

T. Zane Reeves, PhD
PA 525
Spring 2015

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

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

Goals

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

Objectives

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

- (1) To appraise employee performance by valid job-related standards rather than non-

job related criteria such as personality traits, social standing, or political activities.

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

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

Methodology

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

REQUIRED TEXTS

Reeves, T. Zane (2006) *Cases in Public Human Resource Management*, 2nd edition, Belmont, CA:

Thomson/Wadsworth.

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

Covey, Stephen M. R. Covey (2008) *The Speed of Trust: The One Thing That Changes Everything*, New York: Free Press.

Course Outline/Assignments and Agenda

January 17: Course overview and case studies

January 24: Our Dynamic workforce

Public and private sector trends

Family issues and the changing workforce

Traditionalists, baby boomers, Xers & millennials

Our Dynamic workforce: Seeds of trust or distrust?

Readings: Reeves, case study #28 (answer question #1 on p. 156)

Reeves, case study #25 (answer question #1 on p. 133)

Covey, pp. 1-40

January 31: HRM: Planning, policies, procedures, feedback

HR strategic planning and contingencies

HR management and dispute resolution

Transforming the workplace

Applying evidence-based policymaking

Best (and worst) practices

Readings: Reeves, case study #18 (answer questions #1 & 3 on p. 102)

Reeves, case study #20 (answer question #1 on p. 111)

February 7: Merit, accountability, and politics

Public versus private sectors

The Politically responsive bureaucracy

Merit system reform

Measuring HR system effectiveness

Readings: Reeves, case study #17 (answer questions #1 & 2 on p. 96)

Reeves, case study # 7 (answer question #3 on p. 43)

Covey, pp. 41-124 (complete the questionnaire on pp. 50-53; score yourself and ask someone else to also rate you)

February 14: Building trust in the workplace

Becoming your best boss

Trust in the workplace

Living with the worst boss

Building trust, reputation, and legacy

Visiting with Max & Max (film)

Readings: Covey, pp. 233-284

Reeves, Case study #8 (answer questions #1 & 3 on p. 49)

February 21: No class**February 28: Public employee ethics**

Ethics in the public service
 Professional ethics
 Ethical basis of trust
 Religious practices at work
 Cultural values versus universal ethics
 View Gandhi film clip

Readings: Reeves, case study # 30 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 162)
 Reeves, case study #26 (questions #2 & 3 on p. 141)
 Covey, pp. 285-322

March 7: Job evaluation

Techniques in information collection
 Desk audits and job descriptions
 Qualitative and quantitative techniques
 Reclassification abuse
 Comparable worth
 Americans with Disabilities Act

Discuss film, "It's Not Just Important, It's *Wildly* Important"

Readings: Reeves, case study #3 (question #3 on p. 19)
 Reeves, case study #16 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 91)

March 14: Spring break**March 21: Selecting the right employee**

Recruitment, testing, and selection
 Interviewing
 Testing and performance predictability
 References and reputations
 Test validation
 Title VII and the burden of proof
 Recruitment plans & matrices

Readings: Reeves, case study # 1 (questions #2 & 3 on p. 8)
 Reeves, case study # 2 (questions #1 & 2 on p. 14)

March 28: Evaluating work performance without judging

Purposes & contradictions
 Techniques & strategies
 Distortion tendencies
 Performance interviews
 Documentation for evidence-based evaluation
 Setting performance standards
 Choosing performance criteria
 View film clip "Stone"

Readings: Reeves, case study #19 (questions #1-3 on p. 106)
 Covey, pp. 125-232; prepare action plan on 231

April 4: Compensation

Are you paid what you are worth?
 How much pay is enough?
 Public vs. private comparability
 Wage and salary surveys
 Benefits and rights: Pensions, COLAs, and sick leave
 Family and Medical Leave Act
 Fair Labor Standards Act
 View film clip “Teacher”

Readings: Reeves, case study #4 (question #3 on p. 25)
 Reeves, case study # 5 (question #1 on p. 31)

April 11: Corrective and disciplinary actions

Adverse actions as management right
 Progressive discipline & standards of proof
 Negligent actions & tests of just cause
 Documentation and interviewing
 Legal framework and employee rights
 Public employees’ tort liability

Readings: Reeves, case study #15 (questions #2 on p. 106)
 Reeves, case study #24 (question #1 & 3 on p. 128)

April 18: Employee complaint and grievance resolution

Employee-based grievance review
 Lock step grievance reviews
 Hearing officers and fact finders
 Mediation and conciliation
 Arbitration
 Constructive techniques

Readings: Reeves, case study #23 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 125)
 Reeves, case study #22 (question #2 on p.118)

April 25: Negative discrimination at work

Gender discrimination and harassment
 Gender stereotyping
 Glass ceilings
 Data collection issues
 Legal framework and reverse discrimination
 Gender bias and sexual harassment

Readings: Reeves, case study #14, (question #3 on p. 81)
 Reeves, case study #13 (question # 2 on p. 78)

May 2: EEO, affirmative action and workplace diversity

Equal employment opportunity
 Affirmative action and workplace diversity
 EEO: Concepts and intent
 Affirmative action plans

Readings: Reeves, case study #12 (question #1 on p. 72)
 Reeves, case study #21 (questions #1 & 3 on p. 115)

May 9: Handling gender harassment

Principles for investigation
 Intended and unintended harassment
 Investigating suspected gender harassment
 Case of the Cuddly Custodian

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

Criteria for Evaluation

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

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

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

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

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