paraphrasing and quoting with students in the beginning of course; Talk to instructors teaching the introduction Communication course and emphasize the importance of explaining how to properly cite work, paraphrase and quote. I would suggest providing students with a handout the first week of the course reminding students how to properly document sources both as references and within the text of the document. I would also suggest taking the students to a computer lab and having the students conduct online searches using Point Park's databases to obtain more scholarly sources. | X | | |
| Source of Development Level and the Manager of Steel and Level | | Performance Target Was | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning: | Met | Not Met | |
| 1. (See Attached Report – 2010 Assessment Results Bachelor of Bus – SAT Fast) | X | | |
| 2. School of Business Result: Freshman respondents on 2009 survey rated the School of Business on par or above one or more peers for 96% of metrics, with 6% of metrics evaluated as statistically significantly higher than one or more peers and 4% of metrics statistically significantly lower than peers. Senior respondents rated the School of Business on par or above one or more peers for 94% of metrics, with 2% of metrics evaluated as statistically significantly higher than one or more peers and 6% of metrics statistically significantly lower than peers. Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population. | X | | |

Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met:

- 1. Provide training & development opportunities for both full-time and adjunct faculty. While we focus on finding instructors that are experienced in their field, most of the faculty have no formal training in teaching. Therefore, it would be beneficial to provide opportunities to allow faculty to learn about the assessment process and offer workshops teaching how to effective assess and measure objectives.
- 2. School of Business Action Plan for NSSE Results: Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population.

Program-Level Intended Outcomes Form

| Student Learning Information for A.S. & B.S. (Information Technology and Management) | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| Mission of the School of Business: To enhance the career potential of students from various academic and societal backgrounds through a traditional and enterprising education that provides the applied career skills and knowledge of best practices that is desired by employers in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. The School of Business will be the regional leader in developing and adapting programs that prepare students with the skills desired in the workforce through excellence in management programs and business discipline programs. | | | |
| Intended Student Learning Outcomes for A.S. & B.S. | . (Information Technolo | ogy and Management) (detailed definition of learning objectives attached): | |
| 1. Work well with others and with a demonstrated | appreciation of individu | ual differences and a sensitivity to diversity. (Teamwork) | |
| 2. Clearly communicate thoughts and ideas both ve | erbally and in writing. (| Communication) – Assessment Target in 2009/2010 | |
| 3. Apply information technology tools and technique | ues to meet the needs a | nd expectations of the workplace. (Information Technology) | |
| 4. Analyze, integrate and communicate complex information to facilitate management decision-making. (Decision Making/Problem Solving/ Critical Thinking) | | | |
| 5. Apply theory and practice into solving organizat | tional problems. (Theor | y and Practice) | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Lea Direct Measures of Student Learning | arning Outcomes— | Performance Targets/Criteria for Direct Measures: | |
| 1. Written Communication Common Assessment (| Rubric attached) | The standard for achievement is that 75% of students (organized in teams) will score 80% or higher on the rubric. | |
| Assessment Tools/Methods for Intended Student Lea Indirect Measures of Student Learning | arning Outcomes— | Performance Targets/Criteria for Indirect Measures: | |
| 1. Oral Communication Common Assessment (Rul | bric attached) | Lessons Learned Summary to form baseline for future measurement | |
| 2. NSSE Bi-Annual Survey of freshman and senior respondents for total School of Business (breakd unavailable at this time) | | 85% or higher of Survey Responses are equal to or better than Point Park University, Middle States, Carnegie class and/or NSSE respondent pool - measured for freshman and senior respondents respectively | |

| Summary of Results from Implementing Direct Measures of Student Learning: | | Performance Target Was | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | Not Met | |
| 1. The System Design and Analysis deliverables for CMPS 480 were used for the direct measure. The average grade given for these deliverables was 81% which met the standard of achievement. However, only 4 out of 9 groups (44%) received grades higher or equal to 80%. This is well below the standard for achievement. | | X | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing Indirect Measures of Student Learning: | Performance Target Was | | |
| Summary of Results from Implementing findrect Weasures of Student Learning. | Met | Not Met | |
| 1. Student comments addressed common communication problems that the teams encountered. First, need for more oral communication in some form (email, phone, online and in person meetings). Second, need for more and better documentation. There was universal agreement that "communication is the key to a successful project!" | X | | |
| 2. School of Business Result: Freshman respondents on 2009 survey rated the School of Business on par or above one or more peers for 96% of metrics, with 6% of metrics evaluated as statistically significantly higher than one or more peers and 4% of metrics statistically significantly lower than peers. Senior respondents rated the School of Business on par or above one or more peers for 94% of metrics, with 2% of metrics evaluated as statistically significantly higher than one or more peers and 6% of metrics statistically significantly lower than peers. Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population. | X | | |
| Proposed Courses of Action for Improvement in Areas for which Performance Targets Were Not Met: | | | |
| 1. The identification and access of system analysis and design tools should greatly improve the scores of the deliverables. | | | |
| 2. The requirement of a communication tool (i.e. Skype) would allow teams to communicate better and more often. | | | |
| 3. Investigate cost/benefit of project software tools to address system design and analysis deficiencies. | | | |
| 4. School of Business Action Plan for NSSE Results: Main areas of opportunity for both student populations include increased engagement with faculty and programming outside of the classroom. Results consistent with significant number of working professionals within student population. | | | |

Detailed responses

H. Programmatic Information

[Please note: due to the late submission of our 2008-2009 Annual Report to IACBE, these items occurring in academic year 2009-2010 were included. They are being re-submitted for your review in this current report.]

Changes in Business and Business-Related Degree Programs for 2009-2010

- 2. Changes made in business majors, concentration, or emphasis: The undergraduate Accelerated Business Program (Saturday FAST) made several changes in Fall 2009 to its program guide, and in Spring 2010 to introduce a portfolio capstone course to make the program more rigorous and competitive. The undergraduate Business Management major added a new concentration in Entrepreneurship. The MBA program added a new concentration Health Systems Management. These program changes were all addressed through the governance process within the School of Business and by the University. In addition, two new offsite locations were established for the MBA program (management concentration) in 2009. Substantive change reporting to Middle States and their affirmative response is attached for the new offsite locations. Current versions of all School of Business program guides for accredited programs are available on the School of Business website (http://www.pointpark.edu/About/AdminDepts/RegistrarsOffice/ProgramGuides).
- **3.** New degree programs established during the academic year: We established a joint MBA/MA in Communications, effective Fall 2009, with two additional concentrations added to the MA Communications portion of the program approved in Spring 2010. Please see attached program guide and proposal documents as submitted to Middle States and the Pennsylvania Department of Education. No new courses were added to the MBA program to support this joint degree program.
- 4. Approval of your institutional accrediting body: Please see attached new program proposal submissions and responses from Middle States.

I. Other Issues

Our report includes the following attachments and website links, as referenced above:

- IACBE public notification
 - o Public notification of IACBE accreditation: http://www.pointpark.edu/Academics/Schools/Business/IACBEAccreditation
 - o Public disclosure of student achievement information: http://www.pointpark.edu/Academics/Schools/Business/AcademicExcellence
- Point Park University Assessment Program
 - o Program overview approved by Dean's Council in 2009 (PPU Program Assessment Overview.doc)
 - o Plan form (Point Park University Program Assess Plan form.doc)
 - University tracking of progress against assessment timeline (2009-2010 program assessment plan_university reporting as of Sept 2009.xls)
- School of Business Assessment Plans and Reviews
 - o School of Business Goals and Objectives for all school programs (2009_Business Goals and Objectives.xls)

- o 2008 Outcomes Assessment Matrix (2008 Outcomes Assessment Matrix School of Business_all programs.xls)
- o Business Management and Management Services programs (Assessment Plan Bus Mgmt Mgmt Services HRM_Sept 2009.pdf; EXH A_Bus Mgmt_Mgmt Svces_Program Assessment Results_Draft as of May 2010.doc)
- Accounting (PPU Assessment Plan Accounting Fall 2009 09.11.09 revision.doc; Accounting Assessment_Auditing Final Exam Cast Study Essay Rubric.xls; EXH A_Accounting Assessment Results.doc)
- Business Accelerated (Saturday FAST) (Fall 2009 Sat Fast Program Assessment Plan.doc; Program Assessment Results Bachelor of Bus – SAT Fast)
- Information Technology and Management (PPU Assessment Plan IT Fall 2009.doc; IT_Assessment Rubric.doc; EXH A_ITM Assessment Results.doc)
- Indirect Measure for all School of Business Programs: NSSE data
 - o NSSE Analyzed Results for the School of Business (http://www.pointpark.edu/Academics/Schools/Business/AcademicExcellence)
 - Detailed report on review and recommended actions to increase opportunities for faculty-student interaction (2009 NSSE Student Faculty Interaction Results Analysis.docx)
- Direct Measure: 2nd Annual Business Plan Contest (update of second year contest results for undergraduate business programs)
 - o Program overview (Fall 2009 Business Pl... Contest Program.doc)
 - o Rubric (Fall 2009 Contest Evaluation Rubric for Business Plan Group Project with Presentation.doc)
 - o Contest rules (Fall 2009 Business Pl... Contest Rules.doc)
 - o Contest announcement (Fall 2009 Business Pl... Contest Announcement.doc)
 - o Results (Results of Business ... Contest Fall 2009.doc)
- School of Business Program Guides ((http://www.pointpark.edu/About/AdminDepts/RegistrarsOffice/ProgramGuides)
- Point Park University Faculty Assembly Program Review Process
 - o Point Park University_Faculty Assembly_Program Review Process_Rev.doc
- New Program Documentation
 - o MA Communication/MBA program guide (http://www.pointpark.edu/Academics/Schools/Business/GraduatePrograms/MAMBA)
 - Corporate site application and approvals (Substantive Change Report GAI Consultants Final 10-29-09 submitted.pdf; Substantive Change Report US Steel Final Submitted 10-29-09; 100201_Middle States Response to Substantive Chg Request_Memo.pdf)