

PRACTICAL SESSIONS FOR TOPICS 1–8

PRACTICAL SESSION 1

Theoretical and Methodological Foundations of International Project Management

Link to independent work: comparative analysis of the PMBOK, PM² and project cycle management methodologies in an international project environment (9 hrs.)

Session objective

To consolidate theoretical knowledge of the essence, typology and life cycle of an international project, and to develop practical skills in identifying project type, analysing the project environment, and comparatively applying project management methodologies.

Task 1. Identification and classification of an international project (individually, 45 min)

Each student is given a brief description of a real or hypothetical international project (5–7 variants rotated among students, for example: an Interreg NEXT Poland–Ukraine cross-border cooperation project; a Horizon Europe research project; a USAID technical assistance project in the field of governance; an Erasmus+ Capacity Building educational project; an embassy small-grants project).

For the description received, it is necessary to:

- Determine the type of project according to the five classification criteria discussed in the lecture (source of funding, sphere of implementation, scale, nature of the result, number of participants).
- Determine which programme/portfolio the project could potentially belong to, and justify the answer.
- Identify the generic and specific (for international projects) features present in the description.

Task 2. Constructing a model of the project environment (in small groups of 3–4, 60 min)

For the project obtained in Task 1, the group:

- Compiles a list of all possible actors in the project environment (donor, coordinator, partners, associated partners, beneficiaries, target groups, other stakeholders).
- Distributes the actors into the categories "primary/secondary" and "supporters/neutral/opponents".
- Visualises the project environment as a diagram (concentric circles or a relationship map), which is presented to the other groups (up to 5 minutes per presentation).

Task 3. Mapping the project life cycle (in the same groups, 45 min)

For the project from Task 1, the group develops a table in which, for each phase of the life cycle (initiation, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, closure), it determines:

- the estimated duration of the phase;
- the key documents/artefacts produced during that phase;
- the responsible actor (coordinator, donor, partner).

Task 4. Comparative analysis of project management methodologies (group discussion, followed by a plenary discussion, 60 min)

Groups are each assigned one methodology (PMBOK, PM², PCM, LFA) and prepare a short presentation (5–7 min) following a common outline:

- The developing institution and the principal field of application.
- The structure of the methodology (phases/process groups/knowledge areas).
- Advantages of application in an international project environment.
- Limitations and situations in which the methodology is less suitable.

Following the presentations, a discussion moderated by the lecturer takes place: "Can elements of different methodologies be combined within a single project? Under what conditions?"

Task 5. Analytical essay (independent, in class, in writing, 30 min)

Length: 250–350 words. Topic (chosen from a list or formulated by the student in agreement with the lecturer): "The specifics of managing uncertainty in international projects implemented under martial law in Ukraine" or "The role of the intercultural competence of an international consortium leader: a case analysis."

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Correctness of project classification (Task 1)	15
Completeness and soundness of the project environment model (Task 2)	20
Logical consistency of the life-cycle mapping (Task 3)	15
Quality of the presentation and participation in the discussion of methodologies (Task 4)	25
Argumentation and structure of the analytical essay (Task 5)	25
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 2

Project Design: Conceptualisation, Intervention Logic and Justification of the Project

Link to independent work: construction of a problem tree, an objectives tree and a logical framework for an international project idea (9 hrs.)

Session objective

To develop practical skills in constructing a problem tree and an objectives tree, analysing stakeholders using the "power–interest" matrix, and developing the logical framework of an international project.

Task 1. Formulating a project idea (in small groups of 3–4, 20 min)

Each group chooses (or is given by the lecturer) a problem situation in one of the following spheres: regional economic development, green transformation/energy efficiency, digitalisation of public services, support for veterans and reintegration, development of academic mobility, cross-border entrepreneurship. The group formulates a tentative title for the future international project.

Task 2. Constructing a problem tree (in groups, 60 min)

Following the method discussed in the lecture:

- Formulate the core problem.
- Identify at least 3 first-level causes and 1–2 second-level causes for each of them.
- Identify at least 3 consequences of the core problem.
- Present the problem tree as a diagram (on a flipchart, a Miro/Jamboard board, or in PowerPoint).

Task 3. Transformation into an objectives tree and analysis of strategies (in groups, 45 min)

- Convert each element of the problem tree into a positive formulation (objectives tree).
- Identify the "branch" of the objectives tree that your project will choose to implement (taking into account assumed resource constraints and the consortium's competence), and justify the choice (analysis of strategies).

Task 4. Stakeholder analysis using the "power–interest" matrix (in groups, 45 min)

- Compile a list of at least 8 project stakeholders.
- Distribute them across the quadrants of the "power–interest" matrix.
- For each quadrant, formulate an engagement strategy (frequency, format, communication channel).

Task 5. Developing the logical framework (in groups, 60 min)

On the basis of Tasks 2–4, develop the project's logical framework (a 4×4 table) containing:

- the overall objective, the specific objective, at least 3 results, and 2–3 activities for each result;
- one objectively verifiable SMART indicator at each level (except the activity level, where resources are indicated instead);
- means of verification for each indicator;
- assumptions for the transition between each pair of levels.

Task 6. Peer review (in pairs of groups, 20 min)

Groups exchange logical frameworks and provide each other with structured written feedback addressing the following questions: "Is the vertical 'if–then' logic maintained? Do the indicators meet the SMART criteria? Have any 'killer' assumptions been identified that require the design to be revisited?"

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Logical correctness of the problem tree	15
Soundness of the objectives tree and choice of strategy	15
Quality of the stakeholder analysis	15
Internal consistency of the logical framework (vertical logic)	30
Compliance of indicators with the SMART criteria	15
Quality of the peer review	10
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 3

Developing an International Project Proposal and Grant Application

Link to independent work: analysis of typical evaluation criteria for grant applications in EU programmes and among international donors (8 hrs.)

Session objective

To develop skills in structuring a project Concept Note, constructing a work plan, and applying grant-application evaluation criteria in practice.

Task 1. Analysis of a real call for proposals (individually, 30 min)

Each student receives (from the lecturer, as pre-prepared handout material) an excerpt from a real or adapted call for project proposals (for example, under the Erasmus+ Capacity Building, Interreg NEXT or Horizon Europe programmes). It is necessary to note: the purpose of the call, the thematic priorities, the eligibility criteria for the applicant and partners, the evaluation criteria and their weighting, the budgetary conditions, and the submission deadline.

Task 2. Writing a Concept Note (in groups continuing work on the project from Practical Session 2, 90 min)

Building on the logical framework developed in Practical Session 2, the group prepares a concise Concept Note (1.5–2 pages) following the structure discussed in the lecture:

- Project summary (drafted last).
- Relevance and justification (with reference to the priorities of the chosen hypothetical call).
- Project objectives.
- Brief methodology.
- Expected results and impact.
- Sustainability.

Task 3. Constructing the work plan (in groups, 60 min)

- Divide the project into 4–5 work packages (WPs) and identify the leader of each WP.
- For one selected work package, construct a fragment of the work breakdown structure (WBS): WP → tasks → activities, observing the 100% rule.
- Identify at least one project product (deliverable) and one milestone for each work package.

Task 4. Simulation of expert application evaluation (role-play, 60 min)

Groups exchange Concept Notes. Each group acts as an independent expert reviewer and evaluates the application received against the criteria "relevance", "quality of design and implementation", "impact", "sustainability" and "efficiency of the budget" on a 0–5 point scale for each criterion, preparing a brief written justification of the score (modelled on the European Commission's evaluation form) and a list of typical errors identified in the application.

Task 5. Concluding discussion (30 min)

Discussion of the review results: which errors proved most common? What discrepancies arose between the expectations of the applicants and the reviewers' assessments? Moderated by the lecturer, returning to the list of typical errors discussed in the lecture.

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Analysis of the call for proposals (Task 1)	10
Structure and logical coherence of the Concept Note (Task 2)	30
Correctness of the work plan and WBS construction (Task 3)	25
Quality and soundness of the expert review (Task 4)	25
Engagement in the concluding discussion (Task 5)	10
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 4

Grant Funding, Donor Programmes and Building an International Consortium

Link to independent work: searching for a current call for project proposals and preparing a brief analytical profile of the competitive programme (9 hrs.)

Session objective

To develop skills in searching for and comparatively analysing donor programmes, allocating roles within a consortium, drafting partnership documents, and recognising and managing typical ethical risks of grant activity.

Task 1. Comparative analysis of donor programmes (individually or in pairs, 45 min)

Each student/pair selects two programmes from different donor categories (for example: Horizon Europe and USAID; Erasmus+ and an embassy programme; Interreg and the EBRD) and completes a comparative table across the following parameters: type of donor, thematic focus, typical grant size, consortium requirements (minimum number of countries/partners), co-financing rate, submission procedure.

Task 2. Allocating roles within the consortium (role-play in groups of 4–5, 60 min)

Each group is given a description of a hypothetical consortium of 4–5 organisations of different types (a university, an SME, a local self-government body, an NGO, a research institute) for the project developed in previous sessions. The group's members allocate roles among themselves (coordinator, 2–3 partner beneficiaries, associated partner) and justify the allocation on the basis of the principle of compensatory/complementary capacity (who contributes which competence and resource).

Task 3. Preparing a package of partnership documents (in groups, 75 min)

For the simulated consortium, the group prepares (using templates provided by the lecturer):

- A draft mandate letter from one of the partners to the coordinator.
- A draft letter of intent from an associated partner.
- The key provisions of an integrity declaration (a list of assurances the applicant would have to certify).
- A list of the mandatory sections of a Consortium Agreement, with a brief description of the purpose of each section.

Task 4. Case analysis: ethical dilemmas and conflicts of interest (in groups, 45 min)

Groups are presented with 3–4 short cases (for example: a member of the donor's evaluation committee is the academic supervisor of the applicant; the consortium coordinator engages a relative's company for the procurement of goods; a partner reports expenditure in which partially overlaps with expenditure reported under another grant from the same donor). For

each case, it is necessary to: determine the type of violation (conflict of interest, double funding, breach of academic integrity, etc.), assess the potential consequences for the consortium, and propose a mechanism for prevention or resolution.

Task 5. Concluding presentation and rapid poll (35 min)

Each group presents (up to 3 min) the allocation of roles within its consortium and one case from Task 4, together with the reasoning behind the proposed solution. The session concludes with a short written rapid poll (5 closed-type questions) testing the assimilation of the material covered in Topics 1–4.

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Completeness of the comparative analysis of donor programmes (Task 1)	15
Soundness of the role allocation within the consortium (Task 2)	20
Quality of the partnership documents prepared (Task 3)	25
Depth of the analysis of ethical cases (Task 4)	25
Presentation and results of the rapid poll (Task 5)	15
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 5

Planning the Implementation of an International Project and Managing the Project Team

Link to independent work: development of a work breakdown structure, a responsibility assignment matrix and a schedule of the international project (9 hrs)

Session objective

To develop practical skills in constructing a work breakdown structure, scheduling with the use of a Gantt chart and determining the critical path, as well as distributing responsibility within the consortium by means of a RACI matrix.

Task 1. Updating the project idea (in groups continuing work on the project from Practical Sessions 1–4, 20 min)

Each group briefly recalls the logical framework and work plan of its project (developed in previous sessions) and determines which work packages move into the detailed implementation-planning phase.

Task 2. Constructing a detailed work breakdown structure (in groups, 75 min)

- For two selected work packages, construct a complete work breakdown structure (WBS) down to the level of specific operations (WP → tasks → activities → operations), observing the 100% rule.
- Prepare a fragment of the WBS Dictionary for three operations: description of the work, acceptance criterion, required resources, responsible performer.

Task 3. Scheduling and determining the critical path (in groups, 75 min)

- Determine the approximate duration (in weeks) of each task in the constructed WBS and the logical dependencies between the tasks.
- Construct a Gantt chart of the project (on paper, in Miro/Jamboard, or in Excel/MS Project if access is available).
- Determine the critical path of the project, justifying the chosen sequence of tasks.
- Identify at least 3 milestones and mark them on the chart.

Task 4. Developing a RACI matrix (in groups, 45 min)

For at least 8 key tasks/project deliverables, develop a responsibility assignment matrix (RACI), assigning exactly one person Accountable for each task and justifying the distribution of the Responsible, Consulted and Informed roles among the members of the notional consortium.

Task 5. Role-play “Consortium kick-off meeting” (in groups, 45 min)

The group simulates the kick-off meeting of its consortium: it assigns participant roles (coordinator, partners), formulates an agenda, discusses ways of working (language of communication, communication channels, frequency of meetings) and draws up meeting minutes with a list of action items, responsible persons and deadlines.

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Correctness of the WBS construction and the WBS Dictionary (Task 2)	20
Quality of the schedule and justification of the critical path (Task 3)	30
Logical correctness of the RACI matrix (Task 4)	25
Realism and completeness of the kick-off meeting minutes (Task 5)	25
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 6

Financial Management, Budgeting and Administration of International Projects

Link to independent work: preparing the project budget estimate, taking into account cost eligibility, co-financing and financial reporting requirements (9 hrs)

Session objective

To form practical skills in developing the budget of an international project by established cost categories, applying different forms of funding (actual costs, unit rates, lump sums), and identifying breaches of cost eligibility.

Task 1. Developing the project budget (in groups continuing work on the joint project, 90 min)

On the basis of the work plan and schedule developed in Practical Session 5, the group prepares the project budget estimate by category: personnel (calculating person-months by work package), travel, equipment, subcontracting, other direct costs, indirect costs (at an established notional rate of 7% of direct costs). The budget is presented as a table indicating the amount for each category and its share of the total budget.

Task 2. Distributing the budget among partners and calculating co-financing (in groups, 45 min)

- Distribute the total budget among the consortium partners (a notional number of 3–4 organisations) in proportion to the volume of work packages assigned to them.
- At a notional funding rate of 80%, calculate the grant amount and the amount of co-financing required from each partner.
- Determine which part of the co-financing may be covered by an in-kind contribution, and give an example.

Task 3. Choosing the form of funding for costs (in groups, 40 min)

For 5 notional budget lines (for example: the coordinator's salary; daily subsistence allowance for travel to a coordination meeting; printing of training materials; interpreting services; hire of a conference hall for the closing event), determine the most appropriate form of funding (actual costs, unit rates, lump sum) and justify the choice.

Task 4. Budget audit: identifying breaches of cost eligibility (case analysis in groups, 60 min)

Groups are given a notional fragment of the consortium's financial report containing 6–8 declared costs, some of which contain breaches (a cost not supported by a document; a cost incurred before the start of the project; an employee's salary claimed simultaneously under two grants from the same donor; exceeding the travel expenditure limit; procurement of equipment without a competitive procedure above the established threshold). The group's task is to identify all breaches, classify them (ineligible cost / double funding / breach of procurement procedure) and propose corrective actions.

Task 5. Final discussion (25 min)

Discussion of the case-analysis results: which breaches are the most risky in terms of consequences for the consortium? What preventive internal financial control measures could forestall them?

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Consistency of the budget with the work plan (Task 1)	25
Correctness of the co-financing calculation (Task 2)	15
Justification of the choice of funding form (Task 3)	15
Completeness of breach identification and quality of the proposed corrective actions (Task 4)	35
Participation in the final discussion (Task 5)	10
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 7

Managing Risk, Communication and Quality in an International Project

Link to independent work: developing a risk register, a communication plan and a quality assurance plan for the project results (8 hrs)

Session objective

To develop skills in identifying and analysing the risks of an international project, constructing a risk register, developing a communication strategy and a quality assurance plan, and resolving conflict situations within the project team.

Task 1. Risk identification and analysis (in groups continuing work on the joint project, 60 min)

- Identify at least 8 project risks across different categories (political/security, financial/economic, organisational/managerial, operational, reputational, compliance risks), drawing, in particular, on an analysis of the assumptions of the logical framework developed in Practical Session 2.

- Assess each risk by probability and impact (low/medium/high scale) and place it on the probability-impact matrix.

Task 2. Developing a risk register (in groups, 60 min)

For the 5 highest-priority risks from Task 1, develop a risk register containing: description and category of the risk, probability, impact, chosen response strategy (avoidance/mitigation/transfer/acceptance), specific response measures, and the responsible person. For the single highest-priority risk, additionally develop a contingency plan indicating the trigger conditions for its activation.

Task 3. Developing a communication plan (in groups, 50 min)

Develop a project communication plan that defines, for at least 4 target audiences (consortium partners, the donor, target groups, the general public/media), the key message, channel, format and frequency of communication, as well as one specific visibility measure in line with the requirements of a notional donor.

Task 4. Quality assurance plan (in groups, 40 min)

For one project deliverable (for example, a training manual or an analytical report), determine the quality criteria, an internal peer-review procedure (who, at what stage, against which criteria) and a procedure for checking compliance with donor requirements prior to submission.

Task 5. Case analysis of conflict situations (role-play in groups, 60 min)

Groups are given 2–3 cases of conflict within the consortium (for example: a partner is systematically late in submitting data for reporting, jeopardising the coordinator's compliance with the deadline; two partners understand the distribution of the budget for a joint event differently; a cultural misunderstanding between partners concerning decision-making style). For each case, it is necessary to determine the probable source of the conflict, choose an appropriate resolution style (based on the Thomas–Kilmann model), and act out a short negotiation scene (3–5 min) explaining the chosen strategy.

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Completeness of risk identification and quality of the analysis (Task 1)	15
Justification of the risk register and the contingency plan (Task 2)	25
Quality of the communication plan (Task 3)	20
Realism of the quality assurance plan (Task 4)	15
Depth of analysis and persuasiveness of the conflict-resolution role-play (Task 5)	25
Total	100

PRACTICAL SESSION 8

Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting and Sustainability of International Project Results

Link to independent work: preparing the indicator system, monitoring plan and performance evaluation matrix of the international project (9 hrs)

Session objective

To consolidate skills in developing a monitoring system based on logical framework indicators, applying the OECD DAC evaluation criteria, preparing the structure of an interim report, and developing a plan to ensure the sustainability of project results.

Task 1. Developing a monitoring plan (in groups continuing work on the joint project, 60 min)

For each indicator of the logical framework developed in Practical Session 2, determine: the baseline value (notional), the target value, the source of verification, the frequency of measurement, and the responsible person. Present this as a monitoring plan table.

Task 2. Applying the OECD DAC criteria (in groups, 50 min)

For your project, formulate one evaluation question for each of the six OECD DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability) that the final evaluation of the project ought to answer.

Task 3. Preparing the structure of an interim report (in groups, 50 min)

Develop a detailed structure (a table of contents with brief section annotations) for the consortium's interim technical report to the donor, including a description of progress by work package, a comparison of achieved and planned indicators, an updated risk register, and justification of any deviations from the original plan.

Task 4. Developing a sustainability plan (in groups, 50 min)

For your project, develop a sustainability plan across four dimensions (institutional, financial, political/regulatory, social sustainability), determining for each dimension a specific measure, the responsible performer, and the time horizon for its implementation after project completion.

Task 5. Final project presentations and rapid survey (40 min)

Each group prepares a short (5–7 min) final presentation of its project, developed throughout Practical Sessions 1–8: from the problem tree to the sustainability plan, with emphasis on the internal logical consistency of all elements. The session concludes with a short written rapid survey to check mastery of the material of Topics 5–8.

Assessment format and criteria

Criterion	Maximum Score
Completeness and correctness of the monitoring plan (Task 1)	20
Quality of the evaluation questions against the OECD DAC criteria (Task 2)	15
Structure of the interim report (Task 3)	15

Criterion	Maximum Score
Justification of the sustainability plan (Task 4)	20
Quality of the final presentation and the rapid-survey results (Task 5)	30
Total	100