



## Course analysis template

After the course has ended, the course leader fills in this template. This is an important part of the quality assurance of the programme. The programme director decides whether the template should be supplemented with further information/questions.

<b>Course code</b> 4BP041	<b>Course title</b> Project management	<b>Credits</b> 3
<b>Semester</b> Fall 2021	<b>Period</b> October 25 – Nov 16	

<b>Course leader</b> Susanna von Holst	<b>Examiner</b> Susanna von Holst
<b>Other participating teachers</b> Bo Tönnquist (guest lecturer)	<b>Other participating teachers</b> Andreas Lundquist (guest lecturer)

<b>Number of registered students</b> 30	<b>Number passed after regular session</b> 29	<b>Response rate for course survey (%)</b> 80
<b>Methods for student influence other than course survey</b>  Brought up in the introduction their possibilities of continues feed-back during course. Oral evaluation the last day.		

### Note that...

This analysis shall (together with a summary of the quantitative results of the students course survey) be submitted to the LIME educational committee.

This analysis have been submitted to the LIME educational committee on this date:



## **1. Description of any implemented changes since the previous course based on previous students' comments**

*The course is more life science oriented now, with a life science focus on the workshops with a case of launching a new drug. The group project has a life science focus as well. The workshops only focus was to practise the theory, not to repeat theory from the book or from the videos.*

## **2. A brief summary of the students' evaluations of the course**

(Based on the students' quantitative answers to the course evaluation and comments.

Quantitative compilation and possible graphs attached.)

*Overall, good and the students liked the format of videos and related workshops, especially the live sessions were appreciated, and they liked the open atmosphere. Students appreciated that we considered the KTH exam into our schedule. Still, many students felt stress by KTH course and that project management is only 3 weeks with both exam and project. Some suggested more credits for the course.*

*Many students liked the workshops and the fact that they applied and practised the theory. Some students would like to cover more parts of the book in the workshops. Book and workshop should synergize more. Reflection log after each workshop/session.*

*Some students liked the mix of exam and then project work, some argued for the opposite in order. A comment that working with the project along with the theory and workshop was suggested.*

*Many pointed out that it would be nice to have scrum as a workshop live.*

*Comments also that the IOL could be better explained and related to all we did, in the beginning and the usefulness for the whole program.*

*Canvas could include summary of the most important parts from each chapter.*

*Regarding project work in groups many students found it useful and fun. A comment that the groups should get different instructions could lead to more interesting discussions. Another suggestion was to have more commonly used project e.g. like launching a product, develop an app. Moreover, a few wanted more detailed instructions whereas others liked the freedom.*

*In general, all lectures by Bo, Andreas and Susanna were appreciated since all were engaged and caused a nice atmosphere.*

*One comment was to maybe incorporate communication and project management to get more time.*

*Some students mentioned the fact that being able to choose between doing exam part I and II (Pass or PWD) on the exam was good and decreased the stress. Another comment was to have the exam as one with pass and pwd in the same. Some argued for more essay-based questions or reasoning like a case, to more show understanding of the principles.*



### **3. The course-responsible reflection on the course implementation and results**

*I think it was overall good. It was good to have it more life science-oriented for both the workshops and project work. The workshops were more efficient, with only pure work on the theoretical models they beforehand saw on the video lectures or read in the book. However, this year students would like it even more efficient, take less time to define goal and purpose for example.*

*The paper exam was a good solution this year, compared to only online last year. For next year it could be good to only have a paper-exam or a home-based exam with more reasoning questions.*

### **4. Other comments**

*To tailor the workshops and project work towards life science was a good decision. Quite many students answered the survey, good.*

### **5. The course-responsible conclusions and any proposals for changes**

(If any changes are proposed, please specify who is responsible for implementing these and a time schedule.)

*Overall, I am satisfied. Time needs to put into reflection if the examination parts should be changed to a home-based exam, doing a project or what and if keeping the examinations form as they are. I still think the combo of exam and project work is good and relevant. Put more time to deeper explain the constructive alignment. It will be 2022s course director's responsibility.*