

Project Management

Version Fall 2025

Table of Contents

1. Project Stakeholder Mapping	4
• 1.1. Learning Objectives	5
• 1.2. Part 1: Stakeholder Identification (15 minutes)	6
• 1.3. Part 2: Stakeholder Analysis Matrix (20 minutes)	7
• 1.3.1. Influence/Interest Matrix	7
• 1.4. Part 3: Stakeholder Register (15 minutes)	8
• 1.5. Part 4: Engagement Planning (10 minutes)	9
• 1.6. Reflection Questions (5 minutes)	10
• 1.7. Team Presentation Preparation	11
2. Scope Creep	12
• 2.1. Learning Objectives	5
• 2.2. Initial Project Definition	14
• 2.2.1. Project: Student Mobile App Development	14
• 2.3. Round 1: Week 2 Change Requests	15
• 2.3.1. Change Request #1	15
• 2.3.2. Change Request #2	15
• 2.3.3. Decision Matrix - Round 1	15
• 2.4. Round 2: Week 6 Change Requests	17
• 2.4.1. Change Request #3	17
• 2.4.2. Change Request #4	17
• 2.4.3. Change Request #5	17
• 2.4.4. Decision Matrix - Round 2	18
• 2.5. Round 3: Week 12 Change Requests	19
• 2.5.1. Change Request #6	19
• 2.5.2. Change Request #7	19
• 2.5.3. Change Request #8	19
• 2.5.4. Decision Matrix - Round 3	20
• 2.6. Impact Analysis	21
• 2.6.1. Budget Impact	21
• 2.6.2. Schedule Impact	21
• 2.6.3. Scope Impact	21
• 2.6.4. Reflection Questions	21
• 2.7. Lessons Learned	23

- 2.8. Team Discussion Points

Project Stakeholder Mapping

Learning Objectives

By the end of this activity, you will be able to:

- Identify all relevant stakeholders for a project
- Categorize stakeholders by influence and interest levels
- Create a comprehensive stakeholder register
- Develop appropriate engagement strategies for different stakeholder types

Scenario: Campus Sustainability Initiative

Your team has been assigned to manage a comprehensive sustainability project for your CEGEP Heritage College main campus. The project aims to reduce the campus carbon footprint by 30% over the next two years and increase recycling process efficiency through various initiatives including:

- Installing solar panels on the building
- Implementing a campus-wide recycling program
- Creating sustainable dining options in cafeterias
- Establishing student-led sustainability clubs

Budget: \$2.5 million

Timeline: 24 months

Expected Impact: 5,000+ students, 800+ staff and faculty

Part 1: Stakeholder Identification (15 minutes)

Instructions: Brainstorm and list ALL potential stakeholders who might be affected by or have influence over this project. Think broadly - consider internal and external parties.

Categories to Consider:

- CEGEP administration
- Students and student organizations
- Faculty and staff
- Local community
- Government entities
- Vendors and contractors
- Environmental groups
- Regulatory bodies

Your Stakeholder List:

1. _
2. _
3. _
4. _
5. _
6. _

You may continue the list if needed.

Part 2: Stakeholder Analysis Matrix (20 minutes)

Instructions: Plot each stakeholder on the matrix below based on their level of influence (ability to impact project success with performance) and interest (how much the project affects them).

Influence/Interest Matrix

HIGH INTEREST, LOW INFLUENCE	HIGH INTEREST, HIGH INFLUENCE
Keep Satisfied	Manage Closely
LOW INTEREST, LOW INFLUENCE	LOW INTEREST, HIGH INFLUENCE
Monitor	Keep Informed

Quadrant Definitions:

- **Manage Closely:** High influence, high interest - key stakeholders requiring active management
- **Keep Informed:** High influence, low interest - keep satisfied with minimal effort
- **Keep Satisfied:** Low influence, high interest - show consideration for their concerns
- **Monitor:** Low influence, low interest - minimal effort, monitor for changes

Part 3: Stakeholder Register (15 minutes)

Instructions: Select your top 3 most critical stakeholders and complete the register below.

#	Stakeholder Name	Role/ Organization	Influence Level (1-5)	Interest Level (1-5)	Key Concerns/ Expectations	Engagement Strategy
1						
2						
3						

Part 4: Engagement Planning (10 minutes)

Instructions: For each quadrant, develop specific engagement strategies:

Manage Closely Stakeholders:

- Communication frequency: _____
- Communication methods: _____
- Key messages: _____
- Success metrics: _____

Keep Informed Stakeholders:

- Communication frequency: _____
- Communication methods: _____
- Key messages: _____

Keep Satisfied Stakeholders:

- Communication frequency: _____
- Communication methods: _____
- Key messages: _____

Monitor Stakeholders:

- Review frequency: _____
- Monitoring method: _____

Reflection Questions (5 minutes)

1. Which stakeholders were you initially likely to overlook? Why?
2. How might stakeholder positions change throughout the project lifecycle?
3. What challenges do you anticipate in managing the “Manage Closely” stakeholders?
4. How would poor stakeholder management impact this project’s success?

Team Presentation Preparation

Prepare a set of PowerPoint slides for 3-minute presentation covering:

- Your stakeholder mapping matrix (visual)
- Top 3 most critical stakeholders and why
- Biggest stakeholder management challenge anticipated
- One creative engagement strategy you developed

Submission: Submit your completed handout with PowerPoint slides and be prepared to go over your findings.

Scope Creep

Key Features:

- A realistic mobile app development project that students can relate to. Three progressive rounds of change requests that increase in complexity and timing challenges. Structured decision matrices to track choices and reasoning.
- Impact analysis tools to see cumulative effects of decisions. Reflection questions that connect the simulation to real-world project management principles.

Educational Design Elements:

- Change requests come from different stakeholders with varying levels of authority.
- Requests range from reasonable safety features to nice-to-have additions.
- Timing creates realistic pressure (early changes vs. late-stage requests).
- Some requests appear mandatory while others are clearly optional.
- Budget and time constraints force difficult trade-off decisions.

Learning Outcomes:

- Students experience how small changes accumulate into major scope issues.
- They practice evaluating change requests against project constraints.
- They learn to distinguish between essential and optional changes.
- They develop skills in stakeholder communication and expectation management.

Learning Objectives

By the end of this activity, you will be able to:

- Recognize scope creep in project scenarios
- Evaluate change requests against project constraints
- Apply change management principles in decision-making
- Understand the impact of scope changes on project success

Initial Project Definition

Project: Student Mobile App Development

Your team has been contracted to develop a mobile app for your university's student services.

Original Scope:

- Class schedule viewer
- Grade checker
- Campus map with building locations
- Dining hall hours and menus
- Basic user authentication

Approved Budget: \$25,000

Timeline: 4 months (16 weeks)

Team Size: 4 developers

Platform: iOS only

Target Users: 8,000 students

Success Criteria:

- App launches successfully in App Store
- 70% of students download within first month
- User satisfaction rating of 4.0+ stars
- Zero critical security vulnerabilities

Round 1: Week 2 Change Requests

Instructions: Your team has just completed the requirements gathering phase. Review each change request below and make decisions using the Decision Matrix.

Change Request #1

From: Student Government President

Request: Add push notifications for campus emergency alerts

Justification: "This is critical for student safety and would significantly increase app usage."

Impact: +1 week development time, +\$2,000 cost

Change Request #2

From: Athletic Department

Request: Include sports schedules and ticket purchasing

Justification: "We have 15,000 season ticket holders who would love this feature."

Impact: +2 weeks development time, +\$4,500 cost, requires integration with ticketing system

Decision Matrix - Round 1

Change Request	Approve	Deny	Defer	Justification
#1: Emergency Alerts	y/n	y/n	y/n	
#2: Sports Integration	y/n	y/n	y/n	

Updated Project Status After Round 1:

- Budget Used: \$_____ / \$25,000
- Timeline: _____ weeks remaining
- New Success Criteria (if any): _____

Round 2: Week 6 Change Requests

Current Status: You're 25% through development when new requests arrive.

Change Request #3

From: IT Security Department

Request: Add two-factor authentication and biometric login

Justification: "New security policy requires enhanced authentication for all student data access."

Impact: +3 weeks development time, +\$5,000 cost, may delay launch

Change Request #4

From: University President's Office

Request: Add Android version simultaneously

Justification: "60% of our students use Android phones. We need to serve all students equally."

Impact: +6 weeks development time, +\$15,000 cost, requires additional team members

Change Request #5

From: Academic Affairs

Request: Add study room booking system

Justification: "Library study rooms are always full. This would solve a major student complaint."

Impact: +2 weeks development time, +\$3,000 cost, requires library system integration

Decision Matrix - Round 2

Change Request	Approve	Deny	Defer	Justification
#3: Enhanced Security	y/n	y/n	y/n	
#4: Android Version	y/n	y/n	y/n	
#5: Study Room Booking	y/n	y/n	y/n	

Updated Project Status After Round 2:

- Budget Used: \$_____ / \$25,000
- Timeline: _____ weeks remaining
- New Success Criteria (if any): _____

Round 3: Week 12 Change Requests

Current Status: You're 75% through development with 4 weeks remaining.

Change Request #6

From: Student Life Office

Request: Remove dining hall menus, add campus event calendar instead

Justification: "Students say they don't use the menu feature, but constantly ask about events."

Impact: +1 week development time, -\$500 cost (net savings from removal)

Change Request #7

From: Financial Aid Office

Request: Add financial aid status checker

Justification: "This was supposed to be included originally - there must have been a miscommunication."

Impact: +3 weeks development time, +\$6,000 cost

Change Request #8

From: Facilities Management

Request: Add real-time campus parking availability

Justification: "Parking is the #1 student complaint. This feature could generate revenue through premium parking alerts."

Impact: +4 weeks development time, +\$8,000 cost, requires hardware integration

Decision Matrix - Round 3

Change Request	Approve	Deny	Defer	Justification
#6: Event Calendar Swap	y/n	y/n	y/n	
#7: Financial Aid Status	y/n	y/n	y/n	
#8: Parking Availability	y/n	y/n	y/n	

Final Project Status:

- Budget Used: \$_____ / \$25,000
- Timeline: _____ weeks (original: 16 weeks)
- Launch Date: _____
- Final Feature Set: _____

Impact Analysis

Budget Impact

Original Budget: \$25,000

Final Budget: \$_____

Variance: _____ (____% over/under)

Schedule Impact

Original Timeline: 16 weeks

Final Timeline: _____ weeks

Variance: _____ weeks (____% over/under)

Scope Impact

Original Features: 5 core features

Final Features: _____ features

Added: _____

Removed: _____

Deferred: _____

Reflection Questions

1. **Decision Patterns:** Looking back at your decisions, what criteria did you consistently use to approve/deny changes?
2. **Constraint Trade-offs:** Which project constraint (budget, time, scope, quality) did you prioritize most? Why?

3. **Stakeholder Management:** How did the source of the request influence your decisions? Should it have?
4. **Change Timing:** How did the timing of requests (early vs. late in project) affect your decision-making?
5. **Success Criteria:** Based on your final project scope, do you think you'll still meet the original success criteria? Why or why not?

Lessons Learned

What strategies could prevent scope creep?

1.

How should change requests be properly managed?

2.

What would you do differently if starting this project over?

3.

Team Discussion Points

Prepare to discuss:

- Your team's final project outcome (budget, timeline, features)
- The most difficult change request decision and why
- How you would communicate project changes to stakeholders
- Strategies for better scope management in future projects

Debrief Questions for Class:

- Which teams stayed closest to original constraints?
- What patterns do you see in approved vs. denied requests?
- How did different teams handle the same change requests?
- What real-world parallels can you draw from this simulation?

