

LER570
Leadership for HR Managers
Spring 2017
Tuesday 11:00-1:50
47 LER

Instructor: Professor Ying Chen
Office: 241 LER Building
Phone: (217) 244-4096
Email : ychen01@illinois.edu
Office Hours: By appointments

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Like many LER graduates, you will be given some type of leadership role or responsibility within a few years of your graduation. This may involve working with and managing people on a one-on-one basis; and leading, motivating and aligning people behind a common vision or direction. This course is designed to help you understand your own leadership strength and develop your ability to lead people towards organizational goals.

This course is divided into five parts: (1) leading self; (2) leading interpersonally; (3) leading teams and groups; (4) leading change; (5) special topics: women and leadership

What you get out of this course largely depends on your enthusiasm to engage with the course materials and your initiative in sharing your insights with others. We will use a variety of learning techniques in order to (1) keep the classroom a lively, interactive, learning atmosphere and (2) help maximize your learning experience each class period. We will use cases, group discussion, experiential learning activities, and video clips – all balanced with lecture-discussions.

COURSE MATERIALS

- HBS cases. It is available online with purchase at <http://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/57260338>
You must have a copy of all the FIVE cases for taking this course.
- Online: Required readings (except the cases) will be posted on COMPASS.
- There is no textbook for this class.

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

- Class Participation 20%
- Case Presentation 20%
- Weekly Quiz 20%
- Self-Reflection Paper 15%
- Group Presentation 25%

Class Participation. This course requires active participation in classes. The class participation will include your attendance and contributions to the intellectual life of the classroom, demonstrated by your understanding of the assigned readings, active involvement in class activities, and the meaningful questions or comments you raise during lectures and discussions.

Each student is allowed to miss no more than **ONE** classes in the semester for any reason (sickness, interview, etc.). No excuse is needed but I appreciate an email notice. Quiz will not be counted into the grades for the class. However, students who miss one classes will not be eligible to drop the lowest quiz scores. Every additional absence leads to a **3** points cut in the final grade.

If a student has never missed a class throughout the semester they will be eligible to drop the lowest quiz score.

Students are expected to be punctual and to engage in respectful interactions with each other. Any behaviors that would distract others in the classroom such as talking on the phone, texting, surfing the internet, and emailing are prohibited.

Case Presentation. Every week a group of students will be assigned to make a presentation at the following week regarding (1) topics assigned by the instructor or (2) your own observations, experiences, and insights related to leadership. The case presentation should last at least 20 minutes and at most 30 minutes including the discussion.

Students who are assigned to the case should email me their presentation slides **three** days before the class (Saturday) before 10:00 PM.

Weekly Quiz. Each quiz will deal with one or more of the articles and cases that I have assigned either for that class session, or with the previous lecture. I may administer a quiz at the beginning, middle, or the end of class.

Each quiz will consist of a handful questions about main points of the articles, cases and lectures. There are **NO** make-up quizzes.

Self-reflection paper. The paper is designed to help you find your own leadership strength and develop your leadership skills. Thus, the purpose of the assignment is to

apply the content of the course to your own experiences and future concerns. Your self-reflection paper should make it clear to the reader how your thinking has been altered by your engagement with the course readings, in-class discussions, and interactions with your classmates.

In about 1000-1250 words, please discuss the following questions:

1. What key ideas have you learned about leadership in organizations? How do you think these learnings will help you in your future work experiences?
2. What have you learned about how to use or apply the content of the course? Connect these learnings to your work plans (whether known or in-progress) over the next 12 months.
3. What have you learned about the human dimension of leadership? For example, how have you changed in some important way, and have you changed in your ability to interact with others?
4. Come up with a metaphor/visual anchor/image that captures a key learning of the course. Describe/draw or find a creative way of capturing this. Make it as “sticky” (memorable) as possible.

The paper should be double spaced, in Times New Romans 12-point font, with margins of 1 inch.

Paper Due date: Tuesday, Feb. 28th at 11 AM

Submission via Compass is required. Students should submit their papers via Compass. If technical problems occur, students should send their answers as an attachment in Word format to my email listed at the beginning of the syllabus by the due date. **Not submitting your paper on time will result in a 10% deduction from the paper grade for each day late.**

Group Project and Presentation. Group project is research oriented. Each student will participate in a group analysis of a particular topic. Students should not repeat solely what they have already learned in class. Instead, students are expected to conduct research, read relevant research literature and present with new and fresh information. It is acceptable to integrate materials from the interview paper into the group presentation.

Each student will participate in a group analysis of a particular topic, and make a 20 minutes presentation to the class about that topic at the end of the semester. When presenting, it is recommended that each of the group members present some parts of the work. Topics of the group presentation are listed at the end of this syllabus. Make sure to properly reference all materials used to construct your points. Within groups, peers will evaluate group-member contributions.

Team members should ensure that they all contribute to the project. If a group member receives marks of “marginal” or “check out” from all or the majority of the group members he/she may receive a significant deduction of points of the group presentation grade.

Within the class, those listening to presentations (meaning the instructor and all of the students) will evaluate the quality of the presentation. Feedback will be provided to each group. It is presentation only; no written paper is required for group presentation.

Preliminary outline of the group project is due on Feb. 21st at 11:00 AM

Notes on How to Best Use Your Time. Among the three required readings for each session, there is one academic journal paper. Please note you do NOT need to read anything method/statistical related sections in these articles. Rather, focus on main arguments and conclusion the authors made.

SCHOLASTIC DISHONESTY & ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Scholastic dishonesty (including cheating and plagiarism) will not be tolerated. Scholastic dishonesty by a few is grossly unfair to the majority of students who are honest. Cases of apparent scholastic dishonesty will be pursued to the fullest extent allowed by University regulations.

As commonly defined, plagiarism consists of passing off as one's own the ideas, words, writings, etc., which belong to another. In accordance with this definition, you are committing plagiarism if you copy the work of another person and turn it in as your own, even if you should have the permission of that person. Plagiarism is one of the worst academic sins, for the plagiarist destroys the trust among colleagues without which research cannot be safely communicated.

Excerpts from the University of Illinois Student Code

<http://admin.illinois.edu/policy/code/>

§ 1-401 Academic Integrity—Preamble

(a) The University has the responsibility for maintaining academic integrity so as to protect the quality of education and research on our campus and to protect those who depend upon our integrity. It is the responsibility of the student to refrain from infractions of academic integrity, from conduct that may lead to suspicion of such infractions, and from conduct that aids others in such infractions (emphasis added). It is the responsibility of the faculty to establish and maintain an environment that supports academic integrity. An essential part of this faculty responsibility is the enforcement of existing standards of academic integrity. If faculty members do not discourage and act upon violations of which they become aware, respect for those standards is undermined. Faculty members should provide students with a clear statement of their expectations concerning academic integrity. In these regulations, “faculty” includes an instructor or authorized staff member who supervises any academic endeavor. Page 5 of 6

(b) Students have been given notice of this rule by virtue of its publication. Regardless of whether a student has actually read this rule, a student is charged with knowledge of it. Ignorance of a rule is never a defense (emphasis added).

...
§ 1-403 Penalties for Infractions of Academic Integrity

...In determining an appropriate penalty, the instructor shall also take into consideration aggravating circumstances, such as whether the student's conduct was designed not only to advance his or her own grade, but to hinder the academic performance of others.

(c) The instructor may impose one or more of the following penalties for an infraction of academic integrity:

(1) a written notice of warning with a copy to the student's file in the office of the college in which the student is enrolled and to the Senate Committee on Student Discipline; (2) a reduced grade on the assignment; (3) a failing grade (zero if graded numerically) for the assignment; (4) a reduced grade for the course; (5) a failing grade for the course; (6) a denial of credit for the proficiency exam; or (7) any other penalty negotiated and agreed to, in writing, by both parties (not subject to appeal)

(d) The instructor may recommend to the department or unit executive officer (hereafter abbreviated DEO) that the student be suspended or dismissed from the University.

ADA STATEMENT

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal anti-discrimination statute that provides comprehensive civil rights protection for persons with disabilities. Among other things, this legislation requires that all students with disabilities be guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact the University's disability services office.

Course Outline (Tentative/Subject to Change)

Jan. 17

SESSION 1 LEADING SELF

Required Readings

1. Case: Erik Peterson (A)
2. "Managing Oneself," Drucker, HRB, Mar-Apr 1999
3. Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(4), 765.

Jan. 24

SESSION 2 LEADING INTERPERSONALLY

Required Readings

1. Case: Thomas Green: Power, Office Politics and a Career in Crisis
2. Gabarro, J. J., & Kotter, J. P. (1993). Managing your boss. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 150-150.
3. Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L., & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of leader-member exchange integrating the past with an eye toward the future. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715-1759.

Jan. 31

3 LEADING GROUPS & TEAMS

Required Readings

1. Case: Doing Deals and Leading Teams at XAF Partners
2. Movie case: Invictus
3. Majchrzak, A., Malhotra, A., Stamps, J., & Lipnack, J. (2004). Can absence make a team grow stronger? *Harvard business review*, 82(5), 131-137.

Feb. 7

SESSION 4 LEADERSHIP STYLES

Required Readings

1. Movie case: The Devil Wears Prada
2. Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2012). Learning charisma. Transform yourself into the person others want to follow. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(6), 127-30.
3. Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2016). Do Ethical, Authentic, and Servant Leadership Explain Variance Above and Beyond Transformational Leadership? A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*, 0149206316665461.

Feb. 14

SESSION 5 LEADERSHIP PRACTICUM

Leadership Presence Training. No required readings.

Feb. 21

SESSION 6 GLOBAL LEADERSHIP AND LEADING CHANGE

Required Readings

1. Case: IBM Canada: Global Services (A)
2. Hong, H. J., & Doz, Y. (2013). L'Oreal masters multiculturalism. *Harvard Business Review*, 91(6), 114-118.
3. Reiche, B. S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M. E., & Osland, J. S. Contextualizing leadership: a typology of global leadership roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1-21.

Feb. 28

SESSION 7 WOMEN AND LEADERSHIP

Required Readings

1. Case: Beth Stewart: Navigating the Boardroom
2. Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2007). Women and the labyrinth of leadership. *Harvard business review*, 85(9), 62.

3. Kossek, E. E., Su, R., & Wu, L. (2016). "Opting Out" or "Pushed Out"? Integrating Perspectives on Women's Career Equality for Gender Inclusion and Interventions. *Journal of Management*, 0149206316671582.

March 7

SESSION 8 GROUP PRESENTATION

Appendix

Grading Scheme

1. Calculation of Course Grades

Grade	Percentage
A	96-100%
A-	92-95.99%
B+	88-91.99%
B	84-87.99%
B-	80-83.99%
C+	77-79.99%
C	73-76.99%
C-	70-72.99%
D+	67-69.99%
D	63-66.99%
D-	60-62.99%
F	Below 60%

Class participation:

0: absence

5: Presence, but no or irrelevant comments/questions; passive spectators.

8: Participate in group discussion

10: In addition to group discussion participation, a student has individual comments/questions that enhance the learning of fellow students by integrating conceptual frameworks, assigned readings, or personal experiences.

Final Group Presentation

	Poor Quality	←—————→			Excellent
Content	1	2	3	4	5
Delivery	1	2	3	4	5
Speech Body	1	2	3	4	5
Visual	1	2	3	4	5
Panel questions	1	2	3	4	5

Content (70%): whether demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the topic

Delivery (10%): confidence, body language, eye contact, voice quality etc.

Speech body (10%): whether it is organized, and engaging

Visual (5%): whether it is effective; easy to see, no errors, adds meaning to the presentation.

Panel question (5%) whether show clear understanding of the questions and answer them with ease and expertise.

Peer Evaluation for Group Project

Please evaluate the contributions of all members of your team, including yourself. For each person, check one of the five options. This information is confidential. Return to the sheet to me after the group presentation on **March 7, 2017**.

Team member #1 (SELF) _____

- A major force; beyond what is expected
- Normal, solid contributor; did a major part of project; contributions were of high quality
- O.K., but slightly below expectations; did what was asked; contributions were acceptable
- Marginal. Did some work, but could not depend on this person.
- Checked out; was a team member in name only

Team member #2 _____

- A major force; beyond what is expected
- Normal, solid contributor; did a major part of project; contributions were of high quality
- O.K., but slightly below expectations; did what was asked; contributions were acceptable
- Marginal. Did some work, but could not depend on this person.
- Checked out; was a team member in name only

Team member #3 _____

- A major force; beyond what is expected
- Normal, solid contributor; did a major part of project; contributions were of high quality
- O.K., but slightly below expectations; did what was asked; contributions were acceptable
- Marginal. Did some work, but could not depend on this person.
- Checked out; was a team member in name only

Team member #4 _____

- A major force; beyond what is expected
- Normal, solid contributor; did a major part of project; contributions were of high quality
- O.K., but slightly below expectations; did what was asked; contributions were acceptable
- Marginal. Did some work, but could not depend on this person.
- Checked out; was a team member in name only