1COURSE REPORT - Collected documentation of course evaluation

The course report is a comprehensive documentation of the course evaluation. The course evaluation takes into account the students' course evaluations, the views of the study administration, the views of the teachers and the outcome of the course, i.e. the students' actual results, the implementation of the course and the prerequisites for the implementation of the course such as teaching and supervision time, premises and support functions. The course report also contains analysis and development/action plan for the course.

The course report forms the basis for feedback to students and for follow-up in quality dialogues both in the education-related and in the university-wide quality work.

Background information **(To be filled in by the study administrator)**

The LADOK code of the course: **BY206C**	**Scope (hp):** **5**
Course name: **Project Management I**	
Course coordinator: **Marwa Dabaieh**	
Semester that the course has been completed: **Vt23**	**Number of registered students:** **39**
Specify whether the course is a stand-alone course, programme course or commissioned education. If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. **TGAVC21h**	

Study administration perspective **(To be filled in by study administrator)**

The views of the study administration:

Course evaluation forms and feedback

(To be filled in by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation: (Writethe form of the course evaluation and when it has been completed) The evaluation was completed after the examination.	**Number of participants in the course evaluation:** **19**
Summative course evaluation: (Writethe form of the course evaluation and when it has been completed) The evaluation was made anonymous and online	**Number of participants in the course evaluation:** **19**

Feedback to students: (Write how and when feedback is carried out to the relevant student group)
Students were able to give feedback in class after the course closure and online via the anonymous survey.

Student perspective **(To be filled in by the course coordinator)**

Summary of the students' course evaluations: (The five mandatory questions should be highlighted. Summary from survey tools can be attached if desired.)
The students are generally satisfied and appreciative for the new things we have introduced to them like the site visit to two big architecture firms. The students mentioned in couple of incidents that the course is short. That is a nature for a 5 credits course and that is not to change.
Some were a bit too critical about the deadlines due to a typing mistake (a human error) in the assignment text that is not consistent with Canvas and Kronox. They need more time for group dynamics exercise which was an elective thing to help them work smoothly together. They appreciated the tools and methods we introduced to them and how we connected theory to practice. They wanted feedback on the exit tickets.

Teacher's perspective (To be filled in by the course coordinator)

Summary of teachers' views/Results: (Here the comments on the implementation and results of the course are summarised based on an assessment of the students' actual learning outcomes in relation to the intended learning outcomes of the course. Both success factors and problems are identified.)

The site visits to two architecture firms was a volunteering thing we did as teachers. Thanks to our network and the kind acceptance of the firms to host our students for free and to offer them fika and very good treat. That was priceless for students. The short duration for the course made it a good opportunity to be more precise and to the point with the delivery for information and plan it in a concise way.

A human error felt a bit too exaugurated in their critical comment. The delaine was communicated well on Canvas and Kronox. A small typing mistake in a day to be 7 instead of 6 in the assignment text was too exaugurated as confusing.

They asked for more activities which is not possible to do due to the short course duration. They appreciated the tools and methods we introduced and the literature we offered. They also appreciated how we managed the readings.

Analysis and development/action plan **(To be filled in by the course coordinator)**

Analysis: (The course coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the analysis is based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from the teachers and study administrators concerned, the development of knowledge in the research field and that the analysis is done in collaboration with the teaching team.) The evaluation in general is positive. More students participated in the evaluation compared to previous years. The critical comments are of individual nature so can't be generalized. The course guest lectures were highly appreciated, and the students found it diverse and eye opener. They also appreciated how gender plays role in project management.
Development/action plan: (This section indicates the changes planned in the short and long term, as well as the timetable for when the measures are planned to be implemented and who is responsible for their implementation. If identified problems are left unaddressed, this shall be justified. Follow-up of proposed measures according to previous course report(s) is reported here.) As this course will not be offered again so now chance for development. Yet, I will take with me in the new program HAG the positive feedback on the tools and lectures in project management.

Publishing and archiving **(Handled by the study administrator)**

☒ The course report has been published and the students have been notified of the publication,

☒ The course report is archived according to the University's archiving rules,

☒ The course report has been communicated to the programme director (if it is a programme course),

☒ The course report has been saved according to the department's possible additional wishes.