



COLUMBIA  
BUSINESS  
SCHOOL

# **Marketing Core Courses**

B6601 Marketing Strategy

B6602 Managing Marketing Programs

B7601 Marketing Strategy (EMBA)

**Review by subcommittee of the  
Columbia Business School Executive Committee**

**Joel Brockner  
Garrett van Ryzin**

**January 2006**



# Information Gathering Process

Read course outlines and materials

Read course outlines from Wharton, Tuck, NYU, Stanford and Duke

Interviewed faculty teaching the course

Interviewed academic reps

E-mailed “downstream” faculty, in addition to those who teach the course

Course evaluations



# Overview

Taught almost exclusively by tenured or tenure-track faculty

Relevant content that is appreciated by students, but as always, room for (modest) improvements

Course content similar to other schools in our reference group

Positive evaluations, on balance

- occasional clunkers bring average down considerably
- similar evaluations in MBA and EMBA
- faculty rated better than the course, esp. in B6602



## Basic Course Structure

B6601 covers marketing strategy; B6602 covers marketing tactics (analyzing and managing marketing programs)

B6601 and B6602 are 6 week, 12 session courses  
B6601 taught in the second half of students' first term, while B6602 is taught in the first half of students' second term

B7601 (EMBA) combines the two into a full-term course



## Positive Features

- Blends quantitative and qualitative information as bases of decision-making
- Variety of instructional methods/materials
- Shows relevance of marketing to different types of managerial careers, not simply marketing managers
- High level of coordination within the two courses
- Great that one person teaches both (Hitendra Wadhwa)
- Favorable downstream views; “extremely well prepared”



## Potential for Improvement

- Build better connects between the two courses (separated by more than a month)
- More connections to the core strategy class (B6701)
  - how similar, how different?
- Ethics material worked better in B6602 than B6601
- Provide more of a roadmap for the course beforehand
- Statistics knowledge of students is spotty, particularly in EMBA; improve coordination with statistics
- Set the stage for PharmaSim simulation (in B6602) earlier (a bit “overwhelming”); change evaluation to allow for more learning by trial and error
- Fine tuning, more than a dramatic overhaul

# How Other Schools Teach the Course



COLUMBIA  
BUSINESS  
SCHOOL

1. Wharton – same length, two different modules
  - reverse order of ours!
  - simulation (II)
  - case – based, too (I)
2. Tuck – 9 weeks
  - use simulation
  - case emphasis
3. NYU – 13 weeks
  - qualitative and quantitative
  - topics quite similar
4. Stanford – length unknown
  - C's – customer, competitor, company
  - P's – product, price, promotion, and place
5. Duke – 6 weeks to cover both
  - C's
  
  - P's



## How Other Schools Teach the Course continued...

Vary in order and length, but the content and process are quite similar

“Columbia course copied by others”





## Course Evaluations (MBA)

Across 33 sections of B6601 taught from  
Summer 2002 to Summer 2005:

- mean professor rating = 4.2, mean course rating = 4.0
- median professor rating = 4.6, median course rating = 4.2

Across 36 sections of B6602 taught from  
Summer 2002 to Summer 2005:

- mean professor rating = 4.4, mean course rating = 3.9
- median professor rating = 4.45, median course rating = 4.0



## Course Evaluations (MBA) continued...

B6601 10/33 (30%) Professor rating  $< 4.0$ ; 12/33 (36%)  $\geq 4.8$

B6602 1/36 (3%) Professor rating  $< 4.0$ ; 6/36 (16%)  $\geq 4.8$

B6601 11/33 (33%) Course rating  $< 4.0$ ; 10/33 (30%)  $\geq 4.6$

B6602 15/36 (41%) Course rating  $< 4.0$ ; 0/36 (0%)  $\geq 4.6$

Hence, more variance in B6601 than B6602,  
especially in professor rating



## Course Evaluations (EMBA)

Across 16 sections of B7601 taught from Summer 2002 – Summer 2005

mean professor rating = 4.1, mean course rating = 4.0

median professor rating = 4.4, median course rating = 4.2