

**City University of Hong Kong**

**Information on a Course  
offered by Department of Management  
with effect from Semester A in 2010 / 2011**

---

---

**Part I**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Course Title:</b>          | Leadership: Managing in Adverse Situations |
| <b>Course Code:</b>           | MGT6202                                    |
| <b>Course Duration:</b>       | One semester                               |
| <b>Credit Units:</b>          | 3  |
| <b>Level:</b>                 | P6   |
| <b>Medium of Instruction:</b> | English                                    |
| <b>Prerequisites:</b>         | Nil  |
| <b>Precursors:</b>            | Nil  |
| <b>Equivalent Courses:</b>    | Nil  |
| <b>Exclusive Courses:</b>     | Nil  |

**Part II**

**Course Aims:**

This course aims at providing frameworks, concepts and tools for assessing competencies and skills required for leaders who manage adverse situations and to develop a plan for how to improve the knowledge, skills, and competencies needed to manage adverse situations.

## Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

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

| No. | CILOs  | Weighting (if applicable) |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 1.  | Use experiential and action learning principles for developing competencies required of leaders managing adverse situations. | 1                         |
| 2.  | Review, plan and implement strategies for developing such competencies.  | 2                         |
| 3.  | Provide evidence of improved effectiveness in selected leadership skills.  | 1                         |

Note: 1 = Moderate focus, 2 = Major focus.

## 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 in order to stimulate discussion, and with plenty of individual work and group activity. Some class time will be given for students to prepare their group workshop presentations and their leadership development journal projects. For these activities, the faculty member will act as a consultant for the projects.

Total Hours(Group Size) : Seminars 39 (40)

| CILO No      | TLAs  | Hours/week (if applicable) |
|--------------|---|----------------------------|
| CILO 1, 2    | Seminar: This will involve conceptual inputs on leadership in adversity; and Q & A.   | 14/7                       |
| CILO 1, 2, 3 | Self-assessment inventories, experiential exercises and skill practice: These activities will involve diagnosis and identification of leadership skills for managing adverse situations and their planned development through practice. | 13/7                       |
| CILO 1, 3    | Group presentation: The presentation will focus on analyzing and understanding why a prominent leader succeeded or failed when managing an adverse situation.   | 12/6                       |
| CILO 1, 3    | First written assignment  | Outside class activity     |
| CILO 1, 2, 3 | Second written assignment   | Outside class activity     |

## 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)*

100% Coursework

| CILO No      | Type of assessment tasks/activities  | Weighting (if applicable) | Remarks |
|--------------|--|---------------------------|---------|
| CILO 1, 2, 3 | Class participation<br>First individual written assignment<br>Group presentation | 10%<br>25%<br>25%         | 1       |
| CILO 1, 2, 3 | Second individual written assignment   | 40%                       | 2       |

Note: 1 = Moderate focus, 2 = Major focus.

## Grading of Student Achievement:

Please refer to Appendix A for description and grading of assessment tasks.

### **Part III**

#### Keyword Syllabus:

Leadership across Cultures. Leadership traits and behaviors. Adversity Management. Diagnostic instruments. Self-Assessment. Strategies for leadership development. Strategies for managing adversity. Opportunities for leadership development.

#### Recommended Reading:

##### Text(s):

Hartley, R. F. (2008). Management Mistakes and Successes (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Wiley.

House, P. J., Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (2004). Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies [electronic resource]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Klann, G. (2003). Crisis Leadership: How Military Lessons and Corporate Experiences Can Help Leaders Find Opportunity in Times of Chaos. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Manning, G. & Curtis, K. (2009). The Art of Leadership (3rd. ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

Mitroff, I.I. (2004). Crisis leadership: Planning for the Unthinkable. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Northouse, Peter G. (2007). Leadership: Theory and Practice (4th ed.). London: Sage.

Regester, M., & Larkin, J. (2005). Risk Issues and Crisis Management: A Casebook of Best Practice [electronic resource]. VA: Kogan Page.

Riggio, R. E., Murphy, S.E., & Pirozzolo, F.J. (Eds.) (2001/2002). Multiple Intelligences and Leadership [electronic resource]. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Useem, M. (2003). Upward Bound: Nine Original Accounts of How Business Leaders Reached Their Summits [electronic resource]. New York: Crown Publishing.

#### Online Resources:

## Appendix A

Table 1: GRADING CLASS PARTICIPATION

| Criteria    | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4   | Grade Point |
|-------------|--|--|--|---|-------------|
| Punctuality | Student is <b>almost always</b> late to class and/or leaves early.                               | Student is <b>occasionally</b> late to class and/or leaves early.                                | Student is <b>frequently</b> punctual and attends full-time.   | Student is <b>almost always</b> punctual and attends full-time.   |             |
| Preparation | Student is <b>almost never</b> prepared for class with assignments and required class materials. | Student is <b>occasionally</b> prepared for class with assignments and required class materials. | Student is <b>frequently</b> prepared for class with assignments and required class materials.               | Student is <b>almost always</b> prepared for class with assignments and required class materials.                         |             |
| Engagement  | Student <b>almost never</b> contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.         | Student <b>occasionally</b> contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions.         | Student <b>frequently</b> contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions <b>once</b> per class. | Student <b>almost always</b> contributes to class by offering ideas and asking questions <b>more than once</b> per class. |             |
| Behaviour   | Student <b>almost always</b> displays disruptive behaviour during class.                         | Student <b>occasionally</b> displays disruptive behaviour during class.                          | Student <b>frequently</b> displays facilitative behaviour during class.                                      | Student <b>almost always</b> displays facilitative behaviour during class.  |             |

*Note.* Total points available is 16.

*Source:* Adapted from “The Web Portal for Educators! ([www.teach-nology.com](http://www.teach-nology.com))”

**Table 1: Grading Written Assignments – Response Essay**

| Category                  | Weight | Failure<br>F<br>0.0  | Marginal<br>D<br>1.0   | Adequate<br>C- C C+<br>1.7 2.0 2.3   | Good<br>B- B B+<br>2.7 3.0 3.3   | Excellent<br>A- A A+<br>3.7 4.0 4.3  | Score |
|---------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Introduction              | 10%    | Very weak evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has very poor information value.   | Weak evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has poor information value.   | Some evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment but the introduction is limited in information value.   | Strong evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has good information value.   | Very strong evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has very good information value. |       |
| Analysis and discussion   | 60%    | Pieces of evidence are irrelevant and isolated, addressing a limited number of leadership in adverse situations issues. Fails to demonstrate understanding of leadership in adverse situations issues in a minimally acceptable way. Very poor coverage, no originality. | Pieces of evidence are relevant, but are isolated, addressing a limited number of leadership in adverse situations issues. Demonstration of understanding of leadership in adverse situations issues in a minimally acceptable way. Poor coverage, no originality. | The evidence is relevant and covers a fair number of leadership in adverse situations issues. However, there is little evidence of an overall view of the priorities. Demonstrates declarative understanding of a reasonable number of leadership in adverse situations issues. Able to discuss development issues meaningfully but with little integration. | The evidence presents a good appreciation of the general thrust of the leadership in adverse situations priorities. Good coverage of leadership in adverse situations issues with relevant support. A clear view of how various aspects of the development priorities integrate to form a whole. Good evidence of application of concepts to practice. | As in B, but with higher degree of originality and evidence of internalization into a personalized model of practice.        |       |
| Justification of Response | 30%    | Very weak justification of response based on theory and practice.  | Weak justification of response based on theory and practice.   | Fair justification of response based on theory and practice.   | Strong justification of response based on theory and practice.   | Very strong justification of response based on theory and practice.  |       |

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

**Table 3: Grading Written Assignments – Leadership Development Journal**

| Category                        | Weight | Failure<br>F<br>0.0  | Marginal<br>D<br>1.0   | Adequate<br>C- C C+<br>1.7 2.0 2.3   | Good<br>B- B B+<br>2.7 3.0 3.3   | Excellent<br>A- A A+<br>3.7 4.0 4.3  | Score |
|---------------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Introduction                    | 10%    | Very weak evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has very poor information value.   | Weak evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has poor information value.   | Some evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment but the introduction is limited in information value.   | Strong evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has good information value.   | Very strong evidence of using diagnostic data to introduce the assignment. The introduction has very good information value. |       |
| Analysis and discussion         | 60%    | Pieces of evidence are irrelevant and isolated, addressing a limited number of leadership in adverse situations issues. Fails to demonstrate understanding of leadership in adverse situations issues in a minimally acceptable way. Very poor coverage, no originality. | Pieces of evidence are relevant, but are isolated, addressing a limited number of leadership in adverse situations issues. Demonstration of understanding of leadership in adverse situations issues in a minimally acceptable way. Poor coverage, no originality. | The evidence is relevant and covers a fair number of leadership in adverse situations issues. However, there is little evidence of an overall view of the priorities. Demonstrates declarative understanding of a reasonable number of leadership in adverse situations issues. Able to discuss development issues meaningfully but with little integration. | The evidence presents a good appreciation of the general thrust of the leadership in adverse situations priorities. Good coverage of leadership in adverse situations issues with relevant support. A clear view of how various aspects of the development priorities integrate to form a whole. Good evidence of application of concepts to practice. | As in B, but with higher degree of originality and evidence of internalization into a personalized model of practice.        |       |
| Develop plan and justifications | 30%    | Very weak justification of development plan based on theory and practice.  | Weak justification of development plan based on theory and practice.   | Fair justification of development plan based on theory and practice.   | Strong justification of development plan based on theory and practice.   | Very strong justification of development plan based on theory and practice.  |       |

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

**Table 3: Assessing Team Presentation**

Each presentation will last for 45 minutes followed by questions and answers for 10 minutes. The team presentations will be assessed as follows: Excellent = 5, Good = 4, Acceptable = 3, Poor = 2, Very poor = 1.

| Aspects of presentation | Score |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------|-------|---|---|---|---|
| Coverage of issues      | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Clarity of presentation | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Questions and answers   | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Team coordination       | 1     | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

The Instructor will be responsible for assessing the workshops and allocating an overall grade to each team. He/she will also distribute peer review forms for you to assess your own and your team-member's contributions, so that individual grade will reflect peer assessment as well as overall team performance.

*Note for all Assessments (Class participation, First individual written assignment, Second individual written assignment, Group presentation):* Scale: A+ = 95%+; A = 90% to 94%; A- = 85% to 89%; B+ = 80% to 84%; B = 75% to 79%; B- = 70% to 75%; C+ = 65% to 69%; C = 60% to 64%; C- = 55% to 59%; D = 50% to 54%; F = 0% to 49%.