

HIED 66655: Case Studies in Higher Education Administration
Kent State University
Spring 2011

Wednesday, 11 am – 1:45 pm * section 002 (CRN 13133) * 216 white hall

Instructor:

Dr. Susan V. Iverson, assistant professor
Higher Education Administration and Student Personnel
College of Education, Health, & Human Services
Office: 411C White Hall E-mail: siverson@kent.edu

Office hours are Wednesdays, 2-5 pm. Students are invited to also arrange appointments at other times; contact instructor via email.

Syllabus

Course Overview and Rationale

This course integrates concepts and skills addressed throughout the M.Ed. program in Higher Education Administration and Student Personnel (HIED). It affords students the opportunity to develop and improve decision-making skills and to increase understanding of concepts and current practices in student affairs and higher education administration. The class aims to assist in clarifying thinking and values about individual and collective actions in higher education and to polish the ability to communicate that analysis both orally and in writing. Students are expected to share responsibility for collaborative problem-solving involving complex issues in student development and higher educational leadership by involving others in discussing ideas, problems, strategies, and assisting them in clarifying their thinking and emotions. Through the use of case materials and participant-dominated discussion sessions, this course attempts to replicate the complex reality which an administrator faces, presents an opportunity to develop analytical skills, and provides an opportunity to critique and develop a personal administrative style. The course draws on a range of salient topics including leadership and governance, student development, diversity, law, and business administration as they relate to participants in colleges and universities including higher education staff and administrators, faculty, and students.

Learning Objectives

Broadly, *students will know what to do, when they don't know what to do*. More specifically, using case study analysis students will demonstrate the ability to apply concepts and knowledge acquired throughout the HIED program. Upon successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Describe, synthesize, and reflect upon the components of and experience in one's graduate program;
- Identify focal problems to be addressed within a presented set of circumstances;
- Differentiate important facts from peripheral facts and determine their importance in a particular context;
- Identify, integrate, and use for analysis pertinent research, scholarship, and theoretical frameworks relevant to the problem under consideration;

- Articulate ideas in a manner that includes sensitivity to diverse perspectives and audiences;
- Demonstrate increased facility in analysis of the complex, technical, and adaptive problems and issues which higher education administrators face;
- Develop an action strategy and defend it cogently and concisely both orally and in writing, appropriate to completion of a graduate program in Higher Education;
- Describe the events of May 4, 1970 in order to speak coherently and instructively in professional contexts outside of KSU.

REQUIRED:

Duncan, M. A., & Miser, K. M. (2000). Dealing with campus crisis. In Barr & Dessler (Eds.) *The handbook of student affairs administration* (pp. 453-473). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. (on vista)

Grace, T.M. (2009). Kent State: The struggle for memory and meaning. *The Sixties*, 2(2), 245-9. (on vista)

Hemphill, B.O., & LaBanc, B.H. (2010). *Enough is enough: A student affairs perspective on preparedness and response to a campus shooting*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing. ISBN: 978-1-57922-443-1 (paperback)

Lewis, J.M. (forthcoming). Social remembering and Kent State. In C. Barbato & L. Davis (Eds.), *Remembering: Framing, embracing, revising history*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press. (on vista)

Sands, S. (2010). *Murder at Yale: The true story of a beautiful grad student and a cold-blooded crime*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Recommended:

Hamrick, F.A. & Benjamin, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Maybe I should... Case studies on ethics for student affairs professionals*. New York: University Press of America. ISBC: 978-0-7618-4546-1 (paperback).

Lewis, J.M. & Hensley, T.R. (1998). The May 4 shootings at Kent State University: The search for historical accuracy. *Ohio Social Studies Review*. Retrieved January 2, 2011 from <http://isite.lps.org/khubbell/web/documents/KentStateReading.pdf>.

Stage, F. & M. Dannells (Eds.) (2000). *Linking theory to practice: Case studies for working with college students*, 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis Group.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 6th ed. (2010). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. [2nd printing, October 2009. ISBN-10: 1-4338-0561-8]

Students are expected to keep abreast of current issues within higher education through one (or more) of the following:

The Chronicle of Higher Education <<http://chronicle.com>>

InsideHigherEd.com <<http://www.insidehighered.com>> FREE- sign-up for daily news service

Additional Resources:

- Barr, M.J. & Dessler, M.K. (Eds.). (2000). *The handbook of student affairs administration*, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barrett, D. (2006). *Core leadership communication: Business writing and speaking for today's leaders*. McGraw-Hill.
- Brown, M.C. (Ed.). (2000). *Organization and governance in higher education*, 5th ed. ASHE Reader Series. Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Chickering, A. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Evans, N.J., Forney, D.S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Johnson, A. (2006). *Privilege, power and difference*, 2nd ed. McGraw Hill.
- Kaplan W. & Lee, B. (2006). *The law of higher education*, 4th ed. (2 volumes). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 978-0-7879-8659-9.
- Kezar, A.A., Carducci, R., & McGavin-Contreras, M. (2006). *Rethinking the "L" word in higher education: The revolution of research on leadership*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Komives, S. R. & Woodard, D. B. Jr. (Eds.). (2003). *Student services: A handbook for the profession*, 4th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kretovics, M. (2010). *Business practices in higher education: A guide for today's administrators*. New York: Routledge.
- Merriam, S.B., Caffarella, R.S., & Baumgartner, L.M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*, 3rd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. ISBN 9780787975883
- Pope, R., Reynolds, A., & Mueller, J. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. ISBN: 0-7879-6207-4
- Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S.J. (2008). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)Solving moral dilemmas*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Strange, C.C. & Banning, J.H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Most of our class sessions will focus on the analysis and discussion of cases involving problems and issues in higher education. The case study method is demanding and requires thorough preparation prior to each class.

Reading

In preparation, students are required to thoroughly read the assigned case and any other supplemental reading as noted in the syllabus or announced in class. Additional readings may be assigned to supplement cases as needed. Students are also expected to draw widely upon readings from other/previous courses as well as current professional literature in order to formulate and support analyses and problem-solving strategies for the assigned cases. Likewise, students are expected to share key resources that underpin analysis and problem solving as well as to incorporate salient resources in the field of higher education such as guidelines for professional practice (CAS Standards) and position papers from various professional organizations.

Participation

Since the objectives of the course focus on enhancing one's capacity to deal with complex administrative problems and to cultivate one's own administrative style, students are expected to participate consistently and actively in case discussions. Each student should come to class thoroughly prepared to critically dialogue about the assigned case and provide rationale for arguments. With case study method, there are no 'right answers;' rather, there are well-reasoned, well-argued, and well-defended positions. Thus, class discussion is not an evaluation of right and wrong, but an occasion for deliberative dialogue. As such, students are encouraged to take a chance on being wrong, seek clarification, test ideas, challenge an argument, and maintain a sense of humor.

The following serves as a guide for evaluating participation.

100%	Attendance in every class and make thoughtful contributions in each class that cultivate depth in our thinking about the complexity of the issues/problems
95%	One absence and thoughtful contributions in each class OR present for every class and thoughtful contributions in majority of classes
90%	One absence and thoughtful contributions in majority of classes
85%	Two absences and thoughtful contributions in each class OR no absences and thoughtful contributions in some classes
80%	Two absences and thoughtful contributions in some classes
75%	Three absences and thoughtful contributions in some classes OR two absences with limited participation in classes.

NOTE: students who have limited/marginal participation in class, even with perfect attendance, will earn no more than 75% for participation.

The instructor will facilitate students in presenting, explicating, and defending their analyses and recommendations; she will moderate and guide the discussion, asking questions and synthesizing comments. The success of the class depends on students' active and vigorous participation. So, when in class, remember to:

- Advance your ideas and give reasons/rationale for them

- Articulate the decisions that need to be made, weighing pros and cons of alternatives
- Keep an open mind, and be willing to change it upon new insights or evidence
- Enjoy yourself; a sense of humor is helpful when facing tough administrative challenges

Case Analyses

Class time will be focused, primarily, on discussion of cases. This discussion will center on the analysis each student has completed prior to our class meeting. In preparation, students—individually and/or in groups—are expected to review data, conduct analyses, and identify strategies. The description of case study method (appended to syllabus) is provided as a guide for analyzing the case (see also Stage & Dannels, 2000, pp. 41-44), and should be drawn upon to assist with completing a thorough analysis.

Through case analyses, students are expected to demonstrate:¹

- Ability to communicate analysis cogently and concisely both orally and in writing
- Use of scholarship (what you've read/learned from the HIED program) to substantiate analyses
- Organization, creativity, logical consistency
- Rationale, grounded in literature, for decisions and action plan

Topical/T.I.P. Assignments

Students will be given topical assignments. Related to cases, as we 'warm up' to case study method, these assignments, typically 1-3 pgs, might include delineating pros/cons of decisions issues, preparing theoretical rationale, drafting a memo, finding a sample policy. Related to assigned readings, these could require students to submit 3-5 sentences in preparation for class and/or a guest speaker. These exercises, considered thinking-in-progress (T.I.P.), are designed to facilitate learning about the case study method and bridge reading to class discussion.

Facilitating Case Discussion

While most of our cases will be pre-determined, issues and problems continue to unfold and develop around us; maybe on our campuses or realized as we read the news. Students, in their groups, will identify one 'current events case' to bring into class for on-the-spot discussion and analysis. The facilitating group will distribute a short case in class (perhaps an incident on one's campus or taken from *Inside Higher Ed*) and facilitate discussion about decisions issue(s) consistent with the components of case study method. The facilitating group will submit to the instructor, on the day their facilitation, a copy of the case (with necessary attribution/source) and a brief description of the group's goals through use of this case (i.e. what immediate, short- and long-term decision issues do you believe are implicit or explicit in this case?). Following the facilitation, each student in the facilitating group will submit (by Friday) a brief reflection (not to exceed 1pg) on the facilitation process: How did it go? What worked, consistent with your expectations, and what didn't go as planned or was unexpected? How did your group share this collaborative assignment?

¹ Adapted from criteria used for the StudentAffairs.com case study competition

Written Reports (5)

Students will apply the case study method to ill-structured problems, generating written case analyses. Individuals and/or groups² will be responsible for submitting a written report of the case analysis.³ In this report, students will:

1. Briefly summarize relevant facts, actors, and contextual factors surrounding the case. This is not a restatement of the case; rather, it should cue the reader about key factors and assumptions.
2. Concisely describe all central decision issues available, differentiating immediate, short-term, and long-term decisions.
3. Analyze decision issues, using scholarship as rationale in your deliberation about advantages and disadvantages of available options.
4. Delineate course of action and recommendations.
5. Append references for sources relevant to the case.

Oral (Group) Presentation (1)

One group per case will cogently and concisely present analysis of the case (not to exceed 20 minutes). As a group, students will be evaluated on the clarity of the case presentation and the logical consistency of their analyses and arguments as they articulate theoretical considerations and practical implications; identification of decision issues, contingencies, strategies, as well as advantages and disadvantages of these; and delineation of action plan. Students are encouraged to be creative in the presentation of their ideas, and must prepare visuals to complement oral presentation (i.e. PPT/Prezi/pecha kucha, handout).

Following the group presentations, we will examine each stage of the case analysis process in depth. Each class member will contribute her/his own thinking about the case and articulate the process by which decisions were reached. Students are also expected to challenge others' thinking and arguments, in a constructive manner, in order to develop analytic and communication skills. It is exceedingly important that students are prepared (both as a group and individually) to substantiate arguments with relevant scholarship. Outside visitors will often be invited to join our discussion and analyses of cases.

The Case of May 4, 1970

As graduates of Kent State's HIED program, it is expected that students will be able to demonstrate understanding of the events surrounding May 4th 1970 in order to speak coherently and instructively in professional contexts outside of KSU. This day in history, which commemorated its 40th anniversary in 2010, is not only significant to you as KSU graduates but is also instructive for thinking about administrative response to campus crises and institutional remembrance processes.

We will connect with this 'case' in several ways during the semester:

- 1) We will participate in 'audience-testing' on Feb9. Each student will provide evaluative feedback on the narrative script for the visitor's center exhibit (due Feb16).
- 2) Independently, students will visit the May 4th Visitor's Center and complete the May 4th walking tour. Audio can be accessed by calling 330-672-MAY4. A written reflection (200-400 words) must be submitted, via vista assignments, by April 27.

² Submission of case analysis by a group is presumed to be longer than an individual submission.

³ In previous years, students have been assigned to submit 4-6pg report; however, their submissions have tended to be 8-10pgs.

- 3) Students will read 2 articles (Grace, 2009; Lewis, forthcoming) and write an essay (2-3 pgs) on the administrator's role in social remembering and commemoration. Due by 11am on April 27.

Midterm Paper

Students will complete, individually, an analysis of a case focused on institutional response to a death on campus. Unlike most case analyses in class that introduce an ill-structured problem and leave us with the task of problem-solving and decision-making, this incident unfolded in 2009 and Yale's response is detailed in Sands' book. [Students will be required to read Stella Sands' *Murder at Yale* (2010).] Students are assigned to critique decisions and course of action, and consider alternatives. Responses must be well-reasoned and grounded in program scholarship, as well as in-class readings about response to campus crises. While no minimum length is expected, exam submissions in previous years have ranged from 15-20 pages.

The overarching questions that will guide students' thinking and writing about the midterm are:

- What scholarship justifies the administrative decisions made?
- What is missing and/or what alternatives might you propose, and what scholarship provides a rationale for these?

The following questions serve as elicit further thinking. Students, however, are not expected to answer these, but rather use them as a prompt for writing. These questions and categories are not all-inclusive, but are designed to initiate thinking and analysis.

Leadership and Organizational Theory: What approaches to leadership are evident in this case and what is at least one alternative leadership approach for this case? How does institutional mission matter? What aspects of institutional governance must be considered?

Diversity: What scholarship is available that might apply to and/or inform one's thinking about this situation? How might this scholarship modify or contribute to adaptations in the response/course of action in this case?

Legal: What are legal considerations (possible ramifications) for the selected course of action? What alternatives, grounded in legal scholarship, might you suggest/pursue?

Managing Crises: What model(s) for managing campus crises serve as a framework for actions taken by Yale? What critiques do you offer, based on crisis management scholarship, and what alternatives (course of action) would you pursue/recommend?

Context/Environment: What aspects of the context of this case (murder at Yale) are unique; and what might change in (your) administrative decision-making/course of action if variables were different (i.e. public versus private, less visible college versus high profile Ivy league, if Annie Le lived on campus versus off, if Raymond Clark was a student versus an employee)? Note: students are not assigned to engage all the possible alternatives in a midterm paper; rather, students are expected to demonstrate understanding that 'context matters' through attention to particular aspects that do or do not exist.

Peer Review

Each student will be required to review another student's written midterm case analysis and provide careful and thorough feedback prior to submission of midterm exam. Rubric will be provided.

Portfolio⁴

The portfolio is the culminating project for the master's program and is itself a case study of a learner. It is both a summative evaluation, in that it should reflect learning, development, and growth over the course of the master's experience, and a formative evaluation, in that it can inform future professional development and growth. Materials should be organized with a professional appearance and most components will be compiled in an electronic portfolio. Components will be submitted in sections over the course of the semester, and then (re)submitted in the e-portfolio at the end of the semester. The supplemental handout, Portfolio Guidelines, provides an elaboration of the items delineated below.

	% of total
1. Resume	10%
2. Course work summary and overview	20%
3. Program themes	15%
4. Philosophy of student affairs	15%
5. Job search thoughts, plans, and reflections	10%
6. Professional development plan (post-graduation)	10%
7. Artifacts: Work samples, syllabi, admission essay	10%
8. Overall quality of final e-portfolio, i.e. organization, introduction ('about me'), navigation	10%

Evaluation

The components of the course will be weighted as follows:

Participation	10%
Topical Assignments	10%
Facilitating case discussion	5%
Case Analyses (5)	
One group presentation w/ written report	10%
Four written reports (5% each)	20%
Midterm Case Analysis	15%
Peer Review	5%
May 4 th	10%
Portfolio	<u>15%</u>
Total	100%

Grades will be based upon the quality and completion of all work. An "A" represents written and oral work (including class participation) that is of exceptionally high quality and demonstrates superb understanding of material. A "B" represents written and oral work (including class participation) that is of good quality and demonstrates a sound understanding of material and its complexity. A

⁴ For students who are not graduating in May 2011, you will be graded for your work-in-progress; however, you must submit a revised e-portfolio by the last day of classes for the term/semester of your graduation (i.e. August or December).

"C" represents a minimally adequate completion of assignments and participation demonstrating a limited understanding of material. More specifically, the grading scale for the course is:

A	(94-100%)	A-	(90-93%)	B+	(87-89%)
B	(83-86%)	B-	(80-82%)	C+	(77-79%)
C	(73-76%)	C-	(70-72%)	D+	(67-69%)
D	(63-66%)	D-	(60-62%)	F	(below 60%)

Evaluating writing

- *Completeness of response to the assignment:* Submission responds to all parts of the assignment as described in the course syllabus and in class discussion;
- *Mechanics of writing:* consistent with *APA 6th edition* guidelines: Clear statement of thesis, topic sentences; paragraphs focusing on the topic; subheads; spelling; single focus, clear, simple sentences; active voice; inclusive language; appropriate grammar; punctuation, and spelling, economy and appropriateness of language, standard English and spelling are consistently used.
- *Attribution:* direct quotes cited, ideas are attributed, and sources are referenced consistent with APA style guidelines.
- *Organization and coherence:* Submission is arranged in a logical manner and is clear, unclouded by jargon; conceptually coherent--with a clear beginning, middle and end
- *Ensure logical consistency:* If introduction identifies one purpose, but analysis focuses on issues that differ from the stated purpose, the logical inconsistency will be apparent.
- *Clarity:* The introduction clearly signals intention without conclusion/analysis. The submission is unclouded by jargon and flows in logical sequence--attending first to descriptive elements providing the basis for later interpretation and conclusions. The writing reserves the author's opinion until the end after description and analysis earns it.
- *Focus:* Does it do what it says it will do? Logical development of evidence and conclusions. Does it effectively integrate insights from practice with theoretical concepts from class?

Attendance: You are expected to attend each class session. If an absence is unavoidable, please notify the instructor ahead of time. Although it is not possible to "make up" a class session, it is your responsibility to contact the instructor to make arrangements for missed work, announcements, handouts, and lost participation. Failure to seek remedies for missed work and to compensate for lost participation will result in a lower final grade for this course.

Late Work: It is expected that work will be submitted on/by the date due. Late submission will result in one-third grade reduction per 24 hours. Meaning, if the assignment is due by 11am on January 19, and is submitted at 6am on January 20, and if the submission would have earned an A-, the grade with late penalty would be B+. If the same assignment was submitted 2pm on January 20, it would be awarded B; if received 6am on January 21, it would receive B-, and so on... Any student with extenuating or emergency circumstances that prevent submission on the due date should discuss his/her situation individually with the instructor and make necessary arrangements.

General Information

Electronic devices: Out of courtesy to classmates, please remember to silence cell phones and other electronic devices prior to class. As a discussion-based seminar, laptops will not be necessary.

Accommodation: University policy 3342-3-18 requires that students with disabilities be provided reasonable accommodations to ensure their equal access to course content. If you have a documented disability and require accommodations, please contact the instructor at the beginning of the semester. Please note, you must first verify your eligibility for academic accommodation through Student Accessibility Services; they can be reached at 330-672-3391 and are located on the ground floor of the DeWeese Center. FMI about your rights and responsibilities, see <http://www.registrars.kent.edu/disability/Current/StudentHandbook/RightsReas.htm>

Religious Observations: If you will be observing any religious holidays that fall on a class date, and will be unable to participate in class on those days, please notify the instructor in advance.

Statement of Inclusion: Kent State University, as an equal opportunity educational institution, encourages an atmosphere in which the diversity of its members is understood and appreciated; an atmosphere that is free of discrimination and harassment based on identity categories. Thus, all members of the university are expected to join in creating a positive atmosphere in which individuals can learn and work, an environment that is sympathetic, respectful and supportive. (See “University Policy Register”)

The instructor of this course is committed to teaching equitably and inclusively, addressing the needs, concerns, and interests of each and every student, regardless of age, gender/sexual identity, race/ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, English language experience, or disability.

Writing: Kent State has a Writing Commons designed to assist students with all kinds of writing issues, from grammar to transition sentences to writing thesis statements. It’s located on the 4th floor of the library. If you can’t physically visit the Commons, you can e-mail your paper and ask for feedback on a couple of specific problems. The Writing Center will NOT edit a paper for you, but can help you to improve your work. Check the website for details: www.writingcommons.kent.edu or contact at (330)-672-1787 or writing@kent.edu

Academic Integrity: As members of the community of higher education, we are all subject to the standards of academic integrity. As a student, you are subject to the Code of Student Conduct. Using another person’s words, thoughts or ideas without proper attribution is plagiarism and a form of academic dishonesty, which is a violation of University policy. All students must become familiar with and abide by the University’s policy on academic integrity, which prohibits cheating and plagiarism. You should review the Code as ignorance is not a defense should you face charges of academic dishonesty. For more information about University policy see The University Policy Register at <http://imagine.kent.edu/policyreg/> or download the Digest of Rules and Regulations from <http://www.kent.edu/CurrentStudents/>

Further, I direct your attention to the APA style manual for a statement on plagiarism and ch.6 for how to credit sources. Finally, Indiana University offers a useful guide regarding plagiarism: <http://www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml>

CALENDAR OF TOPICS AND ASSIGNED READINGS

This is a working calendar and is subject to change.

DATE	TENTATIVE SCHEDULE	READING DUE:
Week 1: Jan. 12	1. Introductions and Course Overview 2. Review Syllabus and case analysis methods	
Week 2: Jan. 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study Method • Working in groups • E-portfolio • Case analysis in action and use of theory 	Stage & Dannells, ch. 1 & 2 (vista)
Jan. 26-28, OASPA/OCPA Annual Conference, Worthington, OH http://www.ocpaonline.org/Annual%20Conference.html		
Week 3: Jan. 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case analysis in action and use of theory • Attention to ethics 	- Stage & Dannells, ch. 3 - Hamrick & Benjamin, ch1 (on vista)
Jan. 28 – StudentAffairs.com case studies registration deadline http://www.studentaffairs.com/vcs/index.html		
Week 4: Feb. 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case analysis in action • E-portfolios 	<i>Reminder: be reading “Murder at Yale” (for midterm)</i>
Week 5: Feb. 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 4th, 1970 [Laura Davis] • Case analysis in action 	Read ch 1 in “enough is enough” DUE: Portfolio, parts 1 & 2
Week 6: Feb. 16	Responding to crises: mental health and counseling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case analysis in action 	Read ch 2 & 3 in “enough is enough” May 4 th assignment due
Week 7: Feb. 23	Managing the crisis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case analysis in action [Kyle Webster, Reed College] 	Read ch 5-7 in “enough is enough” DUE: Portfolio, parts 3 & 4
Week 8: March 2	Case Analysis with Group presentation	Read ch 4 in “enough is enough”

Week 9: March 9	Responding to crises Draft copy of midterm case analysis posted to peer-reviewer (and instructor) by March 9. Reviewer will provide feedback by Mar13.	Read Duncan & Miser (on vista)
NASPA Convention , March 12-16 http://www.naspa.org/conf		
Week 10: Mar. 16	Working with media	Read ch 8-9 in “enough is enough” Midterm DUE March 18 by 11:59 pm.
March 23	Spring Break – no classes	
ACPA convention , March 26-30 http://convention.myacpa.org/		
Week 11: Mar. 30	Case Analysis with Group presentation	Assigned case
<i>April 4-8: Enough is Enough Awareness Week</i>		
Week 12: Apr. 6	Case Analysis with Group presentation	Assigned case DUE: Portfolio, parts 5 & 6
Week 13: Apr. 13	Case Analysis with Group presentation	Assigned case
Week 14: Apr. 20	Case Analysis with Group presentation	Assigned case
Week 15: Apr. 27	Social remembering	MAY 4TH ESSAY DUE BY 11AM E-PORTFOLIO DUE APR29 BY 11:59PM
Exam Week May 4, 9:45am-noon	Remembrance Day (classes in recess noon – 2pm)	Celebrate!!

1-11-11

Acknowledgment: Content for this syllabus was adapted from syllabi prepared by Dr. Mary Ann D. Sagaria, Professor of Educational Policy & Leadership, University of Denver, Dr. Elizabeth J. Allan, Associate Professor, University of Maine, Dr. Janice Gerda, Kent State University; EDU880, University of Michigan (author unknown).

What is the Case Study Method?⁵

Introduction

The case study method is designed to be especially effective in the development and improvement of leadership and management skills. Successful leadership and managerial decision-making derive from skillful analysis, choice and persuasion in the face of complex and often ambiguous challenges. The case study method actively engages the participant in these processes: first, in the analysis of the problems, facts and details of the case itself; second, in the selection of a strategy; and third, in the refinement and defense of the chosen strategy in the discussion group and before the class.

The case study method is demanding and requires significant preparation time and active class participation. It is intended to build upon the experiences of the class members and to allow them to learn from one another as well as from the material and from faculty members. As in 'real life' situations, there is no right answer or correct solution to the administrative dilemma presented by the case. Thus, the case method doesn't provide a prescriptive set of solutions to higher education administrative problems; rather, it refines an individual's ability to "ask the right questions" and apply appropriate concepts to their solution. Once a strategic decision has been reached, vigorous class participation improves an individual's ability to defend the chosen strategy, to learn from others' perspectives, to fine-tune their choices, and to persuade others of the viability of the decision(s).

The Case Study

A case study is a written description of an administrative problem or situation requiring analysis and decision. Most cases depict real situations where the focus is on the main protagonist who is shown at the point of a major decision. In some instances, the data is disguised, and infrequently, the case may be fictional. Cases are not intended to be comprehensive or exhaustive; indeed, most cases are 'snapshots' of a particular situation within a complex environment. **The case study places participants in the role of decision-makers, asking them to distinguish pertinent from peripheral facts, to identify central problems among several issues competing for attention, and to formulate strategies and policy recommendations.**

Preparation

A case study can be frustrating because it describes complex reality. The ambiguities and difficulties of real-life are reflected in the facts included in the study. Differences in analysis among participants typically arise, and conflicting recommendations emerge as participants with varied perspectives, experiences, and professional responsibilities consider the case. The preparation of a case for the class varies with the background, concerns and natural interests of participants.

However, when analyzing a case for class discussion, it is good to follow these steps:

1. Immerse yourself in the case; establish all the facts
2. Determine the decisions that need to be made
3. Articulate priorities and alternatives or possible solutions
4. Consider the possible intended and unintended consequences of the decisions
5. Develop a course of action, strategy, and /or recommendations

⁵ Adapted from Pearson Hunt "The Case Method of Instruction" *The Harvard Educational Review*, 21(3), pp. 175-192. Copyright by the President and Fellows of Harvard College 1984. This note was prepared by Eileen McDonough-Rogers, Program Director of the Institute for Educational Management, and adapted by Mary Ann D. Sagaria for use in a similar course. It is based in part on information included in similar notes on the case method from the Harvard School of Business Administration and from the Institute for the Management of Lifelong Education.

SUGGESTED TASKS IN ANALYZING CASE STUDIES

Become familiar with the case:

- What are the facts?
- What is happening?
- Is all relevant information available to you?

Determine central issues:

- What decisions need to be made?
- Who is responsible for making which decisions?
- What factors, issues, and consequences need to be taken into account?

Identify objectives and goals to be achieved:

- Which outcomes are possible?
- Which are desirable?
- Which objectives are most important to whom?

Ascertain resources and constraints:

- Which forces support and oppose which actions?
- Which resources can be marshaled in support of actions?
- What are the major obstacles?

Ascertain the nature of conflicts:

- What is the substance of conflicts?
- Can conflicting positions and plans be reconciled?

Identify dynamics of behavior:

- Who is exercising leadership?
- Are there interpersonal conflicts?
- Are the persons involved effective in support of their respective positions?

Determine major alternatives:

- Are there ideas and strategies that have not been presented?
- Is compromise possible?
- Are the alternatives complementary or mutually exclusive?

Assess likely consequences:

- What actions are likely to result from the decisions made?
- What unintended consequences might emerge?
- What are the short and long term consequences for the individuals and the institution?

Consider appropriate strategies:

- What are the most effective ways of and priorities achieving and implementing the objectives and decisions?
- Are there immediate, intermediate, and/or long-term steps or actions?