

Business Plan Proposal BUSI

by Kemi Mustapha

Submission date: 14-Jan-2022 07:47PM (UTC+0000)

Submission ID: 169055059

File name: Business_Plan_Proposal_BUSI_1678724_594412572.docx (22.18K)

Word count: 1374

Character count: 7645

A proposal to solve income related inequalities in affordability and access to primary care in the US

Student ID number: 001184252-0

Coursework Deadline: 14/01/2022 23:30

Word Count: 1,285

Course Title: BUSI 1689 Management Leadership & Enterprise in Public Health Organizations

Module Leader: Aduragbemi Banke-Thomas

Essay 2

Executive summary of the Proposal

This proposal is to provide a solution to a recurring problem in the US as regards the income related inequality in affordability and access to primary care. The problem is that serious income imbalances and a restriction of primary care access might impede pandemic recovery in the United States, where lower-income people do notably worse than their counterparts in other rich nations which will in turn affect our aims and objectives as an organization.

ORGANISATION OVERVIEW

About University Hospital

USA Health University Hospital is an acute care facility serving as the major referral center for southwest Alabama, southeast Mississippi, and portions of northwest Florida. We offer centers for Level I trauma, burn, stroke, cardiovascular disease, and sickle cell disease. As a teaching and research facility for the University of South Alabama College of Medicine, University Hospital plays a key role in the development of innovative technology, treatments, and training of future healthcare professionals.

Services Offered at University Hospital:

This following service is offered in the hospital such as Adult Infectious disease, Adult intensive care, bariatric Surgery, Burn Surgery, Capsule Endoscopy, Neurosurgery Orthopedic Surgery, nutrition care and a lot more. The organization has engaged in the

above services for more than 10 years, and we are regarded as the foremost front runner in this field.

The Mission and Vision of USA Health

From the lab to the hospital, from fighting cancer to fighting colds, medicine is ever changing at USA Health. Our culture encourages curiosity and challenges assumptions as we push each other to improve the health of patients. What we discover in the lab, we take to the hospital. What we learn in the classroom.

Our Mission:

We help people live longer, better lives.

Our Vision:

USA Health strives to be the premier integrated, patient-centered healthcare organization in our region. We educate future generations of healthcare providers, and we discover innovative ways to help people become healthier.

Values:

Teamwork: We believe a team approach offers the best healthcare for our patients.
Patient-centered: We partner with our patients, their families, and their communities.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

I propose that a new policy that captures the lower income adults to assess primary health care services if the United States really want a quick pandemic recovery. We discovered in our findings that the Low-income adults suffer a multitude of issues, the most difficult and widespread of which is access to health care.

With the reference to current studies from the 2020 Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey which show that lower-income Americans experience substantial health and financial challenges as the COVID-19 epidemic continues to affect the globe. According to Commonwealth Fund International Health Policy Survey (2020), adults with lower incomes are much more likely than wealthier adults to have many chronic diseases in the US. It was reported that well over a third (36%) of low-income individuals in the United States suffer many chronic diseases, which is much higher than in other nations with the same economic threshold. And with the number of one-third of persons with lower income in the United States (36%) experienced anxiety or depression, this has the major hurdles faced by lower income adults in assessing the primary health care in the US. The problem does not stop there, however, because of the expense, 50% of people said they skipped medical appointments, suggested tests, treatments, or follow-up care, or prescription drugs in the previous year.

Furthermore, having trouble paying medical costs is primarily a U.S. problem: 36% of low-income persons in the United States reported having this issue. Lower income people depend on the availability of low-cost health care. It has been said that supplying a low-cost health care service will ensure fair access. The excessive cost of medical medications and other services give me a lot of worry for low-income people in the US. More than a quarter (28%) of low-income individuals in the United States showed they were concerned about trying to pay essentials like food or housing.

The current health policy in the US has not really captured the needs of low-income adults. With COVID-19 causes havoc to the global economy, the United States is once again under pressure for the glaring health and economic inequities that individuals with lower income. Long-term health needs consistent source of care. It is also important for COVID-19 recovery because people who get sick will need consistent access to treatment. When a robust policy is available, having access to primary care makes it easier to get them. All adults with lower income in the US said they had difficulty finding a regular doctor which is due to an expensive cost of health care service. The rate of adults who said that range from 85% to 89%. The need for strategizing and analyzing policy is critical here if the US wants a quick pandemic recovery.

PROPOSED PLAN

The proposal is to enable low earners to be able to have good and adequate access to healthcare in their environment

The Strategy

PESTLE Analysis of External Environment of USA Health University Hospital

PESTEL study gives extensive insight about the operational issues that the US healthcare sectors confront in the current macro environment as regards the problems faced by low-income people in assessing primary healthcare services in which our organization is a major player. The political, economic, social, technical, legal, and environmental elements that should be considered are outlined in the PESTLE analysis in the diagram below.

PESTLE analysis of USA Health University Hospital

POLITICAL	ECONOMIC
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Healthcare is becoming a center of political attention and pressure.2. Political will to push policy ideas to expand insurance coverage.3. Governments throughout the world are seeking ways to save money on healthcare.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">6. Global economic crisis.7. The rate of progress in the local government is significantly faster, which may have an influence on health when funds are cut.8. Diminish individual disposal income.

4. Policy that will make greater investments in addressing the social determinants of health for lower income people. 5. .	9. Reduction in healthcare service due to low budget
SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC	TECHNOLOGICAL
1. Increase in population which creates need to be conscious of demographic changes. 2. Patients expect more service closer to their homes. 3. Patients/ public advocates are now increasing.	4. Customized treatments. 5. Increased telemedicine costs and benefits 6. Green agenda and carbon trading. 7. Modernize services and develop integrated care pathways
LEGAL	ENVIRONMENTAL
1. Increase in litigation 2. Global inconstancy 3. American Health Care Act of 2017; taxation and inequality, increasing 4. democratic accountability and public voice 5. Bribery Act	1. Pressure on carbon emissions 2. Energy efficiency 3. Energy costs and cost variability 4. Transport links

Proposed Solutions

8. I propose that a policy that will thoroughly capture the needs of low-income and gives the opportunity to have access to a quality and affordable health care service should be made. There should be more investment in health 9. infrastructure, lack of this has been a key policy issue in countries like the USA, where a low-income population faces severe budget constraints exacerbated by an unprecedented economic downturn. Achieving

greater health equity in the U.S. will require policies that extend insurance coverage, make health care easier to afford, and strengthen primary care system in the U.S

Time budget:

Since health deals with all wellbeing of an individual, it should be a continuous process to assist the low-income population in the state.

References

Doty, M., Tikkanen, R., FitzGerald, M., Fields, K. and Williams, R., (2021). Income-Related Inequality in Affordability and Access to Primary Care in Eleven High-Income Countries. *Health Affairs*, 40(1), pp.113-120.

Lazar, M. and Davenport, L., (2018). Barriers to Health Care Access for Low Income Families: A Review of Literature. *Journal of Community Health Nursing*, 35(1), pp.28-37.

Westhertshospitals.nhs.uk.2022. [online] Available at: https://www.westhertshospitals.nhs.uk/about/documents/Annual_plan_whht_2011-12_v9_final.pdf [Accessed 13 January 2022].

Visconti, R., (2016). Healthcare public-private partnerships in Italy: Assessing risk sharing and governance issues with PESTLE and SWOT analysis. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 13(4), pp.122-131.

Business Plan Proposal BUSI

ORIGINALITY REPORT

32%

SIMILARITY INDEX

27%

INTERNET SOURCES

8%

PUBLICATIONS

26%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

www.usahealthsystem.com

Internet Source

14%

2

pnhp.org

Internet Source

4%

3

Submitted to Regis College

Student Paper

2%

4

Submitted to Curtin University of Technology

Student Paper

2%

5

Submitted to Liverpool John Moores University

Student Paper

2%

6

www.citethisforme.com

Internet Source

2%

7

Submitted to University of Greenwich

Student Paper

2%

8

Submitted to The City College

Student Paper

2%

9

Submitted to Federation University

Student Paper

1%

10

Www.commonwealthfund.org

Internet Source

1 %

11

virtusinterpress.org

Internet Source

1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off

Business Plan Proposal BUSI

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

35 / 100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

For the proposal, you demonstrated some understanding of the context and background of a public health issue.

However, you have not properly addressed the question asked. Indeed, you have not submitted a detailed proposal. What you submitted is less systematic and provides a description rather than an analysis. It was not focused at all. You started with the objectives of the organisation. You needed to provide the context and background to a public health issue, including some previous attempts at resolution or improvement. In doing this, the coherence between the previous attempts, the recommendation and the business plan needed to be established. However, you have not done this at all. You have not included a business plan as was required for this assignment.

There is also a portion of plagiarised texts in the narrative. This is not good academic practice. Please, refer yourself to the student services for additional support in their writing. To avoid in future, please make sure you paraphrase or use double quotation marks for texts copied from other sources. On this occasion, in line with the University of Greenwich academic misconduct policy, 10 marks have been deducted from your initial 45 marks.

For future proposals, endeavour to have a clear strategy on the proposal. Make sure that there is a clear connection between the different parts and the flow is clear.

I hope you find this feedback useful.

Best wishes.

PAGE 1



Comment 1

Very poor academic practice.

PAGE 2



Comment 2

Poor academic practice



Comment 3

It is not about "I" but 'we'.



Comment 4

Good that you try to show the burden of the public health issue

PAGE 3



Comment 5

Some effort with a root cause analysis



Comment 6

Not clear



Comment 7

PESTEL is to help recognise root causes

PAGE 4



Comment 8

Again, not 'I'



Comment 9

Not clear

PAGE 5



Comment 10

Not clear

DOMAIN 1

0 / 0

Part B: Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the context and background to a public health issue, including previous attempts at resolution or improvement.

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	Demonstrates exceptional systematic understanding of the context and background to a public health issue, including previous attempts at resolution or improvement. There is exceptional evidence of engagement with all key elements.
70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	Demonstrates excellent systematic understanding of the context and background to a public health issue, including previous attempts at resolution or improvement. There is excellent evidence of engagement with all key elements.
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	Demonstrates a very good systematic understanding of the context and background to a public health issue, including previous attempts at resolution or improvement. Coherent and detailed knowledge is presented at a very good level and you are able to provide very good critical analysis. There is also very good evidence of engagement with all key elements.
50-59% GOOD (0)	Demonstrates good systematic understanding of the context and background to a public health issue, including previous attempts at resolution or improvement. Detailed knowledge is presented at fairly good level and you are able to provide some good critical analysis. There is also good evidence of engagement with all key elements, with some omissions in detail.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	Demonstrates some understanding of the context and background to a public health issue, including previous attempts at resolution or improvement. However, it is less systematic and provides a description rather than an analysis. There is limited evidence of engagement with all key elements. There is a clear lack of criticality needed at level 7.
30-39% FAIL (0)	Lack of understanding of a key global public health issue. Poor engagement with historical, current and potential future developments in relation to this topic. There is insufficient evidence of engagement with each key element. There is a clear lack of criticality needed at level 7.
0-29% FAIL (0)	Very confused understanding of a key global public health issue. Very poor engagement with historical, current and potential future developments in relation to this topic. Key elements omitted or discussed too briefly. There is no evidence of criticality needed at level 7.

DOMAIN 2

0 / 0

Part B: Demonstrate consistency between public health issue, previous attempts and recommended solution

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	Demonstrates exceptional consistency in identification of previous attempts and the potential of the recommended solution.
----------------------------	--

70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	Demonstrates excellent systematic consistency in identification of previous attempts and the potential pf the recommended solution.
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	Demonstrates very good systematic consistency in identification of previous attempts and the potential pf the recommended solution.
50-59% GOOD (0)	Demonstrates good systematic consistency in identification of previous attempts and the potential pf the recommended solution.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	Demonstrate some level of systematic consistency in identification of previous attempts and the potential pf the recommended solution. However, it is less systematic and provides a description rather than an analysis of the role and lacks criticality.
30-39% FAIL (0)	Confusion in identification of previous attempts and the potential pf the recommended solution. Key elements omitted.
0-29% FAIL (0)	Very confused in identification of previous attempts and the potential pf the recommended solution. Too many key elements omitted.

DOMAIN 3

0 / 0

Part B: Use of relevant evidence to support development of narrative.

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	Demonstrates exceptional systematic use of relevant evidence to support development of narrative.
70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	Demonstrates excellent systematic use of relevant evidence to support development of narrative.
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	Demonstrates very good systematic use of relevant evidence to support development of narrative.
50-59% GOOD (0)	Demonstrates good systematic use of relevant evidence to support development of narrative, with some omissions in detail.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	Demonstrate some level of systematic use of relevant evidence to support development of narrative. However, it is less systematic and provides a description rather than an analysis of the role and lacks criticality.
30-39% FAIL (0)	Confused use of evidence to support development of narrative. Key elements omitted.
0-29% FAIL (0)	Very confused use of evidence to support development of narrative. Too many key elements omitted.

DOMAIN 3B

0 / 0

Part B: Demonstrate coherence and completeness of the proposal

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	The assignment provides exceptionally strong and consistent coherence and completeness of the proposal.
70-79% EXCELLENT	The assignment provides excellent coherence and completeness of the proposal.

(0)	
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	The assignment provides very good coherence and completeness of the proposal.
50-59% GOOD (0)	The assignment provides some good coherence and completeness of the proposal.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	The assignment begins to demonstrate some coherence and completeness of the proposal. However, assignment shows a weak level of understanding. Some understanding of the way concepts presented are related– with clear omissions.
30-39% FAIL (0)	The assignment provides little coherence and completeness of the proposal. Assignment shows a weak level of understanding. The work is descriptive and does not demonstrate understanding of the way concepts presented relate to one another.
0-29% FAIL (0)	The assignment lacks any coherence and/or completeness of the proposal. There is little or no understanding of the way concepts presented relate to one another and many omissions – some of which were covered directly in the module sessions.

DOMAIN 3C

0 / 0

Part B: Appropriate use of relevant management and leadership tools

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	The assignment provides exceptionally strong and consistent analysis leveraging appropriate management and leadership tools.
70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	The assignment provides excellent analysis leveraging appropriate management and leadership tools.
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	The assignment provides very good analysis leveraging appropriate management and leadership tools.
50-59% GOOD (0)	The assignment provides some good analysis leveraging some appropriate management and leadership tools.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	The assignment begins to analyse while leveraging a few appropriate management and leadership tools. However, application shows a weak level of understanding. Some understanding of the way concepts presented are related– with clear omissions.
30-39% FAIL (0)	The assignment provides little analysis leveraging a few appropriate management and leadership tools. Application shows a weak level of understanding. The work is descriptive and does not demonstrate understanding of the way concepts presented relate to one another.
0-29% FAIL (0)	The assignment lacks any analysis leveraging any appropriate management and leadership tools. There is little or no understanding of the way concepts presented relate to one another and many omissions – some of which were covered directly in the module sessions

DOMAIN 4

0 / 0

Part B: Demonstrate use of a wide range of relevant reading and research

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	An extensively wide range of current and appropriate literature is presented to support your strong arguments and different perspectives, and you provide exceptional commentary and advanced scholarship. An exceptional ability to deploy established techniques of analysis and enquiry using the literature.
70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	You provide an extensive range of current and appropriate literature to support your strong arguments and different perspectives, and you provide excellent commentary and strong scholarship. An excellent ability to deploy established techniques of analysis and enquiry when using the literature.
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	A very good range of appropriate literature is used. Views are discussed and arguments presented with reference to this literature, and there is evidence of very good deployment of established techniques of analysis and enquiry. There is also evidence of very good commentary on aspects of current research and scholarship.
50-59% GOOD (0)	Some good relevant reading is evident and demonstrates good understanding of the issues. There is evidence of some use of established techniques of analysis and enquiry. There is also some evidence of good commentary on aspects of current research and scholarship.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	Some reference is made to background reading, but it is limited in nature and draws on a restricted number of authors. There is some limited evidence of techniques of enquiry. There is some evidence that the literature has helped to inform your thinking and some evidence of use of some techniques of analysis.
30-39% FAIL (0)	There is a failure to engage with enough relevant literature and, where background reading is referred to there is little evidence that it has been understood. You have little understanding of the techniques needed for analysis or enquiry into the research around the topic. You need to read much more widely and improve your understanding.
0-29% FAIL (0)	There is almost no evidence of engagement in relevant background reading. There is no real understanding of the techniques needed for analysis or enquiry into the research. You need to spend time researching and engaging with module materials to develop an understanding.

DOMAIN 5

0 / 0

Part B: Assessment referencing and sourcing is correct

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	Sources used are, without exception, acknowledged in the text and the reference list, using correct citation – including online sources. Follows an exceptionally strongly professional approach to academic practice.
70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	Sources used are all acknowledged in the text and the reference list using correct citation – including online sources. Follows an excellent, professional approach to academic practice.

60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	Sources used are almost all acknowledged in the text and the reference list mostly using correct citation – including most online sources. A very good approach to academic practice.
50-59% GOOD (0)	Literature is not always correctly referenced within the text and/or reference list. Reference list is good in terms of number of sources but there are several secondary sources.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	The assignment has a reference list. However, this referencing is often inaccurate and/or there are several omissions. Reference list is short and limited. An over reliance on secondary sources. You need further support with this.
30-39% FAIL (0)	The reference list has many errors in its layout. Many references in the main text are incomplete or incorrect and may be missing from the reference list. You need further support with this.
0-29% FAIL (0)	The assignment lacks a reference list, or it is incorrectly laid out. Referencing system within the assignment (i.e., Harvard) has not been followed and you need further support with this.

DOMAIN 6

0 / 0

Part B: Essay is written in coherent standard English language, is well structured and well presented in an appropriate academic style.

80-100% EXCEPTIONAL (0)	This assessment is exceptionally well structured and organised. The written English is of an extremely high standard and observes all academic conventions in style and content. The assessment flows exceptionally well and is a pleasure to read.
70-79% EXCELLENT (0)	Excellent structure and very well organised ideas. The written English is of a very high standard and the work observes all academic conventions in style and content. Excellent flow and style and a pleasure to read.
60-69% VERY GOOD (0)	A very good structure – with clear presentation and organisation of ideas. The work observes almost all academic conventions in style, content and is presented well, mostly using standard English throughout. The majority of this work uses a style which flows well.
50-59% GOOD (0)	A good structure for the most part. The work observes many academic conventions in style and content and is mostly presented in standard English, with some errors and omissions. Some sentence structure also needs revision, and this can affect the flow of your work in places. The student should refer themselves to student services for additional support in their writing.
40-49% BORDERLINE FAIL (0)	The structure needs improvement. Many errors appear in the use of standard English (possibly due to poor proof reading). The work does not flow well in several places and this affects clarity. The assignment is structured as a case study with sub-headings. The student should refer themselves to student services for additional support in their writing.
30-39% FAIL (0)	Minimal structure. The work is hampered by errors in standard English. It lacks academic style and does not flow well. Further proofreading clearly needed and

additional support for academic writing. The student should refer themselves to student services for additional support in their writing.

0-29% FAIL
(0)

No structure presented and the assessment includes a significant number of errors in Standard English. It lacks academic style, and this impedes flow. Further proofreading clearly needed and additional support for academic writing. The student should refer themselves to student services for additional support in their writing.