

## Minutes from April 3, 2008 EFC meeting

### Attending

Faculty: Ann Campbell, Jon Garfinkel, Nancy Hauserman, George Neumann, Mark Penno

Also attending: Chuck Whiteman, Mary Spreen

Meeting called to order at 2:35pm.

Previous minutes approved.

### New Business – CIMBA undergraduate and MBA program in Italy

#### Administrative Questions:

- 1) Faculty director would be here at UI – chosen individual TBD.
- 2) Marketing support stays in Kansas and is mostly student recruiting oriented.
- 3) Faculty support stays in Texas. Helps with general information and faculty decisions on whether to go and the issues they might face there.
- 4) All staff become UI employees, but are paid “out of” CIMBA funds.

#### UPO Issues:

- 1) Students admitted under what status? B9 might work. They will be non-degree students. Does this open the door to allow non-business or pre-business undergraduates to attend CIMBA? There appear to be plusses and minuses associated with this possibility.
  - a. A larger student pool to draw from increases the odds of significant undergraduate enrollment, and we make money on each credit hour taken by enrolled students.
  - b. The curriculum would likely need significant revisiting. Currently, courses appear to cater to juniors and seniors already admitted to the business college. Does this curriculum fit well with the other potentially larger pool?
- 2) Pre-requisites checked by admissions folks. Currently, it’s hand-checking.
- 3) Course admission criteria at CIMBA is currently higher than UI in general, but maybe a bit lower than Tippie (though that’s not clear).
- 4) CIMBA offers our choice of courses (long-run).
- 5) Slow(er) migration of UI faculty teaching in the undergraduate program there, because it involves a full semester commitment.
  - a. Mary suggested we would like a faster migration of UI faculty to teaching in the MBA program in CIMBA because it resembles HKG (2 weekends)

#### General Issues:

- 1) KT is one approach to problem solving. How “tied” to the program is this? It’s not clear. We might face difficulties reducing the “footprint” of KT / neuroscience of leadership / leadership breakthrough on the overall program.
- 2) A potential advantage is that this offers a “safer/easier” international experience for UI undergraduates that are less keen to experience Spain or London or another more “immersed” international experience.
- 3) The MBA program offers fewer advantages. It’s very small and a loss-leader.
- 4) CIMBA does the pricing, and our contract specifies that they cover costs and we net \$30 per credit hour. There’s a possible moral hazard problem here, where CIMBA might cut corners to reduce costs, given a certain level of tuition (approximately \$16,000 / semester for tuition, room and board). MBA program tuition (only) is \$25,000 for the degree period.

- 5) Kansas sends approximately 200 of their own students per year to the program. It might take some time for us to reach this number, reducing expected profits from the venture (at least in the early years). Alternatively, we might achieve this type of number (or even higher), if we pull students from outside the Tippie College of Business. However, this raises other issues. Will we need to adjust our course offerings to reflect different average student backgrounds?
- 6) Ostensibly, we control the curriculum. Certainly in the first year, courses are more likely to resemble what's been offered by CIMBA in the past. Later, how do we influence course content? Do we check the syllabi of non-UI based faculty that teach there? Do we provide syllabi and other course materials? Might there be copyright issues if we provide "note shells"?
- 7) Does KT "mesh" with UI pedagogy? Does it permeate all courses and/or project-work? Is it specific to certain courses? Are the conceptual underpinnings similar to what we teach at UI, and this is "just a label"?
- 8) How likely is AI (faculty curriculum coordinator on-site at CIMBA) to be flexible (along several dimensions)? For example, we would like more prominent mention of UI in advertising materials. We might also want to reduce the prominence of KT and/or the neuroscience of leadership in advertising materials.
- 9) What is the role of the consortium? We are told that "they support the program and send students". Is this simply another form of advertising or even certification? Michigan is a consortium member. It's not obvious that they send any students or that they provide any other support. Moreover, non-consortium schools can send students to CIMBA as well.
- 10) Lack of female faculty is a major concern.
- 11) This is a bit of a rush job. Many important constituencies were not consulted or only consulted at the "very end". UPO is a prime example. They will play a pivotal role if we sign the agreement, yet they were not consulted until quite recently. There a sense that UPO is somewhat ambivalent about this opportunity. It may be because they simply have not had time to fully digest the implications for them, nor to have all their questions and concerns addressed.
- 12) The Elected Faculty Council would like to reiterate its recommendation that the College develop a strategic plan for its international programs

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33pm.