

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
School of Public Administration

PADM 553, Spring Term 2017—Professional Paper Capstone Course—Syllabus

Mario A. Rivera, Ph.D., Regents' Professor, UNM/School of Public Administration

Class Meetings: Wednesdays 7-9:15 p.m., Woodward Hall 149

Office location: Social Sciences Building, Room #3007

Telephone: Reception number is 277-1092; direct 505-750-4314; *E-mail:* marivera@unm.edu

Office hours: Fridays 3-6 pm or by appointment. Appointments are encouraged. There will be other availability during scheduled televised/online *workshop sessions* and right after each Wednesday's class, in the classroom and/or online (9-9:30 pm from the studio classroom via Zoom/video)

Graduate Assistant: Ryan Edgington, Ph.D.—email is ryanhist@unm.edu. Hours by appointment.

Scope and Purpose of the Course:

This course is a classroom version of the capstone, integrative final assignment for the MPA degree, the Professional Paper. It is intended to provide opportunities for all students enrolled to analyze case material and ancillary readings and to produce cogent, incisive, and insightful professional-quality critiques of agency, community, policy, and leadership challenges faced by public servants in the public and nonprofit sectors, as well as in cross-sector collaborative management. The vehicle for this exploration, to be undertaken through substantial written assignments and, complementarily, class discussion and group work, will be case analyses of four case studies specifically chosen by Dr. Rivera to accomplish these aims. *Cases and all other course materials are posted to UNM LEARN, so that there are no texts, course packs, or other materials to purchase.*

In discussing three introductory cases and one more substantial, final case study, and in writing short case analyses and a long case analysis corresponding to these, students will be integrating knowledge gained from their MPA course of study—particularly in the major subdisciplines of general public management, human resources management, and fiscal and budgetary administration. Students and the instructor will draw from their practitioner experience as well. Finally, they will both draw broadly from the extensive public administration and policy academic and applied literatures in preparing analyses and presentations of the cases assigned.

This course is unique in the history of the School of Public Administration (SPA). This class serves as a pilot for the eventual institutionalization of a capstone ProPaper course in SPA, subject to its evaluation by section instructors and the rest of the faculty, and as informed by student feedback.

Functioning much like a seminar, the course is intended to be a culmination of the MPA experience, advancing students' critical-analytical skills, consistent with *best practices* and core competencies required in the discipline. It also aims to strengthen students' research and written communications skills in contexts of professional public service in public administration. The competencies involved (which translate into course priorities) centrally include a deepened understanding of the following: (1) ethical and performance accountability in government; (2) ethical decisionmaking in the context of public ethics (3) complex value and decisional conflicts in public management; (3) institutional, resource-related, and normative constraints on public policy decisions.

Course Materials:

All course materials, such as case studies and readings and instructor PowerPoint lectures are to be posted to the UNM LEARN system. To access LEARN, students need to login to their My UNM accounts. From there, in the top right hand corner is an icon labeled “UNM LEARN.” It is located next to the “logout” icon. Once you click on that, you are in LEARN. From there, one just needs to click on the PADM 553 class under “My Courses” and then find the appropriate folder, labeled “Syllabus,” “Case Studies,” “Readings,” etc.

Important Accommodation Note:

Anyone requiring special accommodation or assistive technology is asked to advise Dr. Rivera within the first two weeks of class, so that reasonable accommodation may be provided. The School of Public Administration is committed to providing all necessary and feasible accommodation to students with disabilities so that they may fully participate in and contribute to their classes. Confidentiality will be maintained as indicated by the student’s circumstances. Please consult and make sure that you follow and meet the UNM Accessibility Resource Center documentation requirements for disabilities at <http://as2.unm.edu/students/current-students.html>

Title IX Compliance Note:

In an effort to meet obligations under Title IX, UNM faculty, Teaching Assistants, and Graduate Assistants are considered “responsible employees” by the Department of Education (see page 15—<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/qa-201404-title-ix.pdf>). This designation requires that any report of gender discrimination which includes sexual harassment, sexual misconduct and sexual violence made to a faculty member, TA, or GA must be reported to the Title IX Coordinator at the Office of Equal Opportunity (oeo.unm.edu). For more information on the campus policy regarding sexual misconduct, see: <https://policy.unm.edu/university-policies/2000/2740.html>

Course Requirements—Sources of and criteria for the final evaluation of student coursework:

Unlike your regular MPA courses, this course is graded just as the Professional Paper one-on-one course, and as are theses and dissertations at UNM, as CR (credit). Papers may be evaluated as meriting “Distinction” by their three-reader committees—‘With Distinction’ designations appear in student transcripts. Evaluation criteria will be explained fully in class and in the final syllabus, along with other evaluative considerations for the class.

The papers are expected, at minimum, to meet the standard of professional papers in practitioner contexts. *All research and reading sources must be acknowledged and cited using the American Psychological Association (APA) citation style—the citation style required for School of Public Administration professional papers.* A brief, free guide to APA citation may be accessed at the following URL: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01>. If the hyperlink does not work, cut and paste the URL to your web browser—this Purdue University webpage is regularly updated.

Acknowledgement of sources is essential, in order to avoid plagiarism. Although not expected, here is a standard definition: Plagiarism entails presenting someone else's work as one's own; it may result in failure in the given paper assignment and may also eventuate in failure in the course. If referred to the University Dean of Students, it may also eventuate in other disciplinary action including suspension or expulsion from the Public Administration program, or from the University. This is consistent with the University's student code of conduct as well as University and School of Public Administration policy.

Important case analysis paper submission requirements:

1. The papers must be submitted electronically in Microsoft Word to marivera@unm.edu.
2. Papers must be submitted to the instructor as attachments to an email with "553" in the subject line. Any papers submitted without the 553 identifier on the subject line may not be readily retrieved and may therefore not be evaluated in a timely way. Sample case summary/analyses, other sample papers, and other resources for presentations and papers are available on the class webpage and the UNM LEARN online blackboard system. This is so for both draft and final papers; any queries or drafts sent to Dr. Edgington must also be copied to Dr. Rivera.

Paper revisions: Each of the four case analysis papers may be resubmitted once based on the instructor's comments on the first submission, as indicated in the reading and assignment schedule below. Each initial paper submittal is to be proofread, clean, and in final form—it is not considered a *rough* draft. Both paper drafts and final papers are to be finished, proofed, versions to the very best of the student's ability. Draft papers may be revised, rewritten, and resubmitted once (based on instructor comments on the first submission) by the deadline dates provided in this syllabus.

The very best written-analysis and verbal-presentation work is accurate, evidence-based, clear, and creative, and of well-sustained, consistently high quality. Expository and analytical quality for written work includes a well-organized paper or essay, paragraphs that correspond to separate topics and subtopics, cogent sentences with appropriate use of adjectives and adverbs, correct syntax, and other basic elements of grammatical, effective, and polished analytical writing. Essential in this connection is concise, compelling, clear argumentation and analysis. Written work in every instance should draw on the case study under examination and course materials, as well as class lectures.

Correct grammar and spelling. Remember that the spell-checker function cannot distinguish, for instance, between *their*, *there*, and *they're*, or between *discrete* and *discreet*. Reread and edit your work (at least twice, preferably half a dozen times) before you hand it in. Again, paper submissions are *not considered rough drafts*, when submitted for comments and possible revision. Every paper is to be a closely edited, corrected study that is as well executed with reference to these criteria as possible. Please recall that papers with excessive spelling, grammar, typographical, and/or expository writing quality and clarity problems, will be returned with general guiding comments, for revision.

Only consistently excellent written work for the final 'long' case analysis will warrant a designation of 'With Distinction' rather than 'CR' (for 'Credit') for the final Report of Examination submitted for each student at the end of the semester. These designations are standard for masters' theses and dissertations and for the Professional Paper and similar capstone projects at UNM. Historically, only about one of ten Propapers and theses at SPA has received the 'With Distinction' designation, which is therefore reserved for truly exceptional work. However, 'CR' is sufficient for completion

of the MPA and for graduation. It should be noted, however, that all four papers are expected to exhibit excellent writing and analysis.

In order for a student to receive a ‘CR With Distinction’ designation for work in this course, *the instructor (Dr. Rivera) and the second and third readers in a course committee of three core SPA faculty will have to agree* it is warranted by the quality of that student’s work in the long case analysis but also in the shorter analyses submitted throughout the course.

“Safe Space” policy—ground rules for a positive classroom environment and experience: We all agree that classroom discourse must exhibit respect for all other persons, not only within the confines of the classroom but also in general. There can of course be no denigration of anyone (in relation to case materials or readings, videos, or any other point of reference), on account of race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, religion, or political perspective. In short, there is to be real consideration and courtesy in all our dealings and communications with one another.

Explicit statement of this policy is necessary to ensure that everyone feels comfortable and free to articulate ideas or viewpoints. Class discussion allows for disagreement, but comments need to be sustained by evidence, in particular evidence from class materials and readings, and not unsupported assertions of opinion, and never personal. Unnecessary interruption of others is also unacceptable. While this is probably an unnecessary admonition, students need to be aware that interruptions include carrying on conversations during class, checking cell phones or other electronic devices for messages, texting, and other distractions. None of these problems is anticipated, but they do come up.

Though very unlikely, serious breaches of this policy could result in administrative sanctions, up to and including administrative drop of a student from the course. Dr. Rivera will not ordinarily stop a class to correct or call attention to these kinds of problems if they arise, unless it is necessary for the continued conduct of the given class session. No other notification will be required for such sanction to be taken by Dr. Rivera. Stated positively, we all owe one another consideration, respect, and regard, so that everyone can fully benefit from class interaction and therefore produce their very best work.

Everyone is expected to participate consistently and positively in class, for everyone’s mutual benefit. Regular attendance is required (no more than three absences in regular class sessions—other than sessions designated as *workshops*). Excessive absences (more than three) from regular classes or the failure to produce passing course papers on time may eventuate in an administrative drop of a student.

Case Analysis Guidelines

Case studies in brief:

For purposes of this course, a case study is defined as a carefully structured and developed narrative reconstruction of events that presents essential information on the operations of a governmental or other agency in the context of a public management problem. It may also be focused on an entire array of decisions and actions rather than a single decision point or issue.

Case analysis in brief:

Things to keep in mind when analyzing a case study:

- Read the case carefully and make notes as to any terms which are unfamiliar, or portions that seem unclear, and especially of problems or issues which appear to be salient in the case

- Bring your questions and observations from your reading of the case to the next class meeting for everyone to consider; helpful suggestions may be forthcoming from the instructor or from other students.
- The material you will require to carry out your case analysis, in particular the ‘short ones,’ is in your case study text, class readings, and class lectures—additional research is not required in most instances, though you may bring in apt outside material provided it is fully credit and properly cited in papers. Additionally, some cases lend themselves to updating with just a modicum of web-based, follow-on research.

After reading and thinking about the case, identify major administrative issues, decisional challenges, ethical dilemmas, implementation obstacles, or other problems and challenges found in the case. Case writers generally (as in all of our case study selections) tell their story in such a way as to highlight these analytical elements—that is the reason the case is written in the first place.

It is not always necessary to offer a solution or solutions to the issues, obstacles, or problems posed in the case. In fact, it is seldom necessary to do so. What is important is to understand and explicate in the paper what key issue(s) happened and why they happened, to provide plausible reasons for the situations posed in the case, and to carry out corresponding critique and analysis.

In analyzing these issues, obstacles, or problems remember to look below the surface and go beyond simply describing what happened in the case. In fact, only in the long case analysis is there room for picking up selective summary (retelling) of such issues in the case. You are best served by going as directly as possible to the analysis of the case. This is certainly so with the ‘short’ case analyses, which are to be of 6-8 pages length, including end references. Only the long case analysis warrants and can accommodate selective incorporation of external research material. In the short case analyses, stress must always be on the case study as presented and on corresponding class readings and materials. The final case analysis needs to include these materials and may also incorporate outside research, with the emphasis remaining on class materials.

If you think you have a solution or set of solutions to the issues, obstacles, or problems entailed in/by the case, be sure to carefully consider unexpected or unintended outcomes of your proffered solutions. Please remember that many such concerns have no ideal solution; each potential solution has its own problems, costs, disadvantages, drawbacks, etc. What is most essential is that you provide a nuanced and incisive, critical analysis of what transpired in the case, as the case writer depicts it. To use a medical analogy, it is better for you to focus on diagnostics rather than prognosis, and it is seldom necessary to suggest a course of treatment for the ‘patient.’

What is essential for this course is how well you execute *your* critical written analysis. You will be carrying into your analytical effort everything from theoretical and conceptual frameworks (drawn from your class readings, lectures, discussion, and materials, and the whole of your MPA course of study, as well as the totality of your own intellectual exploration and independent reading) to your own professional experience and expertise. Insight is the key, along with clear communication of it on paper in incisive ways. So is compelling argumentation of whatever position(s) you take with respect to the case material.

Returning to case studies:

While business administration case studies are often drawn around strategic analysis or the study of a single firm, in public administration they focus as readily on decisional, programmatic, and/or policy dilemmas that require a more holistic, integrative analysis and evaluation. With our case studies, there are typically a number of problematic issues at work in each instance, although there may also be one that is particularly salient (a decisional or ethical dilemma, for instance).

In this course, we will study cases that lend themselves to *integrative* analysis. That kind of analysis is a stated purpose of the Professional Paper capstone in the School of Public Administration. What this means is that the student/analyst may and should draw widely and deeply from coursework in the MPA course of studies in major functional specialization areas (such as Human Resources Management, Budgeting and Finance) as well as in generalist areas (such as Public Management, Intergovernmental Administrative Problems, Program Evaluation, Research Methods, and Comparative Public Administration). Of course, each of you will summon analytical skills from the whole of your education and experience in bringing your best effort to the four case analysis papers.

The key determinant for any and all of the four case analysis writing assignments should be those elements of course coverage and of practitioner experience that can be logically brought to bear in a particular case study. Integrative analysis should come naturally, organically, with disciplinary sources (HRM, Budget and Finance, etc.) clearly identified or identifiable in some instances but not in others. Disciplinary integration should never be forced, but rather should be drawn naturally in the process of analysis. A particular case may prompt your bringing in sources from one or another subdiscipline of public administration, though not likely all, while another case may elicit analysis that relies on different subdisciplines or inter-disciplinary sources.

Some further pointers for successful case analyses are as follows.

Delimited analysis:

For the cases requiring short papers, you should limit yourself largely or solely to the information set out in the case. For the one case tied to a longer, end-of-semester paper, you can do outside research as necessary but should still rely principally on the material laid out in the case, along with any assigned readings that may complement your analysis.

Do not make speculative inferences or judgments on matters for which no information or data has been provided in the given case study and related course readings or that you have secured in your outside research. Rather, you should ask yourself, first and foremost, in each instance: What information is in the case that supports my critical observations, judgments, and conclusions? Bear in mind that case writers deliberately include and exclude information to come up with the given case study as it reads.

Looking for a leadership issues in case studies:

According to Fred David, in "How to Analyze a Case," the leadership kind of case study (common to our cases) . . . "is one which presents information on the leadership style of the [organization's] executive officer[s]." David continues by saying that "[i]n these cases, specific information is usually provided on the actions . . . that may have [have been taken]." These focal points include, among many possibilities, directed change in organizational culture, in organizational structure (i.e., change management), in human resource management practices, information systems, and the like.

David suggests that “the student-analyst is required to show an understanding of the rationale for each [one of several] separate strategic policies and actions [undertaken],” and how these policy decisions and actions have contributed or failed to contribute to the resolution of the problem(s) or challenges at hand, and how these reflect on the leadership capabilities of the manager(s) depicted in the case. David adds the following:

Be patient and *read the case through once* in its entirety before taking notes and trying to make judgments about the material that is set out in the case. After you have done that, push yourself to come to an understanding of why the author wrote the case . . . Asking yourself a series of questions will also help. For example:

- Does the case present a problem or series of problems to be solved?
- Does the case present an overview of the role of the [agency head or manager(s)] in bringing about change?
- Does the case present a more generalized view of the scope and content of the [policy arena or programmatic context the organization] is in?

Once you have come to a reasonable conclusion here, you can more readily absorb the case material and then analyze and present it cogently.

Other general suggestions adapted from the Fred David Guide and other sources:

If critiquing the decisions and actions taken by public managers, do not assume that they were entirely inept or did not know what they were doing. Most public managers have a reasonable, cogent basis for their decisions, even if they did not attain the result as anticipated. Do exercise critical analysis, but not to the point of caricaturing the protagonists in the case (unless the case writer has already caricatured them, which is unlikely). In other words, find constructive, incisive criticisms and articulate your arguments thoughtfully and thoroughly, marshalling evidence from the case, readings, and other sources to sustain your argumentation.

If the case analysis write-up is more general, with no particular or single problem to be solved, but rather a complex of issues to be addressed, provide a more comprehensive analysis of the case in its entirety. It may be, for instance, that public officials involved took technically-sustained decisions but failed to enlist community support, or they may have allowed “mission creep” to set in, or failed to think strategically, or any number of concerns. If so, look at the overall picture critically rather than try to unearth one overriding problem. All of the cases will be discussed in class, and part of the class discussion should tease out whether or not a case is leadership-connected, problem-oriented, or more comprehensive in nature.

Returning to David’s guide and framework:

Given all of the foregoing, we should assume that there is no one right answer to a case analysis—just as there is seldom a single question posed by a case study. At best, there are answers or solutions (plural) that are *reasonable* given the information in the case. But these are only reasonable if there is information in the case that can be used to back up your conclusions. This means, parenthetically, that you need to do check your paper draft occasionally (all papers should go through numerous drafts before being finalized). Compare the facts as presented in the material in the case with your completed analysis. Do the facts support your conclusions? Are you certain that you have thoroughly covered the issues in the case on the basis of evidence in the case?

Limited information in cases:

The reality of most cases is that they contain a great deal of information that is not as easily analyzed and understood as one would like. However, most case studies also leave out information, generally on purpose, and you may well be left wanting to know more about what occurred. Your own analysis may be similarly limited. Consulting with your colleagues in the class, informally in class discussion or even one-on-one or in group work, helps here. As David argues,

Any serious analyst brings his [or her] own background to the case study. If [s/he] is a finance person, [s/he will] look to the numbers first as a way of getting at the required case analysis [while an HR person will use that lens, etc.]... Since you are neither expected to, nor can you, in fact, know everything that you would like to know, getting into a work sessions with your peers can be a time-saving way of maximizing the learning process . . .

Case analysis formats:

While correct and consistent use of APA citation style will be required of all papers, there is some flexibility as to format in the shorter and draft case analyses—but the final case analysis must fully conform to APA style, from running heads to provision of an abstract, and the like. You may use (or better, adapt) the format found in posted examples of excellent case analyses from sections of this course in the recent past. In looking at their various approaches to case analysis organization, consider the underlying logic of presentation of analytical material. That consideration—key analytical point(s)—is of greater importance than the actual format used for a case analysis.

It should be stressed that all citations in the final case analysis *must* be in APA citation style. The OWL site will give you all you need to follow this requirement. Again, it is free and available at the following URL: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01>. If the hyperlink does not work, cut and paste the URL to your web browser—this Purdue University webpage is regularly updated.

Note on External Sources:

For the long case analysis in particular, consider identifying ten or more references, principally course materials but also (and judiciously) external sources. These additional sources should be carefully incorporated and referenced to back up your recommendations or to identify issues or to frame your analysis in the public administration and policy literature. This additional information would be ideally found in relatively recent peer-reviewed journal articles and should reflect current public management thought and practice with respect to the issues you identify in the paper.

Case analysis are to be prepared as follows (particularly so for the final, long case analysis):

- Paper must be double spaced, and the pages should be numbered
- Have 1-inch margins – top, bottom, left and right
- Use 12 point font size and any version of MS Word. Do not submit a PDF file.
- Analysis is to be closely proofread, and free of spelling, grammar, syntax, and expository quality and clarity errors
- Use APA citation style including formatting (again, consult posted papers and the OWL website). Further guidance and exploration of APA style will be provided in class.

Other submission requirements are specified elsewhere in this syllabus. All papers are to be electronically submitted (by email) to Dr. Rivera, at marivera@unm.edu in MS Word, with ‘553’ on

the subject line, as previously indicated. Papers are not submitted in any other way or to anyone else, although Dr. Edgington may be copied if desired. Please consult posted sample final case analytical papers prepared by students in previous classes as helpful guidance.

Important Note: In addition to the case studies in the Reading and Assignment Schedule that follows, additional options for the fourth and final, ‘long’ case study analysis are to be announced after the first class meeting. The instructor will consult with the class as to individual areas of student academic and professional interest in determining his choice of final case options.

Reading and assignment schedule; by class # and date (subject to revision in final syllabus):

Class 1. Wednesday, 1/18. **Introduction to the Course.** Discussion of the case method and of case analysis. Planning session for the course.

Three-class sequence on the Ellen Schall case, with overview/preview of all four course cases:

Class 2. Wednesday, 1/25: **Preparation for discussion of the *Ellen Schall* case. Lecture overview of case** (posted as a PowerPoint presentation on UNM LEARN). First-cut, general discussion of case material as presented in a PowerPoint lecture. **Overview of the other three assigned cases for the course**, through posted PowerPoint presentations.

Class 3. Wednesday, 2/1: **Full class discussion of the Schall case and supporting readings. Read and discuss Case 1: *Ellen Schall and the DJJ*.** Recommended reading: Erakovich and Wyman, chapter 5 in Cox text, in Section II of the posted text *Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*. Additional readings—

1. *553 2013 leading with ethics and values HKS.pdf, required.*
2. *Ultimate advocacy* (Schall and Vorsanger, 2001), **recommended.**

Class 4. Wednesday 2/8. **Conclude class discussion of the *Schall* case and transition to third case study, the *Ethics Case*.** Discuss the following posted readings: *Notes on reflective practice*, by Ellen Schall (required); and Ellen Schall, “Public-Sector Succession: A Strategic Approach to Sustaining Innovation,” *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (Jan. - Feb., 1997), pp. 4-10 (recommended).

Other posted Schall materials are *recommended resources* for possible use in case analysis (under folder titled “*Additional Readings for the Schall Case*”). Please scan these to identify ones you find helpful.

- *553 Schall case lecture notes--additional considerations following the PPT lecture*
- *553 Schall v Martin Fourteenth Amendment--Due Process and Preventive Detention of Juveniles*
- *553 framing and race Schall NASPAA_NYU_UCLA*
- *553 study of Schall and DJJ Innovation-in-the-Public-Sector-Gilmore-Krantz1*
- *553 Schall LEADERSHIP (RE)CONSTRUCTED*
- *553 Schall matching method to lens*

Class 5. Wednesday 2/15. **Discussion of the second case study, *Ethics Case: What’s Really Going On?*** with supporting readings. PowerPoint case lecture (posted): *Required readings*—

1. *553 2013 policy and managerial mapping HKS.pdf.*
2. *553 2013 MORETOOLS HKS guide to management dilemmas_0.pdf*
3. *553 2016 accountability and ethics relationship Dubnick 2003*

There is one recommended reading for the February 15 class: *Accountability (internal & external)*.

Class 6. Wednesday, 2/22. **Conclude discussion of the *Ethics* case and transition to third, *Budget Cuts* case.** Review readings to date; additional recommended readings:

1. *553 Big Questions in Administrative Ethics Cooper_Terry_L.pdf*
2. *553 policy analysis and mixed case approaches jpae 03_16n04_FosterMcBethClemons.pdf*
3. *553 2013 Sandfort & Stone JPAE summer 2008 policy fields 012908.doc*

Class 7. Wednesday, 3/1: **Discussion of the third case study, *Budget Cuts*.** PowerPoint/lecture: *PADM 553 Budget Cuts Case: Decisional and Value Conflicts.ppt*. Required reading: *Ethics in American Health 1.pdf*; *Chapter 8, Macro-allocation, in Textbook of healthcare ethics.pdf* (entire textbook is posted in PDF format); and *Ethical Conflict Decision Process in Healthcare Organizations.pdf*.

- *The first case analysis draft is due by 5 p.m., Friday March 3rd, at marivera@unm.edu*

The University's Spring Break is Wednesday March 8 to Monday March 13. No class on Wednesday, March 8.

Class 8. Wednesday 3/15: **Consideration of final (long) case study analysis option, *Preventing Drilling in the ANWR*** (the Gwich'in Native American governance case) as a comparative case study with another Native American governance case, *Santa Clara Pueblo Seeks Ancestral Lands & Sequel* (both are posted under the 'Case Studies' folder). What is involved in a comparative case study analysis will be developed and reviewed in class. Team taught by Dr. Ryan Edgington and Dr. Rivera.

Class/Workshops 9 & 10. Wednesday 3/22 and 3/29. Planning discussion for completion of the final case study analysis assignment. Additional discussion of the *Preventing Drilling* and *Santa Clara Pueblo* coupled case study options. Additional discussion to be focused on individual students' writing challenges and progress for the final case analysis. The aim is to have students share their writing experiences with others and give and receive suggestions from their colleagues in class. Required reading: *The Debate Concerning Drilling in the ANWR _Gwich'in & the Great Divide.pdf*. Drs. Rivera and Edgington will be available to work through any writing questions with students singly and in groups during scheduled class time.

- *Revised case analyses are due by 5 pm on Friday, March 31st.*

Class 11. Wednesday 4/5: Conclude review of the Gwich'in/Drilling case and companion Santa Clara Pueblo case.

Class/Writing Workshop 12. Wednesday, 4/12. Discussion of fourth case analysis papers in progress. Remaining classes (April 17 & 24) will be optional workshop/office hour sessions.

- *The long case analysis paper is due by 5 pm on Friday, April 14. Final, polished, APA-format paper, not a draft. Earlier submission of final papers is strongly encouraged.*

Appendix: ONE RECOMMENDED SEQUENCE FOR CASE ANALYSIS PAPERS

Sections (flexible)	Guidelines
I. Abstract and Introduction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One to two paragraphs in length, on the cover page of the report along with the course number and your name—follow APA format. 2. Briefly identify the major problems, challenges, or general or specific issues facing the manager/key players and/or organizations involved. 3. Briefly outline the major thrust of your analysis (a couple of sentences).
II. Characterization of Problems and/or Issue(s), Challenges, Constraints	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State the problems, issue, etc., facing the manager(s)/key person(s) and organizations involved; identify and link the symptoms and root causes of the problems or issues you have identified. 2. Differentiate short term from long term problems. Critique decisions and actions already taken, based on your own judgment as informed by the literature and course readings.
III. Causal Analysis	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a more detailed analysis of the problems identified in brief at the beginning of the paper, 2. In the analysis, apply theories and models from the class readings or readings from courses you've taken in the MPA program, and if necessary outside research sources. 3. Support conclusions and /or assumptions with specific references to the case and to these readings and sources
IV. Decision Criteria and Alternative Solutions or Solution Paths	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the (operational, ethical, or whatever) criteria against which you evaluate alternative solutions (e.g., alternative decisions, changes in the course of implementation indicated in the case, alternative or additional criteria or options based on your judgment and on readings) Include one or two possible alternative solutions, providing more than one whenever possible. 2. Evaluate the pros and cons of each alternative against the criteria you have identified. If the case does not lend itself to problem/solution identification, offer a broader critique of the case.
V. Conclusion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final critique should address the problems and causes of problems identified in the previous sections. 2. The recommended plan of action (if any) might include contingency plans and/or consideration of possible ramifications of these (secondary and tertiary consequences, possible unintended consequences). 3. Using models and theories and analytical frameworks from this or previous MPA courses, justify your recommended course(s) of action (if any) or why you offered the critique you did of decisions/actions taken. 4. Provide a comprehensive concluding analysis if not a problem-oriented case requiring options but rather a case presenting broader set of issues and implications—whether it pertains to leadership qualities or managerial principles, that may be as complex or more complex than a problem-oriented case study. 5. Conclusions need to be substantive recapitulations of the case analysis—key takeaways. They should be no less than three-fourths of a page in length, in several paragraphs.

