CLIENT PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Chapter 3 assessment

Individual assessment rubrics (parts 1, 2, 3)

Each student will be assessed individually based on the completion and quality of their package. Students may collaborate to make decisions, reflect and justify, but each student must write in their own words and complete packages individually.

Part 1: Client consultation and investment strategy

RELATED LESSONS: LESSONS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Learning objectives:

- Explain the difference between DIY investing and using a financial advisor (L1)
- Identify key investment concepts (risk tolerance, time horizon, preferences) (L1)
- Analyze investment strategies based on a client's financial profile (L1)
- Evaluate pros and cons of DIY vs. advisor approaches (L1, L2)
- Communicate strategy using financial terminology (L1)
- Apply knowledge of investment fees and cost comparison (L2)
- Define investment vehicles (L3, L5)
- Match vehicles and account types to client needs (L3)
- Identify and explain direct vs. indirect investing (L5)
- Describe and compare investment styles (active, passive, systematic) (L4)
- Understand diversification (L5)

Part 1

Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
Step 1: Overall quality of reflection	Provides a clear, well-justified recommendation with thoughtful comparison of approaches. Effectively uses specific details from the client profile and fee cards. Clearly explains the fit and identifies realistic drawbacks with insight.	Makes a clear recommendation with appropriate reasoning. Refers to client profile and fees with some specificity. Identifies at least one relevant drawback.	States a recommendation with minimal or generic reasoning. Refers vaguely to client profile or budget. Drawbacks are vague or missing.	Recommendation is unclear, unsupported or off-topic. Little or no reference to the client's specific situation or fees. No meaningful consideration of drawbacks.

MONEY GAINS MAKING IT COUNT

Criteria	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
Step 2: Quality of account selection and evaluation	Clearly identifies the chosen account and thoroughly explains why it suits the client. Makes strong connections to the client profile (goals, risk tolerance, time horizon, etc.). Discusses multiple relevant advantages of the account type. Insightfully addresses drawbacks, linking them to specific client needs and limitations.	Identifies the account and explains the choice with some reference to the client profile. Describes at least one advantage of the account type. Mentions one drawback with some connection to the client's situation.	Chooses an account but gives limited or vague reasoning. Mentions an advantage or drawback without clearly connecting it to the client's profile. Lacks depth or clarity in analysis.	Account choice is unclear or not explained. No meaningful reference to the client profile. Advantages and drawbacks are missing, incorrect or unrelated to the client.
Step 3: Understanding of investment types and impact on client	Thoroughly explains the **benefits and challenges** of direct investing, with clear application to the client's profile. Insightfully discusses how using indirect investments (e.g., mutual funds, ETFs) would change portfolio **management effort, diversification** and risk, using specific, relevant examples.	Clearly explains most benefits and challenges of direct investments. Describes how indirect investing could affect portfolio management or risk, with some connection to client needs.	Gives a basic explanation of direct investment pros/cons but lacks client-specific analysis. Discussion of indirect investments is vague or underdeveloped.	Minimal or unclear explanation of direct investing. No real understanding of how indirect investments would affect management or risk. Client context is missing or misapplied.
Step 4: allocation logic and client fit	Allocations total 100% and clearly reflect the client's risk tolerance and goals. Each percentage is well-justified with specific references to investment characteristics and client needs. Shows strong understanding of risk-return tradeoffs.	Allocations total 100% and generally match the client's profile. Most choices are supported with reasonable explanations that consider investment characteristics.	Allocations may total 100% but show limited connection to the client's profile. Explanations are vague, generic or unbalanced across companies.	Allocations are incomplete, inaccurate or do not total 100%. Justifications are missing or show misunderstanding of risk and investment fit.
Step 5: Alignment of investment style with client profile	Clearly selects an investment style (active, passive or systematic) and provides a detailed, insightful explanation of why it fits the client's goals, time horizon and preferences. Shows strong understanding of the characteristics and implications of the chosen style.	Selects an investment style and offers a reasonable explanation that connects it to most aspects of the client's goals, time horizon or preferences.	Selects a style but provides limited or superficial reasoning. The connection to the client's profile is vague or incomplete.	Does not clearly select a style or explanation is unclear, irrelevant or missing. No meaningful connection to the client's profile.

MONEY GAINS MAKING IT COUNT

Part 2: Trade simulation + portfolio monitoring and performance

RELATED LESSONS: LESSONS 6 AND 7

Learning objectives:

- Understand and apply different types of stock orders (L6)
- Evaluate order execution and strategies based on market conditions (L6)
- Monitor portfolio over time using return data (L7)
- Calculate and analyze total return, including dividends (L7)
- Compare portfolio to benchmarks (TSX, S&P 500, etc.) (L7)
- Describe and assess volatility (beta, standard deviation) (L7)
- Make informed rebalancing decisions to manage risk and stay aligned with goals (L7)

Part 2

Level	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
Step 1: Understanding and justification of order types for client protection	Clearly identifies the most protective order type and thoroughly explains why it protects the client's money. Thoughtfully discusses which order type to avoid, with clear reasoning. Provides well-reasoned, client-specific recommendations for low-risk investors, explicitly linking all answers to client risk tolerance and protection strategies.	Identifies a protective order type with a reasonable explanation. Names an order type to avoid with some reasoning. Provides generally appropriate recommendations for low-risk clients, though some explanations may lack depth or specificity.	Mentions order types with limited understanding or vague reasoning. Recommendations for low-risk clients are incomplete, generic or only loosely connected to client risk tolerance.	Fails to identify appropriate order types or provides unclear, incorrect or unsupported explanations. No meaningful connection to client protection or client risk tolerance.
Step 2: Accuracy and quality of analysis of investment performance vs. benchmarks	Accurately identifies investments that outperformed or underperformed benchmarks. Provides detailed, insightful explanations using checklist points thoroughly. Demonstrates deep understanding by linking performance to dividends, price changes, market conditions and client context. Responses are clear, well-organized and fully address both better and worse performers.	Correctly identifies outperformers and underperformers. Gives reasonable explanations using some checklist points, though some details may be missing or less developed. Response addresses both better and worse performers with adequate clarity.	Identifies performance direction but explanations are superficial or vague. Uses few checklist points and shows limited understanding. Responses may address only one side (better or worse) or lack clear organization.	Misidentifies performance or fails to analyze adequately. Explanations are minimal, unclear or unrelated to checklist points. Responses are incomplete or off-topic.

Level	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
Step 3: Depth and clarity of risk reflection and portfolio analysis	Provides a clear, insightful explanation of how risk metrics (standard deviation, beta) influenced allocation decisions. Thoughtfully analyzes the relationship between higher-risk stocks and returns with strong evidence. Explains how volatility knowledge contributed to building a balanced, strategic portfolio addressing performance and diversification. Responses are detailed, well-organized and client-focused.	Explains how risk measures impacted allocation decisions with reasonable clarity. Analyzes the risk-return tradeoff with some relevant examples. Discusses how volatility understanding aided portfolio balance or strategy with moderate detail.	Addresses risk and allocation decisions superficially or vaguely. Risk-return analysis is incomplete or generic. Mentions volatility's role in portfolio strategy with limited insight.	Provides unclear, minimal or inaccurate explanations of risk influence, risk-return relationship or portfolio strategy. Responses lack coherence or connection to risk metrics.
Step 4: Understanding and justification of rebalancing decisions	Clearly explains reasons for rebalancing or not rebalancing specific accounts, demonstrating strong understanding of allocation shifts and their impact. Provides detailed, client-focused rationale linking decisions to risk management and goal achievement. Shows insight into how rebalancing maintains portfolio alignment and controls risk.	Provides reasonable explanations for rebalancing choices. Addresses client goals and risk management adequately but with less detail or depth. Shows general understanding of portfolio alignment.	Offers limited or vague reasons for rebalancing or not rebalancing. Connections to client goals or risk management are weak or unclear.	Fails to explain rebalancing decisions or provides irrelevant or incorrect reasoning. No meaningful link to client goals or risk.

Part 3 : Final reflection and presentation

RELATED LESSONS: ALL (ESPECIALLY LESSONS 1, 4 AND 7)

Learning objectives:

- Communicate investment learning clearly and effectively (L1)
- Reflect on investment decisions and client alignment (L1, L4)
- Evaluate portfolio decisions over time using key concepts (L7)

MONEY GAINS MAKING IT COUNT

Part 3

Level	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Developing	1 – Beginning
Step 1: Depth and clarity of portfolio performance and management reflections	Clearly explains which stock gave the better total return with strong reasoning. Thoughtfully analyzes the impact of dividends on returns. Demonstrates a solid understanding of how benchmarks help evaluate portfolio performance. Explains the importance of volatility in portfolio management with insight. Provides thoughtful ideas for future portfolio monitoring improvements. Responses are detailed, well-structured and client-focused.	Identifies better-performing stock and explains dividends' effect with reasonable clarity. Shows general understanding of benchmarks and volatility in portfolio evaluation. Suggests practical ideas for monitoring improvements, though explanations may lack depth.	Gives basic or partial answers with limited explanation. Connections between dividends, benchmarks, volatility and portfolio management are superficial or vague. Future improvements are mentioned but underdeveloped.	Provides unclear, minimal or incorrect explanations. Responses lack understanding or coherence, with little to no reflection on portfolio management or performance.
Step 2: Content, organization, clarity and visual design of presentation (group mark)	The slideshow thoroughly covers all required topics with accurate, detailed information clearly tailored to the client's needs and goals. Slides are logically organized with smooth flow. Information is presented clearly using effective headings and concise bullet points. Visuals (charts, tables, icons) are well-integrated and enhance understanding. Fonts, colours and styles are consistent, creating a professional, polished appearance.	The slideshow addresses most required topics accurately with relevant information. Organization is generally clear with mostly logical flow. Uses headings and bullet points effectively, though some slides may be cluttered or unclear. Visuals are used appropriately and style is mostly consistent.	The slideshow covers some required topics but lacks depth or detail in many areas. Organization and flow are inconsistent, with some slides hard to follow or cluttered. Visuals are minimal or poorly integrated. Text may be too long or formatting inconsistent, detracting from professionalism.	The slideshow is incomplete or missing many required topics. Information is often inaccurate or irrelevant. Slides lack clear organization and are confusing to navigate. Visuals are absent or distracting, with inconsistent or distracting formatting.
Step 3: Clarity, specificity and usefulness of peer feedback	Provides clear, specific and balanced feedback, including meaningful positive comments and actionable, well-explained suggestions for improvement.	Provides mostly clear feedback with positive comments and suggestions, though some parts may lack detail or specificity.	Gives feedback that is somewhat vague or general, with limited actionable suggestions or explanation.	Feedback is unclear, very general or missing; lacks positive or constructive elements or is unhelpful.