

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
School of Public Administration

Fall Term 2017—PADM 553 035—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 Zoom hours and workshops.

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, will be four case analysis papers of 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.*

The course builds on students' capacity for reflective, communicative practice, as cultivated through the entirety of their MPA studies as well as practice. The overarching goal is to afford students an opportunity to integrate their academic and practitioner experience and hone their analytic skills.

The course is case-based. In writing case analyses in shorter draft form and then a long, final form, students will draw on knowledge and skills drawn from the MPA program—particularly in the major subdisciplines of general public management, human resources management, and fiscal and budgetary administration. They will also draw from selected public administration and policy readings in preparing written analyses of the cases assigned. The themes of leadership—in particular strategic leadership—and managerial and public ethics will be of central concern in this course.

Functioning much like a seminar, the course is intended to be a culmination of the MPA experience, helping develop students' critical-analytical skills, consistent both with *best practices* and with *core competencies* required in the discipline. It also aims to strengthen students' research and written communications skills in contexts of ethical and a professional public service. These competencies i (which translate into *student learning objectives*) centrally concern a deepened understanding of the following: (1) ethically-responsive performance accountability in government; (2) efficacious managerial decisionmaking in the context of public ethics; (3) effective approaches to the resolution of complex value and decisional conflicts in public management; (4) effective responses to institutional, resource-related, and normative constraints on public policy and administrative decisions today.

Among the case studies for this course are paired cases concerning indigenous (Native American) approaches to value-based strategic management, particularly as these concern resource-preservation issues. Gaining an appreciation for historic and current Native American struggles for autonomy and sovereignty is key in this regard, and for the application of diverse analytical and evaluative frames.

Course Materials:

All course materials, such as case studies and readings and instructor PowerPoint lectures are posted and frequently augmented or updated via 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, whether labeled “Syllabus,” “Case Studies,” “Readings,” or other headings.

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 (TA’s), and Graduate Assistants (GA’s) 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. There is also a link to the same site in a folder labeled APA on UNM LEARN, and an APA template, in a folder at the bottom of the LEARN webpage titled ‘On Using APA.’

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. In this course, it may result in failure in the given paper assignment and/or course, and it may also eventuate in appropriate disciplinary action, 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.

Paper revisions: Any of the subsequent three 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 and attached due date summary. Each paper submittal is to be proofread, clean, and in final form—it is not considered a *rough* draft. Both draft 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 based on instructor comments 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 terms. 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 identity or 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 in class. Class discussion allows for disagreement, but comments need to be sustained by evidence, in particular evidence from class materials and readings, not unsupported assertions of opinion, and never personal. Unnecessary interruption of others is also problematic. 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 issues is anticipated, but they do come up occasionally.

Though very unlikely, and certainly not expected, 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.

Important additional note: *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 result in a PR (‘In Progress’) grade for the course, until the student submits compensatory assignments and a final paper sufficient for a CR grade. That may require signing up for PADM 553 Propaper with Dr. Rivera for one credit hour, on an individual basis (Section 014), indefinitely, until the paper assignment is successfully completed.

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 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, the whole of your MPA studies, and your own intellectual exploration and independent reading) to your own professional experience. Insight is the key, along with clear and incisive communication of it on paper. So is compelling argumentation of whatever position you take regarding the case material. *As feasible, both short and long analytical papers are to include substantive, comparative reference to other case studies in the course.*

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 brief case analysis 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. The paper’s concluding section itself, once you are near completion of a paper, should be about a page in length and re-present key *findings* in the paper. The conclusion should not summarize the case itself, instead focusing on your key findings and, if applicable, recommendations.

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 case 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, as well as incorporated readings assigned for 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 on the case you select—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 closely adapt) the format found in posted examples of excellent case analyses from previous sections of this course. In looking at their approaches to case analysis organization, consider the underlying logic of presentation of analytical material. That factor—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 papers 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. 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 case study analysis may be provided. 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. Your selection of case study for your papers is obviously important.

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

Class 1. Wednesday, 8/23. **Introduction to the Course.** Discussion of the case method and of case analysis. Planning session for the course.

Class 2. Wednesday, 8/30: **Preparation for discussion of the *Ellen Schall* case. Lecture overview of case** (posted as a PowerPoint presentation on UNM LEARN). PowerPoint lecture. **Overview of other assigned cases for the course**, with consideration of posted PowerPoint presentation.

Class 3. Wednesday, 9/6: **Full class discussion of the Schall case and supporting readings. Read and discuss Case 1: *Ellen Schall and the DJJ*.** Recommended readings:

- Erakovich and Wyman, chapter 5 in Cox posted text, Section II, *Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*
- 553 2013 leading with ethics and values HKS.pdf, **required.**
- *Ultimate advocacy* (Schall and Vorsanger, 2001), **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 4. Wednesday 9/12. **Briefly conclude class discussion of the Schall case and transition to full discussion of the second case study, the *Ethics Case*.** Discuss the following reading: *Notes on reflective practice*, by Ellen Schall (required).

Class 5. Wednesday 9/19. **Conclude discussion of the second case study, *Ethics Case: What's Really Going On?* Brief transition to third case study, Budget Cuts (posted).** PowerPoint case

lecture (posted). Discussion of posted *required readings* from the LEARN folder titled *Classes 5-6: Supplementary Readings for "Ethics Case: What's Really Going On?"*

1. *553 Action and Inaction in Ethics*
2. *553 Some Paradoxes of Whistleblowing*
3. *553 The Civic Duty to Report Crime and Corruption*

Remaining readings from the folder *Supplementary Readings for "Ethics Case"* are *recommended* only and will be selectively discussed. These should be scanned by students, who may then read one or more of them closely, depending on their interests. These are additional resources which may be drawn on in writing a case analysis on this case study. Also recommended:

4. *553 2013 MORETOOLS HKS guide to management dilemmas_0.pdf*
5. *553 2016 accountability and ethics relationship Dubnick 2003*
6. *Accountability (internal & external).*

During this class, we will take some time to consider the Ethics case in relation to, in comparison with, the Schall case study. What are the points of similarity and difference between these two public managers? What was the ethical quality of the managerial approaches taken by them?

Class 6. Wednesday 9/26. **Full discussion of the third case study, *Budget Cuts*.** Posted PowerPoint/lecture: *PADM 553 Budget Cuts Case: Decisional and Value Conflicts.ppt*.

Required readings:

1. *Ethics in American Health 1.pdf*;
2. *Chapter 8, Macro-allocation, in Textbook of healthcare ethics.pdf* (entire textbook is posted in PDF format); and
3. *Ethical Conflict Decision Process in Healthcare Organizations.pdf*.

Class 7. Wednesday, 10/4. **Briefly conclude the Budget Cuts case and transition to full discussion of the fourth case study, the following set of Native American cases, *Preventing Drilling in the ANWR* (Gwich'in Case Study) and the *Santa Clara Pueblo Seeks Ancestral Lands & Sequel* (both are posted under the 'Case Studies' folder).** PowerPoint Lecture *553 Preventing Drilling PPT Presentation*. Required readings: *The Debate Concerning Drilling in the ANWR—Gwich'in & the Great Divide.pdf*. And *The Ethical Space of Engagement—Willie Ermine*. Additional readings to be assigned, for the Santa Clara case study.

First assignment due:

- **Monday, October 9: Due date for the first draft of the brief case analysis paper, by 5 pm, by email to Dr. Rivera, as specified earlier in the syllabus.** Students may write on their choice of a single case. For instance, they can write on the Schall case alone, in relation to corresponding posted readings and class lectures and discussion, on the Ethics case alone, or comparatively on both case studies. The same holds for the Native American case studies—they may be approached singly or comparatively. If writing a comparative paper, either case may be given principal focus, or both cases may be treated with equal emphasis. What is involved in a comparative case study analysis will be developed and reviewed further in class.

Wednesday, October 11: No class session. University Fall Break runs October 11-13.

Class 8. Wednesday 10/18: **Conclude consideration of final dual case study set**, *Preventing Drilling in the ANWR* and the *Santa Clara* case. Additional readings to be assigned.

Second assignment due:

- *Revised, clean brief case analysis (revised from the paper due October 9th) is due by 5 pm on **Friday, October 20**. Earlier submission is encouraged. If no revision or no substantial revision is required of a student for the October 9, s/he should submit an extended paper on this date, the 20th, of about 10 pages, if not yet a fully-realized long case analysis.*

Class 9. Wednesday 10/25. Planning discussion for final case study analysis assignment. Additional discussion to be focused on individual students' writing challenges and progress in approaching the final case analysis paper. The aim is to have students share their writing experiences with others and give and receive suggestions from their colleagues in class. Dr. Rivera will be available to work through any writing questions with students singly and in groups during scheduled class time.

Class 10. Wednesday November 1st. Review of all four case studies and corresponding assigned readings. Synthesis of theoretical/conceptual analytical frames from throughout the course. Discussion of papers in progress.

Third assignment due:

- *The near-final long case analysis paper is due by 5 pm on **Friday, November 3rd**. As final and polished a paper as possible, not a draft, and fully APA-formatted. Earlier submission of final papers is encouraged. This assignment is for a 12-15 page paper.*

Class 11. Wednesday, November 8. **No regular class.** *Optional* review session and writing workshop. Discussion of case analysis papers in progress.

The remaining session (November 15) will also be an optional one-hour workshop/consultation session, depending on student need, for those wishing to discuss the final paper they submitted that day, as well as paper review and other course logistics, and other matters of interest.

Fourth and final assignment due:

- *The final long case analysis paper, fully realized and building on earlier draft submissions approved by Dr. Rivera, is due by 5 pm on **Wednesday, November 15th**. This assignment is for a 12-15 page paper. Failure to meet this deadline with a paper that Dr. Rivera can approve and send to the other two readers may well mean that the student will not finish the course successfully this semester. Earlier submission of final papers is encouraged.*
- *Any paper submitted by this deadline, of November 15th, that is not found to meet course requirements/expectations will be returned to the student by Monday, November 20 with guidance in the way of instructor comments; a fully acceptable final revision consistent with those comments *must* be submitted to Dr. Rivera no later than **Friday, November 24th**, to have reasonable prospects for timely approval by committee this semester.*

Other important dates:

The *Thanksgiving Holiday* runs November 23-26.

December 16 (Saturday) is the final day of the semester, on the University's Academic Calendar. All Office of Graduate Studies reports of completed papers are due at OGS via online reports from all readers by the previous afternoon at latest. **All three readers forming the committee for each final case analysis paper must have read, approved, and reported on the given paper by close of business December 15.** This is why final paper submissions are required by November 15, to allow time for readers to evaluate papers, and for any revisions to final papers to be completed.

There will be no class sessions on or after November 22nd. If any final paper requires revision, in the estimation of any of the readers, it will require consultation between Dr. Rivera and the student, by email and/or office hours meeting at his main campus office, or a meeting over Zoom.

Appendix 1: A functional sequence for case analysis papers—adaptable subject to APA citation style

Sections	Guidelines
I. Abstract followed by Introduction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract should be one to two paragraphs in length, on the cover page of the report along with course number and your name—follow APA format. 2. Introduction should briefly identify the major problems, challenges, or general or specific issues facing the manager/key players and/or organizations involved. Briefly outline the major thrust of your analysis. One page to a page and a half.
II. Body: characterization of problems, issues, challenges, and/or 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. Body: 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 comprising the body of the paper, apply theories and models from the class readings, and, as applicable, readings from courses you've taken in the MPA program. If necessary include outside research sources, but class readings are to remain your primary sources. 3. Support conclusions and /or assumptions with specific references to the case and to these readings and sources.
IV. Body: 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, as critiques of the case protagonist's actions. 2. Evaluate the pros and cons of each alternative against the evaluative criteria you have identified. If the case does not lend itself to problem/solution identification, offer a broader critique of the protagonist's decisions/actions.
V. Conclusion	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a final case critique and analytical synthesis. 2. Address the problems and problem causes identified in previous sections. 3. Using theories and analytical frameworks from this and (if possible) 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—not a summary or trailing-off narrative but a critical/analytical synthesis of key arguments that you have made—whether these pertain to decisions taken by the protagonist(s), leadership qualities or managerial principles portrayed or considered in the case study, or other focal points of the case and your preceding analysis. 5. Ensure that the conclusion is a substantive recapitulations of the case analysis. It should be no less than three-fourths of a page in length, in several paragraphs, and may require a page or more to be well executed.

Appendix 2—addendum: Summary of course paper assignments and due dates, deadlines

1. *October 9—first assignment due:*

- **Monday, October 9: Due date for the first draft of the brief case analysis paper**, of 5-8 pages, by 5 pm, by email to Dr. Rivera, as specified in the syllabus. Students may write on their choice of a single case or on two cases, comparatively. For instance, they can write on the Schall case study alone, in relation to corresponding posted readings and class lectures and discussion, on the Ethics case alone, or comparatively on both case studies. The same holds for the Native American case studies—they may be approached singly or comparatively. If writing a comparative paper, either case may be given principal focus, or both cases may be treated with equal emphasis. What is involved in a comparative case study analysis will be developed and reviewed further in class.

2. *October 20—second assignment due:*

- Revised, clean brief case analysis (revised from the paper due October 9th) **is due** by 5 pm on **Friday, October 20**. Earlier submission is encouraged. If no revision or no substantial revision is required of a student for the October 9, s/he should submit an extended paper on this date, the 20th, of about 10 pages, if not yet a fully-realized long case analysis.

3. *November 3rd—third assignment due:*

- The near-final long case analysis paper is due by 5 pm on **Friday, November 3rd**. As final and polished a paper as possible, not a draft, and fully APA-formatted. Earlier submission of final papers is encouraged. This assignment is for a 12-15 page paper.

4. *November 15--fourth and final assignment—the long case analysis (12-15 pages) is due:*

- The final long case analysis paper, fully realized and building on earlier draft submissions approved by Dr. Rivera, is due by 5 pm on **Wednesday, November 15th**. Students who have written or presented on the given case(s) previously are expected to submit a 15 page paper, minimum. Otherwise, this assignment is for a 12-15 page paper. Failure to meet this deadline with a paper that Dr. Rivera can approve and send to the other two readers may well mean that the student will not finish the course successfully this semester. Earlier submission of final papers is encouraged.
- Any paper submitted by this deadline, of November 15th, that is not found to meet course requirements/expectations will be returned to the student by Monday, November 20 with guidance in the way of instructor comments; a fully acceptable final revision consistent with those comments must be submitted to Dr. Rivera no later than **Friday, November 24th**, to have reasonable prospects for timely approval by committee this semester.

*Note: December 16 (Saturday) is the final day of the semester, on the University's Academic Calendar. All Office of Graduate Studies reports of completed papers are due at OGS via online reports from all readers by the previous afternoon at latest. **All three readers forming the committee for each final case analysis paper must have read, approved, and reported on the given paper by close of business December 15.** This is why final paper submissions are required by November 15, to allow time for readers to evaluate papers, and for any revisions to final papers to be completed successfully.*