

FUTURE NOW

Building Futures Literacy Through Creative Foresight

A practical methodology for organising future logistics competence workshops

Developed through the Visegrad Fund project #22420093

“Competences for Future Logistics in V4 Countries”

Partner universities: Corvinus University of Budapest • Jan Kochanowski University of Kielce • Tomas Bata University in Zlín • University of Žilina

Methodology practically tested in national workshops across all four V4 countries and refined for an international V4 workshop in Budapest (November 2025).



The project is co-financed by the governments of Czechia, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia through Visegrad Grants from the International Visegrad Fund. The mission of the fund is to advance ideas for sustainable regional cooperation in Central Europe.

Project website: <https://competences4logistics.ujk.edu.pl/>

External implementation guide



About this guide

This document is a practical, self-contained guide for universities, training providers, professional associations and other organisations that want to run a workshop helping participants explore how logistics competence requirements may change under alternative futures. It translates the V4 project's developed and refined methodology into a step-by-step format that can be reused without prior involvement in the project.

The method was practically verified through repeated implementation: first in national pilot workshops in Hungary, Poland, Czechia and Slovakia, then in a refined international workshop. The national workshops involved 113 students in total. The international workshop brought together 18 students onsite, 19 online participants and 13 academics. The process was subsequently analysed and presented in joint research and conference outputs.

Evidence note “Verified” in this guide means tested and refined through practical implementation and participant/facilitator feedback. It does not imply an independent external certification or formal validation procedure.

Contents

1. Concept and project context
2. Methodology at a glance
3. Preparing the workshop
4. Standard four-hour workshop agenda
5. Step-by-step facilitation guide
6. Facilitation, timing and hybrid delivery best practices
7. Evaluation and continuous improvement
8. Adapting the methodology to other contexts
9. Ready-to-use templates and checklists
10. Project evidence base and further information

1. Concept and project context

1.1 Why a future-oriented logistics workshop?

Logistics and supply chain work is being reshaped by digitalisation, automation, AI, sustainability pressures, regulation, changing consumer expectations and geopolitical uncertainty. In such an environment, preparing students only for today's job descriptions is insufficient. The central educational question becomes: how can learners understand present labour-market signals while also developing the capacity to think with multiple possible futures?

The workshop addresses this challenge by connecting two complementary approaches. Foresight helps participants explore multiple plausible futures rather than predict one "correct" future. Futures Literacy develops the ability to use images of the future consciously when interpreting the present and making decisions. The workshop combines these approaches with concrete labour-market evidence and collaborative, creative tasks.

1.2 Core learning logic: present → futures → action

The methodology is deliberately grounded. Participants do not begin with abstract speculation. They first investigate what employers require today, then move into contrasting future scenarios, and finally translate the differences into future competence profiles and job requirements. This creates a learning arc from evidence to imagination and back to practical implications.

Stage	Core question	Typical output
THE PRESENT	What do employers require from logistics professionals today?	Skills 2025 map: hard, soft and other requirements
THE FUTURE	What would this profession require in a specific 2040 scenario?	Future persona and Skills 2040 profile
THE GAP	What becomes more important, less important, new or obsolete?	Competence-gap matrix
THE APPLICATION	How would an employer recruit for this future role?	Speculative future job advertisement
THE REFLECTION	What should students, educators and organisations do differently now?	Individual and group learning points

1.3 The V4 project behind the methodology

The methodology was created within Visegrad Fund project #22420093, "Competences for Future Logistics in V4 Countries". The consortium brought together Corvinus University of Budapest (Hungary), Jan Kochanowski University of Kielce (Poland), Tomas Bata University in Zlín (Czechia), and the University of Žilina (Slovakia). The project combined expertise in logistics and SCM, industrial engineering, human resources development, foresight, Futures Literacy, statistics, AI and participatory education.

The development followed a two-tier design. A common methodology was first tested in national workshops in all four countries. Facilitators documented what worked, what created difficulties, and what should be modified. These good practices were consolidated and used to refine the methodology for the international workshop. The international version added an explicit cross-country comparison: participants moved from local job-market evidence to a V4 regional baseline before exploring future scenarios in mixed international teams.

Why this matters The methodology is not only a workshop script. Its credibility comes from an iterative design cycle: jointly design → pilot in different settings → collect feedback → compare experiences → refine → apply internationally.

2. Methodology at a glance

2.1 Intended outcomes

By the end of the workshop, participants should be able to:

- identify and categorise current competence requirements from real labour-market evidence;
- distinguish prediction from exploration of multiple possible futures;
- work with a future scenario without treating it as a forecast;
- construct a plausible future professional persona and competence profile;
- compare present and future requirements and identify competence gaps;
- discuss uncertainty, adaptability, sustainability and technological change in a professional context;
- communicate and negotiate interpretations in a diverse team;
- translate future-oriented thinking into practical implications for education, careers and employability.

2.2 Recommended participant profile and group size

Element	Recommendation
Participants	University students or early-career professionals in logistics, SCM, industrial engineering or adjacent fields. The method can also be adapted to other sectors.
Total size	Approximately 15–30 participants works well for an interactive workshop. Larger cohorts can be accommodated with more facilitators and parallel rooms.
Team size	Aim for 5–7 participants per team. The international V4 workshop used three mixed teams of roughly this size.
Team composition	Mix countries, study levels, disciplinary backgrounds or professional experiences where possible. Diversity enriches the discussion, but shared terminology should be established at the start.
Facilitation	One facilitator per working group is strongly recommended.
Guest experts	One or two practitioners or foresight experts can strengthen relevance, provided their inputs are concise and clearly linked to the workshop tasks.

Best practice Mixed groups were repeatedly viewed as valuable in the national and international workshops. Differences in disciplinary and educational backgrounds created richer discussion once common concepts and task instructions were clear.

2.3 Recommended duration

The project's international workshop ran in approximately four hours, including two expert inputs and a break. This is the recommended standard format. If participants have no prior exposure to foresight or Futures Literacy, an extended 5–6 hour format is preferable because project reflections showed that students would benefit from more time for foresight instruction, discussion and scenario work.

3. Preparing the workshop

3.1 Four to six weeks before: define the learning frame

1. Define the participant group and the professional focus. Decide whether all teams will study one logistics profession or different professions such as purchasing, manufacturing/internal logistics, distribution/sales, transport planning or supply chain management.

2. Choose three contrasting future scenarios. The V4 project used pre-existing “Logistics 2040” scenarios as shared stimuli. Your scenarios should differ meaningfully in technology, economic structure, regulation, sustainability, social organisation or geopolitical conditions.
3. Decide whether the workshop is single-country or international. For an international workshop, ensure each team contains participants from multiple countries so that local evidence can be compared within the team.
4. Recruit facilitators and, optionally, guest experts. Brief them on the learning arc and the strict time limits.
5. Prepare participant instructions, worksheets, links to job portals, scenario summaries and evaluation forms.

Scenario design rule Scenarios are lenses, not predictions. Avoid presenting one as “the most likely” or “the best”. Use comparable, similarly detailed scenario summaries so that differences in outputs come from participants’ reasoning rather than unequal information.

3.2 One to two weeks before: prepare the evidence and materials

Participants should work with current job advertisements during the workshop. Ask them to use relevant national or sectoral job portals. Prepare backup advertisements or screenshots in case internet access is unreliable or suitable vacancies are temporarily unavailable.

Physical materials	Digital materials
Flipcharts or large sheets; post-it notes; markers; pens; printed scenario summaries; printed worksheets	Internet access; shared worksheet or spreadsheet; shared presentation or collaborative board; projector; video-conference platform for hybrid delivery
Separate table or wall space for each team	Optional: Miro or equivalent collaborative board; shared Excel/Word table; AI tool for the future job-ad task if permitted by your institution

3.3 Room and technical setup

Use a room that can be rearranged into small-group islands. Each group should have its own work surface and visible area for flipcharts. If possible, avoid a lecture-room layout. The national workshops reported that rearrangeable rooms, whiteboards and large paper supported participation well.

Timing lesson from the pilots Separate “instruction time” from “working time”. Facilitators in the national pilots found that explaining a task could consume a meaningful part of the allocated activity time. Build a small time cushion into each major block.

3.4 Roles

Role	Main responsibilities
Lead facilitator	Opens/closes the workshop; explains the conceptual frame; keeps the overall timetable; coordinates group facilitators and guest experts.
Group facilitator	Clarifies tasks; encourages quieter participants; keeps the team on pace; asks probing questions; avoids imposing their own preferred future.
Rapporteur / data lead	Collects team outputs, photos or digital files; ensures comparable structure across teams; supports later synthesis.
Guest practitioner	Provides a concise view of present or emerging professional requirements; connects the exercise to practice.
Foresight expert (optional)	Introduces multiple futures, uncertainty and scenario thinking; helps prevent scenarios being treated as predictions.

Role	Main responsibilities
Technical host (hybrid)	Manages video conferencing, shared documents, microphones and remote participant access.

4. Standard four-hour workshop agenda

The following schedule mirrors the logic of the refined international V4 workshop while adding small practical buffers based on national-pilot feedback.

Time	Block	Purpose / output
00:00–00:10	Opening and orientation	Objectives, terminology, team structure, rules of engagement
00:10–00:35	Expert input 1: present logistics	Current employer expectations and professional trends
00:35–01:20	THE PRESENT	Local job-ad analysis + cross-country/team synthesis → Skills 2025 map
01:20–01:40	Break	Reset and informal discussion
01:40–02:05	Expert input 2: change/future	Emerging challenges, technology, sustainability or foresight framing
02:05–03:30	THE FUTURE	Scenario → persona → gap analysis → future job advertisement
03:30–03:50	Team presentations	Share future profiles and key gaps
03:50–04:00	Reflection and evaluation	Individual learning, feedback, next steps

Extended format If participants are new to foresight, add 30–45 minutes before THE FUTURE for a deeper foresight/Futures Literacy introduction. A second useful extension is to let participants compare all scenarios at the end rather than hearing only their own team's scenario.

5. Step-by-step facilitation guide

Step 0 — Opening and shared language (10 minutes)

Explain the goal in practical terms: the workshop is about understanding what logistics work requires now, exploring how those requirements could change under different future conditions, and identifying what learners and educators may need to do differently today.

Introduce three skill categories used in the project:

- Hard skills: technical, cognitive and task-specific knowledge or capabilities.
- Soft skills: transferable interpersonal, intrapersonal and employability-related capabilities.
- Other requirements: requirements that do not fit neatly into the first two categories, including qualifications, specific tools, experience requirements or emerging categories.

Briefly distinguish prediction, foresight and Futures Literacy. Emphasise that different futures can be useful even when none is expected to occur exactly as described.

Facilitator language Say “possible futures” or “alternative futures”, not “the future”. This small wording choice helps participants avoid turning the scenario into a forecast.

Step 1 — Local/current job-advertisement analysis (20–25 minutes)

Each team works on an assigned logistics profession or profession family. In an international team, each participant searches a relevant job portal from their own country. In a single-country workshop, assign different portals, regions, employers or role variants.

Instructions to participants:

1. Find several current advertisements for the assigned role at specialist or managerial level.
2. Extract explicit requirements and responsibilities. Do not infer requirements that are not present in the advertisement.
3. Sort the requirements into hard skills, soft skills and other requirements.
4. Identify recurring items and any surprising or ambiguous requirements.
5. Record the source/market so the team can compare contexts.

Output: a concise local/current competence list for each market represented in the team.

Backup plan Have 3–5 preselected job advertisements per profession available. Live searching is valuable because it makes the exercise authentic, but technical problems should not stop the workshop.

Step 2 — Regional or team synthesis (20 minutes)

Participants share their local findings and create one joint Skills 2025 baseline. In the V4 international workshop, this step transformed separate national evidence into a shared regional picture.

Prompt the team with four questions:

- Which requirements appear across most markets?
- Which requirements seem country-, employer- or profession-specific?
- Where do hard and soft skills reinforce each other?
- What is missing from current advertisements that participants nevertheless expect to matter?

Output: a single team poster or shared slide showing the current competency baseline and selected similarities/differences.

Step 3 — Scenario introduction (5–10 minutes)

Assign one future scenario to each team. Give each team a short, similarly structured scenario description. The facilitator summarises the scenario and answers clarification questions about its internal logic, but should not tell participants what competencies “should” result from it.

Ask participants to accept the scenario temporarily as their working world. The task is not to judge whether the scenario is realistic; it is to explore the consequences if it were the operating environment.

Quality check The original project used externally developed scenarios. This supported comparability but limited the depth of scenario-building practice. If learning Futures Literacy itself is the priority and time allows, an advanced version can involve participants in co-creating scenarios before continuing.

Step 4 — Create the future professional persona (25–30 minutes)

Teams imagine a logistics professional operating successfully in the assigned future. A persona makes abstract scenario conditions concrete and gives the group a common reference point.

Ask the team to define:

- role/title and main professional context;
- key responsibilities and decisions;
- technologies, data, systems or physical infrastructure used;
- stakeholders or agents the person interacts with;
- hard skills required;

- soft skills required;
- other requirements, including new or unusual capabilities;
- the 3–5 competencies that are most critical for success in this scenario.

Output: one visual persona per team, ideally on a flipchart or shared board.

Engagement tip Start with 2–3 minutes of silent individual idea generation before group discussion. The national script used individual post-it input before collective persona creation; this helps avoid the first speaker defining the entire discussion.

Step 5 — Present-to-future gap analysis (15–20 minutes)

Place the Skills 2025 baseline next to the future persona. Compare the two systematically. For each requirement, decide whether it is:

- more important in the scenario;
- less important;
- largely unchanged;
- new/emerging; or
- potentially obsolete/disappearing.

Then identify the most significant competence gaps. Ask: “If a student were graduating today, what would they need to start learning, practising or unlearning to remain effective in this scenario?”

Career relevance National workshop reflections suggested making the bridge from “gap” to “how could I develop this?” explicit. Reserve a few minutes for participants to name concrete learning routes, experiences or behaviours that could address the most important gaps.

Step 6 — Write a future job advertisement (20–25 minutes)

The refined international methodology added a future job-advertisement task. This closes the loop by turning the team’s scenario reasoning into a familiar, practical labour-market format.

The future advertisement should include:

- job title and organisational context;
- main tasks and responsibilities;
- must-have hard skills;
- must-have soft skills;
- other requirements or emerging capabilities;
- a short explanation of why these requirements matter in this future context.

AI-assisted prompting can be allowed as a support tool, as it was in the international workshop. If used, participants should treat the AI output as draft material: compare it with their own persona and scenario logic, correct inconsistencies, and remain responsible for the final result.

Do not outsource the thinking The learning value comes from the team’s reasoning. If AI is used, ask participants to explain which parts they accepted, changed or rejected and why.

Step 7 — Presentations and cross-scenario synthesis (20 minutes)

Each team presents its persona, 3–5 most important future competencies, major gaps and future job advertisement. The lead facilitator then synthesises across teams.

Useful synthesis questions:

- Which competencies appear in several very different futures?
- Which competencies are strongly scenario-specific?

- Which present requirements disappear or lose importance?
- What new tensions emerge between technical competence and human/relational competence?
- What do the scenarios suggest about sustainability, resilience, AI, regulation and adaptability?
- Which competencies should education strengthen regardless of which scenario unfolds?

In the V4 project, sustainability-related competencies appeared across all three scenarios, while adaptive soft skills such as resilience, critical thinking and communication remained important across contrasting futures. The project also found that moving from present job advertisements to future job advertisements made foresight more concrete and meaningful for students.

Step 8 — Reflection and evaluation (10 minutes)

End with individual reflection before collecting formal feedback. Suggested prompts:

- What surprised you most?
- Which competence do you now consider more important than before?
- What assumption about logistics work did the scenario challenge?
- What could you do in the next 6–12 months to prepare for uncertainty?
- What part of the workshop helped you most, and what should be changed?

6. Facilitation, timing and hybrid delivery best practices

6.1 Facilitation principles

Facilitate rather than lecture. During group work, ask questions that deepen reasoning instead of supplying answers.

Protect participation. Actively invite quieter participants. National workshop reflections found facilitator support especially useful for less confident students.

Keep pace visibly. Give time warnings and use a shared countdown. Different teams naturally work at different speeds.

Use interim summaries. Briefly state what the team has already produced and what remains. This was reported as helpful in the Slovak pilot.

Pre-brief guest experts. Agree a strict time limit, focus and connection to the next task. One national pilot noted that guest-speaker overruns created timetable pressure.

Do not reward “correct” futures. Reward coherence, evidence, creativity and the ability to explain assumptions.

6.2 Timing and pacing

The national pilots consistently showed that timing deserves active management. Some teams need longer discussion on one task and shorter time on another. Use the overall schedule as a framework, but protect the core learning arc: do not let early activities consume the scenario, persona and gap-analysis time.

Priority rule If time is lost, shorten presentations or optional activities before cutting the persona and gap-analysis stages. The future-focused block is the methodological core.

6.3 Hybrid and online participation

The V4 international workshop used a hybrid format. Remote participation can widen access, but hybrid group work creates additional communication and coordination demands. Decide in advance which of two models you will use:

Model	How it works	When to use
-------	--------------	-------------

Model	How it works	When to use
A. Shared-session hybrid	Remote participants join plenary expert inputs and closing discussion; onsite teams complete the main physical activities.	Simpler technology; suitable when full hybrid facilitation capacity is limited.
B. Fully integrated hybrid	Each team includes remote and onsite members working in a shared digital board/document with a dedicated facilitator and reliable audio/video.	Use when equal participation of remote members is an explicit objective and sufficient technical support is available.

For Model B, assign a dedicated technical host, test microphones and shared documents in advance, and make all physical outputs visible digitally. Avoid making remote participants passive observers of flipchart work.

6.4 Language and international teams

When the workshop language is not participants' first language, use short written task instructions, visible category definitions and simple scenario summaries. Allow a few minutes for clarification before each task. International diversity adds richness, but the V4 experience also showed that it increases communication and coordination complexity.

7. Evaluation and continuous improvement

The methodology was refined through a structured feedback loop. External users are encouraged to reproduce this logic rather than treating the workshop as a one-off event.

After the workshop	Questions to capture
Participant feedback	Engagement; clarity; perceived learning; connection to employability; most/least useful tasks; suggestions.
Facilitator reflection	Recruitment; group balance; room/technology; timing; facilitation; difficult tasks; strong discussions; learning outcomes; recommended changes.
Output review	Were the present/future profiles coherent? Did teams use scenario logic? Were outputs comparable? What novel competencies emerged?
Method update	Which instructions, timing, tools, team structures or scenario materials should be changed before the next workshop?

A useful review process is: individual facilitator notes → one workshop summary → comparison across teams or sites → agreed changes to the next version. This mirrors the project's Good Practices process.

7.1 Common improvement points identified in the V4 pilots

- Allow more time for discussion and foresight instruction when participants are new to futures methods.
- Build a time cushion and distinguish instruction time from activity time.
- Use one facilitator per group where possible.
- Keep or strengthen practitioner involvement; connect expert inputs directly to the tasks.
- Consider more digital collaboration tools, especially for hybrid delivery.
- Give participants a chance to see or compare scenarios beyond the one assigned to their team.
- Make the link from competence gaps to career development and employability explicit.
- In advanced versions, involve participants in scenario creation to deepen Futures Literacy.

8. Adapting the methodology to other contexts

8.1 Single-country workshop

Replace the regional comparison with a comparison across professions, industries, employer types, regions or job portals. Keep the same present → scenario → persona → gap → future job-ad sequence.

8.2 Different educational levels

The V4 pilots included Bachelor's and Master's students. Mixed levels can work well if tasks are concrete and facilitators establish shared terminology. For less experienced participants, simplify professional roles and provide more examples. For advanced participants, deepen the scenario analysis and require evidence for competency claims.

8.3 Beyond logistics

The framework is transferable because its structure is generic. To adapt it to another field, replace (1) the job-advertisement set, (2) the professional roles, (3) sector-specific scenario material and (4) relevant guest experts. Keep the learning logic and evaluation process unchanged.

8.4 Advanced Futures Literacy version

If the main objective is Futures Literacy rather than sectoral competence mapping, extend the workshop by adding assumption-mapping or participant-led scenario creation before the persona stage. The original V4 project used pre-given scenarios for comparability; later reflections identified participant scenario creation as a useful future enhancement.

9. Ready-to-use templates and checklists

Template A — Workshop preparation checklist

- ☐ Learning objective and target profession(s) defined
- ☐ Participant list and team composition prepared
- ☐ Three contrasting scenarios selected and summarised
- ☐ Job portals / backup job ads prepared
- ☐ Facilitators assigned (ideally one per team)
- ☐ Guest experts briefed and time-limited
- ☐ Room arranged for small-group work
- ☐ Flipcharts/post-its/markers available
- ☐ Shared digital files/boards tested
- ☐ Hybrid technology tested if applicable
- ☐ Evaluation form and facilitator reflection sheet ready
- ☐ Plan for collecting and storing team outputs agreed

Template B — Current job-ad analysis sheet

Job/market/source	Hard skills	Soft skills	Other requirements	Notes / recurring items

Template C — Team / regional Skills 2025 synthesis

Category	Common across markets	Differences / outliers	Open questions
Hard skills			
Soft skills			
Other requirements			

Template D — Future persona canvas

Field	Team notes
Scenario	
Role/title	
Professional context	
Key tasks and decisions	
Technology / systems / infrastructure	
Stakeholders / agents	
Hard skills	
Soft skills	
Other requirements	
Top 3–5 critical competencies	

Template E — Competence-gap matrix

Competence / requirement	2025 baseline	2040 scenario	Change type	Learning implication
			More / Less / New / Obsolete / Same	
			More / Less / New / Obsolete / Same	
			More / Less / New / Obsolete / Same	
			More / Less / New / Obsolete / Same	

Template F — Future job advertisement

Job title: _____

Future organisational context:

Main responsibilities:

Required hard skills:

Required soft skills:

Other / emerging requirements:

Why these requirements matter in this scenario:

Template G — Facilitator reflection sheet

- Recruitment & participation: What worked? Was the group balanced?
- Setting: Did the room, technology and layout support participation?
- Timing: Which activities were too short or too long?
- Facilitation: Where did participants need the most support?
- Engagement: Which topics/tasks generated the richest discussion?
- Learning: What future-oriented competencies appeared to develop?
- Employability: Did participants connect the exercise to careers and professional development?
- Method changes: What should be kept, removed, expanded or redesigned next time?

Quick facilitator script

Moment	Suggested wording
Opening	"We are not trying to predict the future. We will use several possible futures to examine what may become important and what that means for decisions today."
Before job ads	"Use only what the advertisement actually says. Capture the evidence first; interpretation comes later."
Before scenarios	"For the next task, temporarily accept the scenario as your operating world. Do not debate whether it will happen; explore what follows if it does."
During persona work	"What would this person need to do successfully in this world? Which capabilities make that possible?"
During gap analysis	"Compared with today, what becomes more important, less important, new, or obsolete?"
Closing	"Which capability would still matter across several different futures, and what could you do now to strengthen it?"

10. Project evidence base and further information

This external guide synthesises the methodology and lessons documented in the V4 project materials.

Project website: <https://competences4logistics.ujk.edu.pl/>

Original project context: Visegrad Fund project #22420093, "Competences for Future Logistics in V4 Countries".

Reuse principle Keep the learning architecture stable while adapting the content: evidence from the present → alternative future → persona → gap → future job ad → reflection. This sequence is the transferable core of the methodology.