T. Zane Reeves, PhD
PA 525
Spring 2016 (DSH 134)

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 Ph.D. from the University of Southern California and MA from UCLA. Dr. Reeves has authored or co-authored ten books in areas of Hungarian modern 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. 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 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 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 create a drug and disease-testing program that is judicially defensible.
r. To plan and prepare for the workforce of the future.
s. 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

January 23: Human resources management: An overview
      HRM, Personnel administration, & human capital development
      Resources to develop
      Phases of HRM
      HRM feedback and evaluation

January 30: Ethical considerations in off- & on-duty conduct
      Purposes of HR issue investigations
      Ethics in the Public Service
      Professional ethics
      Ethical considerations for investigators
      Cultural values versus universal ethics
      Readings: Reeves, Ch. I, "Deciding whether to investigate"
      Answer Discussion Questions for *"Molly O'Rourke's Stand"*

February 6: Preparing to investigate
      Finding the "facts"
      Collecting and weighing evidence
      Conducting a fair & neutral investigation
      Readings: **Reeves,** Reeves, Ch. II, "Preparing to investigate"
      Answer Discussion Questions for *"Trouble in Loboland"*

February 13: 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 Discussion Questions for *"Following in Solomon's Footsteps"*

February 20: Gathering reactive data
      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 Discussion Questions for *"Rowdy in Roswell"*

February 27: 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 Discussion Questions for *"Case of the Missing Chick"*

March 5: No class

March 12: 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 Discussion Questions for *"The Grinch who Stole Mardi Gras"*

March 19: Spring Break

March 26: 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 Discussion Questions for "*Making Dixie Cups*"

April 2: Investigating just cause
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*"

April 9: Disciplinary recommendations
Adverse Actions as Management Right
Progressive Discipline
Negligent Actions
Documentation and Interviewing
Readings: Answer following Discussion Questions for "*The Suspension of Nurse*

Kevin":
>> 1. Discuss the evidence, facts, and conclusions support of: a) upholding the five-day suspension, b) rescinding the suspension entirely, c) modifying suspension to a lesser discipline.
>> 2. Which witnesses were most and least credible to you?

April 16: Fact finding recommendations
> Making recommendations for disciplinary action
> Non-traditional disciplinary options
> Reform and rehabilitation
> Preparing appropriate recommendations
> "Nudging" the decision maker
> **Readings:** Reeves, Ch. IX., "Making Disciplinary Recommendations"
> Answer Discussion Questions for *"Culture Clash at Ramah Navajo"*

April 23: 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 Discussion Questions for *"Medical Marijuana in Coquille"*

April 30: 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 Discussion Questions for *Reasonable Suspicion in Gillette*

May 7: Investigating problems, not people
> Investigating for problem solving
> Formulating an investigative plan
> Avoiding the blame game
> **Readings:** Reeves, Ch. XII, "The Problem-solving investigation"
> Answer Discussion Questions for *"Phoenix Rising"*

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 specified dates. Students should prepare written responses to self-assessment exercises at the conclusion of each case study 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.