



## Course evaluation template

After the course has ended, the course leader must fill in this template. The program director and education management will use your reflections to make adaptations to the program and/or the next time the course is given. The reflections will also be posted on the program web for students to read.

<b>Course code</b> 4FH092	<b>Course title</b> Project management	<b>Credits</b> 3 hp
<b>Semester</b> Fall 2021	<b>Period</b> 20210830-20210910	

<b>Course leader</b> Claudia Hanson	<b>Examiner</b> Claudia Hanson
<b>Other participating teachers</b> Carina King	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Rachel Forse Rustam Nabiev

<b>Number of registered students</b> 44	<b>Number who have not completed the course<sup>1</sup></b> 2	<b>Number passed after regular session<sup>2</sup></b> 42, one of the requested an extension for medical reasons
<b>Methods for student influence other than course survey<sup>3</sup></b>  Discussions during the course. We agreed, for example, that questions were send over CANVAS and replies from the course leader were then send to all over the course group communication. We re-organised the CANVAS homepage in response to the student representatives' email. We had one session on the first Friday to review the course with the course representatives.  We have booked one meeting for Friday, 15 <sup>th</sup> Oct to review the assignment and the course		

<sup>1</sup>At the time of completed grading and mandatory assignments/revisions.

<sup>2</sup> After first summative examination.

<sup>3</sup> State: how the students were given the opportunity to participate in the preparation and decisions at course level, how the students were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the course and how this forms the basis of the analysis and proposals below, response frequency (for example, concluding survey 70 % response frequency, post-it notes – improvement suggestions after the second course week 90 % response frequency, course council 85 % attendance).

## Conclusions from the previous course evaluation

- Revise the assignment (best a fictive project)
- Check if we can integrate lectures from specialists in management / leadership
- Integrate more perspectives from our research collaborators



## Description of conducted changes since previous course occasion

I revised the assignment, and a fictive project was chosen. In review of the submitted assignments I judge the information provided as sufficient to stimulate the outline of a concrete project. A few items will need clarification such as more concrete information in relation to the timeline.

I made efforts to find specialists in management/leadership, for example colleagues in LIME, but nobody had time. Reaching to private firms may introduce other problems. Still, I feel a specialist is needed and I will try again for the next term.

I integrated more perspectives from research collaborators as well as also non-research collaborations. The diversity seemed to be valued and appreciated by the students.

I added a session on equitable and respectful partnership and took the session on RedCap out in response to recommendations from last year. Again, I feel this was a good change.

On overall the time for lectures/seminars and the assignment remained the same as previous year.

## Summary of the students' response to the course valuation

In view of the students' responses there seemed to be a gap in understanding of the learning outcomes and what they are supposed to achieve during the course. While the students showed in the assignment that they had learned what they were supposed to, the feedback indicated that they *felt* they did not learn. 10 of 23 indicated that they had only developed expertise/skills to some extent, and 4 and 8 of 23 indicated that they achieved the learning outcomes only to a small or to some extent.

I interpret this that there was a gap in realizing what the course had presented and the learning it provided and what was expected in terms of "application" in the assignment. The course and the leading through the course seem to have failed to provide the student sufficiently with check-in's to identify what they have learned. For example, students explained that they had not learned to do a "Gantt Chart" while the overall concept of scheduling was part of the material and putting the information in excel (whereas learning excel is not part of the course).

I conclude that the gap between what the students achieved/learned and what they felt having achieved/learned needs to be addressed in two ways i) making it more explicit what sessions support which learning objective and ii) provide more concrete links to resources of how to prepare ppt and Gantt charts.

Due to the low response rate it is difficult to judge the overall satisfaction of the students (I also received some emails thanking me). A larger part of the students highlighted the sharing of experience from lectures as very valuable. However, other students indicated too few learning opportunities, particular in relation to Gantt charts and in relation to budgeting.

Regarding time, students indicated that they felt stressed, seven students indicates that there was too little time, in the previous course evaluation this number was lower. Also, more students indicated that the demands of the course were not reasonable. A discussion with students indicated that they only started to work on the assignment the second course week and did not use the time indicated in the first week to familiarize themselves with the material. This might have been an underlying reason for the feeling of having too little time.



I shared the students' feedback with Carina King and the reflections were discussed.

### **The course leader's reflections on the implementation and results of the course**

I feel I should not change the assignment or lectures but focus on restructure. I reviewed the course together with three students. In line with the recommendation, I will plan to include one shorter review session targeting specifically the Gantt chart in the first week. I will also shift the review sessions in the second week from Tuesday to Monday to encourage the students to start the work on the assignment earlier. Further, the students proposed to take out the peer review which caused more stress than it helped. We also agreed to take out a budget session as drafting a budget demand too much context specific knowledge. However, the budget session was appreciated and should continue to be part of the course. The insight from managing projects were perceived as valuable, and that is one important strength of the course.

### **Course leader's conclusions and suggestions for improvement**

I have reviewed the course with a smaller group (3 students) to discuss potential adjustments. Canvas will be re-organized. I will follow a double structure, i) by day to upload the presentation, and ii) by topic to allow the students to deepen what they have learned using the additional learning materials.

I will advise each lecturer to clearly present at the beginning of their lecture which learning objective their lecture will support using the exact language as used in the syllabus. This should support the students to recognize the alignment more easily between the i) lectures/learning material, ii) the assignment and the iii) course objectives.

The changes to the assignment are described above (drop the budget section).

### **Other comments**

I like to thank the students to take their time for the review the course with me and hope this will improve the course next year.