City University of Hong Kong

Information on a Course
offered by Department of Management
with effect from Semester A in 2013 / 2014

Part I

Course Title:	Employee Engagement and Performance
Course Code:	MGT6318
Course Duration:	One semester
Credit Units:	3
Level:	P6
Medium of Instruction:	English
Prerequisites:	MGT5204: Organizational Behavior OR equivalent;
Precursors:	MGT6311: Human Capital Management OR equivalent;
Equivalent Courses:	Nil
Exclusive Courses:	MGT5316: Human Resources Management

Part II

Course Aims

This course aims to

Provide students with an overview and understanding of as well as insight on the principles, concepts and skills needed to engage employees and manage their performance by doing the following:

- Extending students' knowledge of and providing opportunities to practice the fundamental skills they need to engage, motivate, develop, and reward diverse workforces, including expatriates.

- Providing students with an appreciation and understanding of as well as insight on how to structure performance management programs and systems to support and work in partnership with senior line managers to meet the human capital needs of their businesses.

- Enabling students to analyze and evaluate the challenges and complexities of implementing engagement and performance initiatives that are compliant with company objectives and legal standards.

Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to:

No.	CILOs	Weighting (if applicable)
1.	Display insightful knowledge of fundamental skills they need to engage, motivate, develop and reward diverse workforces, including expatriates. [knowledge & understanding]	25%
2.	Demonstrate competency in developing fundamental engagement and performance management skills (e.g., developing and implementing a coaching system) [application of concepts]	25%
3.	Identify and resolve issues in order to align individual employee performance with company objectives and standards [appraisal of evidence]	25%
4.	Provide evidence of critical analytical and evaluative ability in managing the legal, strategic, and operational complexities of managing employee performance [analysis & evaluation]	25%

Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)
(Indicative of likely activities and tasks designed to facilitate students' achievement of the CILOs. Final details will be provided to students in their first week of attendance in this course)

Teaching and learning will be in the form of seminars, with ideas, concepts, and frameworks introduced by the faculty member to stimulate discussion. There will be a lot of individual and group work inside and outside the classroom. In addition, the faculty member will act as a consultant to the project groups that will need to demonstrate their ability to develop solution for an employee engagement and performance management problem confronting a business.

CILO No.	TLAs	Hours/week (if applicable)
1,2,3,4,	Seminar: This will involve conceptual inputs on managing employee engagement and performance	
1, 2, 3, 4	Experiential exercises, cases, and skill practice: These activities will involve identification, diagnosis and implementation of fundamental skills related to	

	managing employee engagement and performance and their development through practice	
1, 2, 3, 4	Group project: The project will focus on the development and implementation of a solution to an employee engagement and performance management problem.	

Assessment Tasks/Activities

(Indicative of likely activities and tasks designed to assess how well the students achieve the CILOs. Final details will be provided to students in their first week of attendance in this course)

70% Coursework
30% Final examination (2 hours)

CILO No.	Type of Assessment Tasks/Activities	Weighting (if applicable)	Remarks
CILO 1,2,3,4	Class participation	10%	
CILO 1,2,3,4	Mid-term test	20%	
CILO 1,2,3,4	Group Project	40%	
CILO 1,2,3,4	Final examination (2-hours)	30%	

Grading of Student Achievement:

Please refer to Appendix A for grading of assessment tasks.

Part III

Keyword Syllabus

Employee engagement; Identifying, interpreting, and applying key performance indicators. Aligning performance management systems. Coaching. Feedback. Appraising / evaluating employees. Expatriate management.   Incentive and pay systems.

Indicative Texts

Aguinis, H. (2013). *Performance management* (3nd ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2009). *Employee Engagement: Tools for Analysis, Practice, and Competitive Advantage*. John Wiley & Son.

Recommended Readings

Armstrong, M. (2006). *Performance management: Key strategies and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). London: Kogan Page.

Cascio, Wayne F., Boudreau, John W. (2008). *Investing in people: Financial impact of human resource initiatives.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.

Cook, Sarah. (2008). *The essential guide to employee engagement: Better business performance through staff satisfaction.* Philadelphia: Kogan Page.

Dessler, G., & Huat, T. C. (2009). *Human resource management: An Asian perspective (2nd ed.).* Singapore: Prentice Hall.

Harvey, C., & Allard, M. J. (2002). *Understanding and managing diversity.* Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.

Heneman, Robert L. (2002). *Strategic reward management: Design, implementation, and evaluation.* Greenwich, Conn.: Information Age Pub.

Kenton, B., & Yarnall, J. (2005). *HR - the business partner: Shaping a new direction.* Boston: Elsevier.

Latham. Gary P. & Wexley, Kenneth N. (1994). *Increasing productivity through performance appraisal, 2nd ed.* Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA

Marr, Bernard (2006). *Strategic performance management: Leveraging and measuring your intangible value drivers.* London: Elsevier/Butterworth – Heinemann.

Wilson, Thomas B. (2003). *Innovative reward systems for the changing workplace.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A

Grading Class Participation

Criteria	0	1	2	3	4	Points
Punctuality (25%)	Student is **always** late to class and/or leaves early.	Student is **almost always** late to class and/or leaves early.	Student is **occasionally** late to class and/or leaves early.	Student is **frequently** punctual and attends full-time.	Student is **almost always** punctual and attends full-time.	**/ 4**
Knowledge Sharing (50%)	Student **never** contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.	Student **almos**t **never** contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.	Student **occasionally** contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.	Student **frequently** contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions **once** per class.	Student **almost always** contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions **more than once** per class.	**/ 8**
Behavior (25%)	Student **always** displays disruptive or disturbing behavior during class.	Student **almost always** displays disruptive or disturbing behavior during class.	Student **occasionally** displays disruptive or disturbing behavior during class.	Student **frequently** displays facilitative behavior during class.	Student **almost always** displays facilitative behavior during class.	**/ 4**

Note. Total points available is 16.

Source: Adapted from "The Web Portal for Educators! (www.teach-nology.com)"

Table 2: Grading Case and/or Scenario Based Examinations

Failure F < 50%	Marginal D 50-54%	Adequate C- C C+ 55-69%	Good B- B B+ 70-84%	Excellent A- A A+ ≥ 85%
The analysis does not identify any problems. Or, problems mentioned are not based on the facts in the case/ scenario. Very poor use of course content that might be relevant to problem identification. Sees no arguments, overlooks differences and relationships between problems, and fails to propose justifiable solutions or recommendations.	The analysis does not clearly identify problems. Or, problems mentioned are partially based on the facts in the case/ scenario. Poor use of course content that might be relevant to problem identification. Sees some arguments but overlooks differences and relationships between problems. Weak justification of solutions or recommendations.	Rudimentary problem identification with some relevant evidence. Some use of course content relevant to problem identification. Sees some arguments, identifies some differences and relationships between problems. Fair justification of solutions or recommendations.	The analysis clearly identifies problems. Good use of course content relevant to problem identification. Recognizes arguments. There is some discussion of differences and relationships between problems. Evaluates evidence and prioritizes problems. Solutions or recommendations well justified.	The analysis very clearly identifies problems. Excellent use of course content relevant to problem identification. Recognizes arguments and uses reasonable judgement. A holistic view of how various problems differ and relate to one another. Views information critically, synthesizes evidence and prioritizes problems. Solutions or recommendations very well justified.

Source: www.csueastbay.edu/ira/wasc/slo/SLO%20Bus%20Admin%20MBA.doc

Table 3: Grading Essay Type Examination Questions

Failure F < 50%	Marginal D 50-54%	Adequate C- C C+ 55-69%	Good B- B B+ 70-84%	Excellent A- A A+ ≥ 85%
Little evidence of familiarity with the subject matter; weakness in critical and analytical skills; limited or irrelevant use of literature.	Sufficient familiarity with the subject matter to enable the student to progress.	Student who is profiting from the university experience; understanding of the subject; ability to develop solutions to simple problems in the material.	Evidence of grasp of subject, some evidence of critical capacity and analytical ability; reasonable understanding of issues; evidence of familiarity with the subject matter.	Strong evidence of original thinking; good organization, capacity to analyze and synthesize; superior grasp of subject matter; evidence of extensive knowledge base.

Source. Adapted from Registrar's Office, "The Assessment of Students under the Credit Unit System". Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong, December 1997.

Table 4: Grading Group Project

Category	Weight	Failure F < 50%	Marginal D 50-54%	Adequate C- C C+ 55-69%	Good B- B B+ 70-84%	Excellent A- A A+ ≥ 85%	Score
Company background	10%	Very weak evidence of using secondary data to introduce the company. The introduction has very poor information value.	Weak evidence of using secondary data to introduce the company. The introduction has poor information value.	Some evidence of using secondary data to introduce the company but the introduction is limited in information value.	Strong evidence of using secondary data to introduce the company. The introduction has good information value.	Very strong evidence of using secondary data to introduce the company. The introduction has very good information value.	
Analysis and discussion	50%	Pieces of evidence are irrelevant and isolated, addressing a limited number of issues. Fails to demonstrate understanding of issues in a minimally acceptable way. Very poor coverage, no originality.	Pieces of evidence are relevant, but are isolated, addressing a limited number of issues. Demonstration of understanding of issues in a minimally acceptable way. Poor coverage, no originality.	The evidence is relevant and covers a fair number of issues. However, there is little evidence of an overall view of the project. Declarative understanding of a reasonable number of issues. Able to discuss issues meaningfully but with little discovery and integration.	The evidence presents a good appreciation of the general thrust of the project. Good coverage of issues with relevant support. A clear view of how various aspects of the project integrate to form a whole. Good evidence of discovery and application of concepts to practice.	As in B, but with higher degree of discovery and originality and evidence of internalization into a personalized model of practice.	
Recommendations and justifications	30%	Very weak justification of recommendations based on discovery and practice.	Weak justification of recommendations based on discovery and practice.	Fair justification of recommendations based on discovery and practice.	Strong justification of recommendations based on discovery and practice.	Very strong justification of recommendations based on discovery and practice.	
Search skills and writing format	10%	No evidence of library skills, incorrect formatting.	Little evidence of library skills, incorrect formatting.	Evidence of some search skills; standard references in mostly correct formatting.	Comprehensive, showing care in researching the issue, correct formatting.	As in B, but uses unusual references to bolster an original argument	

Source: Partly adapted from Tang Catherine & Biggs John, "Developing Grading Criteria for ILOs". Seminar presented at City University of Hong Kong, February 6, 2006.