Lorange

Institute of Business Zurich

Executive Education and its Trends in the World

BMDA CONFERENCE, KAUNAS MAY 9, 2013

Peter Lorange President / Chairman Lorange Institute of Business Zurich

Starting Point: The University

- Discipline-driven; axiomatic focus (von Humboldt, 1809)
- Classical departmental structure, based on disciplines
- Positions (academic jobs), dictated by disciplines
- Doctoral programs
 - Discipline-based
 - And, as qualifier for academic positions



The University - continued

- Criteria for promotion / tenure:
 - Axiomatic-based research
 - «publish or perish»
 - Single-authored articles, refered, in axiomatic academic journals (Gordon and Howell, Ford Foundation, 1965)
 - «me, me, me»
- Teaching relatively less important
 - A «burden» to be minimized!
 - Standard courses; relatively little content changes over time; large co-horts; one-way lectures
 - «my course»



The Business School

- Many business schools came out of the University (perhaps, above all, the US)
 - Harvard HBS
 - Dartmouth Tuck
 - University of Pennsylvania Wharton
 - Berkeley Haas
 - University of Chicago Booth



But, many business schools evolved as independent entities, too.

- Particularly so in Europe
- And from a «Fachhochschul» tradition. School and job few-way learning!
- Examples:
 - Germany: Handelshochschulen
 - France: HEC
 - Switzerland: Hochschule St. Gallen
 - Scandinavia
 - Austria: Hochschule f
 ür Welthandel



And, traditionally a student typically went to business schools, to:

- Receive basic insights regarding various business conceps typically axiomatic!
- Receive a degree, typically prestigeous: Diplomkaufmann, MBA
- Become part of a (predominantely national) alumni network



But, what about today's students?

(Definition: Students = Participants = Customers)(Individual customers as well as organizations entities are customers)

A. The Relatively Young Students

- US
- Undergraduate in a basic discipline then MBA
- younger and younger participants
- Europe
- Business studies contain more-and-more basic materials
- Study time longer-and-longer



But, what about today's students - continued?

B. Experience-based individuals / executives

- Have at least 5 years of practical experience.
- (average age at the Lorange Institute: 38 ½ years)
- Have good full-time jobs, and want to keep them
- Starter modules; flexible
- And practical, discuss dilemmas; cross-disciplinary!
- Basics (axiomatic) can be studied through distance learning!



What about todays's customers – continued?

C. Corporations

- Europe is working harder-and-harder
- Also avoid «signals» that executive development would take time –
 and typically away from the job!
- Hence, starter modules
- With the best of pedagogy
- Often workshops, certificates, rather than E-MBA!
- Flexibility.



And, let us keep these three research findings in mind:

- 1. Research from fast-moving consumer goods (Lorange and Rembiszewski, 2013:
- Understand the modern consumer
- Then, innovate, to meet his/her needs (fast; relatively small)
- Then, communicate effectively (Social Media)

Result: You sell more, at a higher price! Top-line growth and bottom-line growth!

Implication: Education

2. No one can listen for more than 20 minutes. And, importance of involving a person!

Result: Faster, more effective learning!

Implication: Pedagogy

3. Effective learning is done with ample light, sufficient height under the roof, and in a context of beauty (Piaget)

Implication: Facility / Campus

Executive education and the business school of the future – Global Trends!

We are seeing several types of providers in this «space»

- traditional business schools
- «new» business schools, including privately owned ones:
 - Corporate Universities / Learning Centres
 - Appollo
 - Hult
 - Consulting firms (e.g. Mc Kinsey, ...)
 - Auditing firms (e.g. KPMG, ...)
 - Individual (or teams of) coaches / providers



Issues that shall count, to «win» the «business»:

1. Our curriculum

- A more integrated teaching approach, in line with our understanding the modern consumer and, how to pull off relevant innovations for the modern consumer, and how to communicate this to our target group – above all through modern social media
- Is this one course, not 3? (Marketing; Innovations; Communication)
- Do we have enough cutting-edge competence in each of these 3 areas with each seen in the context of the totality?

2. The students / participants / customers require

- They would typically want to keep their full-time jobs, and learn with us, in parallel! Positive power of this two-way learning.
- More focus on what is practical knowledge «how to do it»!

3. For our corporate customers

- Are more sparsely staffed than ever each person doing more! This is the reality of today's competitive climate
- Can only «afford» to send their employees to relatively short modules at the time, but often in a sequence
- Teams



Issues that shall count, to «win» the «business» cont.:

4. The issue of the latest regarding research and publishing

- Joint, interdisciplinary research
- Joint publications
- Not necessarily only in axiomatic journals
- Incentive system for faculty:
 - Broader than single-authored academic journal publishing!
 - Another key is relevant communication!
 - Hence, also books, more practitioner-oriented journals, web-based pieces, etc.
 - Teaching is perhaps equally key: research and teaching: two sides of the same coin!
- And, what about citizenship?
 - Work with students! (projects)
 - Work with corporations!
 - More modularized, shorter courses, within a more flexible overall curriculum structure
 - Keep the role of the traditional tenure professors as an in-house resource. More open networks!
 - Less administrative bureaucracy!



Issues that shall count, to «win» the «business» cont.:

5. The issues of organization, promotion and career

- So, why do we have all these axiomatic-focused academic departments?
- And, why do we keep tenure?
- And, why do we encourage a career to «work in the academic institution solely»?
 What about more of a pulsation: academia and practice?
- Are we too inward oriented? «We know best?» Imposing our own «correct answers», rather than dialogueing around dilemmas!?

6. The issue of competing with ourselves

- Let us keep in mind that we «own» our academic institution
 - Our main asset «only» value: the accumulated body of knowledge crossaxiomatic!
 - Building, balance sheet, etc. not critical true value!
 - Thus, this implies that we should work together «we, we, we»!
 - So, do we have individuals at our academic institution that might be offering their own competences, on their own? I.e. are some of us acting in an extreme «me, me, me» way regarding this?
 - So, a «we, we, we» philosophy in outside work is more than:
 - a «one day per week» consulting allowance
 - A prior approval policy!
 - -> It is a committment to building our school!



Issues that shall count, to «win» the «business» cont.:

7. The issue of teaching.

- Several professors, with complementary competences involved together, not «my» course!
 - e.g.: marketing / innovation / communication
 - finance / psychology
 - logistics / cycles / organizational behaviours
- Also include experts from outside practitioners as well as visiting professors
- I.e. a network of teaching competences, rather than exclusive, typically in-house, resources / professors



Conclusions

- Executive education and its trends in the world can take place in many ways and in different contexts
- Key success factors: Speed, adaptability, practical. But rigorous / research-based.
- We are back to much more networked ways of thinking and executing!

