

**T. Zane Reeves, PhD**  
**PA 525 (DSH 132)**  
**Fall 2016**

**HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT**  
**SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**  
**UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO**

**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, California State Mediation and Conciliation Service, US Postal Service/American Postal Workers, Federal Aviation Administration/National Association of Air Traffic Controllers, and Pantex Guards Assoc. /BWXT Corporation. He received his PhD from the University of Southern California and MA from UCLA. Dr. Reeves has authored or co-authored ten books in areas of modern European history, dispute resolution, labor-management relations and human resources management, as well as numerous academic articles and professional publications. He serves as a 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. Dr. Reeves currently is on the Board of Directors of Outcomes, Inc., Julius Rezler Foundation of Budapest, Hungary, and the City of Albuquerque Personnel Board.

Zane Reeves may be reached anytime at [tzane@unm.edu](mailto:tzane@unm.edu). Office hours are made by appointment only for Saturdays.

**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. Particular attention is given to investigating human resources issues in public administration. It is an operating assumption that public personnel administration is an integral part of human resources management, but is not the exclusive purview of HR specialists. Rather, it is a critical function shared with line managers in the public sector.

**Objectives**

Students will be exposed to public human resources management as a 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 investigate and research consequences or outcomes of HRM decisions in addition to various techniques. Students are asked to weigh different HRM 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 HRM administrative skills:

- (1) To weigh competing ethical considerations in making HRM decisions
- (2) To investigate HRM issues by preparing an evidence-based plan.
- (3) To select a fair and neutral investigator
- (4) To collect and analyze reactive and non-reactive data
- (5) To develop sound interviewing skills for structured and non-structured interviews.
- (6) To make findings of fact based on evidence
- (7) To reach reasonable conclusions after considering facts
- (8) To make recommendations for action by decision makers
- (9) To appreciate the following HRM tools and techniques:
  - a. To appraise and evaluate actual employee performance rather than non-job related factors such as personality traits.
  - b. To provide balanced appraisal feedback, both positive and negative, to employees.
  - c. To set up a performance evaluation system that enhances employee development while providing solid documentation.
  - d. To understand positive and corrective disciplinary concepts.
  - e. To develop constructive personnel policies and procedures which minimize disciplinary problems.
  - f. To appreciate the purposes and techniques of job evaluation.
  - g. To set up a system for evaluating position reclassification requests.
  - h. To compare the advantages and disadvantages of various compensation packages, and in particular “cafeteria” benefit options.
  - i. To develop a management philosophy, policies and procedures for monitoring employee leave programs.
  - j. To implement merit-based recruitment and selection concepts.
  - k. To construct fair and equitable techniques for resolving grievances in union and non-union work environments.
  - l. To develop a basic understanding of pay equity (comparable worth) and its impact on personnel management.
  - m. To understand how affirmative action goals, guidelines and timetables are set along with their major criticisms.
  - n. To evaluate the merits of group preference versus individual merit in employee selection decisions.
  - o. To implement procedures for minimizing gender harassment and other forms of discrimination in the work setting.
  - p. To evaluate the conflict between merit-based & political appointee systems.
  - q. To plan and prepare for the workforce of the future.
  - r. 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 setting expectations for a more productive public bureaucracy, transforming the workplace and the development of specific management skills.

## **Methodology**

The course will utilize a variety of learning opportunities for students within the weekly analysis of case studies through lectures, discussion, and small group consensus building.

## Readings

Reeves, T. Zane (2015), *Preparing an Evidence-Based Report*, San Diego: Cognella Academic Publishing. Book may be ordered on-line through *University Readers Student Store* by creating an account (select UNM).

## Course Outline/Assignments and Agenda

### August 27: Human resources management: An overview

View & discuss film, “Max & Max”  
 HRM, Personnel administration, & human capital development  
 Resources to develop  
 Phases of HRM  
 HRM feedback and evaluation

### September 3: No class (labor day holiday)

### September 10: Deciding whether to formally investigate

Purposes of HR investigations  
 Ethics in public service  
 Professional ethics  
 Cultural values versus individual ethics  
**Readings:** Reeves, Preface and Ch. I, “Deciding whether to investigate”  
 Answer Discussion Questions for “*Molly O’Rourke’s Stand*”

### September 17: Preparing to investigate

Finding the “facts”  
 Collecting and weighing evidence  
 Conducting a fair & neutral investigation  
**Readings:** Reeves, Reeves, Ch. II, “Preparing to investigate”  
 Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Trouble in Loboland*”

### September 24: The fair and neutral investigator

Investigator competence and character  
 Purposes of the investigation  
 Organizational trust level  
 Employees as investigators  
**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. III, “The neutral investigator”  
 Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Following in Solomon’s Footsteps*”

### October 1: Crafting the skillful interview

Uses of reactive and non-reactive data in investigations  
 Structured and non-structuring interviewing  
 Preparing structured interviews

Knowns, unknowns, and known unknowns

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. IV., “Crafting the Skillful Interview”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Rowdy in Roswell*”

### **October 8: The Fact finding investigation**

Improving perceptual skills

Fact finding reliability

Beliefs as facts

Who is Bill Clinton?

Evaluating evidence

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. V, “Finding Facts”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Case of the Missing Chick*”

### **October 15: Inferring facts from evidence**

Confusing evidence as facts

What are *not* facts?

Distortion tendencies

Analyzing evidence for facts

Human biases

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. VI, “Inferring Facts from Evidence”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*The Grinch who Stole Mardi gras*”

### **October 22: Disconnects between facts and conclusions**

Separating beliefs from conclusions

Conclusions derived from personal experiences

Memory distortions

Making credibility assessments

**Readings:** Reeves, VII, “When Facts Don’t Add Up”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Making Dixie Cups*”

### **October 29: Investigating just cause: Jumping to conclusions**

Accusatory investigations

Role of intuition

Tests of just cause & Standards of proof

Non-disciplinary discharge investigations

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. VIII., “Jumping to Conclusions”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Power Surge in OKC*”

### **November 5: Suspension of Nurse Kevin**

Adverse Actions as Management Right

Progressive Discipline

Negligent Actions

Documentation and Interviewing

**Readings:** Answer following Self-Assessment exercises for “*The Suspension of Nurse Kevin*” (**This assignment will be distributed; there is no text reading assignment**):

1. Discuss the evidence, facts, and conclusions support of: a) upholding the five-day suspension, b) rescinding suspension entirely, c) modifying

suspension to a lesser discipline.

2. Which witnesses were most and least credible to you?

### **November 12: Making disciplinary recommendations in Fact finding reports**

Recommending disciplinary and corrective actions

Non-traditional disciplinary options

Reform and rehabilitation

Preparing appropriate recommendations

“Nudging” the decision maker

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. IX., “Making Disciplinary Recommendations”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Culture Clash at Ramah Navajo*”

### **November 19: Writing a persuasive report**

Format, style and presentation

Preliminary feedback

Handling remand and rejection

Timeliness issues

Writing persuasively

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. X, “Writing a Persuasive Report”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*The Coquille Medical Marijuana Case*”

### **November 26: Thanksgiving holiday**

### **December 3: Investigating harassment claims**

Four types of harassment claims

Designing a fact finding investigation

Making a recommendation for resolution

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. XI, “Gender Discrimination Investigations”

Answer Self-Assessment exercises for “*Reasonable Suspicion in Gillette*”

### **December 10: The Problem-solving investigation**

Investigating for problem solving

Formulating an investigative plan

Avoiding the blame game

**Readings:** Reeves, Ch. XII, “The Problem-solving investigation”

Answer the following questions for “*Phoenix Rising*”:

1. What creative plan of investigation would you propose to involve all stakeholders?

2. What problem-solving process would you apply?

3. What recommendations would you make?

### **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 turned in by specified dates. Students should prepare written responses to

self-assessment exercises at the conclusion of each case study (or elsewhere) for submission and be prepared to discuss these cases in small groups. 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 [non-assigned] readings and research. Response papers are due via email by 9 a.m. on the date of each class (tzane@unm.edu). 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 group discussion on the designated case study. 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%+).

Students will be graded by the following criteria:

- A+ Truly outstanding performance on all case studies, insightful participation in classroom discussion, and timely completion of all Self-Assessment assignments.
- A Excellent contribution on all case studies and through solid participation in classroom discussion.
- A- Excellent contribution on most case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion.
- B+ Excellent contribution on a majority of case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion.
- B Solid contribution on a majority of case studies and through consistent participation in classroom discussion.
- B- Solid contribution on at least half of case studies and through participation in classroom discussion.
- C+ Unacceptable level of performance on most case studies and inconsistent participation in classroom discussion.