

WCE-GLD201

Organizational Development and Change Across Cultures

Eight-week professional-development course Owner review edition

Course purpose

WCE-GLD201 develops practical organizational development skills for international NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, educational institutions and cross-border businesses. Learners investigate culture, teams, diagnosis, learning, leadership and change while protecting local voice and avoiding cultural stereotypes.

Format and audience

Eight weeks; online and adaptable to instructor-led or self-paced study. Designed for managers, educators, consultants and emerging international leaders. No formal prerequisite; basic professional writing and experience in a team are useful. Suggested effort: 6-8 hours weekly, 48-64 hours total. This is a proposed WCE professional-development course; academic credit, accreditation and certificate terms are not represented as approved.

Learning outcomes

By completion, learners can: scope an ethical OD engagement; audit culture with behavioral evidence; design inclusive teams; compare diagnostic models and evidence methods; build an organizational learning process; create a culturally responsive change plan; critique leadership claims and responsible AI use; and defend a feasible consulting proposal with equity-sensitive evaluation.

Course delivery and assessment

How to study

Read the lesson, examine the case, watch the assigned video segment, complete the self-check, join the discussion and produce the portfolio milestone. Maintain a source log from Week 1. Revisit earlier work as new evidence emerges. In self-paced mode, replace peer exchanges with two contrasting stakeholder perspectives and a revision note.

Assessment

Weekly discussions and video reflections: 20% (2.5% each). Weekly portfolio milestones: 70%, distributed 5%, 8%, 7%, 10%, 7%, 10%, 8%, 15%. Final individual defense and reflective revision: 10%. Self-checks are formative and ungraded. For the defense, answer three instructor questions about your evidence, a tradeoff and a limitation; self-paced learners submit a 600-word defense instead.

Proposed delivery policies for approval

Instructor-led schedule: initial discussion Thursday and two substantive replies plus milestone Sunday, 23:59 in the cohort timezone stated before enrollment. First-week welcome is a learning activity, not an automatic withdrawal trigger. WCE must approve fees, enrollment dates, timezone, refund/withdrawal terms, accommodation arrangements and certificate conditions before enrollment opens. Proposed feedback targets: acknowledge messages within two working days; return graded work within seven days. Extension and appeal requests go to the designated course contact. No automatic late penalty is imposed in this draft.

Academic integrity and responsible AI

Learners must submit their own analysis and cite sources in APA 7 or another consistently approved style. Disclose substantive AI assistance and verify sources and translations. AI assistance is optional; no paid tool is required. Do not upload personal, confidential or proprietary information. AI detector scores alone do not establish misconduct or determine a grade; any concern requires an evidence-based review and an opportunity to respond.

Access and technology

Use a modern browser and a document editor; no paid textbook is required. Videos need internet access and may be restricted by region. Official video links accompany embedded players. Learners may use the supplied text lesson and a source-based written reflection when video access fails. Captions and translations depend on the publisher; WCE should confirm accessible alternatives for each cohort. The draft page saves notes and completion on the current browser and can export a text study portfolio; it does not provide a gradebook, enrollment or secure assignment submission.

Instructor and branding

World Cultures & Education (WCE). Course developed for Dr. Wagih Elgohary. Course code and policies are proposed for owner approval. Version: 14 October 2026. WCE branding is used; cited international organizations are learning examples and do not imply sponsorship or endorsement.

Your consulting case

BridgeWorld Learning Alliance - fictional teaching case

BridgeWorld is a fictional international education NGO with 120 staff: Geneva 30, Cairo 35, Nairobi 30 and Manila 25. It partners with local learning centers. A donor requires a common quarterly reporting format, but partners say approval is slow and consultation occurs too late. The director proposes a new reporting platform. All names, figures and incidents below are invented for learning; they are not findings about any real organization.

Baseline dataset

The same anonymous three-item survey was offered to all staff; responses were Geneva 24/30, Cairo 14/35, Nairobi 18/30 and Manila 20/25. Mean scores on a 1-5 scale (higher is better): voice in decisions 4.0, 2.6, 2.8, 3.1; role clarity 3.8, 2.9, 3.0, 3.2; ability to access learning resources 4.2, 2.7, 2.9, 3.5. Means represent respondents only; no demographic breakdown or uncertainty estimates are supplied. Approval time medians across 20 completed requests per office were 5, 12, 10 and 8 working days. Case complexity was not controlled.

Qualitative evidence

Geneva manager: We need comparable reports, but I rarely see local partners before the deadline. Cairo coordinator: An English-only template arrives after our consultation meetings. Nairobi coordinator: The platform drops during low-connectivity periods, and I repeat entries later. Manila team member: Our pilot notes are posted, but there is no time to explain them. These are fictional interview excerpts, not representative quotations. Investigate rather than treating them as proof.

Constraints and decisions

Pilot budget ceiling: USD 18,000; 90 days available; no added permanent staff; personal beneficiary records must remain in authorized systems. Partners must be consulted before changing data collection. Choose and justify two pilot offices. Allocate time for training, translation, support and evaluation. Consider whether simplifying approval is preferable to purchasing a platform.

Week 8 update - fictional results

After a six-week pilot in Cairo and Nairobi, medians are 8 and 7 days over 20 completed requests each. Geneva remains 5 and Manila 8. Cairo reports two hours of additional weekly entry work per respondent; Nairobi reports one. A pulse survey receives 18 responses in Cairo and 22 in Nairobi, with voice scores 3.2 and 3.4. Two partners report confusing translation. No randomized control, case-mix adjustment or long-term outcome data are available. Assess feasibility and fairness; do not assert the platform caused all changes.

Real international case study

Documented case: UN culture change

Read the UN NewWork page and the UN 2.0 policy brief. The published UN materials frame organizational culture as part of change and connect new capabilities with organizational adaptation. WCE uses these public materials for analysis, not as evidence of a WCE partnership. The source pages describe aspirations and initiatives; they do not establish that every intervention succeeded.

Case investigation

Identify the problem as described by the UN, the proposed capabilities and cultural shifts, and the stakeholders whose participation is required. Cite a page or section for each documented claim. Then propose an evaluation plan with two outcome measures and one unintended-effect measure. Explicitly label your proposed measures and any assumptions.

Transfer exercise

Compare the UN context with BridgeWorld or an approved real workplace. Which practice could transfer, which authority or resource difference might prevent it, and whose voice could be lost? Submit a 400-word case note in Week 5 and incorporate a revised version into the final portfolio.

Primary sources

UN NewWork: <https://www.un.org/en/newwork/> ; UN 2.0 policy brief: <https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/our-common-agenda-policy-brief-un-2.0-en.pdf> . Sources accessed 14 October 2026.

Week 1 | OD foundations and the international consultant

Learning objective

Define an OD problem, separate symptoms from causes, and scope an ethical consulting engagement.

Lesson

Organizational development (OD) is planned, evidence-informed work to improve how people and organizational systems function together. A consultant considers mission, processes, leadership, incentives, relationships and the experiences of those affected. Faster output is not automatically a better outcome if it excludes communities or overburdens workers.

Use a five-part cycle: agree the purpose and boundaries; gather evidence; interpret and feed back findings; co-design and test interventions; evaluate and adapt. The cycle is iterative. In an international organization, identify headquarters, regional teams, local partners and service users separately: each may have different authority and access to information.

The psychological contract concerns perceived promises and expectations, beyond the formal employment contract. A promised flexible schedule that is repeatedly ignored can damage trust. Ask whose expectations are missing before labeling people resistant. Secure consent, protect confidentiality and agree how findings will be used.

Real-life scenario

A Nairobi coordinator misses three Geneva-led meetings. A manager labels her disengaged, but the meetings fall outside her workday and her connection fails during storms. What evidence would change your diagnosis?

Discuss

Choose an international NGO, intergovernmental organization or cross-border company. Identify one performance problem, two alternative explanations and the stakeholder whose perspective is easiest to overlook. Explain how you would seek that perspective without exposing private information.

Portfolio assignment

Produce a 600-word consulting brief for the BridgeWorld case. Include a problem statement, five stakeholders with interests and influence, two measurable goals, engagement boundaries, three ethical risks and a six-question interview guide. Mark every assumption. Explain which finding would make you change your problem statement.

Milestone weight

Consulting brief and stakeholder map (5%)

Video activity

ILO: Introduction to the self-assessment method for social dialogue institutions. [Open official video page](#).

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). Identify two steps in the ILO self-assessment process that could strengthen participation in an OD engagement. Record a timestamp for each. Explain one limitation of transferring a social-dialogue tool to an NGO.

Self-check

Which action should come before selecting an intervention? Buy a new platform / Agree the problem and gather perspectives / Assume staff need motivation

Week 2 | Culture, ethics and local ownership

Learning objective

Diagnose organizational culture without treating nationality as a fixed personality trait.

Lesson

Culture includes visible practices, stated values and underlying assumptions. A policy may promise inclusion while promotion decisions reward only headquarters visibility. Compare what leaders say with meeting rules, budget decisions, language access and recognition practices. Differences within a country or team can be as important as differences between countries.

Use cultural humility: ask, listen, test your interpretation and revise. National culture frameworks can prompt questions but cannot predict an individual's behavior. Role, seniority, profession, language, gender, disability and local history all affect how people participate. Do not describe a population as naturally passive, authoritarian or resistant.

Distinguish the organizational psychological contract from the broader social contract discussed by the ILO. Both raise questions about trust and fairness, but they operate at different levels. A workable culture change links values to routines, gives affected people a voice and measures whether the promised change is experienced.

Real-life scenario

A Cairo partner requests consultation before a public launch. Headquarters interprets this as delay; the partner believes announcing the project without community review breaks a promise. Develop two explanations before making a cultural judgment.

Discuss

When can a single global policy improve fairness, and when should implementation vary locally? Propose a common principle and two legitimate local adaptations. State a boundary that should not be waived.

Portfolio assignment

Write an 800-word culture audit and a two-page evidence table for BridgeWorld. Compare stated values with three observable practices. Use the supplied data and at least three credible sources, including a primary source. Create five behavior-based audit questions, propose two locally adaptable practices, and identify a fairness risk in each. Do not infer employee attitudes from nationality.

Milestone weight

Culture audit and evidence table (8%)

Video activity

ILO: Rethinking the economy: A social contract for equality, dignity and opportunity. [Open official video page.](#)

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). After viewing the interview with Jayati Ghosh, connect one argument about trust or opportunity to a workplace practice. Distinguish the speaker's argument from your own proposed application.

Self-check

Which is the strongest culture claim? Everyone in a country avoids disagreement / Interview and meeting data suggest staff fear penalties for disagreement / The website says inclusion, so inclusion is achieved

Week 3 | Multicultural teams and inclusive collaboration

Learning objective

Design a team charter that distributes voice, responsibility and opportunity fairly.

Lesson

Teams develop shared expectations through interaction; early conflict can signal unclear roles rather than poor character. A charter should state purpose, deliverables, roles, decision rules, communication channels and a process for resolving disagreement. Revisit it when membership or conditions change.

International teams face time-zone asymmetry, unequal language fluency, different employment arrangements and uneven connectivity. Rotate inconvenient meetings, circulate plain-language agendas, allow asynchronous contributions and summarize decisions in writing. Translation helps only if terminology and meaning are checked.

Psychological safety means people can raise questions and concerns without undue interpersonal punishment; it does not remove accountability. Facilitation should invite dissent without forcing public disclosure. Use a decision log and clarify who decides, who advises and who implements. A RACI matrix clarifies responsible, accountable, consulted and informed roles, but should not replace conversation.

Real-life scenario

A partner representative is added to a team but cannot access the decision platform. Other members interpret silence as agreement. Design a process that allows meaningful contribution before a decision closes.

Discuss

Your team must select a project site while members disagree about urgency and consultation. Describe a fair decision process, an escalation rule and how you would document a minority view.

Portfolio assignment

Create a three-page team operating manual: one-page charter, one-page RACI matrix and one-page conflict protocol. Include rotating meeting rules, language and accessibility arrangements, response expectations, decisions requiring partner consultation, and a worked example of disagreement. Test the charter with a peer role-playing a field coordinator; record two revisions.

Milestone weight

Inclusive team manual (7%)

Video activity

ILO: Rights at Work and Social Dialogue in Asia and the Pacific. [Open official video page.](#)

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). Use the historical Asia-Pacific video as a lens on representation and voice, rather than as current country-level legal guidance. Identify one lesson for a cross-border team and one issue requiring current local evidence.

Self-check

Silence in an online meeting most reliably means: Agreement / A need to check access and invite input / Lack of ability

Week 4 | Diagnosis, evidence and responsible AI

Learning objective

Compare diagnostic models and design a safe, credible evidence plan.

Lesson

A diagnostic model organizes questions; it does not prove a cause. Weisbord's Six-Box model examines purposes, structure, relationships, rewards, leadership and helpful mechanisms. The Burke-Litwin model connects external conditions and organizational factors, distinguishing broad transformation from everyday operations. Use the first for a manageable initial scan and the second when interdependencies and major change require deeper investigation.

Triangulate survey responses, interviews, process records and observation. Report denominators, response rates and missing data. A low survey score may reflect workload, translation or selection bias. Correlation between training and performance does not establish that training caused the improvement. In small teams, even anonymous comments can identify individuals.

AI may help draft non-sensitive questions or expose alternative interpretations, but verify every factual claim against original sources. Never upload confidential staff records. Document the tool, date, purpose, relevant prompts and substantive edits. Complete a human analysis first; an AI-free route is equally acceptable.

Real-life scenario

A director asks you to upload identifiable survey comments into a public chatbot and rank country offices. Respond with a safer analysis plan and explain why the ranking may mislead.

Discuss

Compare Six-Box and Burke-Litwin for BridgeWorld. What would each model reveal, and what might it conceal? If using AI, critique two outputs; otherwise critique two interpretations you develop yourself. Explain how you verified the claims.

Portfolio assignment

Submit a 900-word diagnostic report plus a data collection plan. Map the case evidence to two models, distinguish three symptoms from two testable causal hypotheses, calculate survey response rates, and propose interviews, privacy safeguards and a missing-data strategy. Include a source-verification table and either an AI disclosure or an AI-free declaration.

Milestone weight

Diagnostic report and evidence plan (10%)

Video activity

ILO: Conceptual framework of the self-assessment method for social dialogue institutions. [Open official video page.](#)

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). From the ILO conceptual-framework animation, identify how a framework relates inputs or processes to outcomes. Apply that distinction to one BridgeWorld hypothesis and name an alternative explanation.

Self-check

A diagnostic model establishes causation: Automatically / Only when AI confirms it / No; hypotheses require further evidence

Week 5 | Learning organizations and knowledge exchange

Learning objective

Build a learning process that transfers knowledge across organizational and language boundaries.

Lesson

A learning organization makes it possible to question routines, share evidence and adjust behavior. Single-loop learning improves a process within existing goals; double-loop learning asks whether the goals or assumptions need revision. Fixing a slow approval form is different from asking whether headquarters approval is necessary.

An after-action review asks: what was expected, what happened, why was there a difference, and what will we do next? Use a facilitator, clear records and psychological safety. A community of practice connects people around a shared task, but requires protected time and usable documentation rather than another meeting burden.

Knowledge must flow in both directions. Local teams hold practical expertise that central dashboards may omit. Use short multilingual summaries, agreed vocabulary and feedback on whether guidance worked. Measure adoption and usefulness, not just the number of training sessions delivered.

Real-life scenario

A Manila pilot solves a partner-onboarding problem, but the guidance is published only in technical English and Cairo staff repeat the same mistakes. Design a knowledge-transfer experiment.

Discuss

Choose a recurring organizational mistake. Explain a single-loop correction and a double-loop challenge to an assumption. Which would you test first, and what evidence would justify changing course?

Portfolio assignment

Design a two-page learning system and conduct a mock after-action review with a peer or through two written role perspectives. Supply a 30-minute agenda, four review questions, a one-page learning log, multilingual dissemination plan and three adoption measures. Use at least one insight from the real UN culture-change case, clearly separating documented evidence from your proposal.

Milestone weight

Learning system and review log (7%)

Video activity

ILO: Sustaining peace through decent work: The role of social partners and social dialogue. [Open official video page](#).

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). View the first five minutes of the ILO peace-and-dialogue session, or another five-minute segment you identify with timestamps. Note two stakeholder perspectives and explain how a learning forum could retain disagreement productively.

Self-check

Double-loop learning asks: How to process the same form faster / Whether the approval requirement itself is needed / How to schedule more identical training

Week 6 | Change design, readiness and implementation

Learning objective

Create a staged change plan with local consultation, owners and measurable safeguards.

Lesson

Lewin's unfreeze-change-refreeze sequence is a useful organizing lens: prepare people and conditions, trial new ways of working, and stabilize practices that prove useful. Refreezing need not mean permanent rigidity; review points keep a practice adaptable. The lens simplifies a complex process and may underrepresent political conflict or repeated shocks.

A force-field analysis identifies forces supporting and restraining a proposed change. Staff concern may reveal genuine risk, such as increased unpaid workload or loss of local authority. Consultation should shape the intervention before rollout, not merely persuade people to accept a predetermined decision.

Write a theory of change: if we implement a defined intervention, under stated assumptions, a measurable result should follow. Link activities, outputs and outcomes; specify the owner, resources, dependencies and decision gates. Pilot before scale, set stop rules, and consider an alternative change approach when conditions are uncertain.

Real-life scenario

BridgeWorld plans a new reporting platform. Field teams fear duplicate entry while donors want comparable data. Pilot a simplified workflow in two offices before requiring global adoption.

Discuss

Which part of Lewin's lens is most useful for this scenario, and where does it oversimplify the situation? Compare it with an iterative test-and-learn approach. Describe a condition that would make you stop the pilot.

Portfolio assignment

Create a 90-day change plan with a force-field table, stakeholder consultation steps, a staged workplan, a costed resource estimate with explicit assumptions, three risks, and baseline/target metrics. Include at least two alternatives considered, a rollout decision gate and a rollback rule. Explain one adaptation for each participating office without using national stereotypes.

Milestone weight

90-day change plan (10%)

Video activity

ILO: Employers and the social contract: Building sustainable workplaces. [Open official video page.](#)

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). After the employers' interview, identify one potential tension between organizational resilience and worker interests. Build a consultation or monitoring step into your change plan to address it.

Self-check

A pilot should scale when: Its launch date arrives / Pre-agreed success and safety criteria are met / Headquarters likes the platform

Week 7 | Leadership, trust and wellbeing

Learning objective

Design leadership behavior that supports voice while critically evaluating claims about the brain.

Lesson

Leadership during change affects whether people understand the purpose, trust the process and can raise risks. Predictable communication, fair procedures and realistic workloads support participation. Ask who carries the burden of change and whether temporary arrangements become permanent expectations.

Neuroscience can inform research questions about attention, stress and decision-making, but popular labels do not establish the effectiveness of a workplace intervention. Avoid left-brain/right-brain personality claims or promises to rewire employees. Evaluate study design, sample, relevance, limitations and independent replication. Where evidence is uncertain, describe a proposal as a hypothesis.

A manager can explain decisions, invite questions, acknowledge uncertainty and provide an accessible reporting route. Support wellbeing through workload review and referral to appropriate services rather than diagnosing staff. Cultural sensitivity means offering different ways to contribute while maintaining common standards of respect and accountability.

Real-life scenario

A director publicly calls cautious staff negative thinkers and mandates a brain-based workshop. Rewrite the response to address legitimate implementation concerns and evaluate the workshop's evidence before purchase.

Discuss

Select a leadership or neuroleadership claim from a named source. What evidence would persuade you to use it? Identify one ethical concern and propose a practical leadership behavior supported by transparent reasoning.

Portfolio assignment

Write a 700-word leadership advisory memo and a 250-word announcement for the pilot. Include a claim-evidence-limitations table, two listening channels, workload protections, a non-retaliation escalation route and an evaluation method. Use two research sources, including one original empirical study where available. Explain why a reasonable employee might oppose your plan.

Milestone weight

Leadership memo and communication (8%)

Video activity

ILO: Workers and the social contract: Decent work for all. [Open official video page](#).

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). From the workers' interview, identify an issue about fairness or participation and connect it to one leadership behavior. The interview is a stakeholder perspective, not neuroscience evidence.

Self-check

A popular brain-based leadership claim should be: Accepted because it sounds scientific / Checked for research quality and applicability / Used to diagnose employees

Week 8 | Integration, evaluation and global impact

Learning objective

Defend an evidence-based OD proposal and evaluate outcomes across contexts.

Lesson

An integrated OD proposal links a diagnosed problem to a justified intervention, a feasible implementation plan and an evaluation strategy. Explain competing interpretations and limits. A polished presentation cannot compensate for a weak link between evidence and recommendation.

Measure outcomes alongside equity and burden. Faster approvals may be valuable, but not if quality deteriorates or one office absorbs hidden labor. Disaggregate results where appropriate, suppress small groups to protect identity, and avoid overinterpreting differences. Identify baselines, denominators, data owners and review dates.

Sustainability requires owners, resources, routines and learning loops. Review whether the intervention remains useful after six months and under changing conditions. Distinguish what you demonstrated from what you predict. Responsible international practice preserves local voice and makes tradeoffs visible to decision-makers.

Real-life scenario

A pilot reduces average approval time, but one field office has poorer language access and overtime rises. The board asks whether to scale globally. Present a conditional recommendation and a corrective plan.

Discuss

Defend your final recommendation to a board containing donors, staff and community representatives. Identify its strongest objection, the evidence that could reverse your recommendation and one outcome you cannot yet claim.

Portfolio assignment

Submit an 8-10-page consulting portfolio integrating revised weekly work, plus an 8-slide board briefing with speaker notes (or a 6-8-minute recorded presentation with transcript). Include executive summary, diagnosis, culture and team design, change roadmap, budget assumptions, leadership communication, risk register and six-month evaluation dashboard. Add a one-page response-to-feedback log. Cite at least six credible sources, including two primary sources; distinguish fictional data from real case evidence.

Milestone weight

Integrated consulting portfolio and board briefing (15%)

Video activity

ILO: The social contract: A global commitment to combat inequality. [Open official video page.](#)

Watch up to five minutes (or the complete clip if shorter). Use the inequality interview to test whether your success measures capture who benefits and who bears the cost. Add one distributional measure and identify what it cannot establish.

Self-check

The strongest global scale-up recommendation: Uses average speed alone / Considers outcomes, local effects and safeguards / Promises the same results everywhere

Rubrics, templates and answer guide

Portfolio milestone rubric - 100 points

Problem and model application 25; evidence quality and limitations 25; intercultural inclusion and ethics 20; feasibility and evaluation 20; clarity, sources and required deliverables 10. Excellent work applies concepts accurately, tests assumptions, includes affected voices, and connects an implementable action to measurable outcomes. Developing work relies on generic recommendations or incomplete evidence. Insufficient work omits core deliverables or bases conclusions on unsupported stereotypes.

Discussion and video rubric - 100 points

Conceptual accuracy 30; evidence and video/source connection 25; intercultural reasoning 25; constructive engagement and clarity 20. Initial post: 250-350 words. Two replies: 100-150 words each, offering a different interpretation, useful evidence or a question that advances the analysis. Video reflection: 150-200 words with title, segment or timestamps, one insight, one limitation and one application. A source-based text alternative is available when video is inaccessible.

Final defense rubric - 100 points

Justification of recommendation 35; response to challenge and limitations 25; feasibility and ethical tradeoffs 20; reflection and revision 20. Include what changed after feedback and why, and identify evidence that would reverse the recommendation.

Reusable evidence table

Use columns: claim; source or case evidence; model applied; alternative explanation; limitation; verification step; resulting decision. Distinguish observations, interpretations and recommendations.

Reusable evaluation dashboard

Use columns: metric; definition and denominator; baseline; target; data owner; review date; local/equity breakdown; privacy safeguard; action if target or safety threshold is missed. Targets are proposals, not promised results.

Worked calculation and sample reasoning

Survey response rates: Geneva 80%; Cairo 40%; Nairobi 60%; Manila 80%; overall $76/120 = 63.3\%$. Cairo's lower voice score suggests a question for investigation, not proof that culture or nationality caused low participation. Its 40% response rate may hide nonrespondent perspectives. Test interview explanations and translation/access conditions before choosing an intervention.

Week 1: Agree the problem and gather perspectives. Define the engagement and collect evidence before choosing a solution.

Week 2: Interview and meeting data suggest staff fear penalties for disagreement. Behavioral evidence is stronger than a stereotype or an untested value statement.

Week 3: A need to check access and invite input. Silence is ambiguous; access, safety and understanding must be checked.

Week 4: No; hypotheses require further evidence. Models structure inquiry; causal claims require appropriate evidence.

Week 5: Whether the approval requirement itself is needed. Double-loop learning examines underlying assumptions and goals.

Week 6: Pre-agreed success and safety criteria are met. Use evidence and agreed decision criteria rather than a date alone.

Week 7: Checked for research quality and applicability. Scientific language does not replace evidence or ethical boundaries.

Week 8: Considers outcomes, local effects and safeguards. Outcome quality and distribution matter alongside efficiency.

Video resource directory and launch review

Week 1: Introduction to the self-assessment method for social dialogue institutions

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 2: Rethinking the economy: A social contract for equality, dignity and opportunity

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 3: Rights at Work and Social Dialogue in Asia and the Pacific

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 4: Conceptual framework of the self-assessment method for social dialogue institutions

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 5: Sustaining peace through decent work: The role of social partners and social dialogue

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 6: Employers and the social contract: Building sustainable workplaces

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 7: Workers and the social contract: Decent work for all

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Week 8: The social contract: A global commitment to combat inequality

[Official ILO resource](#) | [Direct video](#)

Publication review

Confirm WCE-GLD201 and the course name, eight-week format, proposed workload and grading, and the delivery policies. Confirm fee/free access, instructor-led versus self-paced delivery, enrollment and certificate terms before advertising those services. Owner approval is required before uploading this draft to the public WCE website.

Media and evidence limits

Videos are linked and embedded from official publisher resources; media files are not copied into this package. Embed addresses were retrieved from ILO pages. Playback and caption completeness have not been tested in a browser and can vary by region or publisher. The built-in lessons provide a text route. Learners should verify current local legal requirements separately. No affiliation with the ILO or UN is claimed.

Further reading for model verification

Weisbord, M. R. (1976), Organizational diagnosis: Six places to look for trouble with or without a theory, *Group & Organization Studies*, 1(4), 430-447. Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992), A causal model of organizational performance and change, *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 523-545. Lewin, K. (1947), Frontiers in group dynamics, *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5-41. Learners may locate these original works through a library; required core explanations are included here. Submitted assignments should verify the sources actually used.