

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
School of Public Administration

PA 553, Summer Term 2016—Professional Paper Capstone Course

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

Class Meetings: Mondays and 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

Summer Office hours: By appointment, during workshop sessions, and right after class.

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 three to four case studies specifically chosen by Dr. Rivera to accomplish these aims. *Cases and all other course materials will be posted to UNM LEARN, so that there are no texts, course packs, or other materials to purchase.*

In discussing introductory cases and one more substantial, final case study, and in writing three 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 human resource management, public management, fiscal and budgetary administration, and accountable management. 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 will serve 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, as informed by student feedback. Therefore, student views on the course's success will be solicited in various ways, at semester's end.

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 the following: (1) ethical and performance accountability; (2) efficacy in addressing the linked challenges of diversity, globalization, and inter-organizational and cross-sector collaboration; (3) the ability to address institutional constraints and opportunities in the law, economy, and public policy; and (4) the ability to summon the information resources, methods, sensibilities, and commitments that are essential for efficacy in public service.

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.

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). This evaluation criterion will be explained fully in class and in the final syllabus along with the other evaluative criteria for the class. A novel feature will be a student peer-review process, so that several groups of three students will review, critique, and help revise each others’ work in draft form for the final case study.

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. Plagiarism, defined as presenting someone else’s work as one’s own, may result in failure in the 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.

Paper revisions: Each of the four case analysis papers may be submitted 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 draft.*** The

paper is to be a finished, proofed, version. It may be revised, rewritten, and resubmitted once (based on instructor comments on the first submission) by the dates provided in the final 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 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 the two course texts, 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. Your paper submission is *not considered a draft*, even when submitted for comments and possible revision. It is to be a closely edited, corrected paper that is as well executed with reference to these criteria as you can make it. As indicated previously, papers with excessive spelling and grammar, and expository writing quality and clarity, problems, will be returned without further comment for revision.

Only consistently excellent written work for the final ‘long’ case analysis will warrant a designation of ‘With Distinction’ rather than ‘Pass’ for the final Report of Examination submitted for each student at the end of the semester. These designations are standard for theses and dissertations and for the Professional Paper and similar capstone projects at UNM. Historically, only about one of ten or twelve Propapers at SPA has received the ‘With Distinction’ designation, which is therefore reserved for truly exceptional work. However, ‘Pass’ is sufficient for completion of the MPA and for graduation. These designations and expectations will be explained more fully to the class. It should be noted, however, that all four papers should exhibit excellent writing and analysis, and that consistently excellent work across the board will have a bearing on the final Pass or Pass-with-Distinction determination.

In order for a student to receive a ‘Pass 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—some ground rules for a positive classroom environment and experience:

We would 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 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 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 have 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. This includes 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.

However unlikely, breaches of this policy may result in administrative and/or University sanctions, including administrative drop of a student from the course. The instructor will not be interrupting class to correct or call attention to these kinds of problems if they arise unless it is necessary for the continued conduct of the class. No other notification will be required for any of these options to be taken up by the instructor. Stated more positively, we all owe one another consideration and respect, and positive regard, so that everyone can benefit from class interaction and therefore produce their very best work in this final class.

Case Analysis Guidelines

Case studies in brief:

For purposes of this course, a case study is defined as a carefully structured and delineated narrative reconstruction of events that presents essential information on the operations of a governmental or nonprofit agency in the context of a public management problem. The focal agency (along with key agency actors) is often cast as working in concert with other organizations across sectors in addressing the management problem, challenge, or crisis involved. The focus of the narrative and of the case analysis may therefore be a set of collaborative agencies. It may also be an entire array of decisions and actions rather than a single decision point or issue (more often the case with business administration case studies).

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, or 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 or to the UNM LEARN platform 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. 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, implementation obstacles, or other problems and challenges found in the case. Case writers generally (and specifically 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 what happened and why it 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 of 4-6 pages length. Again, the long case analysis may warrant selective incorporation of background and possibly also external (research) material.

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 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.’

You are being provided with several guides or sets of suggestions for carrying out a case analysis. Some are from business administration curricula or simply adapted to purposes, only partially overlapping with our own in this capstone course. 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 readings, class lectures, discussion, and materials, the whole of your MPA experience) 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:

As already suggested, with our public management cases the problem or problems and issues to be scrutinized may obtain within a complex of linked (often networked/collaborative) organizations, among themselves or with other organizations, community advocacy groups, or overseers—the possibilities are many. 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 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 Intergovernmental Administrative Problems, Program Evaluation, Comparative Public Administration, and Research Methods). 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 sourcing from one or another subdiscipline of public administration, though not likely all, while another case may elicit analysis that relies on different subdisciplines.

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 judgments on matters for which no information or data has been provided or secured in your outside research, depending on whether you are doing the short or long case analysis. Therefore, you should ask yourself, first and foremost, in each instance: What information is in the case that supports my critical observations, judgments, and conclusions?"

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 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?

Consider that you can learn a lot from your peers if you discuss their work and yours with them as fully as possible in class—class will in part serve as a forum for sharing drafts of written work with fellow students, so as to elicit their suggestions and constructive critiques. In this class, the instructor will work with you to devise various means of systematically sharing your analyses of the four cases, including use of UNM LEARN as a forum. It would be instructive to all in the class to have you share your work in progress with one another.

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, more or less 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. Several possible models are provided in the sections that follow. You may also use (or better, adapt) the format found in posted examples of excellent case analyses from the recent past.

In looking at these various approaches to case analysis organization, consider the underlying logic of presentation of your material. That consideration is of greater importance than the actual format used for a case analysis.

It should be recalled 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.

ONE RECOMMENDED FORMAT FOR CASE ANALYSIS PAPERS

<i>Sections (flexible)</i>	<i>Guidelines</i>
I. Abstract	<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 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.

Note on External Sources:

For the long case analysis in particular, consider identifying ten or more external sources, in addition to course materials. These additional sources should be referenced to back up your recommendations or to identify issues or to frame your analysis in the public administration and policy literature. This information would be ideally found in relatively recent journal articles and should reflect current public management thought or practice with respect to the issues identified.

Irrespective of format chosen, a case analysis should be prepared as follows:

- Include the sections listed in the outline above, or a similar sequence and structure that makes sense for you and for the given case
- Be double spaced, and the pages should be numbered
- Have 1inch 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, free of spelling, grammar, syntax, and expository quality and clarity errors
- Use APA citation style
- Present the executive summary on the first page of the assignment along with your name, course number and name (PADM 553, Professional Paper Capstone) and due date

Other submission requirements are specified elsewhere in this syllabus. All papers are to be electronically submitted (by email) as previously indicated. Please consult posted sample case analytical papers prepared by students in previous classes.

Important Note: In addition to the three case studies in the Reading and Assignment Schedule that follows, 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 studies. Any one of the three case studies in the schedule that follows may serve in individual instances as the ‘long case’ for purposes of completion of this principal assignment in the course, if the student has received a 5 ‘With Distinction’ in the short analytical paper on that particular case. Such a determination will require consultation with and approval from Dr. Rivera. This option will be explained in detail in class.

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

1. Monday, June 6. **Introduction to the Course.** Discussion of the case method and of case analysis. Planning session for the course.

Three-class sequence on Case 1, the Ellen Schall case:

Class 2. Wednesday, June 8: **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.

Class 3. Monday, 6/13: **First full class discussion of the Schall case and supporting readings.** Read and discuss the case study, Case 1: *Ellen Schall and the DJJ*. Presentation of video background material, “Ellen Schall on Creating Leaders of Color in the Social Sector.” Required reading: Read chapters 4, 5, and 6 in Section II of the posted text *Ethics and Integrity in Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* (Cox).

Class 4. Wednesday 6/15. **Final full class discussions of the Schall case and supporting readings.** Also read and discuss the following three additional posted readings: *Notes on reflective practice*, by Ellen Schall (required); 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); and *553 2013 How to Analyze a Case Study (Pathi).docx* (recommended).

Additional readings—

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

Additional posted Schall resources—recommended for possible use in case analysis (under folder titled “Additional Readings for the Schall Case”):

- *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*

When starting to write your Schall case analysis, consider the following student case papers as guides: *553 2013 Schall case summary and analysis example 1.doc*, *example 2.doc*, and *example 3.doc*.

Class 5. Monday 6/20. Transition to discussion of the second case study, *Ethics Case: What’s Really Going On?* (posted), with supporting readings. Read and begin discussion on the *Ethics Case*; lecture on the case (PowerPoint 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*

Recommended readings: Preparing an Effective Case Analysis; Accountability (internal & external).

- The Schall Case Analysis is due by the beginning of this class session, 6/29.

Class 6. Wednesday, 6/22. **Second class discussion of the Ethics case.** *Review readings to date; additional required 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*

Recommended: 553 2013 Sandfort & Stone JPAE summer 2008 policy fields 012908.doc

Class 7. Monday, 6/27: Conclude discussion of the *Ethics* case study, recalling the Schall case study as well. Begin consideration of 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*.

Class 8. Wednesday 6/29: Continue discussion of third case analysis, the *Budget Cuts* case. 553 Required reading: Shared health governance ethical paradigm.pdf (Ethics in American Health 2).

- The *Ethics Case Analysis* is due by the beginning of this class session, 6/20.

July 4: No class meeting because of the national and University Independence Day holiday.

Class 9. Wednesday, 7/6: Conclude discussion of the *Budget Cuts* case. Review of previous cases and consideration of final (long) case study analysis option, *Preventing Drilling in the ANWR* (the Gwich'in Native American governance case). Required readings: *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*.

Class 10. Monday 7/11. Final planning discussion for completion of the final case study analysis assignment. Final discussion of the *Preventing Drilling* case study option, with PowerPoint lecture. 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*.

- ***Wednesday, 7/13: The long case analysis paper is due no later than this class session. Earlier submission of papers is strongly encouraged. No formal class meeting, but Dr. Rivera will be available in the classroom for any consultation or discussion of the assignment that any student may wish to pursue. This is an optional meeting.***

Class 11, 12, 13, and 14. Monday July 18, Wednesday July 20, Monday July 25, and Wednesday July 27: Optional working/consultation sessions (of an hour to an hour and a half) for those working on revisions to the final case analysis paper. Dr. Rivera will be available in the ITV classroom for any questions concerning the conclusion of the course, the process of submission of revised final paper, and instructor reporting of final paper assessments to the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS).

Important note: Friday, July 29 is the last weekday of the summer semester (which ends Saturday July 30), and all Reports of Examination (on completed papers, if evaluated as either CR or CR With Distinction) are due in to the Office of Graduate Studies by close of business on July 29. All readers on student paper committees will need to sign off on their respective papers by this date.

The paper committees for the final case analyses (chaired by Dr. Rivera and including two other approved readers in each instance) will begin reading final paper submissions as they come in, with the absolute deadline for submission of the final paper being July 13th. Early submission of papers will allow the instructor more time to give helpful, constructive feedback such as will allow students to work at their best level. Early submissions therefore may have a better chance for 'Distinction.'

Final case analyses submitted on time that require a revision for a CR would be sent back to students with corresponding comments by Dr. Rivera by close of business on Monday July 18th. Revisions of the final paper are due electronically to Dr. Rivera, at marivera@unm.edu, *no later than* Wednesday the 20th of July by 5 p.m. Dr. Rivera and paper committee members will read and evaluate those revisions between the 20st and 25th of July and notify any students still needing to work on revisions and corrections/edits to their papers by COB July 25th. Successful revisions on papers turned back by the instructor by the 25th must be in by COB July 27, with July 29 being the deadline for their signing of the OGS forms.

Appendix: Analyzing a Case Study Strategically—Another Template

Important Facts—Notes from close reading of the case

Statement(s) of Principal Problems, Issues Posed by Case

SWOT Analysis (Optional)

Strengths	Weaknesses
Opportunities	Threats

Objectives (what you'd want your *critiques* to do for this organization and protagonist[s])

--

Alternative Solutions/critiques (for each problem identified)

List alternative solutions and/or critiques for each problem identified in the case

--

Conclusion/Recommendations

--