

# CHEM-E0115 Planning and Execution of Pulp and Paper Investment Project

## Feedback summary

Outi Suomi (Afry Oy) / Kyösti Ruuttunen

16.1.2020



Aalto University  
School of Chemical  
Engineering



# Lectures and project work: 50 h + 85 h

**Number of students: 16 (in 2018: 16)**

**Lectures both at Puu and at Pöyry (Martinlaakso, Vantaa)**

- Outi Suomi & her Pöyry colleagues
- Kyösti's role only coordination

**Project work on paper bottle manufacturing plant**

- All students worked in the same project, different areas
- Visiting Pöyry enables utilisation of real-life tools

**Evaluation**

- Project work report & presentation, exam
- Peer and self evaluation

# Feedback summary; questions 1-8

*n=9; scale 1 – 5 (1 = most negative, 5 = most positive)*

Question	Average (2018)	Min. – Max.
1. Overall assessment	4.00 (4.14)	2 – 5
2. Teaching methods	3.56 (3.85)	1 – 5
3. I am pleased with my study effort	3.75* (4.29)	3 – 5
4. Workload compared to other courses	3.44 (3.43)	2 – 5
5. Correspondence to the description	4.25* (4.57)	3 – 5
6. Effect on the study motivation	3.78 (4.29)	2 – 5
7. Difficulty compared to other courses	3.11 (3.42)	2 – 4
8. The course enhanced my general skills	4.00 (4.43)	1 – 5

\*n=8



# Feedback summary; resemblance to real life

The course gave me a comprehensive picture about planning and execution of an investment project, especially from the engineering and project management perspectives. E=Not applicable, 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Completely agree

Average: 4.11 (n=9; variation: 3 – 5; in 2018: 4.86)

# General comments and suggestions

Visiting the Pöyry House in Martinlaakso was seen positive in general (also the breakfast served!); however, some negative feedback on having *too much* teaching at Pöyry House

- *Outi's comment: We can have more teaching in Otaniemi in the future.*

**Lectures and materials mostly seen quite good**

- Pöyry maybe presented too much/too many times.

**Quotations:**

- “Many presenters from Pöyry had the same "basic facts" -slides of Pöyry, would be enough to have these only at the first lecture/lectures”
- “I would say that things were a bit uneven. Like there were some really informative lectures and slides but then there were also those that seemed practically useless.”
- “Some time difficulties as some project groups are very dependent on other groups. We did most of our work extremely late in the course.”

# What is your opinion on the project assignment?

**Some mixed feelings about this but mostly received positive feedback**

- Many wanted clearer instructions (especially getting started was challenging, also some felt that the objectives and the depth were not clearly defined)

**The coordination and communication between the different teams could have been better.**

**Quotations:**

- “Quite practical. Maybe some themes that were not addressed so deeply in the lectures, could have had more material provided. Of course this led to fertile conversations with Pöyry employees, but everyone might not be so proactive.”
- “The instructions were inadequate. Since in the school of chemical engineering, we haven't had that much of project courses with companies (this was my first) more instructions would have been needed. In my opinion, there were too many people doing the project so that some people had only minor part to be completed.”
- “Personally I learned a lot and enjoyed the course assignment as I understood project work from different angles! Thank you for the course!”

*Outi's comments: We were very happy with the final outcome of the assignment! The project was quite realistic, and the teams received quite a bit of advice in the beginning. The instructions were intentionally vague but probably we have to look into this approach again. Many teams were very active and asked very good questions!*

# Conclusions

**Overall, no major changes needed.**

- Project work instructions and organization will be looked into

**The peer and self assessment was probably working well  
(or was it?)**

**We will consider, how much teaching at Pöyry (Afry?) House is  
necessary/reasonable.**