



RIYAADA INSTITUTE FOR LEADERSHIP & GOVERNANCE

Educating Leaders. Producing Knowledge. Transforming Institutions.



RIYAADA ACADEMY

Executive Programme Handbook

Curricula learning materials and academic standards

Advanced Public Administration
Public Financial Management
Diplomatic Protocol and International Affairs
Women in Senior Leadership

Document control	Specification
Document code	RIYAADA-EXEC-2026-001
Edition	Version 1.0 September 2026
Status	Final programme package for academic approval
Academic owner	RIYAADA Academy Programmes Division
Review cycle	Annual and after the first delivery of each programme
Use	Academic reviewers, programme staff and learners after adoption

LEARN. QUALIFY. LEAD.

© 2026 RIYAADA Institute for Leadership & Governance. RIYAADA framework names and supplied brand identity are retained. Internal educational use of this package is permitted with attribution. External readings remain with their respective rights holders.



Contents

Select a section title to navigate. The programme handbook contains learner materials and common standards; the separate faculty guide contains controlled answers, teaching instructions and quality assurance records.

<u>1 Purpose and institutional alignment</u>	3
<u>2 Leadership frameworks and graduate standards</u>	4
<u>3 Awards credit hours and learning workload</u>	5
<u>4 Standardised admission and enrolment</u>	6
<u>5 Delivery learning materials and digital access</u>	9
<u>6 Advanced Public Administration</u>	11
<u>7 Public Financial Management</u>	23
<u>8 Diplomatic Protocol and International Affairs</u>	33
<u>9 Women in Senior Leadership</u>	42
<u>10 Assessment rubrics and award rules</u>	53
<u>11 Learner forms and reusable working tools</u>	58
<u>12 Governance approval and programme release</u>	63
<u>13 References and source register</u>	64



1 Purpose and institutional alignment

This package specifies four executive programmes for RIYAADA Academy. It provides the curriculum, learning workload, admission routes, study materials, practical cases, assessment tasks and award requirements needed for an academic approval decision and consistent delivery. Each programme develops an applied institutional product and a plan for its use during the following 90 days.

The package is submitted to the Academic and Quality Committee for programme approval, with Academic Board scrutiny of curriculum, assessment and delivery classification. The Founder and Chair records institutional authorisation through the applicable delegation. Programme delivery becomes effective on the recorded approval date. The approval record is in Section 12.

The RIYAADA educational approach

Systems thinking, applied professional mastery, ethical public purpose, and practice with reflection provide the four organising principles. Learners examine a problem in its institutional setting, produce a useful tool, test it through challenge and revise it in light of evidence. Integrity, service, evidence, equity, prudence and learning by doing guide both teaching and assessment. [I1, I2, I3]

Source architecture	Application in this suite
Leadership and Governance	Mandates, decision rights, integrity, accountability and public value in all programmes.
Executive and Cross-Cutting Skills	Communication, judgement, negotiation, developing people and adaptability across the suite.
Data and Digital Health theme	Transferable data quality and digital governance methods applied to administrative and leadership work.
Health systems, hospital and emergency themes	Optional sector applications and continuity cases; no clinical competence or health qualification is implied.
Capstone integration	One coherent institutional product and a 90-day implementation plan in every programme.

Relationship to the existing portfolio

Advanced Public Administration extends the government administration and public sector reform strand. Public Financial Management provides a general public resource pathway. Diplomacy adds representational and international engagement competence. Women in Senior Leadership develops executive practice alongside institutional inclusion. New programme identifiers distinguish this suite from existing short courses, including the existing RA-PFM-304 facilities-related listing. Existing course credits or awards are not automatically replaced or counted twice. [I4, I6]



2 Leadership frameworks and graduate standards

The four RIYAADA frameworks are used with their supplied wording. They are institutional teaching frameworks and are not represented as externally validated psychometric instruments. The seven competencies below define the evidence collected across programmes. [I4]

Framework	RIYAADA wording
LEADER	Lead; Empower; Accountable; Decisive; Engage; Results-Driven.
MANAGER	Motivate; Align; Nurture; Administer; Guide; Engage; Results-Driven.
DIRECTOR	Define Direction; Inspire Purpose; Resolve Challenges; Empower People; Communicate Clearly; Track Performance; Oversee Accountability; Results-Focused Leadership.
LEADERSHIP	Listening; Empowering; Adaptive; Decisive; Ethical; Respectful; Service; Humility; Innovative; Perseverance.

Graduate competency	Evidence expected
Strategic thinking	Explicit objectives, credible options, trade-offs and a resource-aware recommendation.
Communication	Clear decision brief, purposeful listening, accurate record and response to challenge.
Emotional intelligence	Reflection on behaviour and its effect; respectful response under pressure.
Developing people	Constructive feedback, fair delegation and a feasible development or support arrangement.
Decision making and critical thinking	Accurate analysis, transparent assumptions, uncertainty and proportionate judgement.
Adaptability	A revised response to new evidence, funding pressure or a changed context.
Integrity and accountability	Authority, conflict management, privacy, inclusion and evidence of individual authorship.

Tier 01 tasks emphasise direction, stewardship and oversight; Tier 02 tasks emphasise implementation, teams and resources; Tier 03 tasks emphasise reliable daily practice. Award level and management tier are distinct: seniority alone neither earns an award nor waives assessment. [I4]



3 Awards credit hours and learning workload

For this suite, one RIYAADA executive credit hour (RECH) represents 30 notional learning hours: 10 hours of structured learning and 20 hours of independent study and assessed production. This is the programme credit convention submitted for academic adoption. It is an internal executive education measure, not a claim of ECTS, university semester credit, national qualification level, professional licensure or external accreditation. One learning hour is 60 minutes; breaks and optional events are excluded.

Programme	Weeks	RECH	Total hours	Award
Advanced Public Administration	12	6	180	RL3
Public Financial Management	8	4	120	RL2
Diplomatic Protocol and International Affairs	6	3	90	RL2
Women in Senior Leadership	10	5	150	RL3
Suite total	36	18	540	Separate awards

Programme	Live or observed	Guided asynchronous	Independent study	Assessed production
APA	12	48	72	48
PFM	24	16	48	32
DPI	18	12	36	24
WSL	30	20	60	40
Total	84	96	216	144

Structured learning is the sum of live or observed work and guided asynchronous work. Asynchronous study is structured only when a faculty-designed task, feedback and completion evidence exist; a reading list alone is insufficient. Independent study includes research, reading and practice. Assessed production covers the learner's preparation and revision of graded work. The assessed live event itself is counted under live or observed hours, so no time is counted twice.

Award level and progression

Advanced Public Administration and Women in Senior Leadership lead to RL3 Advanced Certificates. Public Financial Management and Diplomatic Protocol and International Affairs lead to RL2 Professional Certificates. RL2 and RL3 are RIYAADA institutional award levels. Completing all four programmes does not automatically confer an Executive Diploma. Any later pathway requires an approved alignment and integrative assessment, with no double counting. [15]

Each subject spans two weeks, carries one RECH and totals 30 hours. All subjects are core. The final subject in each programme is integrative and is not eligible for RPL. Module completion is recorded as Competent or RPL; the overall award carries the final programme grade. Credit is released after all programme award conditions are satisfied.



4 Standardised admission and enrolment

The Admissions and Learner Eligibility Policy RIYAADA-ADM-2026-006 governs admission. These programme specifications operationalise its routes, evidence and timelines. Entry route does not appear on the certificate. [I5, pp. 3-8]

Programme level	Standard route	Alternative and conditions
RL2 PFM and DPI	Relevant first degree or professional qualification plus at least two years of relevant responsibility.	Portfolio route: at least five years of relevant responsibility, verified practice evidence and structured interview.
RL3 APA and WSL	RL2 award in a constituent course, or a relevant degree plus at least five years of responsibility including line or budget accountability.	For constituent-course entry, the Academic Board confirms the course mapping. RPL recognises demonstrated module competence within the policy cap; it does not by itself waive eligibility. Applicants lacking an RL3 route are advised on an appropriate RL2 pathway.

All applicants identify a realistic institutional challenge and opportunity to apply learning. A sponsor or RIYAADA-approved case can support learning where workplace access is restricted. Women in Senior Leadership centres women's experiences and advancement; the published non-discrimination policy remains in force, and gender is not used as a scored admissions criterion. Targeted outreach and appropriate peer support widen access without lowering exit standards.

Application evidence

- Signed application; CV; leadership challenge of no more than 500 words; verified photographic identity; and highest relevant qualification or portfolio evidence.
- Where sponsored, signed nomination and financial undertaking; professional registration only where relevant to the applicant's practice.
- Portfolio route: verified five-year professional history, three personally produced practice artefacts, two referees including a former or current supervisor, reflective statement, and a 30-minute interview by two assessors.
- Language proficiency demonstrated by relevant study, work, recognised test or interview. No universal test score is invented. The assessment language is the cohort delivery language.
- Digital readiness test, availability for compulsory sessions, consent and any requested reasonable adjustment. Sensitive adjustment information is reviewed separately from merit scoring.

Readiness scoring for this suite

After minimum eligibility is verified, two assessors independently score five criteria from 0 to 4: relevance of responsibility; evidence of practice; challenge and application opportunity; analytical reflection; and study readiness. Admit at 12/20 or above with no zero. A score of 0 means no usable evidence, 1 limited evidence, 2 adequate evidence, 3 strong evidence and 4 compelling verified evidence. Scores support judgement and do not substitute for the published entry route. The faculty guide supplies anchors and a decision record.



Admission decisions and learner support

Step	Service standard	Required record
Enquiry	2 working days	Advice and programme information
Completeness check	3 working days	Acknowledgement and missing evidence list
Nomination verification	5 working days	Verified sponsor undertaking where applicable
Identity and qualification verification	5 working days	Verification log
Written decision after complete evidence	10 working days	Two-assessor decision with reasons
Offer and enrolment	5 working days	Accepted terms, fee arrangement and joining instructions
Induction	Day one	Integrity briefing and Executive Development Record

Enrolment is complete only when identity, eligibility, written offer acceptance, published fee or approved instalment arrangement, compulsory modality requirements and the learner undertaking are recorded. The Registrar supplies the controlled fee schedule, any concession, administration charge and practical block dates before a financial commitment. No fee, scholarship entitlement or partner endorsement is inferred from this academic package.



Credit recognition access and learner terms

RPL and equivalence

RPL for an Advanced Certificate is capped at one third of its total credit. With whole one-credit subjects, APA may receive at most two RECH and WSL at most one RECH. The final integrative subject, capstone and panel defence are excluded. Prior learning must be from the preceding five years unless continuing practice establishes currency. The course owner assesses the outcome map, internal moderation checks the evidence, and the Academic Board approves credit. RL2 experience-based admission is not an automatic award of credit. [I5, p. 6]

Support access and complaints

English is the default language for this edition. Somali discussion and bilingual resources may be used when terminology and assessment are reviewed; Arabic delivery requires an appropriately prepared commissioned cohort. Assessment judges competence rather than language errors that do not obscure meaning. Provide accessible files, reasonable extra time or equivalent observation methods as agreed, without lowering the competence standard.

An applicant may seek review within 15 working days for misapplied criteria, procedural irregularity or overlooked evidence; an uninvolved reviewer responds within 10 working days. Unsuccessful application records are retained for two years and admitted learner records for five years after the last award, then securely destroyed under the policy. Sponsor reporting is limited to attendance, completion and award unless the learner gives further written consent. [I5, pp. 6-8]

Deferral withdrawal and refund information

One pre-start deferral is permitted on application. Transfer is subject to availability and no assessment having been attempted. More than 21 days before start, the policy provides a full refund less the published administration charge; 8-21 days gives a 50% refund; seven days or fewer or after commencement gives no refund, although one later transfer within 12 months may be permitted. RIYAADA cancellation gives the learner a full refund or transfer choice. A withdrawing learner may request a Statement of Attendance; no award credit is issued. [I5, p. 7]



5 Delivery learning materials and digital access

The Online and Blended Learning Policy RIYAADA-OBL-2026-008 requires parity of standard, parity of evidence and identity assurance. These new programme classifications form part of the academic approval decision; they do not expand the permitted modes of existing courses. First delivery in each approved online mode is a monitored pilot with enhanced observation and moderation. [I6, pp. 4-8]

Programme	Operating pattern	Compulsory evidence
APA M5	12 weeks; self-paced weekly study; one hour of live clinic or individual supervised work per learner per week.	Observed reform simulation and live individual defence; self-paced does not mean unobserved assessment.
PFM M3	Eight weeks; live online clinics plus six-hour in-person blocks in Weeks 4 and 8, excluding breaks.	Both practical blocks and individual financial control observations. A missed block requires an approved in-person replacement.
DPI M4	Six weeks; three live hours per week in two 90-minute sessions with breaks as needed.	Observed negotiation, protocol walk-through, crisis response and defence.
WSL M4	Ten weeks; three live hours per week in facilitated laboratories and coaching.	Observed leadership negotiation, individual evidence and live defence.

The timetable publishes every required session and assessment window in Mogadishu time (UTC+3) and UTC. Learners complete scheduled work within each week while choosing the timing of asynchronous study. A missed assessed event is rescheduled with a fresh equivalent prompt. PFM learners who complete online work but not the compulsory practical requirement receive a Statement of Attendance only. [I6]

Learning material standard

- Every subject opens with outcomes, workload, weekly tasks, submission points and the linked assessment. The handbook provides the core teaching brief, practical laboratory and learner case materials.
- Every subject has a monitored peer interaction and a faculty feedback point. Readings are linked to a task; original evidence and revision histories are retained in the learner portfolio.
- Optional recordings are segmented into units of no more than 12 minutes and supplied with captions, transcript, audio-only and downloadable text alternatives. Core participation never depends on watching video.
- Live sessions are no longer than 90 minutes without a break; no live online day exceeds five screen hours or four sessions. At least half of live time is active work; presentations stop after 20 minutes. [I6, D2-D5]
- Technical support acknowledges requests within four working hours during published support hours; faculty respond within two working days. Named contacts, a fallback platform and assessed-event contingency are in the joining instructions.



Learning innovation and participant responsibilities

Feature	Ready-to-use implementation	Learning evidence
Decision branches	Case injects introduce a budget, mandate, access or reputational constraint. Learners choose, explain and revise.	Original decision, new evidence and revised decision log.
Evidence passport	One Executive Development Record links diagnostic, module tools, feedback, assessments and follow-up.	Traceable artefacts and learner reflections.
Practice studio	Participants revise a real or fictional institutional product in each subject.	Before and after versions against a shared rubric.
Peer challenge	Pairs identify one unsupported assumption and one feasible improvement; the author responds.	Specific feedback and revision rationale.
Low-bandwidth parity	Text-first core pack, downloadable case tables and editable Word worksheets.	Equivalent outputs regardless of device or connectivity.
Ethical AI literacy	Optional critique of an AI-generated draft using only public or fictional data. A manual route is always available.	Disclosure of tool and use, checked sources and the learner's own judgement.
90-day transfer review	Day 30 and 60 check-ins and day 90 evidence review.	Implemented action, verification, barriers and next decision.

The Word teaching briefs can be delivered directly as text-first learning units. They also serve as the source text for optional audio or short recordings. The delivery team checks accessibility, current links, terminology and platform operation before release. Confidential assessor answers and diagnostic keys remain in the faculty guide, not in the learner area.

Integrity confidentiality and identity

Use original work and acknowledge sources, collaboration and permitted AI assistance. Do not upload confidential institutional or personal data to external tools. No patient data are required. Obtain permission before using workplace documents and remove identifiers. A fictional case can demonstrate the same competencies when workplace use would be unsafe or unauthorised. No learner is required to disclose trauma, political affiliation or a sensitive personal experience.

Identity is checked against the verified photographic document at assessed live events. Online defences use two assessors; recording requires consent and a stated retention purpose. Where recording is not consented to, contemporaneous two-assessor notes preserve moderation evidence. Connectivity loss does not earn a penalty: reschedule or provide an approved equivalent. Invasive remote surveillance is not used. [I6, pp. 6-7]



6 Advanced Public Administration

Develop administrators who can turn a public mandate into lawful decisions, workable institutional arrangements and measurable service improvements under fiscal, capacity and political constraints.

Programme specification	Requirement
Programme code	RA-APA-2026
Award	Advanced Certificate in Advanced Public Administration
Duration and workload	12 weeks 15 hours per week 180 total hours 6 RECH
Delivery	M5 supported distance Online with self-paced study and scheduled supervised clinics
Participants	Directors, department heads, senior civil servants, public agency managers, policy advisers and reform leads with line or budget accountability.
Academic owner	Public Administration and Governance Course Owner
Entry level	RL3 under Section 4
Core output	Public administration reform dossier

Programme learning outcomes

APA1 Diagnose mandate overlap, accountability gaps and service bottlenecks using documented institutional evidence.

APA2 Compare policy and administrative options using explicit public value, affordability and equity criteria.

APA3 Design merit based workforce, delegation and integrity arrangements with clear decision rights.

APA4 Build an operational service improvement plan with cost, access, data protection and continuity controls.

APA5 Use performance evidence and structured stakeholder engagement to adapt implementation.

APA6 Defend a feasible reform proposal and a 90-day implementation plan before an assessment panel.



Subject structure and assessment alignment

Subject	Weeks	Live	Guided	Study	Assess	RECH
APA01 Public purpose and administrative systems	1-2	2	8	12	8	1
APA02 Policy analysis and intergovernmental coordination	3-4	2	8	12	8	1
APA03 Civil service capability and integrity	5-6	2	8	12	8	1
APA04 Public resources and inclusive digital services	7-8	2	8	12	8	1
APA05 Performance management and adaptive reform	9-10	2	8	12	8	1
APA06 Integrated public administration reform	11-12	2	8	12	8	1
Total	12	12	48	72	48	6

Hours: Live = live or observed work; Guided = structured asynchronous work; Study = independent study; Assess = preparation and revision of graded work. All core subjects carry 30 hours. Subject order is sequential, with completed outputs retained for capstone integration.

Evidence	Due	Weight	Outcome coverage
Participation and reflection	Across all subjects	20%	All; judged through the four reflection criteria
Applied Assignment A	Week 4	12.5%	APA1 APA2 APA5
Applied Assignment B	Week 8	12.5%	APA3 APA4 APA5
Observed simulation	Week 10	25%	APA2 APA3 APA4 APA5
Capstone written product	Week 12	22.5%	APA1 APA2 APA3 APA4 APA5 APA6
Individual capstone defence	Week 12	7.5%	APA1 APA2 APA3 APA4 APA5 APA6

Every subject output is required evidence of learning. Only the tasks identified in the assessment table receive a separate weighted mark; the remaining weekly outputs are formative preparation. Revised work may feed the capstone, but the capstone mark assesses integration and improvement rather than re-awarding the earlier assignment mark.

Each week uses 1 live, 4 guided, 6 independent and 4 assessed-production hours. Clinics, simulation work and the individual defence are scheduled within the live allocation. Individual assessment slots replace the relevant clinic time.



APA01 Public purpose and administrative systems

Weeks 1 and 2 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes APA1 APA2 | Readings R1 and R2

Teaching brief

Public administration connects authority with the daily experience of a service user. A mandate tells an institution what it may do; a delegation identifies who may decide; a procedure explains how; and an accountability mechanism makes the decision open to review. These are separate design choices. A new office will not solve a problem if the bottleneck is an unclear approval or an unfunded task. Begin with a bounded service and follow a real transaction from request to decision. Record elapsed time, handovers, rejected applications and unanswered questions. Distinguish rules that protect public interests from habits that create delay. A systems map should show dependencies and feedback, including the effect of citizen complaints on management decisions. Compare administrative models by the problem they help solve. Predictable rules support consistency, managerial discretion can improve responsiveness, and collaborative governance can coordinate interdependent actors; each requires safeguards.

Week 1 Public mandate and public value

Define the service problem and distinguish purpose, mandate, delegation and procedure. Compare rule based administration, performance management and collaborative governance.

Learning output: Create a one-page mandate map and a 200-word problem statement.

Week 2 Systems diagnosis and accountability

Trace one service journey, classify delays and map formal authority, informal influence and user feedback.

Learning output: Submit a two-page diagnostic with three evidence gaps and a stakeholder map.

Applied laboratory

Use Case APA in the handbook. Draw the seven-step permit pathway. Mark who requests, checks, approves, pays and reviews. Identify the duplicated identity checks and one missing accountability step. In the clinic, defend which step you would investigate first and why. Revise the map after one peer challenge; keep the original and revised versions.

Check your understanding: An agency proposes a new committee to resolve every delayed application. What must be established first?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



APA02 Policy analysis and intergovernmental coordination

Weeks 3 and 4 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes APA1 APA2 APA5 | Readings R1 and R2

Teaching brief

A decision memorandum starts with a decision that a named authority can actually take. Define the baseline and compare a small set of credible options, including maintaining the current approach where relevant. State the criteria before scoring options. Separate a forecast from an observed result and distinguish a national policy preference from an institution's legal power. Intergovernmental work needs explicit interfaces: which level sets standards, which funds delivery, who implements, who owns data and how disputes are resolved. Consultation should improve a decision, not merely validate it. Record who was heard, which concerns changed the proposal and which could not be accommodated. In a fragile setting, an option that depends on unavailable staffing or indefinite donor support is not yet an implementation plan. Sequence essential dependencies and use a small test before expanding.

Week 3 Evidence and policy options

Appraise evidence quality, identify uncertainty and compare three options against agreed criteria.

Learning output: Draft a two-page options matrix with a reasoned recommendation.

Week 4 Coordination and implementation agreements

Allocate functions across collaborating institutions without inventing statutory powers; design escalation and consultation.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment A using the diagnostic and a coordination compact.

Applied laboratory

Assign roles as central agency, regional office, finance function and service user representative. Negotiate a one-page compact covering decisions, resources, information sharing and dispute resolution. Test it against a delayed transfer and an inconsistent eligibility rule. Record what can be agreed administratively and what requires a higher decision.

Check your understanding: What is wrong with choosing an option and then selecting criteria that make it win?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



APA03 Civil service capability and integrity

Weeks 5 and 6 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes APA3 APA5 | Readings R2

Teaching brief

An organisation chart is useful only when duties, authority and accountability fit together. Job descriptions should specify required outputs and competencies rather than the personal characteristics of a preferred candidate. Recruitment criteria should be agreed before applications are reviewed, with conflicts declared and scoring recorded. Delegation should identify the decision, value or risk limit, conditions and reporting requirement. It does not remove the delegator's oversight responsibilities. Integrity controls need both prevention and a credible response: accessible procedures, segregation of duties where feasible, documented exceptions and an independent route for concern. Performance conversations should use evidence, explain expectations, identify support and agree follow-up. They should not convert disagreement into misconduct. Where staff are scarce, design compensating review controls and disclose the remaining risk.

Week 5 Workforce planning and merit

Analyse workload, define competencies, write role profiles and design a scored recruitment process.

Learning output: Complete a role profile and a workforce gap table.

Week 6 Delegation and integrity systems

Prepare a delegation register, conflict declaration process and fair performance conversation.

Learning output: Submit a delegation matrix and a 500-word integrity response.

Applied laboratory

A service manager both approves eligibility and records payments because only two staff are available. Propose a proportionate control package with transaction logs, reconciliation, independent sample review and exception escalation. Run a five-minute performance conversation that focuses on facts and support rather than blame.

Check your understanding: Does a conflict declaration alone manage a procurement conflict?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



APA04 Public resources and inclusive digital services

Weeks 7 and 8 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes APA2 APA4 | Readings R3 overview and R4 reporting and budgeting

Teaching brief

A service plan should connect activities with inputs, cost drivers and an affordable funding envelope. Count recurrent costs as well as the initial purchase. Distinguish the budget approved, cash available, commitments entered and payments made. An apparently cheap digital service can create new costs through licensing, support, data protection and user assistance. Map the service before automating it. Digital records should collect only information needed for the stated purpose, restrict access and provide an audit trail. Design an assisted channel for users without a device, literacy, connectivity or acceptable identification. An efficiency gain that excludes more applicants is an incomplete result. Compare cost per completed service alongside completion time, rejection reasons and access differences.

Week 7 Resource planning and service costing

Link service demand to staffing, procurement, operating costs and cash constraints.

Learning output: Prepare a costed service improvement budget with assumptions.

Week 8 Digital service design and inclusion

Redesign the process before choosing technology; specify minimum data, access controls and an assisted route.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment B with a service blueprint and access safeguards.

Applied laboratory

Compare the three reform options in Case APA using first-year cost, recurrent cost, feasibility and access. Design a paper-compatible case identifier and a simple status register. Test a scenario in which the system is offline for two days. Explain how pending applications are recovered without duplication.

Check your understanding: Can a digital portal be considered successful because 90% of online users complete an application?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



APA05 Performance management and adaptive reform

Weeks 9 and 10 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes APA4 APA5 | Readings R1 and R2 participation and oversight

Teaching brief

A performance measure needs a precise definition, numerator, denominator, source, reporting interval and owner. A target without a baseline is a hypothesis about improvement. Pair output measures with quality and equity checks so that a faster process does not simply reject difficult cases. Use a short review cycle: examine evidence, investigate variation, decide an action and record who will check its effect. In unstable conditions, a reform needs a minimum service continuity plan as well as a preferred operating model. Distinguish what management can adjust from changes requiring formal approval. A learning log records why a decision changed, including failed tests. Honest adaptation is more useful than reporting every pilot as a success.

Week 9 Results and evaluation

Build a short results chain and indicator dictionary; distinguish contribution from causal attribution.

Learning output: Create a five-indicator dashboard and a review agenda.

Week 10 Change leadership and continuity

Map support and resistance, rehearse an interagency review and respond to a disruption.

Learning output: Complete the observed simulation and an individual decision log.

Applied laboratory

Run the Case APA reform review. After the first recommendation, receive the budget reduction and access complaint. Revise scope, protect essential service access and assign a decision owner. Explain what evidence could reverse the decision and when the next review will occur.

Check your understanding: If waiting time falls after a pilot, can the pilot be credited with the entire improvement?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



APA06 Integrated public administration reform

Weeks 11 and 12 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes APA1 APA2 APA3 APA4 APA5 APA6 | Readings R1 to R4 as relevant

Teaching brief

The final reform dossier should allow a governing authority to decide, a manager to act and a reviewer to check progress. Begin with the decision requested and the public problem it addresses. Explain the mandate, evidence and limits of the analysis. Show why the recommended option is preferable and what it costs. Attach a workable delegation or coordination tool, a service improvement process and a small performance framework. Name dependencies that must be resolved before implementation. The 90-day plan should identify a sponsor, action owners, milestones and triggers for escalation. Approval of a classroom proposal is not approval by the employing institution. The learner remains responsible for securing any real-world authorisation before implementation.

Week 11 Capstone integration and peer challenge

Integrate evidence, options, costs, authority and equity in a coherent reform dossier.

Learning output: Submit a full draft for structured peer and faculty feedback.

Week 12 Executive defence and transition to practice

Defend the recommendation, revise it after challenge and agree follow-up evidence.

Learning output: Submit the final capstone and complete the individual panel defence.

Applied laboratory

Use the capstone readiness checklist: decision, authority, evidence, alternatives, costs, implementation, risk, equity, indicators and learning. Exchange dossiers and identify the single most consequential unsupported assumption. Address that assumption before panel submission.

Check your understanding: What makes a 90-day plan assessable?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



Assessment briefs and submission requirements

Applied Assignment A Institutional diagnostic and options memorandum

Week 4 | 1,500 words plus two working exhibits | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Define a bounded administrative problem using the case or authorised workplace evidence. Submit a mandate and accountability map, service journey, three-option comparison and an interinstitutional coordination compact. State the authority required for the recommended action and distinguish verified facts from assumptions.

Applied Assignment B Costed inclusive service improvement design

Week 8 | 1,500 words plus a budget and service blueprint | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Translate the chosen option into a service workflow, workforce and delegation arrangements, first-year and recurrent costs, minimum data requirements and an assisted access route. Identify procurement or approval dependencies, continuity arrangements and a short indicator dictionary.

Observed simulation

Week 10 | 25% of programme grade | Rubric S

Each learner performs a decision role, responds to one new constraint and submits a 500-word decision log within 48 hours. The assessed activity includes the Case APA budget and access injects.

Participation and reflection portfolio

Keep one 250-word reflection per subject. Identify a decision or behaviour, the evidence or feedback that challenged it, what changed and how you will apply the learning. Attach peer feedback and the response to it. The portfolio is assessed at the programme end using Rubric R; activity counts and attendance alone do not earn marks.



Capstone and transition to practice

Public administration reform dossier

Week 12 | 3,000 words plus up to eight pages of operational exhibits | 30% combined written product and defence

A 250-word decision brief; institutional diagnosis; evidence and limitations; options and justification; mandate and delegation or coordination tool; costed implementation design; citizen access and integrity safeguards; five indicators; a risk register; and a 90-day action plan.

Prepare an eight-minute presentation, followed by 12 minutes of questions and five minutes for panel feedback. A 30-minute appointment includes identity checks and transition. The written product carries 75% and defence 25% of the capstone component. Use Rubrics C and D. The overall assessment and award rules in Section 10 also apply.

Required competence safeguard

The proposal identifies a lawful decision route, preserves a review or complaints route, protects personal information and does not assign powers unsupported by the evidence.

Panel preparation questions

- Which decision can your sponsor authorise, and which requires another authority?
- Which excluded service user is least well served by your design?
- What would make you reverse your preferred option?
- Show how one cost and one indicator were calculated.

Submission format

Submit editable Word or accessible PDF narrative and readable tables through the approved learning platform. Financial workings may be included as an editable spreadsheet or Word calculation table. Use learner ID, programme code, assessment and version in the filename. State sources, permissions, assumptions, contribution and AI assistance. Word limits exclude tables, references and annexes; a 10% tolerance applies. An annex must support the argument and cannot replace missing analysis.

90-day application

At day 30, confirm the sponsor decision and initial action. At day 60, review barriers, resource use and necessary adjustment. At day 90, submit a two-page implementation reflection with evidence and the next decision. This follow-up is included in programme support and is recorded separately; it is not an additional credit-bearing extension or a guarantee of workplace adoption.



Case APA Reforming a regional public service office

Fictional teaching case. The Regional Public Service Office processes small business service permits in a resource-constrained setting. The facts do not describe a named government agency. The director has authority to redesign internal workflow and assign staff, but changes to fees, statutory eligibility and interagency mandates require approval by the competent authority.

Measure	Case information
Applications in the last quarter	240
Completed within 10 working days	96
Returned because documents were incomplete	72
Other cases still pending at quarter end	72
Women applicants and timely completions	100 applicants; 30 timely completions
Men applicants and timely completions	140 applicants; 66 timely completions
Rural applicants and timely completions	80 applicants; 20 timely completions
Urban applicants and timely completions	160 applicants; 76 timely completions

Process step	Current owner	Observed issue
1 Receive paper form	Reception	Requirements vary by clerk
2 Check identity	Records clerk	No written checklist
3 Review eligibility	Technical officer	Cases batched once a week
4 Recheck identity	Administrative officer	Duplicates step 2
5 Approve case	Director	Routine cases await travel return
6 Confirm authorised payment	Cashier	Payment log not reconciled daily
7 Issue permit and close record	Reception	No named complaint reviewer

Option	First-year cost	Annual recurrent cost	Design feature
A Clarify and simplify	USD 6,000	USD 2,000	Written checklist, delegated routine decisions, assisted counter
B Digital portal	USD 18,000	USD 6,000	Online applications, status tracking, training and support
C Additional counter	USD 12,000	USD 10,000	More staff, current workflow retained



APA Case workshop and working tools

Learner instructions

- Calculate overall timely completion and the gender and residence gaps. Categories for sex and residence overlap and must not be added together.
- Compare the three options against public value, affordability, administrative authority and access. Do not treat forecast improvements as observed results.
- Design a minimum complaint and review route, a delegation control and an assisted access channel.
- Prepare an options memorandum and a costed 90-day test. The initial reform envelope is USD 15,000; existing baseline operations are funded separately.

Role cards

- Director: may approve internal workflow changes within the reform envelope; must refer fee and statutory changes.
- Regional coordinator: wants consistent standards and a weekly unresolved-case report.
- Finance manager: requires recurrent cost disclosure and an approved spending route.
- Service user representative: wants clear requirements, predictable times and a fair review route.

The facilitator introduces one or more changes during the exercise. Respond with a decision, rationale, approval route and record of the implications. Submit your own account; a group product does not establish individual competence.

Decision rights worksheet

Decision	Authority and limit	Evidence and review
Routine eligibility		
Fee or statutory change		
Payment reconciliation		
Complaint review		



7 Public Financial Management

Enable participants to plan, execute, reconcile and explain public resource decisions, connecting fiscal discipline with service priorities, internal control and equitable use of funds.

Programme specification	Requirement
Programme code	RA-PFMX-2026
Award	Professional Certificate in Public Financial Management
Duration and workload	8 weeks 15 hours per week 120 total hours 4 RECH
Delivery	M3 blended Online study and clinics with two compulsory in-person practical blocks
Participants	Finance and budget officers, programme managers, administrators, procurement staff and public sector managers with responsibility for resources or financial oversight.
Academic owner	Public Financial Management Course Owner
Entry level	RL2 under Section 4
Core output	Financial management improvement package

Programme learning outcomes

PFM1 Explain the budget cycle and distinguish appropriation, release, commitment, obligation, payment and arrears.

PFM2 Prepare a balanced programme budget and a realistic cash plan with a documented funding shock response.

PFM3 Apply procurement and commitment controls and demonstrate a verifiable payment and reconciliation process.

PFM4 Interpret budget variances, fiscal risks and equity implications using transparent calculations.

PFM5 Produce and defend a financial improvement package with assigned controls and a 90-day action plan.



Subject structure and assessment alignment

Subject	Weeks	Live	Guided	Study	Assess	RECH
PFM01 Budget institutions and credible planning	1-2	4	6	12	8	1
PFM02 Cash commitment and procurement control	3-4	8	2	12	8	1
PFM03 Accounting reporting and financial assurance	5-6	4	6	12	8	1
PFM04 Equity fiscal risk and executive decisions	7-8	8	2	12	8	1
Total	8	24	16	48	32	4

Hours: Live = live or observed work; Guided = structured asynchronous work; Study = independent study; Assess = preparation and revision of graded work. All core subjects carry 30 hours. Subject order is sequential, with completed outputs retained for capstone integration.

Evidence	Due	Weight	Outcome coverage
Participation and reflection	Across all subjects	20%	All; judged through the four reflection criteria
Applied Assignment A	Week 2	12.5%	PFM1 PFM2
Applied Assignment B	Week 5	12.5%	PFM1 PFM3 PFM4
Observed simulation	Week 8 with practical evidence from Week 4	25%	PFM2 PFM3 PFM4
Capstone written product	Week 8	22.5%	PFM1 PFM2 PFM3 PFM4 PFM5
Individual capstone defence	Week 8	7.5%	PFM1 PFM2 PFM3 PFM4 PFM5

Every subject output is required evidence of learning. Only the tasks identified in the assessment table receive a separate weighted mark; the remaining weekly outputs are formative preparation. Revised work may feed the capstone, but the capstone mark assesses integration and improvement rather than re-awarding the earlier assignment mark.

Weekly workload: Weeks 1, 2, 5 and 6 each use 2 live, 3 guided, 6 study and 4 assessed-production hours. Weeks 3 and 7 use 2, 2, 7 and 4 hours. Weeks 4 and 8 use 6, 0, 5 and 4 hours, with live time delivered in person. Each week totals 15 hours.



PFM01 Budget institutions and credible planning

Weeks 1 and 2 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes PFM1 PFM2 | Readings R3 overview and R4 budgeting

Teaching brief

Public financial management links policy choices to authorised resources and the evidence that those resources were used as intended. The budget cycle includes formulation, legislative or governing approval, execution, reporting and scrutiny. Aggregate fiscal discipline, allocation to priorities and service delivery performance are complementary objectives. A programme budget should identify outputs, quantities, unit costs, timing and recurrent implications. Avoid starting with last year's total and adding a percentage without examining demand and commitments. Classification allows the same transaction to be understood by organisation, economic type and programme purpose. Use the classifications approved for the institution; the labels in a teaching case are not a replacement for a government chart of accounts.

Week 1 Budget cycle and accountability

Map actors, authorisations and reporting relationships; interpret the main PFM objectives.

Learning output: Complete a budget cycle map and classify ten example transactions.

Week 2 Costing and budget formulation

Calculate quantities and unit costs, prioritise within a ceiling and identify recurrent implications.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment A with a programme budget and assumptions.

Applied laboratory

Using Case PFM, reconcile the six approved budget lines to the total ceiling. Create a service priority note explaining which expenditures protect continuity. Identify the information needed before treating a donor pledge as available financing. Present one sensitivity calculation.

Check your understanding: Why can an approved budget not be treated as cash available today?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



PFM02 Cash commitment and procurement control

Weeks 3 and 4 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes PFM1 PFM2 PFM3 | Readings R3 predictability and control and R2 risk management

Teaching brief

A cash forecast shows when money is expected to arrive and when authorised obligations fall due. A commitment control asks whether a purchase can be undertaken before an order is placed. An obligation becomes payable under the relevant contractual and accounting rules; overdue unpaid obligations may become arrears. Procurement should link an approved need to clear specifications, an appropriate method, a documented evaluation and contract management. The cheapest quoted price is not necessarily the best evaluated offer if quality, delivery and life-cycle costs are material. A declared conflict requires a management decision, such as recusal and independent review. An urgent request does not erase the need for authority, evidence and later accountability.

Week 3 Cash planning and commitments

Build a monthly cash forecast and register existing commitments and payment deadlines.

Learning output: Prepare a three-month cash plan with a shortfall response.

Week 4 Procurement and payment practical

Complete the first six-hour in-person block: procurement file, payment controls and observed authorisation exercise.

Learning output: Submit the first practical observation record and control checklist.

Applied laboratory

Use the quotations and conflict in Case PFM. Check compliance before comparing offers, record reasons, separate evaluation from approval and build an audit trail. In the payment drill, match request, approval, delivery evidence, invoice and payment record. Escalate missing documents rather than inventing them.

Check your understanding: A supplier offers to split one order into three invoices below an approval limit. Is this an acceptable efficiency measure?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



PFM03 Accounting reporting and financial assurance

Weeks 5 and 6 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes PFM3 PFM4 | Readings R3 accounting and scrutiny and R4 reporting and risk

Teaching brief

A reconciliation explains the difference between two records of the same financial position. A bank reconciliation separates items already recorded in the cashbook but not on the bank statement from items on the bank statement not yet entered in the cashbook. Correct errors with an authorised audit trail. Never insert an unexplained balancing amount to force agreement. Variance analysis compares like with like and explains both amount and service implication. A lower spend may reflect efficiency, a procurement delay or a failure to deliver. Internal control is management's responsibility; internal audit provides independent assurance within the organisation; external audit and legislative scrutiny serve distinct oversight roles. An audit finding is closed only when the action and supporting evidence have been checked.

Week 5 Accounting and reconciliation

Reconcile the teaching cashbook and bank statement; identify corrections and supporting evidence.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment B with reconciliation and a variance commentary.

Week 6 Risk audit and assurance

Design a control register, differentiate assurance roles and prepare an audit action tracker.

Learning output: Create a risk register and a management response to two findings.

Applied laboratory

Complete the Case PFM reconciliation and explain each timing difference. Recalculate paid and committed expenditure against the approved budget. Identify one financial risk, one service delivery risk and the assurance needed for each.

Check your understanding: Should internal audit approve routine payments to strengthen control?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



PFM04 Equity fiscal risk and executive decisions

Weeks 7 and 8 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes PFM2 PFM3 PFM4 PFM5 | Readings R4 and R5

Teaching brief

A spending plan can be balanced yet distribute benefits unfairly. Ask who uses the service, who cannot reach it and which costs are shifted onto households or staff. Analyse allocation, execution and results, rather than treating expenditure on a labelled group as proof of benefit. Fiscal risk includes events that can change revenue, expenditure, assets or liabilities; guarantees and future operating costs should not disappear because they are outside today's cash payment. Under a funding shock, protect lawful obligations and essential functions while reviewing deferrable activities. Document the authority for changes and communicate the service consequences. A useful executive financial brief makes the shortfall, choices, risks and decision requested visible in a small number of clear tables.

Week 7 Equitable allocation and fiscal risk

Analyse distribution, contingent commitments, donor uncertainty and service consequences of reductions.

Learning output: Draft an equity note and a funding shock decision memorandum.

Week 8 Integrated financial review and defence

Complete the second six-hour in-person block: cash shock simulation, individual defence and capstone review.

Learning output: Submit the final package, simulation log and panel defence.

Applied laboratory

The Case PFM expected transfer falls by USD 10,000. Negotiate a revised payment schedule, preserve evidence of outstanding obligations and state who must approve any reprioritisation. Defend a service protection choice and an equity safeguard in the final review.

Check your understanding: Does a reduction in unpaid invoices prove better financial performance?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



Assessment briefs and submission requirements

Applied Assignment A Programme budget and financial diagnosis

Week 2 | 1,000 words plus budget tables | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Reconcile the approved budget, identify cost drivers and existing commitments, specify the accounting period and basis, and prepare a budget priority note. Show formula workings, assumptions and one funding sensitivity.

Applied Assignment B Cash reconciliation and variance report

Week 5 | 1,000 words plus workings and registers | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Submit the corrected cashbook, bank reconciliation, budget versus paid-and-committed analysis and a short management report. Explain timing items and corrections; attach a commitment and payment control checklist.

Observed simulation

Week 8 with practical evidence from Week 4 | 25% of programme grade | Rubric S

Each learner demonstrates procurement or payment controls in Block 1 and financial reprioritisation in Block 2. Submit a 500-word individual decision log. Block 1 contributes 40% and Block 2 60% of the simulation mark.

Participation and reflection portfolio

Keep one 250-word reflection per subject. Identify a decision or behaviour, the evidence or feedback that challenged it, what changed and how you will apply the learning. Attach peer feedback and the response to it. The portfolio is assessed at the programme end using Rubric R; activity counts and attendance alone do not earn marks.



Capstone and transition to practice

Financial management improvement package

Week 8 | 2,000 words plus up to eight pages of financial exhibits | 30% combined written product and defence

A balanced budget summary; cash forecast and funding shock revision; reconciliation; procurement and commitment controls; financial and service risks; an equity note; an audit action tracker; and a 90-day financial improvement plan.

Prepare an eight-minute presentation, followed by 12 minutes of questions and five minutes for panel feedback. A 30-minute appointment includes identity checks and transition. The written product carries 75% and defence 25% of the capstone component. Use Rubrics C and D. The overall assessment and award rules in Section 10 also apply.

Required competence safeguard

Cash and budget schedules reconcile without an unexplained balancing entry; outstanding obligations remain visible; the learner applies an authorised approval route and manages the declared conflict of interest.

Panel preparation questions

- Why is the outstanding commitment not the same as a bank payment?
- Explain each adjustment in your reconciliation.
- Which proposed reduction needs approval and which can management schedule?
- How does your plan protect both financial control and essential service access?

Submission format

Submit editable Word or accessible PDF narrative and readable tables through the approved learning platform. Financial workings may be included as an editable spreadsheet or Word calculation table. Use learner ID, programme code, assessment and version in the filename. State sources, permissions, assumptions, contribution and AI assistance. Word limits exclude tables, references and annexes; a 10% tolerance applies. An annex must support the argument and cannot replace missing analysis.

90-day application

At day 30, confirm the sponsor decision and initial action. At day 60, review barriers, resource use and necessary adjustment. At day 90, submit a two-page implementation reflection with evidence and the next decision. This follow-up is included in programme support and is recorded separately; it is not an additional credit-bearing extension or a guarantee of workplace adoption.



Case PFM Managing a service budget under a funding shock

Fictional teaching case. All amounts are USD. The annual approved budget is USD 120,000. The six-month expenditure report uses cash payments, with valid unpaid commitments shown separately. The cash forecast covers the next three months. The institution may reprioritise discretionary activity only through its authorised approval route; no new borrowing or waiver is assumed.

Budget line	Approved annual	Paid to date	Unpaid commitments
Personnel	48,000	24,000	0
Service supplies	24,000	10,000	5,000
Outreach	18,000	7,000	3,000
Operations	12,000	6,000	1,000
Training	10,000	4,000	2,000
Equipment	8,000	5,000	0
Total	120,000	56,000	11,000

Bank reconciliation item	Amount	Treatment to determine
Cashbook balance before correction	19,950	Includes the deposit and cheque below
Bank statement balance	21,200	Includes the bank charge and direct receipt below
Deposit in transit	1,500	Not yet on bank statement
Unpresented cheque	2,000	Already deducted in cashbook
Bank charge	50	Not yet entered in cashbook
Direct receipt	800	Not yet entered in cashbook

Cash forecast	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3
Expected inflows	15,000	12,000	8,000
Planned payments	20,000	18,000	16,000



PFM Procurement and practical workshop

Procurement offer	Quoted price	Delivery	Compliance
Supplier A	6,000	14 days	Meets the stated specification
Supplier B	5,500	30 days	Does not meet the required 14-day delivery
Supplier C	6,400	10 days	Meets the stated specification

Learner instructions

- Calculate paid plus committed expenditure, the uncommitted balance and the proportion of the annual budget paid. Do not call the result a PEFA indicator score.
- Reconcile the bank and cashbook and use the corrected cashbook as the opening cash balance for the forecast.
- Prepare monthly closing cash balances and a response to a reduction of USD 10,000 in Month 2 inflows. Planned payments already include the USD 11,000 valid commitments; do not add those commitments again.
- Evaluate the quotations. Delivery within 14 days is a mandatory criterion published before bids. The evaluation chair is related to Supplier A and must declare the conflict. No award decision has yet been made.
- Month 3 payments include USD 5,000 discretionary training that can be deferred if authorised, without breaching a contract. Explain the residual risk and service implications.

Role cards

- Budget owner: protects service continuity and requests any revised allocation.
- Finance officer: owns the cash forecast, commitment register and reconciliation.
- Procurement officer: applies the published specification and retains the evaluation record.
- Independent reviewer: checks conflict management, authority and audit evidence.

The facilitator introduces one or more changes during the exercise. Respond with a decision, rationale, approval route and record of the implications. Submit your own account; a group product does not establish individual competence.



8 Diplomatic Protocol and International Affairs

Develop disciplined representation, protocol planning, diplomatic communication and negotiation, with an understanding of international institutions and the limits of delegated authority.

Programme specification	Requirement
Programme code	RA-DPI-2026
Award	Professional Certificate in Diplomatic Protocol and International Affairs
Duration and workload	6 weeks 15 hours per week 90 total hours 3 RECH
Delivery	M4 live online Live online workshops with guided study and observed diplomatic simulations
Participants	Protocol and international relations officers, executive assistants, public officials, university and civil society partnership leads, and professionals preparing for representational responsibilities.
Academic owner	Diplomacy and International Affairs Course Owner
Entry level	RL2 under Section 4
Core output	Official engagement and international affairs dossier

Programme learning outcomes

DPI1 Distinguish diplomatic functions, protocol practice and legal privilege using appropriate official sources.

DPI2 Prepare an accurate, accessible official visit and meeting protocol package.

DPI3 Draft diplomatic correspondence, speaking notes and an international affairs briefing.

DPI4 Negotiate within a documented mandate and record agreements and unresolved issues accurately.

DPI5 Manage a protocol disruption and defend an integrated engagement dossier.



Subject structure and assessment alignment

Subject	Weeks	Live	Guided	Study	Assess	RECH
DPI01 International affairs and representation	1-2	6	4	12	8	1
DPI02 Official visits protocol and correspondence	3-4	6	4	12	8	1
DPI03 Negotiation crisis communication and engagement	5-6	6	4	12	8	1
Total	6	18	12	36	24	3

Hours: Live = live or observed work; Guided = structured asynchronous work; Study = independent study; Assess = preparation and revision of graded work. All core subjects carry 30 hours. Subject order is sequential, with completed outputs retained for capstone integration.

Evidence	Due	Weight	Outcome coverage
Participation and reflection	Across all subjects	20%	All; judged through the four reflection criteria
Applied Assignment A	Week 2	12.5%	DPI1 DPI3
Applied Assignment B	Week 4	12.5%	DPI1 DPI2 DPI3
Observed simulation	Week 5 with crisis challenge in Week 6	25%	DPI2 DPI3 DPI4 DPI5
Capstone written product	Week 6	22.5%	DPI1 DPI2 DPI3 DPI4 DPI5
Individual capstone defence	Week 6	7.5%	DPI1 DPI2 DPI3 DPI4 DPI5

Every subject output is required evidence of learning. Only the tasks identified in the assessment table receive a separate weighted mark; the remaining weekly outputs are formative preparation. Revised work may feed the capstone, but the capstone mark assesses integration and improvement rather than re-awarding the earlier assignment mark.

Each week uses 3 live, 2 guided, 6 independent and 4 assessed-production hours. Observed assessment and defence slots replace the relevant scheduled laboratory time; they are not additional hidden workload.



DPI01 International affairs and representation

Weeks 1 and 2 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes DPI1 DPI3 | Readings R6 R7 Articles 3 and 41 and R10

Teaching brief

Diplomacy concerns representation, communication and the pursuit of interests through authorised relationships. Protocol creates orderly procedures for those interactions. Etiquette concerns courtesy and appropriate conduct; it should not be confused with legal status. A participant in an international meeting does not acquire diplomatic immunity simply by holding a senior title or carrying an invitation. Different rules apply to diplomats, consular personnel and international organisation representatives. Begin any brief by stating the institution represented, the purpose of engagement and the speaker's authority. Distinguish bilateral engagement from multilateral procedure, and analysis from an official national position. Use official sources to verify a body's mandate and the current status of a proposal. Record uncertainty explicitly when a counterpart's position is unconfirmed.

Week 1 International institutions and interests

Map states, international organisations and non-state actors; distinguish interests, mandate and official position.

Learning output: Prepare a one-page actor map and issue brief.

Week 2 Diplomatic functions and professional conduct

Study mission functions and responsibilities; distinguish privilege from protocol courtesy and establish clearance.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment A with an international affairs brief.

Applied laboratory

Use Case DPI to identify who may speak, negotiate, confirm attendance and sign. Mark the difference between a meeting record, a non-binding intention and an agreement requiring legal clearance. Draft two lines that preserve cooperation without exceeding delegated authority.

Check your understanding: Does an international conference badge establish diplomatic immunity?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



DPI02 Official visits protocol and correspondence

Weeks 3 and 4 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes DPI1 DPI2 DPI3 | Readings R6 R7 Articles 13 to 18 and R10

Teaching brief

An official visit should be planned around its substantive purpose. Confirm the level of representation, arrival details, titles, interpretation, access requirements and the approval route before finalising the programme. Precedence is context dependent: diplomatic corps precedence does not automatically determine the seating of every mixed institutional event. Agree the order with the host protocol authority and record the basis. Use equal dignity, accurate naming and consistent treatment of comparable guests. A run sheet should identify times, activity owners, movement, interpretation and contingencies. Correspondence needs a clear purpose, verified recipient, appropriate institutional format and authorisation. A note verbale commonly uses third-person institutional language, while an official letter follows the sender's authorised letter format. A title or translation error can change meaning and should receive a second review.

Week 3 Visit planning and precedence

Build a delegation register, seating plan, run sheet and accessibility arrangements.

Learning output: Produce a protocol plan with a documented precedence basis.

Week 4 Diplomatic correspondence and messaging

Draft an invitation, note verbale, speaking note and record of meeting; verify clearance.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment B with three communication products.

Applied laboratory

Construct the Case DPI eight-seat table from the supplied fictional host rule. Re-plan when the lead delegate is replaced. Draft a note requesting confirmed delegation details, interpretation needs and any approved schedule change. Pair-review names, dates, titles and clearance.

Check your understanding: What is the safest response when two delegations dispute precedence?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



DPI03 Negotiation crisis communication and engagement

Weeks 5 and 6 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes DPI3 DPI4 DPI5 | Readings R6 R10 and R2 integrity

Teaching brief

Before negotiation, specify the desired result, acceptable alternatives, issues requiring clearance and the point at which further authority must be sought. Separate interests from initial positions. A useful concession should advance a legitimate objective and remain within the mandate. Record agreed wording, unresolved items, owners and deadlines; do not announce agreement where only a proposal was discussed. A protocol disruption requires calm coordination among the chair, protocol, security, interpretation and communication functions. Communicate confirmed facts and the next update time, while avoiding speculation. Confidential negotiating instructions remain restricted. Public materials should reflect authorised decisions and should never imply endorsement or a commitment that the represented institution has not made.

Week 5 Negotiation and multilateral practice

Prepare an authority matrix, opening position, alternatives and an agreement log; rehearse mediated discussion.

Learning output: Complete the observed negotiation and individual reflection.

Week 6 Crisis response and executive defence

Respond to a schedule and media disruption, protect accessibility and defend the engagement dossier.

Learning output: Submit the capstone and complete the panel defence.

Applied laboratory

Negotiate the Case DPI cooperation meeting. Receive a last-minute change of delegation and a misleading social media claim. Keep an issue log, obtain necessary clearances and draft a 100-word holding statement. The panel will test whether your documented commitments remain within mandate.

Check your understanding: The media report that an agreement was signed when only minutes were agreed. What should the spokesperson do?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



Assessment briefs and submission requirements

Applied Assignment A International affairs briefing

Week 2 | 1,000 words plus an actor and authority map | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Explain the engagement purpose, relevant institutions, actor interests, verified facts, uncertainties and negotiating authority. Distinguish institutional analysis from an official national position. Cite the relevant official sources.

Applied Assignment B Protocol and diplomatic writing portfolio

Week 4 | Up to six pages | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Submit a visit run sheet, a justified seating plan, an invitation or note verbale, a two-minute speaking note, an accessibility and interpretation checklist, and a clearance record. Use the fictional case facts consistently.

Observed simulation

Week 5 with crisis challenge in Week 6 | 25% of programme grade | Rubric S

Perform an observed negotiating, protocol or spokesperson role and answer an individual challenge. Submit a 500-word decision log and an accurate record of agreements and unresolved matters. The negotiation contributes 70% and the crisis challenge 30% of the simulation mark.

Participation and reflection portfolio

Keep one 250-word reflection per subject. Identify a decision or behaviour, the evidence or feedback that challenged it, what changed and how you will apply the learning. Attach peer feedback and the response to it. The portfolio is assessed at the programme end using Rubric R; activity counts and attendance alone do not earn marks.



Capstone and transition to practice

Official engagement and international affairs dossier

Week 6 | 1,800 words plus up to eight pages of event and communication tools | 30% combined written product and defence

A decision brief; verified institutional context; objectives and authority; delegation register; protocol run sheet; seating basis; communication products; negotiation strategy; contingency plan; meeting record; and a 90-day relationship follow-up plan.

Prepare an eight-minute presentation, followed by 12 minutes of questions and five minutes for panel feedback. A 30-minute appointment includes identity checks and transition. The written product carries 75% and defence 25% of the capstone component. Use Rubrics C and D. The overall assessment and award rules in Section 10 also apply.

Required competence safeguard

Names and roles are consistent with the case, commitments stay within mandate, precedence is justified by the applicable host rule, and confidential instructions are not disclosed in public communication.

Panel preparation questions

- Which element of your precedence decision is specific to this event?
- What can you agree today, and what must be referred for clearance?
- How would you correct a public statement that overstates the outcome?
- What changes when the head of delegation is replaced?

Submission format

Submit editable Word or accessible PDF narrative and readable tables through the approved learning platform. Financial workings may be included as an editable spreadsheet or Word calculation table. Use learner ID, programme code, assessment and version in the filename. State sources, permissions, assumptions, contribution and AI assistance. Word limits exclude tables, references and annexes; a 10% tolerance applies. An annex must support the argument and cannot replace missing analysis.

90-day application

At day 30, confirm the sponsor decision and initial action. At day 60, review barriers, resource use and necessary adjustment. At day 90, submit a two-page implementation reflection with evidence and the next decision. This follow-up is included in programme support and is recorded separately; it is not an additional credit-bearing extension or a guarantee of workplace adoption.



Case DPI A regional cooperation meeting

Fictional teaching case. The host institution is the Public Governance Learning Centre. It will convene a 90-minute cooperation meeting on staff development and information exchange. All delegations and states below are fictional. No participant is authorised to sign a treaty, spend money or announce a binding partnership. The host may agree a non-binding record of discussion and nominate technical focal points.

Seat or role	Delegation	Verified case detail
H1 Chair	Host	Director of the Centre
H2 Host finance lead	Host	May advise on cost; cannot approve new funding today
H3 Host programme lead	Host	Owens technical follow-up
H4 Host protocol lead	Host	Confirms event arrangements
V1 Ambassador	State Luma	Took up functions 15 January 2024
V2 Ambassador	State Neri	Took up functions 20 March 2025
V3 Resident coordinator	Regional Cooperation Agency	Head of agency delegation
V4 Chargé d'affaires	State Tavi	Head of delegation

Event requirement	Case instruction
Table configuration	Two rows of four facing seats; list each row from the chair's left to right
Agreed host allocation	Host row: H2 H1 H3 H4. Visitor row: V2 V1 V3 V4
Basis	Host protocol office has confirmed this arrangement for this event; V1 is opposite H1
Diplomatic corps reference	V1 precedes V2 within the ambassador class; mixed-event places follow the agreed host allocation
Interpretation	English and Somali; the interpreter needs a sightline and audio connection outside the eight delegate seats
Accessibility	Step-free entry and an accessible route to the table
Schedule	Welcome 10 minutes; issue discussion 35; options 25; agreed record 15; close 5



DPI Case workshop and working tools

Learner instructions

- Prepare the eight-seat plan exactly from the fictional host instruction and document its event-specific basis.
- Create a run sheet including check-in, interpretation, access, speaking order, meeting record and contingency ownership.
- Draft a 200-word note verbale requesting confirmed delegation details, and a two-minute opening note that does not overstate authority.
- Negotiate two practical next steps and record what remains subject to institutional approval.

Role cards

- Host chair: wants a clear technical follow-up with no financial commitment.
- State Luma delegate: wants a named focal point and a six-week technical meeting.
- State Neri delegate: wants a public statement describing the exchange of ideas, without implying endorsement.
- Agency representative: wants an accessible participation plan and a documented record of responsibilities.

The facilitator introduces one or more changes during the exercise. Respond with a decision, rationale, approval route and record of the implications. Submit your own account; a group product does not establish individual competence.

Event run sheet worksheet

Time	Activity and owner	Clearance or contingency
Before arrival		
Opening		
Discussion		
Agreed record and close		



9 Women in Senior Leadership

Strengthen senior leadership practice while equipping participants to address institutional barriers to women's authority, progression, safety and influence through evidence, governance and accountable organisational change.

Programme specification	Requirement
Programme code	RA-WSL-2026
Award	Advanced Certificate in Women in Senior Leadership
Duration and workload	10 weeks 15 hours per week 150 total hours 5 RECH
Delivery	M4 live online Live online leadership laboratories with guided study, peer coaching and applied institutional work
Participants	Women holding or preparing for senior managerial, governance, policy, academic or professional leadership responsibilities, and other eligible applicants committed to advancing women's leadership under RIYAADA's non-discrimination policy.
Academic owner	Executive Leadership and Inclusion Course Owner
Entry level	RL3 under Section 4
Core output	Senior leadership and institutional inclusion portfolio

Programme learning outcomes

WSL1 Assess leadership practice, institutional power and barriers to progression using evidence and reflection.

WSL2 Lead strategic decisions and resource discussions with a clear public or organisational value case.

WSL3 Demonstrate negotiation, influence, executive communication and constructive challenge.

WSL4 Design fair talent, sponsorship, work and reporting arrangements that address structural barriers.

WSL5 Interpret leadership pipeline and influence indicators without unsupported causal claims.

WSL6 Defend a personal leadership plan and an institutional inclusion reform with 90-day milestones.



Subject structure and assessment alignment

Subject	Weeks	Live	Guided	Study	Assess	RECH
WSL01 Leadership identity power and institutional barriers	1-2	6	4	12	8	1
WSL02 Strategic authority and financial judgement	3-4	6	4	12	8	1
WSL03 Influence negotiation and executive communication	5-6	6	4	12	8	1
WSL04 Inclusive talent systems and safe leadership	7-8	6	4	12	8	1
WSL05 Institutional change and senior leadership practice	9-10	6	4	12	8	1
Total	10	30	20	60	40	5

Hours: Live = live or observed work; Guided = structured asynchronous work; Study = independent study; Assess = preparation and revision of graded work. All core subjects carry 30 hours. Subject order is sequential, with completed outputs retained for capstone integration.

Evidence	Due	Weight	Outcome coverage
Participation and reflection	Across all subjects	20%	All; judged through the four reflection criteria
Applied Assignment A	Week 2	12.5%	WSL1 WSL5
Applied Assignment B	Week 8	12.5%	WSL2 WSL4 WSL5
Observed simulation	Week 6	25%	WSL2 WSL3
Capstone written product	Week 10	22.5%	WSL1 WSL2 WSL3 WSL4 WSL5 WSL6
Individual capstone defence	Week 10	7.5%	WSL1 WSL2 WSL3 WSL4 WSL5 WSL6

Every subject output is required evidence of learning. Only the tasks identified in the assessment table receive a separate weighted mark; the remaining weekly outputs are formative preparation. Revised work may feed the capstone, but the capstone mark assesses integration and improvement rather than re-awarding the earlier assignment mark.

Each week uses 3 live, 2 guided, 6 independent and 4 assessed-production hours. Observed assessment and defence slots replace the relevant scheduled laboratory time; they are not additional hidden workload.



WSL01 Leadership identity power and institutional barriers

Weeks 1 and 2 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes WSL1 WSL5 | Readings R8 and R2 merit

Teaching brief

Senior leadership development combines individual practice with institutional conditions. Confidence can help a leader participate, but it cannot by itself correct opaque promotion, exclusion from important assignments or unsafe reporting arrangements. Analyse who holds decision rights, budgets, information and access to influential networks. Representation measures should distinguish entry into employment from progression into senior roles and authority over substantive decisions. A reflective baseline is useful when linked to observed behaviours and examples; it is not a diagnosis of personality or a ranking of personal worth. Seek feedback with consent and allow respondents to decline. Use aggregate themes and protect identity. Translate reflection into a small number of behaviours that can be practised and reviewed.

Week 1 Leadership baseline and values

Map role demands, strengths, values and behavioural development goals using the seven RIYAADA competencies.

Learning output: Complete a confidential development baseline and leadership challenge statement.

Week 2 Power and progression barriers

Analyse formal authority, informal networks, access to assignments and promotion pathways.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment A with a leadership and barrier diagnostic.

Applied laboratory

Use Case WSL to calculate progression rates at each stage. Separate the observed pattern from possible explanations. Draw an influence map showing who can change assignment criteria and who must approve promotion procedures. Keep personal reflection separate from the institutional evidence file.

Check your understanding: What does a lower promotion rate for women establish?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



WSL02 Strategic authority and financial judgement

Weeks 3 and 4 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes WSL2 WSL5 | Readings R4 and R5

Teaching brief

Senior leaders are accountable for choices among competing priorities. A clear strategy explains the result sought, why it matters, the resources required and the trade-offs involved. A resource request should show assumptions and the implications of doing less. Distinguish governance oversight from operational execution: a leader may challenge a budget and require assurance without authorising every transaction personally. Inclusive resource decisions examine who benefits, who bears costs and who can influence priorities. Participation in a committee is not equivalent to decision authority. Assess the allocation of chairing roles, budget responsibility and access to strategic assignments alongside headcounts. Use transparent criteria to justify choices rather than relying on personal connections or presentation style.

Week 3 Strategy and executive judgement

Define strategic options, risks and outcomes; practise evidence based challenge in a senior management review.

Learning output: Draft a strategic options brief.

Week 4 Financial voice and resource allocation

Interpret a budget, test recurrent costs and prepare an inclusive investment argument.

Learning output: Produce a costed investment note and decision request.

Applied laboratory

The Case WSL institution has USD 20,000 for an inclusion pilot. Compare structured selection, sponsorship and accessible meeting arrangements. Recommend an affordable combination, identify opportunity costs and state which governing authority must approve policy changes.

Check your understanding: What should a leader ask before endorsing a training-only response to a progression gap?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



WSL03 Influence negotiation and executive communication

Weeks 5 and 6 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes WSL2 WSL3 | Readings R2 leadership and participation

Teaching brief

Influence begins with a clear objective and a realistic account of who can decide. Prepare the evidence, understand counterpart interests and distinguish what can be negotiated from what requires policy or legal approval. A persuasive message explains the decision requested, supporting reasons, practical consequences and next step. Listening allows the leader to detect constraints and adapt without abandoning legitimate objectives. Sponsorship involves an influential person taking agreed action to create opportunity; mentoring primarily offers advice and development support. Neither should substitute for transparent selection or become a promise of an award, role or promotion. Establish boundaries, expectations and consent. Feedback should describe a behaviour and its effect, then identify an alternative that can be practised.

Week 5 Negotiation and coalition building

Prepare interests, alternatives, mandate and a coalition plan; rehearse a resource negotiation.

Learning output: Complete a negotiation preparation sheet and practice log.

Week 6 Executive voice and public communication

Deliver an evidence based briefing, handle challenge and provide constructive peer feedback.

Learning output: Complete the observed leadership simulation and submit its decision log.

Applied laboratory

Run the Case WSL senior management discussion. Seek agreement on the pilot without claiming authority you do not hold. Handle an interruption by restating the decision and inviting evidence. Produce a short written record that acknowledges concerns and assigns next steps.

Check your understanding: How is sponsorship different from favouritism?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



WSL04 Inclusive talent systems and safe leadership

Weeks 7 and 8 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes WSL1 WSL4 WSL5 | Readings R8 R9 and R2

Teaching brief

A fair talent system makes entry, development and progression criteria visible and reviews how they work in practice. Examine access to stretch assignments, acting roles, appraisal feedback, sponsorship and decision panels. Flexible working and predictable meeting times should be assessed against operational needs and fair access rather than treated as a concession to one group. Safety and dignity require clear standards, trusted reporting options, protection from retaliation and fair handling of allegations. Teaching staff should not investigate a learner's personal disclosure in a classroom. Explain the support and referral route, respect choice and limit access to sensitive information. Institutional analysis should use the minimum data needed, suppress identifiable small groups and avoid publishing individual complaints as evidence.

Week 7 Talent sponsorship and succession

Design transparent assignment criteria, sponsorship agreements and an accountable succession process.

Learning output: Draft an inclusive talent system with measurable access standards.

Week 8 Safe culture and fair reporting

Design prevention, support, reporting and independent review arrangements; practise a safe first response.

Learning output: Submit Applied Assignment B with a talent and safe culture reform brief.

Applied laboratory

Review the Case WSL assignment process and redesign it using published criteria, open expressions of interest and a recorded panel decision. Map a confidential concern pathway that separates support from investigation. State what managers must do when they have a conflict.

Check your understanding: A learner starts to describe a personal harassment experience in a recorded group session. What is the facilitator's immediate duty?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



WSL05 Institutional change and senior leadership practice

Weeks 9 and 10 | 30 learning hours | 1 RECH | Outcomes WSL1 WSL2 WSL3 WSL4 WSL5 WSL6 | Readings R8 and R5

Teaching brief

The final leadership portfolio connects a personal practice goal to an institutional improvement that can be assessed. Personal actions may include structured delegation, better decision briefs or deliberate feedback; institutional actions may change selection, assignment access or accountability. Do not assume a participant controls all necessary decisions. Name a sponsor and distinguish actions within the learner's authority from recommendations needing approval. Measure access, experience and influence as well as representation. A rise in complaint reporting may indicate greater trust, so interpret it alongside response quality and safety. At 90 days, evaluate what was implemented, what evidence changed and what barriers remain. Treat learning as evidence for the next decision rather than a requirement to report success.

Week 9 Change design and measurement

Integrate the institutional reform, indicators, resources and sponsorship with personal leadership goals.

Learning output: Submit a draft capstone and a 90-day evidence plan.

Week 10 Senior leadership defence and transition

Defend trade-offs and safeguards, revise the plan and agree a follow-up review.

Learning output: Submit the final portfolio and complete the individual panel defence.

Applied laboratory

Test the Case WSL pilot against a limited budget, a sceptical manager and an equity concern. Specify a go, revise or stop decision at day 90. Explain how feedback will be gathered without exposing respondents or allowing sponsors to influence assessment.

Check your understanding: Why is the number of women trained an insufficient indicator for this programme's institutional impact?

Bring a draft output and one question to the faculty clinic. Give one peer a specific evidence-based improvement suggestion and record how their feedback changed your work. Faculty provide the worked debrief after the activity.



Assessment briefs and submission requirements

Applied Assignment A Leadership and institutional barrier diagnostic

Week 2 | 1,200 words plus a progression table | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Connect an evidence based leadership reflection to an institutional barrier analysis. Calculate progression rates correctly, identify data limitations, map decision rights and distinguish structural reform from personal development. Personal feedback is summarised with consent.

Applied Assignment B Inclusive talent and safe culture reform brief

Week 8 | 1,500 words plus a process map | 12.5% of programme grade | Rubric A

Design transparent access to assignments, fair selection, sponsorship boundaries and a safe reporting route. Show the approval authority, costs, data safeguards and indicators of access and influence. Do not include identifiable personal disclosures.

Observed simulation

Week 6 | 25% of programme grade | Rubric S

Each learner presents an evidence based case, listens to challenge, negotiates within authority and records a decision. Submit a 500-word individual log. The personal reflection is not shared with an employer without consent.

Participation and reflection portfolio

Keep one 250-word reflection per subject. Identify a decision or behaviour, the evidence or feedback that challenged it, what changed and how you will apply the learning. Attach peer feedback and the response to it. The portfolio is assessed at the programme end using Rubric R; activity counts and attendance alone do not earn marks.



Capstone and transition to practice

Senior leadership and institutional inclusion portfolio

Week 10 | 2,500 words plus up to eight pages of exhibits | 30% combined written product and defence

A senior leadership decision brief; institutional barrier evidence; personal leadership practice goals; an affordable inclusion intervention; transparent talent or sponsorship arrangements; safe reporting and privacy controls; influence and progression indicators; and a 90-day implementation and reflection plan.

Prepare an eight-minute presentation, followed by 12 minutes of questions and five minutes for panel feedback. A 30-minute appointment includes identity checks and transition. The written product carries 75% and defence 25% of the capstone component. Use Rubrics C and D. The overall assessment and award rules in Section 10 also apply.

Required competence safeguard

Analysis avoids discriminatory stereotypes, protects confidential feedback, distinguishes institutional barriers from individual deficits and provides a safe reporting and non-retaliation route.

Panel preparation questions

- What changes in institutional opportunity as a result of your proposal?
- Which denominator supports your progression comparison?
- How can the intervention be assessed without exposing individual respondents?
- How do you prevent sponsorship from bypassing merit?

Submission format

Submit editable Word or accessible PDF narrative and readable tables through the approved learning platform. Financial workings may be included as an editable spreadsheet or Word calculation table. Use learner ID, programme code, assessment and version in the filename. State sources, permissions, assumptions, contribution and AI assistance. Word limits exclude tables, references and annexes; a 10% tolerance applies. An annex must support the argument and cannot replace missing analysis.

90-day application

At day 30, confirm the sponsor decision and initial action. At day 60, review barriers, resource use and necessary adjustment. At day 90, submit a two-page implementation reflection with evidence and the next decision. This follow-up is included in programme support and is recorded separately; it is not an additional credit-bearing extension or a guarantee of workplace adoption.



Case WSL Opening fair pathways to senior responsibility

Fictional teaching case. The Civic Services Institute has 120 staff: 60 women and 60 men. Of 20 senior managers, four are women and sixteen are men. Data below describe one promotion cycle and access to stretch assignments; they do not establish the cause of the differences. The institution has USD 20,000 for a 90-day improvement pilot.

Promotion stage	Women	Men
Eligible staff	30	30
Applicants	24	18
Shortlisted	8	12
Appointed	2	6

Opportunity indicator	Women	Men
Eligible staff for stretch assignments	30	30
Received a stretch assignment	6	18
Chaired a strategic committee	2	8

Pilot option	Cost	Operating feature
Structured selection and panel calibration	8,000	Published criteria, scored evidence and conflict records
Transparent sponsorship and stretch assignments	7,000	Open expression of interest, matching and accountable goals
Predictable and accessible meeting arrangements	5,000	Scheduled core hours, remote access and accessible materials



WSL Case workshop and working tools

Learner instructions

- Calculate representation among senior managers, application rates, shortlisting rates among applicants, appointment rates among shortlisted candidates and stretch-assignment access rates.
- Identify possible mechanisms and the further evidence needed to assess them. Do not infer lower capability from lower progression.
- Propose an affordable pilot, appropriate approvals and a 90-day evaluation with access, experience and influence measures.
- Draft sponsorship boundaries and a safe concern pathway, separating support from investigation and preventing retaliation.

Role cards

- Executive director: wants a feasible pilot and a clear day-90 decision.
- Human resources lead: can prepare procedures but needs approval for policy changes.
- Finance lead: enforces the USD 20,000 ceiling and asks about future operating costs.
- Programme director: wants fair access to critical assignments while maintaining service continuity.

The facilitator introduces one or more changes during the exercise. Respond with a decision, rationale, approval route and record of the implications. Submit your own account; a group product does not establish individual competence.

Opportunity and influence worksheet

Measure	Denominator and evidence	Owner and review
Stretch assignment access		
Progression through selection		
Decision authority		
Safe reporting response		



10 Assessment rubrics and award rules

Assessment follows the Programme Book executive pattern: participation and reflection 20%, applied assignments 25%, simulation 25% and capstone 30%. Rubrics C, D, R and S retain the source criteria and weights, with programme-specific performance evidence. The pass thresholds and operational rules below are suite specifications for academic adoption, not a statement that every earlier RIYAADA course uses the same scheme. [I3, pp. 18 and 26-27]

Component	Calculation
Participation and reflection	Rubric R total out of 20; contributes directly up to 20 programme points.
Applied assignments	Average the two scores out of 100, then multiply by 0.25.
Simulation	Score out of 100 multiplied by 0.25. Use the specified PFM and DPI subevent weights.
Capstone	Written score $\times$ 0.75 plus defence score $\times$ 0.25; multiply the result by 0.30.

Award decision

The learner must achieve at least 60/100 overall; at least 50/100 in each applied assignment and the normalised reflection component; at least 60/100 in simulation, written capstone and defence; and meet every programme competence safeguard. All required outputs, identity checks and practical observations must be complete. A high average cannot compensate for a failed safeguard or missing required observation. Attendance supports participation but does not establish competence.

Learners attend at least 85% of scheduled live learning hours, with equivalent supervised make-up recorded for missed essential work, and complete all compulsory assessed events. The 85% condition is adopted for this suite; the online policy uses 85% as a quality indicator. At least 80% of linked asynchronous preparation should be complete before a live clinic as a support trigger; all core modules must be complete before award. [I6, pp. 7-8]

Final classification	Requirement
Distinction	80-100 overall, all award gates met and no capped reassessed component.
Merit	70-79.99 overall and all award gates met.
Pass	60-69.99 overall and all award gates met.
Not yet competent	Below 60 overall or any unmet mandatory gate. Feedback and remediation follow.

Report the result to one decimal place; do not round a failing raw mark upward across a threshold. Calculation errors are corrected transparently. A second marker reviews every fail, safeguard failure and result within two points of a classification boundary.



Common performance bands

For each criterion, the assessor assigns a percentage using the band descriptors and multiplies it by that criterion's maximum points. An 80% judgement on a 25-point criterion earns 20 points. Apply the criterion evidence anchors on the following pages; avoid grading the learner's seniority, fluency, confidence or institutional prestige.

Band	Shared descriptor
80-100 Strong	Accurate, well-evidenced and coherent; tests assumptions and trade-offs; proposes workable controls and responds thoughtfully to challenge.
70-79 Secure	Clear and accurate with convincing application; small omissions do not undermine the recommendation or safeguards.
60-69 Threshold competence	Essential analysis and a feasible action are present; some depth or detail is limited, but the result can be used safely with normal review.
50-59 Developing	Some usable evidence, but important gaps limit application or integration. This band cannot pass a 60% mandatory component.
0-49 Insufficient	Major error, unsupported judgement, missing output or an unusable plan; evidence does not establish the required competence.

Rubric A for each applied assignment

Criterion	Points	Evidence at threshold competence
Problem and purpose	15	A bounded problem, clear user and decision or output purpose.
Technical accuracy	25	Correct concepts and calculations with a traceable method.
Evidence and analysis	20	Relevant sources, transparent assumptions and reasoned interpretation.
Feasibility and application	20	A usable tool or recommendation within stated constraints and authority.
Equity integrity and risk	10	Specific safeguards relevant to the task and affected users.
Communication and professional form	10	Clear structure, usable tables and accurate source acknowledgement.

Strong work adds a justified comparison, sensitivity or an informed challenge to an assumption. Insufficient work contains a material calculation error, generic recommendations without a mechanism, misrepresented evidence or missing authority. Programme safeguards still apply even when the numerical score appears high.



Capstone and defence rubrics

Rubric C for the written capstone

Criterion	Points	Evidence at threshold competence
Problem clarity and evidence	25	Problem, baseline and credible sources are clear; uncertainty is acknowledged.
Options and criteria	20	At least two credible alternatives and stated criteria support the choice.
Feasibility and risk	15	Resources, authority, dependencies and material risks are addressed.
Equity and ethics	10	Who benefits or may be excluded is considered with concrete safeguards.
Implementation and indicators	15	Owners, timing, 90-day milestones and defined indicators allow follow-up.
Communication quality	15	Decision requested is prominent; narrative and annexes form one usable dossier.

Rubric D for the individual defence

Criterion	Points	Evidence at threshold competence
Executive clarity	25	The learner explains the decision, rationale and expected result concisely.
Analytical rigour	25	Answers demonstrate understanding of evidence, method and limitations.
Practicality and alignment	20	Proposed actions fit authority, resources and institutional purpose.
Use of data and visuals	15	Tables or verbal evidence are accurate, readable and interpreted correctly.
Handling questions	15	The learner listens, answers the question and recognises uncertainty or limits.

Strong defences can revise a position when new evidence appears. Insufficient defences cannot explain the submitted calculations, overstate authority or evade material limitations. A accessible verbal explanation can meet the data criterion; decorative slides are not required.



Simulation reflection and assessment procedures

Rubric S for observed simulation

Criterion	Points	Evidence at threshold competence
Role execution and teamwork	30	Performs the assigned role, contributes individually and works constructively.
Procedures and safety	30	Applies authority, controls, confidentiality and relevant participant or service safeguards.
Decision quality	20	Uses the case evidence, weighs options and responds to the new constraint.
Communication	20	Communicates clearly, listens and leaves an accurate decision or action record.

Rubric R for participation and reflection

Criterion	Points	Evidence at threshold competence
Preparedness	5	Uses the reading and arrives with the required draft or evidence.
Constructive contribution	5	Adds a relevant reason, question or practical response in observed interaction.
Peer feedback quality	5	Provides specific, respectful feedback linked to evidence and a possible improvement.
Reflection depth	5	Connects behaviour or a decision with evidence, revision and an application step.

Reflection is marked once across the programme. Use the same 0-100 criterion bands and scale each to five points. A learner with 12/20 has a normalised reflection score of 60%. Assess the quality of contributions, not message volume, camera duration or attendance alone. [I6]



Feedback reassessment and appeals

Give formative comments within seven calendar days of a subject submission and provisional summative feedback within 10 working days. An extension agreed before the deadline, or documented emergency relief, carries no penalty. Unapproved work up to seven calendar days late is marked with a five-percentage-point deduction from that assessment, to a floor of zero; later work enters reassessment. The Registrar records the reason and applies the same published rule consistently.

One reassessment is available within 30 calendar days of feedback, using revised work or a fresh equivalent observation. The reassessed component is capped at 60/100; its raw and capped marks are retained. A learner who still fails receives a learning record without the award and may apply to re-enrol. Alleged integrity breaches follow the institutional procedure with notice, opportunity to respond and appeal; software flags alone do not establish misconduct.

An assessment appeal may be lodged within 15 working days for procedural error, misapplied criteria, bias or overlooked material evidence. An uninvolved reviewer reports within 10 working days and may order independent remarking or a fresh assessment. These suite timelines apply until a controlling institutional assessment policy sets a different procedure; any controlling change is published before a cohort begins.

Feedback record

Learner ID _____ Assessment _____ Date _____

Strength supported by evidence

Criterion requiring improvement and the expected correction

Reassessment or support agreed and deadline



11 Learner forms and reusable working tools

Form L1 Application and learner undertaking

Full legal name and verified identity reference

Programme and cohort

Current organisation role and responsibility

Entry route and qualification or portfolio evidence

Years of relevant responsibility

Delivery language and evidence of proficiency

Contact details and availability for required sessions

Institutional challenge in no more than 500 words attached

Sponsor undertaking attached if applicable

Adjustment request sent privately to the Registrar if required

I confirm that my application evidence is accurate, that I understand the published workload and assessment requirements, and that I will acknowledge sources, protect confidential information and submit my own work. I understand the fee, withdrawal and practical attendance conditions in my written offer.

Applicant signature _____ Date _____



Form L2 Executive Development Record

Learner ID _____ Programme _____ Cohort _____

Record	Evidence or entry
Leadership challenge	
Admission and induction completed	
Baseline competency profile	
Subject outputs and feedback links	
Peer feedback and revision log	
Applied assignment marks	
Simulation observation and safeguards	
Capstone written and defence marks	
RPL approved subject and evidence if applicable	
Moderated final result and award identifier	
Day 30 day 60 and day 90 application evidence	

Reflection prompt

What decision or behaviour did I practise? What evidence or feedback challenged my first approach? What changed in my reasoning or conduct? What will I do next, with whose authority and how will I know whether it helped?

Peer feedback prompt

Name one strength supported by evidence, one assumption that needs testing and one feasible improvement. The author records whether the suggestion was adopted and why. Feedback is respectful and addresses the work rather than the person.



Form L3 Decision brief and evidence record

Decision requested

State the specific decision and the authority asked to take it.

Problem and baseline

Describe who is affected, the current position and the period covered.

Evidence and limitations

List source, date, relevance, reliability and what remains uncertain.

Options and criteria

Compare realistic choices and explain the selection criteria.

Recommendation and resources

State the preferred action, cost, recurrent implications and dependencies.

Equity integrity and risk

Identify exclusion, conflicts, privacy or operational risks and controls.

Implementation and review

Name the owner, first milestone, evidence to collect and review trigger.



Form L4 Ninety day action and evaluation plan

Learner _____ Institution or case _____ Sponsor or reviewer _____

Period	Action and owner	Evidence and measure	Decision or dependency
Days 1-30			
Days 31-60			
Days 61-90			

Indicator dictionary

Indicator	Definition and denominator	Baseline and target	Source owner and frequency

Risk and decision register

Risk or assumption	Control and owner	Trigger	Decision route

Day ninety review questions

- Which action was implemented and what independent evidence confirms it?
- What changed for service users, staff or institutional decisions, and what other factors may explain the change?
- Whose access or experience was missed, and what should be adjusted?
- What is the next decision: continue, revise, expand or stop, and who authorises it?



Form L5 Submission declaration and sponsor agreement

Individual submission declaration

Learner ID _____ Assessment _____ Version and date _____

I confirm that the submitted work is my own except where collaboration and sources are acknowledged. I have not represented a fictional case as observed institutional evidence. Permissions for workplace material are recorded, identifiers are removed and confidential information has not been entered into an external AI service. I can explain the methods, calculations and decisions in this submission.

Collaboration and individual contribution

AI tool and permitted purpose if used, with verification performed

Learner signature _____ Date _____

Sponsor undertaking

Institution _____ Authorised signatory _____ Learner _____

The sponsor confirms the agreed fee arrangement and reasonable time for learning and compulsory sessions. Workplace implementation remains subject to institutional approval. Routine reporting to the sponsor is limited to attendance, completion and award. Personal reflections, coaching notes and further assessment detail require separate written learner consent. Sponsorship does not influence admission, marking or award decisions.

Agreed application opportunity and authorised data access

Sponsor signature _____ Date _____



12 Governance approval and programme release

The governance structure separates programme development, quality review, operational delivery and governing oversight. The Academy Programmes Division owns delivery; the Academic Board reviews academic evidence and the Academic and Quality Committee exercises programme approval under the governance instrument. The approval record identifies the applicable delegation and effective date. [I7, pp. 1-4]

Function	Responsibility and evidence
Course owner	Maintains syllabus, case currency, workload, reading list and outcome alignment.
Registrar	Verifies entry, records offers and terms, maintains learner and award records.
Digital Learning Unit	Checks accessibility, learning navigation, low-bandwidth provision and identity arrangements.
Quality Assurance Unit	Checks assessment validity, moderation, learner equity and delivery readiness.
Academic Board	Reviews curriculum, RPL, assessment decisions and proposed delivery classifications.
Academic and Quality Committee	Approves new programmes and major revisions within the institutional governance framework.
Founder and Chair or delegated authority	Records institutional authorisation, resources and effective date.

Academic adoption record

Decision element	Record for authorised completion
Programme titles codes and award levels	
Credit convention and workload approved	
Assessment gates and operating rules approved	
Delivery modes and first-cohort monitoring approved	
Applicable delegation or meeting minute reference	
Academic and Quality Committee decision date	
Institutional authorisation and effective date	
Review date and document register reference	

Authorised name _____ Role _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Before enrolment opens, the Registrar confirms the faculty, fees, calendar, venue, support contacts, moderation and approved learning platform in the release record.



13 References and source register

Internal references identify the supplied RIYAADA documents used to establish the institutional architecture. Page numbers refer to the supplied PDFs. Older promotional details and example partnerships do not establish current legal recognition, accreditation or endorsement.

- I1 RIYAADA Institute (2025). Programme Philosophy Structure and Core Themes. 27 pages.
pp. 2-5 philosophy and six themes; pp. 24-27 capstones and integrity.
- I2 RIYAADA Academy (2024 edition shown on cover). RIYAADA Academy institutional profile. 17 pages.
pp. 2-5 institutional purpose, values and learning by doing.
- I3 RIYAADA Institute (n.d.). Program Book Riyaada. 30 pages.
p. 4 purpose; pp. 17-18 executive structure; p. 22 faculty ratios; pp. 26-27 rubrics.
- I4 RIYAADA Institute (2026). Executive Leadership Governance and Strategic Management. 29 pages.
pp. 4-7 frameworks, tiers and seven competencies; pp. 24-27 quality and implementation.
- I5 RIYAADA Academy (2026). Admissions and Learner Eligibility Policy. RIYAADA-ADM-2026-006.
pp. 3-8 principles, entry routes, RPL, language, terms, support and review.
- I6 RIYAADA Academy (2026). Online and Blended Learning Policy. RIYAADA-OBL-2026-008.
pp. 4-8 modes, design, assessment, access, faculty and quality.
- I7 RIYAADA Institute (2026). Governance and Organizational Structure. RIYAADA-INST-2026-004.
pp. 1-4 governing bodies, division responsibilities and review cycles.
- I8 RIYAADA Institute (2026). Hospital Leadership Management and Governance training package. RA-HLMG-2026.
pp. 7-11 applied teaching, certification and evaluation; subject session-plan structure.
- I9 RIYAADA Institute (2026). Official Blank Master Template. 2 pages.
Seal, institutional identity, navy and gold styling, footer contact details and document control architecture.



External reading list and learning use

Official source links checked on 9 September 2026. Course owners confirm the current edition and relevant sections before each cohort. These sources support learning; no endorsement or partnership with the issuing organisations is implied. Provide lawful accessible copies or official links, not unlicensed reproductions of publications.

R1 United Nations CEPA (2018). [Principles of effective governance for sustainable development](#)

Use the effectiveness, accountability and inclusiveness clusters as a diagnostic lens, without treating them as a national legal instrument.

R2 OECD (2020). [OECD Public Integrity Handbook](#)

Read the sections on responsibilities, merit, risk management, oversight and participation relevant to the weekly task.

R3 PEFA Secretariat (2016). [PEFA 2016 Framework for assessing public financial management](#)

Read the overview and the indicators relevant to budget reliability, predictability and control, accounting and external scrutiny. Classroom exercises are not official PEFA assessments.

R4 International Monetary Fund (2019). [Fiscal Transparency Code and supporting guidance](#)

Use the reporting, forecasting and budgeting, fiscal risk, and resource revenue pillars as reference points for transparent financial decisions.

R5 PEFA Secretariat (2020). [Supplementary Framework for Assessing Gender Responsive Public Financial Management](#)

Use the nine indicator framework to connect gender analysis with budgeting, execution, reporting and scrutiny.

R6 United Nations DGACM (n.d.). [Manual of Protocol](#)

Consult the current online manual and the host institution protocol office. UN Headquarters procedures are context specific.

R7 United Nations (1961). [Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations](#)

Assigned provisions: Articles 3, 13 to 18, 22, 27, 29 to 32 and 41. Distinguish mission functions, precedence, privileges and responsibilities.

R8 UNDP and University of Pittsburgh (2021). [Global Report on Gender Equality in Public Administration](#)

Read the executive summary and recommendations; distinguish representation from seniority, occupational segregation and influence.

R9 International Labour Organization (2019). [Violence and Harassment Convention No 190 and Recommendation No 206](#)

Read the prevention, protection, reporting and remedy provisions as international reference standards. Application in a jurisdiction requires checking its current law and treaty position.

R10 United Nations DGACM (n.d.). [Protocol and Liaison Service reference materials](#)

Use current official reference materials to verify document conventions, names, titles and institutional procedures before an event.

For workplace application, use the institution's current approved mandate, finance and procurement rules, civil service instruments and event-specific protocol instructions. Record issuer, version, date and applicability. Where authority is unclear, identify the decision that needs verification rather than presenting a classroom assumption as law.