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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

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

B6601 11/33 (33%) Course rating < 4.0; 10/33 (30%) ≥ 4.6
B6602 15/36 (41%) Course rating < 4.0; 0/36 (0%) ≥ 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