KUMARAGURU
college of technology
character is life

Register Number: ……

MBA DEGREE EXAMINATIONS: NOV/DEC 2023

(Regulation 2022)

First Semester

MBA – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

P22MPB1105**:** Principles of Project Management

COURSE OUTCOMES

CO1: Understand the knowledge areas of project management.

CO2: Explain process of interaction with the knowledge areas of project management.

Time: Three Hours **Maximum Marks: 100**

PART A (5Q x 04 Marks = 20 Marks)

1	Define a project and list four key characteristics that distinguish it from a process.	CO1	[K_1]
2	Explain the Triple Constraints in project management. Provide examples to illustrate each constraint.	CO1	[K_2]
3	Discuss the reasons for project failure and suggest preventive measures for each identified reason.	CO1	[K_6]
4	Analyze the knowledge areas in project management and briefly describe the significance of each.	CO1	[K_4]
5	Explain the contents of a project charter.	CO1	[K_2]

PART B (5Q x 8 Marks = 40 Marks)

6	Analyze the characteristics of project phases and discuss how they contribute to the overall success of a project	CO2	[K_4]
7	Explain the concept of fast-tracking in Project Life Cycle (PLC). Discuss its advantages and potential challenges.	CO2	[K_2]
8	Evaluate the role of stakeholders in project management. How can a project manager effectively manage stakeholder expectations?	CO2	[K_5]
9	Discuss the qualities required for an effective project manager. How do these qualities contribute to successful project execution?	CO2	[K_6]
10	Compare and contrast different organizational structures and their impact on project management.	CO2	[K_6]

Part – C (2Qx20 Marks = 40 marks) Compulsory – Case Study

11 Elaborate on the Project Management Office (PMO). Discuss its functions, types and roles & responsibilities. CO2 [K_6]

12 **CASE STUDY: AARONSIDE GOES TO TEAMS** CO2 [K_4]

It took AaronSide, Inc. almost 80 years to grow from a small mom - and - pop business to a company that held the largest market share internationally. What made this feat special was that a single family owned the company since its inception. It is suffice to say that this success made owners, management, and all employees more than proud.

A WALL IS BETWEEN US

Operating in the metal machining industry, AaronSide's organization was perfected over time through experience and many saw this as a competitive advantage. Basically, it was an efficient, functional organization where marketing, engineering, and manufacturing with a strong quality group played a major role. The engineering department achieved the fastest 16 - month lead time for a new product development project when compared with competitors. Fundamentally, product development was an operation that worked like a well – oiled machine. It started with marketing, which did market research and then threw the specification of what customers desired "over the wall" to the engineering department, which released final drawings to manufacturing, which made the quality product. The approach was called the relay race. Its secret was an efficient, functional department. Typically, if you worked in a specific department, say marketing, you would never talk to a guy from a different engineering. If you did, you might be reprimanded. Indeed, departments talk to each other, not individuals that belong to different departments. How do departments converse? Usually, only heads of departments are authorized to speak on behalf of their staff.

TO SURVIVE, CHANGE IS REQUIRED

The more intense globalization of business brought more international competition. The two largest rivals in the industry from Europe, subsidiaries of the large multinational organizations, largely expanded their operations in the U.S. market. This is when problems for AaronSide began to mushroom. AaronSide found it difficult to compete with the Europeans, who had access to resources and new management of their rich parents. As a result, AaronSide slipped to a close third in market share, behind the European rivals. Freefall continued and by 1990, AaronSide was the distant third. Several management teams were replaced during this period, new manufacturing equipment was installed, the company was seriously reengineered, and different management was used to catch up with the leaders without significant results. So, AaronSide became ripe for a sale.

After talking with four suitors from the United States and Europe over the last several years, owners concluded that the best offer for purchase of AaronSide was one from Titan Corp, a Swedish company. So, after

almost 90 years of being family - owned, AaronSide became a wholly owned subsidiary of a large multinational firm.

To facilitate the integration of AaronSide into Titan Corp's network of companies, the management team of AaronSide was retained. The first initiative of the new owner was to direct AaronSide to commission a pilot project management team (in manufacturing companies usually referred to as concurrent engineering teams), cross - functional in nature, and made up of the permanent members from marketing, engineering, and manufacturing, and auxiliary members from finance and field repair. The team was chartered to develop a new mining vehicle in eight months, twice faster than usual and as fast as the world leader. The new team was empowered to make all major decisions. The idea was to accomplish success with this team, and then use it as a paradigm along with the lessons learned from its operation to establish a company - wide project management system.

Eight months later the project was not finished, and needed eight more months to reach its conclusion. The Swedish parent asked for an immediate investigation. The investigation showed that the team did not make any major decisions. Instead vice - presidents (VPs) who were heads of the departments directed the members of their team to make no decisions, but to bring all necessary information to them and they, the VPs, would make the decision. Having discovered this, the management of Titan Corp decided to fire the CEO and all VPs.

Discussion items

1. What are the pros and cons of the relay race approach and the cross - functional team approach to product development projects? Which approach is better?
2. Who gets more power and who gets less power by shifting product development projects from the relay race to the cross - functional team approach?
3. Does the shift from the relay race to the cross - functional team approach require a significant cultural change? Explain why or why not.
4. Why do you think the VPs took the approach of not letting a pilot team make major decisions although the team was empowered to do so?
5. Was the firing of the CEO and all VPs justified? Why or why not?

****