

Graduate Council
CBS Deans Conference Room
March 6, 2015

I. Welcome – 11:48

Prayer - S. Johnson

Welcome COBA. Thank you all for attending. Single agenda item today.

I. Proposed MBA Online

Dr. Lytle –

Thank you council. Overview of our thinking then I'll turn over to Brad. Our reality is private schools struggling to stay in business. There are schools also thriving Belmont, Baylor and Samford. There are opportunities in the marketplace. To be a great College of Business must be attached to great university. No stand alone.

1) Proposition is an attempt for us to support University need to contemplate and design what future looks like; 2) time to probe market, desire to be AACSB program and distinctively Christian and 3) price point is \$25-30,000.

Dr. Crisp -

Highlighting how questions. Working professionals key audience; part time, reasonable completion, online. 2 years.

Profile of that person. Program outcomes on Leadership, Organizational innovation, Analytics, Faith & Ethics.

Proposed 36 credit hours, 27 required. First course in leadership. 5 courses in carousel. Second year required courses and electives. Electives could be offerings in COBA or other.

Marketability of MBA – Industry sector an important driver. Healthcare? Could be a Certificate 15 or 18 hours. Energy? Security? Lead teachers and facilitators meet AACSB and/or SACS requirements.

What makes this different in student's mind?

Concentrations, price point, opportunity to interact with Christian business professionals and leaders. Opportunities outside curriculum. Summit type experience. Interaction with committed Christians in the workplace.

Questions:

J. Camp – comment regarding competition with OD. Last year 71 admitted. 1 is COBA. 9 were ACU undergrads. In terms of impact unsure based on research 85% come from outside ACU. Question on Page 3 – appreciate attention to Christian vocation “MBA distinctive...roles.” Modification to include submitting my values and goals to Christ centered values and goals.

B. Crisp – we want to be clear about who we are and how Christian faith impacts these things.

R. Lytle – good point own values vs. God's values.

G. Bailey – course description nothing related to “Christian.” More explicit, with us it is a draw in our program.

B. Crisp – our intention to relate that in first course.

A. Little – piece we’ve thought through a lot. Promotional and course content side. Classroom vs. online. How to you not just say it but mean it. Open to suggestions as we think through and promote.

S. Johnson – with our existing people involved can speak to that. Our commitment would be to provide meaningful resources on Christian vocation and practice.

J. Camp – I’ll jump in on that discussion with integrating faith with online. We conduct exit interview with students – they say went into program for skills, did not expect for faith to be enriched. When asked to expand on that they mentioned certain books, discussion boards.

G. Bailey – marketing side, students want to know if asynchronous. Residency requirements. Online requires being more explicit. Articulate in assignments faith pieces.

K. Maxwell – in our program each course has faith read. Book that is carefully selected to go along with course content. Toward end of course assignment that includes references to book. Academic is blended with faith. The way you make sure it happens online is you choose lead teacher & facilitator very carefully. Course developer embed content into course. In our program lead teacher taught 1st course then cloned course given to facilitator as model. Clear with facilitators with model.

D. Snider – do you anticipate content experts to develop 27 hours?

B. Crisp -SMEs will be internal and external. Want to make sure courses up to our standards.

D. Snider -Adjunct developing content doesn’t know ACU culture.

S. Johnson – we’ve found developers in Ed. D high quality that are previous ACU grads.

D. Snider – secondly, as it scales out what is number students you think we can handle?

B. Crisp- with carousel model in place we think couple hundred students is possible. This is with anticipation for additional faculty to make this happen.

S. Johnson – Appendix C link shows carousel model.

A. Little – 285/290 not a prediction.

T. Milholland – concern limits international scope. Can’t say “worldwide.” Just another consideration.

S. Johnson – carousel on screen. Other thoughts or questions?

W. Paris – Page 10 section h “we anticipate program recoup” are you saying it becomes self sustaining at 86?

B. Crisp – that is the point at which it becomes cash flow positive. Making investments to get to larger number. 13-15 months seems reasonable. Upfront costs mostly course development.

S. Johnson – important distinction that if you’re building a plan on a larger goal you are building in investments.

W. Paris – what would you anticipate if you didn’t meet 86? What are potential losses? Ran numbers on potential revenue. Lose if less than 86, \$1500 per student.

B. Crisp – no, model is more complicated than I'd like. True breakeven number is lower.

J. Cardot – looks like cost is \$700/hour.

B. Crisp – yes

J. Cardot – what is estimated cost per facilitator?

B. Crisp – Lead will be overload and fulltime, Facilitator cost \$2500 approximately.

T. Milholland – credentials for facilitators?

B. Crisp – meet SACS requirement, Masters 18 hrs in discipline.

T. Milholland – role & % of role in lead teacher with facilitator – clear articulation of lead teacher (Phd) vs facilitator (never see lead teacher).

K. Maxwell – Lead teacher involved with posts, etc. Stipulations about how often facilitator is to be in the class. Be very clear.

J. Cardot – mess if student gets expectation that facilitator is hand holder.

T. Milholland – faculty credentials key, who is teaching and who does student think is teaching course.

J. Camp – more active role for lead teacher. Posting and comments.

G. Bailey – our courses are team approaches to leading.

D. Snider – lead teacher is also content expert until course is ironed out.

S. Johnson – ability to see interactions & measure outcomes. Different set of tools in online environment.

R. Lytle – encouraging. Do not want to reinvent. Thanks for input.

A. Huddleston – housed in Dallas. If online what's rush?

S. Johnson – we vend with Embanet with current programs. Marketing end we are building enrollment management team in Dallas. Highly visible, market to tap into workforce and to support learning outcomes. Strategic choice as we scale up with other key programs.

R. Lytle – reporting relationship with come back to COBA. From faculty and curriculum standpoint COBAs call in conjunction with Grad.

S. Johnson – partnership. Confident in dual reporting roles.

Action item. Asking council to move on proposal. Advantage in advancing is faculty meeting scheduled after spring break. Is some urgency.

S. Lewis – if council doesn't act today. We would mention in Faculty meeting.

Motion to approve?

J. Cardot – 1st

J. Camp – 2nd

Further?

In favor – 9 + Hope by proxy. Total of 10 yes.

Dr. Paris - abstain.

Motion carries and proposal recommended to faculty.

S. Johnson – encourage active role with colleagues with questions.

2nd March meeting –

17th or 24th?

Will meet again on 3/24.

Adjourn 12:55

Attendees:

Garry Bailey

Joe Cardot

Andrew Huddleston

Hope Martin

Becky Hammack

Jaime Goff

Donnie Snider

Susan Lewis

Rick Lytle

Brad Crisp

Joy Powers

Lauren Lemley

Jon Camp

Karen Maxwell

Wayne Paris

John Neill

Mark McCallon

Tom Milholland

Alison Hale

Andy Little

Stephen Johnson