Instructor information

Your course instructor is a Regents Professor of Public Administration at the University of New Mexico and a practicing labor/employment arbitrator with the National Academy of Arbitrators, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, American Arbitration Association, US Postal Service/American Postal Workers Union, FAA/National Air Traffic Controllers Association, Pantex Guards Association/BWX, and the California State Mediation and Conciliation Service. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Southern California and M.A. from the University of California, Los Angeles. Zane has authored or co-authored ten books in areas of dispute resolution, labor-management relations and human resources management, as well as numerous academic articles and professional publications. He serves as a consultant and grievance hearing officer to a wide variety of public, private, and not-for-profit organizations and was a Personnel Hearing Officer for the City of Albuquerque from 1987 to 2012. Zane is a member of the Board of Directors of the Julius Rezler Foundation in Budapest, Hungary and Outcomes, Inc in Albuquerque.

Zane Reeves may be reached anytime at tzane@unm.edu and his web page is www.tzanereeves.com. Office hours are by appointment only.

Goals

This course is a graduate level introduction to the concepts, policies, and practices of federal, state, and local jurisdictions in human resource management and development, particularly among public agencies in the United States. It is an operating assumption that human resources management is not the exclusive purview of HR specialists. Rather, it is a critical function shared with line managers and supervisors in the public sector organizations.

Objectives

Students will be exposed to public human resources management as an systematic approach rather than exploring its fragmented or isolated components, i.e. performance appraisal, affirmative action, testing or labor-management relations. Personnel policy making is presented as a deliberate, systematic approach, not as a neutral activity practiced by personnel “technicians”. Students are encouraged to consider consequences or outcomes of personnel administrative decisions rather than techniques. Students are asked to weigh different personnel administration utilization options by criteria of employee morale as well as organizational productivity. Among others, students will also learn to apply the following types of specific administrative skills:

(1) To appraise employee performance by valid job-related standards rather than non-
job related criteria such as personality traits, social standing, or political activities.
(2) To provide balanced appraisal feedback, both positive and negative, to employees.
(3) To set up a performance evaluation system that enhances employee development while providing solid documentation.
(4) To understand and apply positive, corrective disciplinary concepts.
(5) To develop corrective policies and procedures that offer incentives for employee reform and rehabilitation.
(6) To appreciate the purposes and techniques of job evaluation.
(7) To set up a system for evaluating position reclassification requests.
(8) To compare the advantages and disadvantages of various compensation packages, and in particular “cafeteria” benefit options.
(9) To develop management philosophy, policies and procedures for monitoring employee leave programs.
(10) To utilize validated tests as predictors of applicant potential.
(11) To implement merit-based recruitment and selection concepts.
(12) To simulate and evaluate assessment centers as an alternative selection and employee development option.
(13) To construct fair and equitable techniques for resolving grievances in union and non-union work environments.
(14) To develop a basic understanding of pay equity (comparable worth) and its impact on personnel management.
(15) To understand how affirmative action goals, guidelines and timetables are set along with their major criticisms.
(16) To evaluate the merits of group preference versus individual merit in employee selection decisions.
(17) To implement procedures for minimizing gender harassment and other forms of discrimination in the work setting.
(18) To evaluate the struggle for merit-based personnel systems.
(19) To create a drug and disease-testing program that is judicially defensible.
(20) To plan and prepare for the workforce of the future.
(21) To write personnel policies that respect an employee’s privacy rights while on and off duty as well as define guidelines for employers.

In essence, the course combines emphases on theoretical issues of human resources management, the importance of policy making in motivating a more productive public bureaucracy, and the development of specific personnel administration skills. The topic of Labor-Management Relations will not be covered in this course because it is explored in depth in PA 527.

Methodology

The course will utilize a variety of learning opportunities during the times that we meet, i.e., lecture, discussion and case study analyses. Each student also will be responsible for completing case study assignment via email.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Thomson/Wadsworth.

Reeves, T. Zane, Power point handouts on human resource management (on ereserves).


**Course Outline/Assignments and Agenda**

**January 17: Course overview and case studies**

**January 24: Our Dynamic workforce**
- Public and private sector trends
- Family issues and the changing workforce
- Traditionalists, baby boomers, Xers & millennials
- Our Dynamic workforce: Seeds of trust or distrust?
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #28 (answer question #1 on p. 156)
  Reeves, case study #25 (answer question #1 on p. 133)
  Covey, pp. 1-40

**January 31: HRM: Planning, policies, procedures, feedback**
- HR strategic planning and contingencies
- HR management and dispute resolution
- Transforming the workplace
- Applying evidence-based policymaking
- Best (and worst) practices
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #18 (answer questions #1 & 3 on p. 102)
  Reeves, case study #20 (answer question #1 on p. 111)

**February 7: Merit, accountability, and politics**
- Public versus private sectors
- The Politically responsive bureaucracy
- Merit system reform
- Measuring HR system effectiveness
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #17 (answer questions #1 & 2 on p. 96)
  Reeves, case study #7 (answer question #3 on p. 43)
  Covey, pp. 41-124 (complete the questionnaire on pp. 50-53; score yourself and ask someone else to also rate you)

**February 14: Building trust in the workplace**
- Becoming your best boss
- Trust in the workplace
- Living with the worst boss
- Building trust, reputation, and legacy
- Visiting with Max & Max (film)
  **Readings:** Covey, pp. 233-284
  Reeves, Case study #8 (answer questions #1 & 3 on p. 49)
February 21: No class

February 28: Public employee ethics
  Ethics in the public service
  Professional ethics
  Ethical basis of trust
  Religious practices at work
  Cultural values versus universal ethics
  View Gandhi film clip
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #30 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 162)
                  Reeves, case study #26 (questions #2 & 3 on p. 141)
                  Covey, pp. 285-322

March 7: Job evaluation
  Techniques in information collection
  Desk audits and job descriptions
  Qualitative and quantitative techniques
  Reclassification abuse
  Comparable worth
  Americans with Disabilities Act
  Discuss film, “It's Not Just Important, It’s Wildly Important”
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #3 (question #3 on p. 19)
                  Reeves, case study #16 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 91)

March 14: Spring break

March 21: Selecting the right employee
  Recruitment, testing, and selection
  Interviewing
  Testing and performance predictability
  References and reputations
  Test validation
  Title VII and the burden of proof
  Recruitment plans & matrices
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #1 (questions #2 & 3 on p. 8)
                Reeves, case study #2 (questions #1 & 2 on p. 14)

March 28: Evaluating work performance without judging
  Purposes & contradictions
  Techniques & strategies
  Distortion tendencies
  Performance interviews
  Documentation for evidence-based evaluation
  Setting performance standards
  Choosing performance criteria
  View film clip “Stone”
  **Readings:** Reeves, case study #19 (questions #1-3 on p. 106)
                  Covey, pp. 125-232; prepare action plan on 231
April 4: Compensation
Are you paid what you are worth?
How much pay is enough?
Public vs. private comparability
Wage and salary surveys
Benefits and rights: Pensions, COLAs, and sick leave
Family and Medical Leave Act
Fair Labor Standards Act
View film clip “Teacher”
Readings: Reeves, case study #4 (question #3 on p. 25)
Reeves, case study # 5 (question #1 on p. 31)

April 11: Corrective and disciplinary actions
Adverse actions as management right
Progressive discipline & standards of proof
Negligent actions & tests of just cause
Documentation and interviewing
Legal framework and employee rights
Public employees’ tort liability
Readings: Reeves, case study #15 (questions #2 on p. 106)
Reeves, case study #24 (question #1 & 3 on p. 128)

April 18: Employee complaint and grievance resolution
Employee-based grievance review
Lock step grievance reviews
Hearing officers and fact finders
Mediation and conciliation
Arbitration
Constructive techniques
Readings: Reeves, case study #23 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 125)
Reeves, case study #22 (question #2 on p.118)

April 25: Negative discrimination at work
Gender discrimination and harassment
Gender stereotyping
Glass ceilings
Data collection issues
Legal framework and reverse discrimination
Gender bias and sexual harassment
Readings: Reeves, case study #14, (question #3 on p. 81)
Reeves, case study #13 (question # 2 on p. 78)

May 2: EEO, affirmative action and workplace diversity
Equal employment opportunity
Affirmative action and workplace diversity
EEO: Concepts and intent
Affirmative action plans
**Readings:** Reeves, case study #12 (question #1 on p. 72)
Reeves, case study #21 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 115)

**May 9: Handling gender harassment**
- Principles for investigation
- Intended and unintended harassment
- Investigating suspected gender harassment
- Case of the Cuddly Custodian

**Readings:** Reeves, case study #27 (questions #1 & 2 on p. 149)

**Criteria for Evaluation**

Students are expected to complete all course assignments in a professional and timely manner. Specifically, the evaluation criteria are as follows:

Case studies must be completed by specific dates. Students should prepare (typed) responses to the designated questions at the conclusion of each case study for submission and be prepared to discuss these cases in class. Response papers will be graded by: 1) the quality and depth of analysis, 2) expository writing style, 3) professionalism (grammar, spelling, and presentation), 4) and incorporation of outside readings. Response papers are due via email by 9 a.m. on the date indicated. Late papers will be accepted, but the grade will be discounted. Students who are absent from class will be expected to send papers on time by email.

A student will be randomly selected to lead a class discussion on the designated case study or students may volunteer (for extra credit) to lead a particular discussion. Student attendance is mandatory and full participation is expected. Students who are unable to complete course requirements because of illness or other justifiable circumstances may be allowed to take an incomplete grade in those cases where a major portion of the work has been completed (50%+).

Because this is a graduate course, students will be eligible to earn one of the following grades:

- **A+** Truly outstanding responses on all case studies, insightful participation in classroom discussion, and consistent attendance.
- **A** Excellent contribution on all case studies, solid participation in classroom discussion, and consistent attendance.
- **A-** Excellent contribution on most case studies, consistent participation in classroom discussion, and attendance at a majority of classes.
- **B+** Excellent contribution on a majority of case studies, consistent participation in classroom discussion, and attendance at most classes.
- **B** Solid contribution on a majority of case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion, and attendance at most classes.
- **B-** Solid contribution on at least half of case studies and through participation in classroom discussion and attendance at least half of classes.
- **C** Unacceptable level of performance on most case studies and inconsistent participation in classroom discussion, or spotty attendance.