



## Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

### BS Finance, Real Estate, & Law Finance, Real Estate, & Law College of Business Administration

#### CONTACT

Name of Program Assessment Lead Anthony Orlando

Name of Person Completing Report Anthony Orlando

#### DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION Yes

#### DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)

- Our disciplinary accrediting agency has recommended learning outcomes, so we used and/or modified them.

Other than the CPP Catalog and the Office of Assessment and Program Review website, where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.

- Department Website - provide URL: <https://www.cpp.edu/cba/finance-real-estate-and-law/assessment/index.shtml>
- Course Syllabi
- Published in alternative place. Please specify: Expanded Course Outlines (ECOs)

#### ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023**. This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?

- 3

**How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?**

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

**Please list the SLOs examined**

- SLO #1: SLO 2: FRL students will demonstrate the ability (2a) to identify key issues, (2b) to evaluate information sources, and (2c) to solve unstructured problems using appropriate quantitative and qualitative skills.
- SLO #2: SLO 3: FRL students will be able to use computer software such as Excel and investment related software to solve related problems.
- SLO #3: SLO 5: Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize key aspects of ethical issues.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 2: FRL students will demonstrate the ability (2a) to identify key issues, (2b) to evaluate information sources, and (2c) to solve unstructured problems using appropriate quantitative and qualitative skills.**

<b>Assessment Activities</b>	<b>Evidence Used</b>	<b>Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework</li></ul>	

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 3: FRL students will be able to use computer software such as Excel and investment related software to solve related problems.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average Score=68.8; Standard Deviation=26.6</li> <li>Six Students (9.1%) achieved perfect score</li> <li>37 out of 66 (56.1%) of students achieved an overall score of 70 and above</li> </ul>

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
66	Scores based on rubric		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students did well in finding the regression Beta using either the SLOPE function or Regression tool in Excel Data Analysis ToolPak               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those who made mistakes in finding the Beta mistakenly referenced R square or Standard Deviation as the regression Beta</li> </ul> </li> <li>Most students possessed knowledge of the CAPM model in calculating the cost of equity, but struggled to apply it in practical situations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improper reference to the risk-free rate</li> <li>Improperly reference to the market risk premium</li> </ul> </li> <li>Students struggled with Cost of Debt calculations – only 16.7% students calculated the cost of debt correctly               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mistakenly used the coupon rate as the cost of debt</li> <li>Forgot to adjust the coupon payment, number of periods for a semi-annual coupon bond</li> <li>Couldn't apply the RATE function to calculate YTM</li> </ul> </li> <li>Students struggled in finding the weight of debt and weight of equity               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mistakenly calculated weights as D/E, rather than D/V or D/(D+E).</li> <li>Mistakenly used book values, rather than market values in calculating weights</li> </ul> </li> <li>Most students who answered this question possessed knowledge of the WACC formula, but struggled to apply it in practical situations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mismatched component cost of capital with respective weights</li> <li>Misplaced brackets in WACC calculations</li> <li>Forgot to adjust the before-tax cost of debt to after-tax cost of debt</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 5: Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize key aspects of ethical issues.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assignment/exam/paper completed as part of regular coursework</li> </ul>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Tested Knowledge Area</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scored "Satisfactory" or Above</b>
		MC: Application	Jurisdiction/Venue	82.17%
		MC: Concept	Burden of Proof	71.74%
		MC: Concept	Pleadings	82.60%
		Essay: Application	Tort, Negligence	69.74%
		Essay: Application	Contract	69.74%

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
216	Percentage of Students Scored "Satisfactory" or Above		<p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A short 5-questions common final as a supplement to instructor's regular final exam is an effective and feasible assessment measure for FRL 2013.</li> <li>Common final exam will probably include four multiple choice questions and one essay question to balance rigor and flexibility.</li> <li>As reflected by the assessment data, a satisfactory percentage of FRL 2013 (~70%) students demonstrate awareness of the ethical and legal aspects of the global and diverse business environment.</li> <li>A satisfactory percentage of FRL 2013 students demonstrate the ability to recognize key aspects of ethical issues, achieving the student learning goal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Closing the Gap Suggestions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design of common question can be further improved; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The slightly lower satisfactory percentage in common question 3 can be attributed to students performance or question design</li> </ul> </li> <li>Norming sessions should be planned for all FRL 2013 instructors to better prepare for the grading process, the university and college should probably think of ways of better supporting instructor norming sessions (e.g., grants etc.);</li> <li>Assessment announcements should be made earlier to instructors to better prepare for data collection during the semester (oral participations, presentations etc.)</li> </ul>

## IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.

- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.

- Program/department faculty as whole
- A committee of program/department faculty
- Program/department assessment committee
- College assessment committee
- Students

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.

Instructors have been sharing ideas to improve FRL 3000, which has been a bottleneck course for the CBA and has fallen short of the common assessment threshold frequently in recent years, and the instructional improvements have apparently worked, as the assessment results are improving; we are also working on new instructional videos, as described above. applied for and received university-level grant to develop new instructional videos to prepare students for math prerequisite skills, where students often struggle in FRL 3000; currently in the process of designing the new videos.

Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, [CPP's GI2025 markers](#), [CSU Dashboard](#), [CPP's Student Success Dashboard](#) on Tableau, course evaluations, etc.

<narrative here>

Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?

- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found [here](#). To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan - No

Curriculum Matrix - No

If you would like us to review other assessment documents such as your evidence (e.g., assignment, survey, interview questions etc.) or scoring rubric, please upload/provide them. (Select all that apply)

- Other: Indirect Assessment (Senior Exit Survey)