

**Undergraduate Academic Program Review - Finance & Financial Services  
(Revised on November 21, 2007)**

**Name of the Program:** Finance Major

**NOTE: The Department of Finance and Financial Services is responsible for two separate majors within the same department. As a result resources such as faculty and space are shared and have not been separated out in the two reports.**

**Name and contact information for person completing the review:**

Marlena Akhbari, Ph.D.  
*Associate Professor*  
254 E Rike Hall  
(937) 775-3175  
Email: [Marlena.Akhbari@wright.edu](mailto:Marlena.Akhbari@wright.edu)

**Indicate whether the program is**

on campus  
 online  
 both

NCA Criterion 1 – Mission and Integrity  
NCA Criterion 2 – Preparing for the Future  
NCA Criterion 3 – Student Learning and Effective Teaching  
NCA Criterion 4 – Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge  
NCA Criterion 5 – Engagement and Service

**I Program Mission (NCA Criterion 1 and Criterion 5)**

Department of Finance & Financial Services  
Mission, Objective, Outcomes and Assessment

The **mission** of the Department of Finance and Financial Services is to contribute to the mission of the Raj Soin College of Business (RSCOB). We do this by 1) providing for the intellectual growth of students through the design, delivery and monitoring of a high quality curriculum; 2) advancing knowledge in the fields of finance and financial services through basic and applied scholarship and 3) providing service to our profession, to the university and to business firms, government agencies and non-profit organizations in our region.

Our **primary objective** is to assist students to acquire the knowledge and skills that are necessary to further their career objectives and to make meaningful contributions to business organizations.

Our desired **educational outcome** is to increase student proficiency in the following areas:

1. Application of the fundamental concepts, theories, and analytical techniques of financial management or financial services.
2. Critical thinking, problem solving and decision making skills.
3. Oral and written communication skills.
4. Working effectively as a member of a team.
5. Use of the library, the internet and other information technologies.
6. Computer applications to financial decision making.

The **finance major** will be assessed as follows:

Outcome 1. A set of marker questions will be incorporated into all final examinations in FIN 311, 401, 418, and 490. The results will be reviewed on an annual basis by the department. All syllabi are reviewed by the department chair prior to distribution to students.

Outcome 2. The final exams in FIN 311, 401, 490 and 418 will include problem solving questions. FIN 418 will require students to analyze cases and to recommend and defend appropriate courses of action. Professors will report on student performance to the department on an annual basis.

Outcome 3. Finance 418 is a writing intensive course. Students are required to make both oral and written presentations of cases. The professor will report to the department on student performance annually.

Outcome 4. FIN 418 and 490 all require team projects. Professors will report to the department annually.

Outcome 5. Finance 401 and 418 require the use of the library and the internet. Professors will report to the department annually.

Outcome 6. Finance 418, 401, and 490 will require at least one project that necessitates the use of a computer to perform the necessary quantitative analysis. Finance 418 to develop a financial spreadsheet as an integral part of at least one case analysis using several finance specific functions. Professors will report to the department annually.

Our success in achieving our **primary objective** will be assessed as follows:

- a. Semi annual surveys of graduating seniors.
- b. Exit survey of firms interviewing for finance students at the career placement office (effective Winter 2001).
- c. Annual survey of alumni who graduated 5 years ago.

- d. Regular meetings with local business leaders to review curriculum.
- e. Survey of employers every 5 years.
- f. Annual department assessment meeting.

## II Program Description (NCA Criterion 2)

### A. Brief History of the Department of Finance & Financial Services

The Department of Finance and Financial Services has enjoyed a high degree of success. Our outstanding graduates are dispersed not only throughout the Miami Valley in such positions of distinction as CEO of MTC Technologies, Regional Presidents of Union Bank, Liberty Bank, and Huntington Bank, Vice President of Human Resources at NCR and many, many others, but also we have had the distinct pleasure of producing a large number of students who have gone to pursue Ph.D.s.

Our students have been investing money provided by the WSU Foundation in a real money investing course since the mid-1990s. Our student investment teams have the distinction of always outperforming their benchmarks since the inception of this program. The following chart is an indication of their more recent performance.

Performance Data as of October 30, 2007

| Date                      | WSU Foundation       |          | Raider Asset Management |              | TOTAL FUNDS                 |            |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----------|-------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|
|                           | Morgan Stanley       |          | Merrill Lynch           |              |                             |            |
| 31-Jul-02                 | \$ 98,182.63         |          |                         |              | \$ 98,182.63                |            |
| 31-Dec-02                 | \$ 95,985.95         |          |                         |              | \$ 95,985.95                |            |
| 31-Dec-03                 | \$ 124,986.73        |          |                         |              | \$ 124,986.73               |            |
| 31-Aug-04                 | \$ 125,550.53        |          |                         |              | \$ 125,550.53               |            |
| 31-Dec-04                 | \$ 148,955.34        |          |                         |              | \$ 148,955.34               |            |
| 28-Feb-05                 | \$ 157,935.71        |          | \$ 500,103.50           |              | \$ 658,039.21               |            |
| 31-Aug-05                 | \$ 164,530.59        |          | \$ 522,244.43           |              | \$ 686,775.02               |            |
| 31-Dec-05                 | \$ 170,462.10        |          | \$ 541,301.95           |              | \$ 711,764.05               |            |
| 31-Aug-06                 | \$ 172,015.45        |          | \$ 588,543.06           |              | \$ 760,558.51               |            |
| 30-Sep-06                 | \$ 170,155.00        |          | \$ 594,398.00           |              | \$ 764,553.00               |            |
| 31-Dec-06                 | \$ 180,450.70        |          | \$ 626,678.23           |              | \$ 807,128.93               |            |
| 31-Aug-07                 | \$ 190,054.25        |          | \$ 675,745.33           |              | \$ 865,799.58               |            |
| 28-Sep-07                 | \$ 204,312.00        |          | \$ 718,944.00           |              | \$ 923,256.00               |            |
| <b>30-Oct-07</b>          | <b>\$ 218,938.16</b> |          | <b>\$ 739,329.00</b>    |              | <b>\$ 958,267.16</b>        |            |
| <b>AVG ANNUAL RETURNS</b> | <b>YTD</b>           | <b>1</b> | <b>AVG 3</b>            | <b>AVG 5</b> | <b>AVG Since Inception*</b> |            |
| <b>WSU Foundation</b>     | 13.22%               | 20.07%   | 17.13%                  | 18.71%       | 21.62%                      | 7/31/2002* |
| <b>Raider Asset Mgt</b>   | 14.72%               | 20.95%   |                         |              | 16.94%                      | 2/28/2005* |
| <b>TOTAL</b>              | 13.97%               | 20.51%   | 17.13%                  | 18.71%       | 21.62%                      |            |
| <b>S&amp;P 500</b>        | 9.13%                | 16.44%   | 13.44%                  | 15.45%       |                             |            |

(taken from: <http://www2.standardandpoors.com/spf/pdf/index/500factsheet.pdf>)

We had the pleasure of receiving an award for outstanding classroom design for our design and construction of the MTC Technologies Trading Center.

Over the past seven years we have had two chairs of the Department. Peter Bacon served a second stint as chair from 1999 until his retirement after 37 years of service in spring of 2004. Upon Dr. Bacon's retirement, Dr. Fall Ainina was appointed as chair of the Department. The Department has focused on creating firmer ties with the business community. The Department has also been instrumental in the construction of a Wall Street-like trading room. As a result our students enjoy the highest quality of current technology as part of their finance curriculum here at the RSCOB.

We have also succeeded in growing the number of students participating in internships under Dr. Ainina's leadership. Dr. Ainina has made great efforts to connect each student in the real money investing courses with a local professional mentor. This has enhanced both our students understanding of the investment profession and the visibility of our students in the community at large and very often led to internship opportunities. Under Dr. Ainina's leadership we have also been able to establish Student Advisory Boards each year and they have been very instrumental in enhancing the department's image among the student body.

Finally, we have had developed a very active Finance Club under the leadership of Dr. Marlena Akhbari. The club is for students who are either finance or financial services majors or who have an interest in becoming majors. This club has consistently sponsored a biweekly speaker series, taken annual trips to the Chicago Board of Trade and many establishments in and around Wall Street, including the NYSE, American Express Bank, Citigroup, Bloomberg, New York Life and Morgan Stanley Dean Witter. Student understanding of various job opportunities within our discipline is greatly enhanced by the excitement of these big cities.

**B. Number of students served**

| Year | Undergraduate Students* Taking Finance Classes | FTE* |
|------|--|------|
| 2006 | 1054   | 4216 |
| 2005 | 1011   | 4028 |
| 2004 | 983  | 3932 |
| 2003 | 1489   | 4790 |
| 2002 | 1629   | 4853 |

**C. Number of majors\***

| 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 254  | 170  | 169  | 149  | 159  |

\* Includes dual majors

**D. Number of minors – Not applicable**

**E. Number enrolled in certificate program – Not applicable**

**F. Number of faculty by rank**

|              | 2006      | 2005      | 2004      | 2003      | 2002      |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Professors   | 4         | 4         | 5         | 5         | 4         |
| Associates   | 2         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 2         |
| Assistants   | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         | 1         |
| Adjunct      | 5         | 5         | 3         | 3         | 5         |
| Instructors  | 2         | 2         | 2         | 1         | 1         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>14</b> | <b>13</b> | <b>12</b> | <b>11</b> | <b>13</b> |

**G. Average class size**

| 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 29   | 30   | 35   | 30   | 33   |

**H. Number of staff**

|       | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Staff | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.75 | 1.31 | 1.72 |

**I. Diversity****Faculty Ethnic Background**

|                  | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Asia             | 2    | 1    | 1    |      |      |
|                  | 17%  | 9%   | 9%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| African-American | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    | 1    |
|                  | 8%   | 9%   | 9%   | 11%  | 8%   |
| White            | 9    | 9    | 9    | 8    | 12   |
|                  | 75%  | 82%  | 82%  | 89%  | 92%  |

**Faculty Gender**

|              | <b>2006</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2004</b> | <b>2003</b> | <b>2002</b> |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Female       | 2           | 1           | 1           | 1           | 1           |
|              | 17%         | 11%         | 13%         | 10%         | 10%         |
| Male         | 10          | 8           | 7           | 9           | 9           |
|              | 83%         | 89%         | 88%         | 90%         | 90%         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>12</b>   | <b>9</b>    | <b>8</b>    | <b>10</b>   | <b>10</b>   |

**Staff Ethnic Background**

|          | <b>2006</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2004</b> | <b>2003</b> | <b>2002</b> |
|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Hispanic | 1           | 1           | 1           | 1           | 1           |
|          | 50%         | 50%         | 50%         | 50%         | 50%         |
| White    | 1           | 1           | 1           | 1           | 1           |
|          | 50%         | 50%         | 50%         | 50%         | 50%         |

|        | <b>2006</b> | <b>2005</b> | <b>2004</b> | <b>2003</b> | <b>2002</b> |
|--------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Female | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        | 100%        |

**Finance Undergraduate Majors by Ethnic Group for Fall Term\***

|                  | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Asian            | 13   | 1    | 2    | 4    | 5    | 3    |
| African-American | 4    | 12   | 11   | 12   | 12   | 7    |
| Native American  | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    |      | 0    |
| Hispanic         | 3    | 3    | 2    | 0    | 0    | 1    |
| Foreign          | 3    | 2    | 3    | 0    | 3    | 4    |
| White            | 118  | 79   | 104  | 90   | 1    | 103  |
| Unknown          | 10   | 6    | 5    | 8    | 103  | 4    |
| Total            | 151  | 103  | 127  | 114  | 124  | 122  |

|                  | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Asian            | 9%   | 1%   | 2%   | 4%   | 4%   | 2%   |
| African-American | 3%   | 12%  | 9%   | 11%  | 10%  | 6%   |
| Native American  | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   | 0%   |
| Foreign          | 2%   | 3%   | 2%   | 0%   | 1%   | 1%   |
| Unknown          | 2%   | 2%   | 2%   | 0%   | 0%   | 3%   |
| Hispanic         | 78%  | 77%  | 82%  | 79%  | 83%  | 84%  |
| White            | 7%   | 6%   | 4%   | 7%   | 2%   | 3%   |
| Total            | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**Finance Undergraduate Majors by Gender for Fall Term**

|        | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Female | 36%  | 38%  | 44%  | 41%  | 44%  | 39%  |
| Male   | 64%  | 62%  | 56%  | 59%  | 56%  | 61%  |

\* Note: These ethnic and gender counts do not include dual majors.

**Department Budget**

|  | 2001-2002 | 2002-2003 | 2003-2004 | 2005-2005 | 2004-2006 |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Total Personnel Services and Benefits \$ | 1,047,943 | 1,053,797 | 1,100,703 | 1,078,453 | 1,125,023 |
| Total Operations \$                      | 114,214   | 138,613   | 154,865   | 149,945   | 160,642   |
| Total Expenditures \$                    | 1,162,157 | 1,192,410 | 1,255,568 | 1,228,398 | 1,285,665 |

**III Program Effectiveness (NCA Criterion 3 and Criterion 4)****A. Achievement of student learning outcomes (Please summarize program assessment findings for past five years and subsequent improvement to program) (3A)**

**Department of Finance and Financial Services  
Assessment Plan  
Finance Major**

1. Objective of the program.
  - a. Prepare individuals to understand, analyze, and manage the process of value creation.
  - b. Prepare individuals for entry level positions in business organization or in a graduate school program.
  - c. Prepare individuals for a process of life long learning.
2. Verification of achievement of program objectives.
  - a. Exit interviews
  - b. Surveys of alumni
  - c. Employment data.
3. Learning outcomes – Graduates will be able to:
  - a. compute a weighted average cost of capital.
  - b. use DCF methodology to value a company and/or a capital expenditure opportunity.
  - c. analyze a firm's current financial condition.
  - d. forecast a firm's future financing requirements.
  - e. design an optimal capital structure.
  - f. identify and value real options in capital budgeting decisions.
  - g. use derivative securities to manage financial risks.

- h. forecast foreign exchange rates based on international parity conditions.
- i. hedge foreign exchange exposure using traditional hedging tools.
- j. demonstrate an understanding of the functioning of various security markets.
- k. recommend a portfolio that balances an investor's risk profile and return objectives.

4. Assessment Measures

All learning outcomes will be assessed by examination in various courses as follows:

| Learning Outcomes            | Course  |
|------------------------------|---------|
| a) WACC                      | 310,311 |
| b) DCF                       | 310,311 |
| c) Financial Analysis        | 311     |
| d) Financial Forecasting     | 311     |
| e) Capital Structure         | 311     |
| f) Real Options              | 419     |
| g) Derivatives               | 419     |
| h) Exchange Rate Forecasting | 490     |
| i) Hedging Foreign Exchange  | 490     |
| j) Security Markets          | 401     |
| k) Portfolio Construction    | 401     |

5. Measuring Performance

The relevant exam in each core course will have one or more multipart questions/problems that address the appropriate learning objective. The department assessment committee has determined that each question/problem will be graded on a four point scale as follows:

- 4 – Excellent 90+
- 3 – Good 80+
- 2 – Passing 70+
- 1 – Unsatisfactory

6. Derivation of findings

- ? Faculty teaching the core courses will prepare a report that summarizes the performance of each finance major on each of the marker questions. The report is submitted to the department assessment committee no later than 30 days following completion of the course.

7. Improvement Process

Findings will be analyzed at a quarterly meeting of the department assessment committee. Suggestions for improving outcomes will be communicated to respective faculty in a timely manner.

8. Timetable for Assessment

Assessment will take place over a 3 year cycle as follows:

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Objectives Assessed</u> |
|-------------|----------------------------|
| 1           | a-b                        |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 2 | c-e |
| 3 | f-k |

9. Accreditation

The department assessment plan is consistent with AACSB accreditation requirements.

**Assessment Report**  
July 1, 2001 – June 30, 2002

**PROGRAM ASSESSED:** Finance Major

**ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR:** Peter W. Bacon, Chair

**OUTCOMES ASSESSED**

- Outcome 1. Ability to apply financial concepts
2. Ability to solve financial problems
3. Content of Finance curriculum

**MEASURES EMPLOYED**

- Measure 1: Survey of graduating finance majors
- Measure 2: Marker questions
- Measure 3: Pass Rate on CFM exam

**SUMMARY MATRIX**

|           | Measure #1 | Measure #2 | Measure #3 |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| OUTCOME 1 | X          | X          | X          |
| OUTCOME 2 | X          | X          | X          |
| OUTCOME 3 | X          |            | X          |

**Findings:**

Measure 1: The following is a summary of the results of our survey of 2001 graduates. A five point scale is used.

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. ability to apply financial concepts | 3.5 |
| 2. ability to solve financial problems | 4.4 |
| 3. content of finance curriculum       | 4.0 |

Measure 2: Marker questions generally confirmed that students were able to solve financial problems but had difficulty applying concepts to unique situations

Measure 3: Pass rate on CFM exam was

| Quarter | Number Taking Exam | Number Passing Exam |
|---------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Winter  | 13                 | 2                   |
| Spring  | 17                 | 1                   |

**Improvements:**

- Increased case emphasis in the curriculum.
- Revised curriculum to include more topics covered on CFM exam.
- Changed content of finance 421 to include more financial analysis.
- Developed a new course financial planning and analysis, to be offered in 2003.

**Assessment Report**  
July 1, 2002 – June 30, 2003

**PROGRAM ASSESSED:** Finance Major

**ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR:** Peter W. Bacon, Chair

**OUTCOMES ASSESSED**

- Outcome 1. Ability to solve financial problems
- 2. Content of Finance curriculum

**MEASURES EMPLOYED**

- Measure 1: Survey of graduating finance majors
- Measure 2: Assessment test
- Measure 3: Performance on CFA exam

**SUMMARY MATRIX**

|           | Measure #1 | Measure #2 | Measure #3 |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| OUTCOME 1 | X          | X          | X          |
| OUTCOME 2 | X          | X          | X          |

**Findings:**

Outcome 1: Graduating seniors rated the extent to which the finance program enhanced their ability to solve financial problems as a 4.2 on a 5 point scale. Performance on the nationally administered CFA exam confirmed that finance majors were able to solve financial problems. The WSU pass rate exceeded the national average.

Outcome 2: Graduating seniors rated the content of the finance curriculum as 4.0 on a five point scale but performance on the assessment exam identified several areas of weakness in student understanding.

**Improvements:**

- More attention given to refinement of learning outcomes in core courses
- Greater attention given to areas of weakness identified in assessment exam.

**Assessment Report Standard Format**  
**July 1, 2004-June 30, 2005**

**Program(s) Assessed:** Finance

**Assessment Coordinator:** Dr. Marlena Akhbari

**Year 2 of a 3 Year Cycle**

**1. ASSESSMENT MEASURES EMPLOYED**

Briefly describe the assessment measures employed during the year.

*What was done?*

- a. Specific test questions were developed to assess knowledge.
  - i. During the winter quarter of 2005 assessment marker questions were developed and included in the final exams of all finance majors in the Finance 311 course.
    - ? Marker questions were both multiple choice format and multiple part problem-solving questions.
  - ii. Marker questions were again employed in all Finance 311 classes during the spring quarter to document changes in performance.
- a. Graduate Surveys
  - i. In the spring of 2005 surveys were collected from 22 graduating finance seniors.

*Who participated in the process?*

The Finance Department Curriculum Committee is made up of the entire finance department faculty given the size of our faculty. Any faculty member teaching any section of Finance 311 participated in the administration of marker questions.

*What challenges were encountered?*

With a change in management from the chairman who helped to design the plan to a new chair, we had some difficulty operationalizing the plan. It is clear from these difficulties that the orchestration of the plan needs improvement.

**2. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS**

**FINANCE MAJORS**

We are assessing the following program objectives:

- ? Prepare individuals to understand, analyze, and manage the process of value creation.
- ? Prepare individuals to for entry level positions in business organizations or in a graduate school program.
- ? Prepare individuals for a process of life long learning.

This year we focused on three specific learning outcomes supporting these objectives:

- ✍ Use DCF methodology to value a company and/or a capital expenditure opportunity.
- ✍ Forecast a firm's future financing requirements
- ✍ Design an optimal capital structure

a. Marker Question Findings

Marker questions were included in Finance 311 classes during the winter and spring quarters. In the winter quarter the performance on individual multiple choice questions varied from a low of 41.4% responding correctly to 91.4% responding correctly. The multipart problem was completed with passing grades by 100% of the students taking the test with 10.34% receiving just a passing score, 36.21% a good score and 53.5% an excellent score. However, only 13/33 or 39.4% of majors received a score of 70% or better on marker questions. With a goal of 70% for finance majors we have clearly fallen short on the winter quarter.

The same outcomes were tested in the spring quarter Finance 311 classes with the following results. Performance on individual multiple choice questions varied from a low of 47.9% of students responding correctly to a high of 81.3%. The multipart problem showed a marked improvement with a 100% pass rate as before but 91.67% received an excellent rating and only 8.33% received a good rating, no simple passes and no failures. There was an improvement in the pass rate of majors on the marker questions to a 58.6% with a score of 70% or better.

Please see attached performance grid for more detail.

b. Graduate Survey Findings

Twenty-two graduating seniors were surveyed prior to graduation in May 2005. 82% of respondents were employed at the time, 33% of them in finance related positions. Two of the twenty-two respondents had hopes of obtaining the CFA designation.

In rating the overall quality of the program the following were rated at or near 4.00 on a 5.00 scale: relevancy of the curriculum, knowledge of the faculty, instruction received, and classmates indicating that several essential elements of the program are above average, but not outstanding on average. Facilities were also rated good but not outstanding. Advising was rated below average at 2.95 with average being 3.00. This might be due to the difficulty of using central advising to navigate the complexity of choices in the Department of Finance and Financial Services. We should cautiously observe this variable as we gradually switch to an even more complex curriculum that includes tracks in investments, financial management, banking and financial services. Placement also was rated a lackluster 3.43. Students mention a need for a RSCOB specific placement effort.

Students were asked to select a rating between 1(not at all) and 5 (extremely) for the level of importance of specific skills to a successful career. The highest marks were given to solving business problems, decision making skills, spreadsheets, thinking analytically,

interpersonal skills, and ability to use the internet with scores of 4.59, 4.55, 4.55, 4.52, 4.50 and 4.50 respectively. The Department of Finance and Financial Services appears to have enhanced the bulk of these skills at a level of above moderate and not quite to the same extreme as their importance with scores of 4.00, 3.77, 4.00, 3.95, 3.24, and 4.00 respectively given for enhancement. Note the one score that is the lowest is a 3.24 in interpersonal skills. The question was specifically about how the department's curriculum enhanced these skills and it appears quite logical that the finance curriculum does not address this particular skill as directly as say the management department's curriculum does. It is quite logical, however, that the department receives the highest marks in the area of applying financial concepts with a score of 4.09. The ability to use the library is of only moderate importance to the respondents and the department's contribution to their skills in this area is slightly below moderate.

Most students agree that their degree in finance has adequately prepared them for graduate study with an average score of 4.07, but it should be noted that these students are about to embark on graduate study and have not yet completed a program. Most feel their degree has had a positive influence on their career [average score = 3.93]; their current job performance [average score = 3.81]; and the skills demanded by their employer [average score = 3.81].

Overall there appears to be no glaring deficiencies in the eyes of our graduating seniors. Both advising and placement are areas of concern.

### **3. PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS**

We have established a Student Advisory Board in the year 2004-2005 and are in the process of establishing a Business Advisory Board. The Student Advisory Board has made several helpful suggestions about better communication with majors and potential majors that we will be implementing in the 2005-2006 year.

With the opening of the new MTC Technologies Trading Room, the faculty has revisited the curriculum and recommended the establishment of an investments track within the finance discipline. Course have been designed to cover gaps in investment training such as derivatives, fixed income securities, and advanced portfolio management and security analysis. These courses will begin in the fall of 2006. Faculty have also recommended various assignments within the curriculum that are designed to familiarize students with the Trading Room.

### **4. ASSESSMENT COMPLIANCE**

The learning outcomes assessed, assessment measures used, and the review of the findings are consistent with the Finance and Financial Services Assessment plan. We are, however, slightly off cycle and will rectify that in the 2005-2006 period.

### **5. NEW ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENTS**

As we have begun operationalizing the assessment plan, we find that marker questions can be better developed and perhaps timing of their administration improved. It is the observation of several faculty members that always administering marker questions

coincident with the final may not provide the best or fairest representation of our majors' accomplishments. Finals week is generally very hectic and some of the best students may choose not to prepare very well because the bulk of their grades have already been established. We are considering other testing options.

| <b>Summary of Marker Question Performance</b>  |                          |                             |                    |                              |                    |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Winter Quarter 2005</b>   |                          |                             |                    |                              |                    |
| <b>Panel A. The overall performance of all students taking the final with these 10 marker questions and the single multi-part problem.</b> |                          |                             |                    |                              |                    |
| <b>Question</b>  | <b>Topic</b>             | <b>Overall Performance</b>  |                    |                              |                    |
|  |                          | <b># Correct</b>            | <b># Incorrect</b> | <b>% Correct</b>             | <b>% Incorrect</b> |
| 1  | Primary Goal of the Firm | 50                          | 8                  | 86.2%                        | 13.8%              |
| 2  | WACC                     | 40                          | 17                 | 70.7%                        | 29.3%              |
| 3  | DCF                      | 37                          | 21                 | 63.8%                        | 36.2%              |
| 4  | MIRR                     | 30                          | 28                 | 51.7%                        | 48.3%              |
| 5  | AFN                      | 30                          | 28                 | 51.7%                        | 48.3%              |
| 6  | AFN                      | 28                          | 30                 | 48.3%                        | 51.7%              |
| 7  | AFN                      | 24                          | 34                 | 41.4%                        | 58.6%              |
| 8  | Capital Structure        | 38                          | 20                 | 65.5%                        | 34.5%              |
| 9  | Capital Structure        | 53                          | 5                  | 91.4%                        | 8.6%               |
| 10   | Capital Structure        | 33                          | 25                 | 56.9%                        | 43.1%              |
| Multi-part Capital Budgeting Question  |                          | # 1                         | #2                 | #3                           | #4                 |
| Scored on a scale of 1-4 (1=failed, 4=excellent)   |                          | 0                           | 6                  | 21                           | 31                 |
| Percent receiving this score   |                          | 0%                          | 10.34%             | 36.21%                       | 53.45%             |
| <b>Panel B. Ranges of Individual Performances for all Finance students in 311.</b>   |                          |                             |                    |                              |                    |
| <b>Winter 2005</b>   |                          | <b>% Correct –Market Qs</b> |                    | <b>Score on Multi-part Q</b> |                    |
| Student 1  |                          | 80%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 2  |                          | 60%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 3  |                          | 70%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 4  |                          | 90%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 5  |                          | 50%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 6  |                          | 70%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 7  |                          | 40%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 8  |                          | 40%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 9  |                          | 60%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 10   |                          | 50%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 11   |                          | 40%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 12   |                          | 70%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 13   |                          | 60%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 14   |                          | 50%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 15   |                          | 80%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 16   |                          | 50%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 17   |                          | 30%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 18   |                          | 60%                         |                    | 2                            |                    |
| Student 19   |                          | 50%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |
| Student 20   |                          | 30%                         |                    | 3                            |                    |
| Student 21   |                          | 70%                         |                    | 4                            |                    |

| Student 22   |                    | 60%                  |             | 4                     |             |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Student 23   |                    | 50%                  |             | 3                     |             |
| Student 24   |                    | 20%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 25   |                    | 60%                  |             | 3                     |             |
| Student 26   |                    | 60%                  |             | 3                     |             |
| Student 27   |                    | 80%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 28   |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 29   |                    | 70%                  |             | 2                     |             |
| Student 30   |                    | 90%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 31   |                    | 50%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 32   |                    | 80%                  |             | 2                     |             |
| Student 33   |                    | 50%                  |             | 3                     |             |
| <b>Summary of Marker Question Performance<br/>Spring Quarter 2005</b>  |                    |                      |             |                       |             |
| <b>Panel C. The overall performance of all students taking the final with these 10 marker questions and the single multi-part problem.</b> |                    |                      |             |                       |             |
| Question   | Topic              | Overall Performance  |             |                       |             |
|  |                    | # Correct            | # Incorrect | % Correct             | % Incorrect |
| 1  | DCF -MIRR          | 34                   | 14          | 70.8%                 | 29.2%       |
| 2  | WACC               | 26                   | 22          | 54.2%                 | 45.8%       |
| 3  | Capital Structure  | 24                   | 24          | 50%                   | 50%         |
| 4  | Capital Structure  | 36                   | 12          | 75%                   | 25%         |
| 5  | Capital Structure  | 39                   | 9           | 81.3%                 | 18.7%       |
| 6  | Financial Leverage | 30                   | 18          | 62.5%                 | 37.5%       |
| 7  | Forecasting        | 23                   | 25          | 47.9%                 | 52.1%       |
| 8  | Forecasting        | 33                   | 15          | 68.8%                 | 31.3%       |
| 9  | Forecasting        | 30                   | 18          | 62.5%                 | 37.5%       |
| 10   | Forecasting        | 38                   | 10          | 79.2%                 | 20.8%       |
| Multi-part Capital Budgeting Question  |                    | # 1                  | #2          | #3                    | #4          |
| Scored on a scale of 1-4 (1=failed, 4=excellent)   |                    | 0                    | 0           | 4                     | 44          |
| Percent receiving this score   |                    | 0%                   | 0%          | 8.33%                 | 91.67%      |
| <b>Panel D. Ranges of Individual Performances for all Finance students in 311.</b>   |                    |                      |             |                       |             |
| <b>Spring 2005</b>   |                    | % Correct –Market Qs |             | Score on Multi-part Q |             |
| Student 1  |                    | 65%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 2  |                    | 40%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 3  |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 4  |                    | 90%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 5  |                    | 55%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 6  |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 7  |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 8  |                    | 85%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 9  |                    | 60%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 10   |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 11   |                    | 55%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 12   |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 13   |                    | 70%                  |             | 4                     |             |
| Student 14   |                    | 85%                  |             | 4                     |             |

|            |      |   |
|------------|------|---|
| Student 15 | 90%  | 4 |
| Student 16 | 75%  | 4 |
| Student 17 | 65%  | 4 |
| Student 18 | 80%  | 4 |
| Student 19 | 65%  | 4 |
| Student 20 | 65%  | 4 |
| Student 21 | 45%  | 4 |
| Student 22 | 85%  | 4 |
| Student 23 | 50%  | 4 |
| Student 24 | 75%  | 4 |
| Student 25 | 55%  | 4 |
| Student 26 | 85%  | 4 |
| Student 27 | 85%  | 4 |
| Student 28 | 60%  | 4 |
| Student 29 | 100% | 4 |

**Survey  
Undergraduate Finance Major  
Spring 2005**

Dear Graduate,

This survey is part of a continuing effort to improve the design and delivery of our finance/financial services curricula. Your candid response to all questions with strong consideration for the students who follow you, would be greatly appreciated by both faculty and students alike.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What year did you graduate from WSU? 2005</b>   | Sex Male <b>36.36%</b> Female <b>63.64%</b>  |
| What was your primary major? Finance   | Secondary major, if any? varies  |
| What is your current employment status?<br>Full-time <b>23%</b> Part-time <b>59%</b><br>Not employed <b>18%</b>                    | If you are employed full-time, what is your current salary range?<br>_____ under \$20,000 _____ \$40,000-\$69,999<br>_____ \$20,000-\$39,999 _____ \$70,000-\$89,999<br>_____ \$90,000 + |
| If employed, is the position finance related?<br>Yes <b>33%</b> No <b>67%</b>  | Have you received an advanced degree?<br>Yes _____ No _____<br>If yes, please specify degree and year received. _____  |
| Have you applied for professional certification, such as CFP, CFA, CFM, or CMA? Yes <b>2</b> No _____<br>If yes, which? <b>CFA</b> |  |

**1. Reflecting on your undergraduate program at WSU, what is your assessment of the overall quality of each of the following? Number responding is listed beside each question. Average score at the right.**

|   | Very Poor |   |    |    |   | Average |   |   |   |   | Outstanding |   |   |   |   | Avg Score |
|---|-----------|---|----|----|---|---------|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----------|
|   | 1         | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5 | 1       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |           |
| Scale   |           |   |    |    |   |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   |           |
| a. Relevancy of finance/financial services curriculum | 0         | 1 | 4  | 14 | 3 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 3.86      |
| b. Knowledge of finance/financial services faculty    | 0         | 1 | 4  | 11 | 6 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 4.00      |
| c. Instruction in finance/financial services courses  | 0         | 0 | 6  | 10 | 6 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 4.00      |
| d. Your classmates                                    | 0         | 0 | 7  | 10 | 5 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 3.91      |
| e. Facilities   | 0         | 1 | 8  | 9  | 3 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 3.67      |
| f. Advising   | 3         | 3 | 9  | 4  | 2 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 2.95      |
| g. Placement  | 1         | 1 | 10 | 6  | 3 |         |   |   |   |   |             |   |   |   |   | 3.43      |

|   | 2a. How important are the skills and abilities listed in the left column to a successful career: |      |           |    |    | Avg Score | 2b. To what extent did your finance/financial services program enhance these skills and abilities: |      |           |    |   | Avg Score |
|---|--|------|-----------|----|----|-----------|--|------|-----------|----|---|-----------|
|   | Not At all   | Mod. | Extremely |    |    |           | Not At all   | Mod. | Extremely |    |   |           |
| Scale                                   | 1  | 2    | 3         | 4  | 5  |           | 1  | 2    | 3         | 4  | 5 |           |
| Interpersonal skills                    | 0  | 0    | 1         | 9  | 12 | 4.50      | 2  | 2    | 8         | 7  | 2 | 3.24      |
| Written communication skills            | 0  | 0    | 3         | 10 | 9  | 4.27      | 0  | 1    | 7         | 9  | 5 | 3.82      |
| Oral presentation skills                | 0  | 1    | 1         | 12 | 8  | 4.23      | 0  | 2    | 8         | 9  | 3 | 3.59      |
| Decision making skills                  | 0  | 1    | 1         | 5  | 15 | 4.55      | 0  | 2    | 6         | 9  | 5 | 3.77      |
| Leadership skills                       | 0  | 0    | 3         | 7  | 12 | 4.41      | 1  | 1    | 10        | 5  | 5 | 3.55      |
| Ability to deal with ambiguity          | 0  | 0    | 2         | 13 | 7  | 4.23      | 0  | 2    | 5         | 12 | 3 | 3.73      |
| Ability to work in teams                | 0  | 0    | 3         | 10 | 9  | 4.27      | 1  | 0    | 5         | 9  | 7 | 3.95      |
| Ability to think analytically           | 0  | 0    | 1         | 8  | 12 | 4.52      | 0  | 1    | 4         | 12 | 5 | 3.95      |
| Ability to think critically             | 0  | 1    | 1         | 9  | 11 | 4.36      | 0  | 1    | 4         | 12 | 5 | 3.95      |
| Ability to think creatively             | 0  | 0    | 3         | 12 | 7  | 4.18      | 1  | 2    | 4         | 10 | 5 | 3.73      |
| Ability to apply financial concepts     | 0  | 0    | 0         | 12 | 10 | 4.45      | 0  | 1    | 2         | 13 | 6 | 4.09      |
| Ability to solve business problems      | 0  | 0    | 0         | 9  | 13 | 4.59      | 0  | 1    | 5         | 9  | 7 | 4.00      |
| Ability to use the internet             | 0  | 0    | 2         | 7  | 13 | 4.50      | 0  | 3    | 6         | 7  | 6 | 3.73      |
| Ability to use the library              | 2  | 1    | 11        | 5  | 3  | 3.27      | 3  | 3    | 11        | 4  | 1 | 2.86      |
| Ability to produce spreadsheet analyses | 1  | 0    | 0         | 6  | 15 | 4.55      | 0  | 1    | 5         | 9  | 7 | 4.00      |

3. Please evaluate the following questions on a scale of 1=strongly disagree, to 5=strongly agree.

My undergraduate major in finance or financial services adequately prepared me for skills demanded by my employer.

|           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | AVG  |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|
| # of resp | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 6   | 3.81 |

In my current employment, I make use of the knowledge I acquired in my undergraduate education.

|           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5 | N/A | AVG  |
|-----------|---|---|---|----|---|-----|------|
| # of resp | 1 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 5   | 3.65 |

My undergraduate degree in finance or financial services has had a positive influence on my performance in my current job.

|           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | AVG  |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|
| # of resp | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 6   | 3.81 |

My undergraduate degree in finance or financial services has had a positive influence on my career.

|           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | AVG  |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|
| # of resp | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 8   | 3.93 |

My undergraduate degree in finance or financial services has adequately prepared me for graduate study.

|           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | N/A | AVG  |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|
| # of resp | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 7   | 4.07 |

4. What do you find especially useful about your finance or financial services major at WSU?
  - ? I feel more educated about financing in general, whether it be personal finances or for a company. I found investing and budgeting interesting and would feel comfortable investing myself.
  - ? I found the FIN 401 class very useful. Specifically, I found the investing project to be very interesting and useful.
  - ? The staff has always been wonderful and able to empathize- my coursework has been directly related to my job at a large bank.
  - ? Large corporations seem to value Finance as "the big picture". By having degrees in both accounting and finance I have more to offer my future employers.
  - ? I believe that having a dual major of accounting and finance will give me an edge against other applicants when trying to get a job.
  - ? The teachers know what they are talking and some are very helpful when confused with concepts.
  - ? So far ACC 307 and 308
  - ? Case study knowledge
5. What did you find either missing or lacking in your finance or financial services major at WSU?
  - ? I would have enjoyed more "real-life" scenario projects that I could better apply and learn from for my career.
  - ? I don't think that the advising in RSCOB is as good as it should be – sometimes throughout undergrad I wish I had more guidance.
  - ? Provide a wider range of finance electives.
  - ? I found that having a poor professor in 311 & 490 really hurt me and I don't believe I got the information I should have out of those classes.
  - ? Sometimes not enough teachers to pick from and no morning classes in 400 levels.
  - ? Nothing
  - ? More finance related courses.
  - ? CFA knowledge
6. What suggestions do you have for improving the program?
  - ? I believe the program offers students everything they need to prepare themselves for a career in finance if they choose classes effectively.

- ? Too much emphasis is placed upon student's writing abilities. More emphasis should be placed upon evaluating investments and applying financial concepts. I feel that at this point in our education, most of us will not advance our abilities by having writing intensive classes. This is not a downfall with the professor's but less writing intensive classes should be required, so we can focus on other things.
- ? Aid the finance club in becoming more visible and useful to the business college. Suggestions: attend the FMA national conference (all members), take field trips to local finance firms
- ? Have better professors available every quarter because I had no choice but to take the professor mentioned above.
- ? Some morning classes or afternoon.
- ? Offer certain classes more often eg. FIN 419.
- ? More placement help.

**Assessment Report Standard Format  
July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006**

**PROGRAM ASSESSED:** Finance Major within the Department of Finance and Financial Services

**ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR** Marlena L. Akhbari, Ph.D.

**YEAR 3 of a 3 YEAR CYCLE**

**1. ASSESSMENT MEASURES EMPLOYED**

Briefly describe the assessment measures employed during the year.

- a. Embedded test questions were developed to assess knowledge.
  - i. During all quarters assessment marker questions were developed and included in either final exams or exams throughout the quarter for the following courses
    - ☒ Finance 311: Learning outcomes a – e
    - ☒ Finance 418/419: Learning outcomes f-g
    - ☒ Finance 490: Learning outcomes h-i
    - ☒ Finance 401: Learning outcomes j-k
- b. All faculty teaching these courses participated in the same assessment process.
- c. The following changes were encountered:
  - i. Due to curricular changes the learning outcomes formerly tested in Finance 419 were moved to Finance 418.
  - ii.
    - ? What challenges (if any) were encountered?

**2. ASSESSMENT FINDINGS**

We are assessing the following program objectives:

- ☒ Prepare individuals to understand, analyze, and manage the process of value creation.
- ☒ Prepare individuals for entry level positions in business organizations or in a graduate school program.
- ☒ Prepare individuals for a process of life long learning.

This year we focused on all the learning outcomes supporting these objectives:

Graduates will be able to:

- a. Compute a weighted average cost of capital.
- b. Use DCF methodology to value a company and/or a capital expenditure.

- c. Analyze a firm's current financial condition.
- d. Forecast a firm's future financing requirements.
- e. Design an optimal capital structure.
- f. Identify and value real options in capital budgeting decisions.
- g. Use derivative securities to manage financial risks.
- h. Forecast foreign exchange rates based on international parity conditions.
- i. Hedge foreign exchange exposure using traditional hedging tools.
- j. Demonstrate an understanding of the functioning of various security markets.
- k. Recommend a portfolio that balances an investor's risk profile and return objectives.

a. Marker Question Findings

Overall market question performance ranged from only 25% correct to 100% correct on individual performance. Students scoring above 90% totaled 29 out of 116 tested or 25% of those tested. Students scoring between 80% and 89% totaled 39 out of 116 or 34% of those tested. Students scoring between 70% and 79% totaled 24 out of 116 tested or 21%. Students scoring between 60% and 69% totaled 12 out of 116 tested or slightly over 10%. Student scoring between 50% and 59% totaled 9 out of 116 tested or approximately 8% and students scoring below 50% totaled only 3 out of 116 tested or 2.6%. It is noteworthy that not all majors were tested on all learning outcomes because their participation in the program may have spanned several reporting years.

Overall performance by learning outcome was as follows:

| Learning Outcome          | Percent Scoring 3 or 4 | Average Score out of 4.0 |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| WACC                      | 56.3%                  | 2.44                     |
| DCF                       | 62.5%                  | 2.62                     |
| Financial Analysis        | 68.8%                  | 2.94                     |
| Financial Forecasting     | 81.3%                  | 3.25                     |
| Capital Structure         | 12.5%                  | 1.56                     |
| Real Options              | 100.0%                 | 3.50                     |
| Derivatives               | 93.9%                  | 3.24                     |
| Exchange Rate Forecasting | 90.0%                  | 3.17                     |
| Hedging Foreign Exch      | 62.1%                  | 2.93                     |
| Security Markets          | 95.1%                  | 3.65                     |
| Portfolio Construction    | 86.4%                  | 3.19                     |

From this review it is apparent that capital structure issues appear to be difficult for most majors along with the weighted average cost of capital but to a lesser degree.

### 3. PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Finance 418 became the required writing intensive course for the department during this period and its emphasis on both case work and writing has helped to reinforce the financial management curriculum at the junior level. Students have

received the change well and agree that this is an opportunity to apply concepts previously learned leading to a much higher understanding of the material.

#### **4. ASSESSMENT PLAN COMPLIANCE**

There was one instance in the Winter quarter in which a professor inadvertently discarded final exams before the date was collected for this assessment report. We are working on tightening all compliance but feel that this report is a good representation of the state of student performance in this major.

A second problem with compliance is that our graduate and senior surveys were not redesigned and administered in this period. We will attempt to adhere to this plan in the future as it will provide a different perspective on assessment.

#### **5. NEW ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENTS**

We continue to struggle with the best method of both delivery and data collection for this assessment plan and anticipate making some refinements in the not too distant future.

| Last Name  | a | b | c | d | e | f | g | h | i | j | k | Avg     |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| Student 1  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 2  |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 2 |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 3  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 0 | 37.50%  |
| Student 4  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 5  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 6  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 7  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 8  | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 75.00%  |
| Student 9  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 87.50%  |
| Student 10 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 87.50%  |
| Student 11 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 12 |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 83.33%  |
| Student 13 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 14 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 15 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 16 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 1 |   |   | 62.50%  |
| Student 17 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 60.00%  |
| Student 18 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 19 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 20 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 21 |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 |   |   |   |   | 100.00% |
| Student 22 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 23 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 24 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 25 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 65.00%  |
| Student 26 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 27 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 28 |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 |   |   |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 29 |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 91.67%  |
| Student 30 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 55.00%  |
| Student 31 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 2 | 75.00%  |
| Student 32 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 33 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 2 | 2 | 50.00%  |
| Student 34 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |

|            |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   |   |         |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| Student 35 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 36 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   | 4 |   |   |   | 100.00% |
| Student 37 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 38 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   | 3 | 1 | 3 | 62.50%  |
| Student 39 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 40 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   | 55.00%  |
| Student 41 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 42 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 4 | 3 |   |   | 4 | 93.75%  |
| Student 43 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   | 3 | 2 | 4 | 75.00%  |
| Student 44 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 45 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |   |   |   |   | 2 | 39.29%  |
| Student 46 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   | 2 | 2 |   | 50.00%  |
| Student 47 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 3 |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 48 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   | 2 | 3 | 66.67%  |
| Student 49 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 50 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 95.83%  |
| Student 51 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   | 4 | 3 | 4 | 91.67%  |
| Student 52 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 83.33%  |
| Student 53 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 79.17%  |
| Student 54 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 55 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 |  |   |   |   |   |   | 65.00%  |
| Student 56 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 2 | 50.00%  |
| Student 57 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 58 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 |  |   |   |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 59 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 60 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 87.50%  |
| Student 61 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 83.33%  |
| Student 62 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 3 | 2 |   |   | 3 | 68.75%  |
| Student 63 |   |   |   |   |   |  | 3 | 3 |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 64 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 87.50%  |
| Student 65 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 66 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 87.50%  |
| Student 67 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 68 |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 69 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |   |   |   |   | 3 | 53.57%  |

|             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |         |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------|
| Student 70  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 71  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 0 | 50.00%  |
| Student 72  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 73  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |   |   | 100.00% |
| Student 74  |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 |   |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 75  |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 |   |   | 4 | 3 | 81.25%  |
| Student 76  |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 |   |   | 4 | 4 | 93.75%  |
| Student 77  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 78  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 2 |   |   | 62.50%  |
| Student 79  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 87.50%  |
| Student 80  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 60.71%  |
| Student 81  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 75.00%  |
| Student 82  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 83  |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 83.33%  |
| Student 84  |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 87.50%  |
| Student 85  | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 92.86%  |
| Student 86  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 87  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 1 |   |   | 50.00%  |
| Student 88  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 2 | 0 | 25.00%  |
| Student 89  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 93.75%  |
| Student 90  |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 91  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 1 |   |   | 50.00%  |
| Student 92  |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 |   |   |   |   | 75.00%  |
| Student 93  |   |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 80.00%  |
| Student 94  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 95  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 96  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 97  |   |   |   |   |   | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 79.17%  |
| Student 98  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 2 | 75.00%  |
| Student 99  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |
| Student 100 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 93.75%  |
| Student 101 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |   |   |   |   |   |   | 100.00% |
| Student 102 |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 103 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |
| Student 104 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | 4 | 3 | 87.50%  |

|               |        |        |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |         |        |
|---------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|--------|
| Student 105   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          | 3        | 4        |          |          | 87.50%  |        |
| Student 106   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          |          |          | 4        | 4        | 100.00% |        |
| Student 107   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          |          |          | 3        | 3        | 75.00%  |        |
| Student 108   |        |        |        |        |        | 3       | 4        |          |          | 4        | 1        | 75.00%  |        |
| Student 109   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          |          |          | 4        | 3        | 87.50%  |        |
| Student 110   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          |          |          | 4        | 3        | 87.50%  |        |
| Student 111   | 3      | 3      | 2      | 4      | 1      |         |          |          |          |          |          | 65.00%  |        |
| Student 112   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          | 4        | 4        |          |          | 100.00% |        |
| Student 113   | 0      | 3      | 4      | 3      | 0      |         |          |          |          | 4        | 4        | 64.29%  |        |
| Student 114   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          | 4        | 4        | 4        | 1        | 81.25%  |        |
| Student 115   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          | 3        | 3       | 75.00% |
| Student 116   |        |        |        |        |        |         |          | 3        | 1        | 3        | 3        | 62.50%  |        |
| Sum           | 39     | 42     | 47     | 52     | 25     | 91      | 107      | 92       | 85       | 299      | 258      |         |        |
| Count if 4    | 4      | 4      | 4      | 8      | 1      | 13      | 10       | 8        | 14       | 57       | 34       |         |        |
| Count if 3    | 5      | 6      | 7      | 5      | 1      | 13      | 21       | 18       | 4        | 21       | 36       |         |        |
| Count         | 16     | 16     | 16     | 16     | 16     | 26      | 33       | 29       | 29       | 82       | 81       |         |        |
| Average Score | 2.4375 | 2.625  | 2.9375 | 3.25   | 1.5625 | 3.5     | 3.242424 | 3.172414 | 2.931034 | 3.646341 | 3.185185 |         |        |
| % 3 or 4      | 56.25% | 62.50% | 68.75% | 81.25% | 12.50% | 100.00% | 93.94%   | 89.66%   | 62.07%   | 95.12%   | 86.42%   |         |        |

|          |       |
|----------|-------|
| Max      | 100%  |
| Min      | 25%   |
| Mode     | 87.5% |
| 90 Above | 29    |
| 80-89    | 39    |
| 70-79    | 24    |
| 60-69    | 12    |
| 50-59    | 9     |
| Below 50 | 3     |
| Total    | 116   |

**B. Student retention rate (3A) – Not applicable**

**C. Number of graduates annually (3A)**

| 2005-2006 | 2004-2005 | 2003-2004 | 2002-2003 | 2001-2002 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 43        | 49        | 56        | 58        | 64        |

**D. Placement of graduate (e.g. employment, graduate study) (3A) – not applicable**

**E. Teaching effectiveness (3B, 3D)**

\*Students conduct teaching evaluations for the instructors based on a set of standard teaching criteria and provide specific teaching comments every quarter.

\*Students provide in-term feedback on instructors' teaching performance through the help of CTL (Center of Teaching and Learning).

\*Teaching Award is granted to faculty members based on teaching performance and student evaluations regularly.

\*Faculty members routinely attend workshops and training seminars on teaching improvement conducted by CTL (Center of Teaching and Learning).

\*Faculty members are distributed brochures on various instructional teaching tips delivered by The Professor in the Classroom semi-monthly.

\*Every faculty member keeps a copy of Teaching for Excellence Handbook. Featured books and video on teaching techniques are recommended to faculty periodically.

**F. Faculty productivity (e.g. , publications, grants) (4A)**

**Faculty Publications and Grants Since 2002**

| Faculty Member  | Rank                | Publications |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Khurshid Ahmad  | Associate Professor | 1            |
| Fall Ainina     | Professor           | 6            |
| Marlena Akhbari | Assistant Professor | 6            |
| Peter Bacon     | Professor           |              |
| Burhan Kawosa   | Instructor          | 1            |
| James Larsen    | Professor           | 13           |
| Nicolas Gressis | Professor           | 5            |
| Robert Sweeney  | Professor           | 6            |
| Carol Wang      | Assistant Professor | 1            |
| William Wood    | Instructor          | 0            |

### **G. Interrelations of program's teaching, research, service activities (3A-D, fA-C, 5 A-C)**

The finance discipline lends itself to an integration of teaching, research and service components. The bulk of the faculty's service activity involve interacting with professionals within the Dayton community and beyond. Many faculty members serve on boards for finance, real estate, financial planning, and insurance associations as well as serving as consultants for area firms within the same disciplines. Similarly most faculty write articles on topics closely related to the topics covered in the classroom.

### **H. Integration of technology into curriculum and instruction (3C)**

\*A state-of-the-art MTC Technologies Trading Center was established in 2005 to help students gain real world experience in investments. This room is used primarily for Finance and Financial Services classes that can benefit most from the various databases present there.

\*Electronic classrooms are arranged for various finance classes. These electronic classrooms are equipped with computers, ceiling projectors, sound systems, VCRs, DVD players and overhead projectors. Instructors benefit from this multi-media resources in delivering comprehensive concepts and improved teaching efficiency. A courtesy telephone is installed in each classroom. Hot-line number is provided in case the instructor needs immediate assistance.

\*Many finance and financial services professors are using WebCT and online library services to supplement learning materials for their classes.

\*Electronic spreadsheets requiring the use of finance related functions are required in many of the finance courses.

### **I. Description of how program ensures that it is always current 4C)**

\* Though the Department of Finance and Financial Services has not as yet formalized an Advisory Board, we have made good use of outside community advisors in the revision of our curriculum. Our close ties to both the IAFP and the CFA Society supplies us with well qualified professionals for this type of interaction. We all draw from the same sources for outside speakers for to our classrooms and to our department's very active Finance Club.

\*Faculty members focus their research and publish papers on topics of current issues that receive the most attention in finance and financial services.

\*Faculty members subscribe to top finance journals and WSJ to stay informed on current research and financial activity trends.

\*Faculty members regularly attend major national finance conferences where they present papers, discuss papers and exchange research ideas with other finance professionals from other schools.

\*Faculty members form an investment club, conduct professional financial analysis to obtain firsthand experience on security investments.

\*Faculty members also hone their skills through various consulting engagements that require up to date methods and skills.

**J. “comparative advantage” (e.g. distinctiveness in terms of students served, differentiation from programs offered at other regional institutions, strengths attributable to collaborative/interdisciplinary nature of program, etc.)**

Our programs within the Department of Finance and Financial Services are unique in several ways that provide us a comparative advantage. For example, we are the only program in the area that offers a CFA oriented curriculum within the Finance major. As a result of this focus our students are equipped to sit for the part one of the CFA exam upon graduation giving them an advantage over other graduates intending to pursue a career in investments.

Our MTC Technologies Trading Center also provides a comparative advantage for our program. Not only is the facility an award winning classroom setting, but also it allows our students to develop experience with several state of the art databases that are generally used in investment businesses. Our students have access to and required experiences with data services from Bloomberg, Valueline, Baseline, Morningstar and Ibbotson. This gives our graduates a distinct advantage as they begin their employment in the field.

**IV. Program Needs/Areas in Need of Improvement**

With the existence of the MTC Technologies Trading Center and its extraordinary resources we feel we are in perfect position to upgrade our curriculum to provide a CFA focus. To do this we feel the need to add at a minimum four new courses to our major offerings, namely, a course in derivatives, one in advanced portfolio management, one in financial statement analysis and finally a fixed income course.

The second major need for our department is the addition of faculty. With the above proposal and also with the retirement of Professors Bacon and Ahmad, we have a real need to hire at least one additional faculty person.

Finally we have a real need to continue to try to perfect and perhaps automate our assessment processes. Compliance is difficult if we do not take the necessary steps to automate some of this process.

## **V. Proposed Improvement Action Plan**

With regard to curriculum changes, we expect to conclude the approval process to add the courses outlined to our department inventory and expect to begin offering these courses in the Fall of 2006 continuing to through the Spring of 2007 at which point we hope to sponsor the CFA level 1 for at least 10 students. We intend to offer these CFA specific courses primarily in the evenings in hopes of also attracting local practitioners in need of the same preparation.

With regard to our need for additional faculty we will seek approval and attend the Financial Management Association's Annual Meeting in October 2006 in hopes of hiring the appropriate talent to join our faculty and support these new courses.

We expect to continue improving our assessment process. The expectation is that we will create several versions of marker questions from which a set will be selected and simply included in our final exams. We are also considering moving some points of assessment to courses later in our majors' program. These pertain to some of the most difficult topics and we feel perhaps students need more exposure to these topics to develop a firmer understanding.