Software Project Management, 2004, pad005

1. General

This course information concerns Software Project Management - course code PAD005. The course starts in week 36 and ends in week 44, 2004. The course has been given six times before.

2. Examination

The examination includes:

- Presence at all lectures in table 1. If presence is not possible, please contact the course responsible.
- Delivery of mandatory reports before the deadlines, see table 2. Reports delivered after the deadline will be ignored and you will not pass the course. Note also that you must keep your reports within the maximum number of pages allowed (cover sheet and table of contents excluded). You must show your ability to extract the most important knowledge!
- Prescence at lectures, and pass on all the seminars and reports. The requirements for passing each assignment are described in section 8. Note that the oral part of an assignment is also a part of the graduation.

The grade for the course will be given:

- according to the Swedish grading system (Fail, Pass or High Pass), and
- according to the European grading system ECTS (A, B, C, D, E, FX, F).

3. General Information

Course responsible is Conny Johansson.

Teachers are:

- Conny Johansson (Conny.Johansson@bth.se)
- Patrik Berander (Patrik.Berander@bth.se).
- Anna Wikström Ask (Anna.Ask.Wikstrom@bth.se).

If you intend to follow this course, and want continuous information, you must sign on the mailing list. See instructions at ide-net.

4. Preliminary Schedule

The course schedule for week 36 to week 44 in table 1 is preliminary and may be changed during the course. A change is announced via e-mail to the mailing list and at the course home page at ide-net.

Table 1: Mandatory lectures and seminars

Day	Time	Point	Place
Aug. 31	14-17	Introduction. Project management part 1: The questions at issue. (CJH)	Venus
Sept. 10	10-12	Project management Part 2. Intro (AWA)	Rubinen
Sept. 16	8-10, 15-18	Project Management seminar part 1, Communication exercise, Intro Process Model/Development method assignment (CJH)	Diamant-en
Sept. 27	10-16	Humphreys/Demarco, seminar 1 (CJH)	Opalen
Sept. 29	15-17	Interview techniques, coordination (AWA)	Opalen
Oct. 1	8-17	Project Management meetings part 2 (AWA)	Leda
Oct. 4	9-23.59	Questionnaire (AWA)	Opalen
Oct. 11	10-16	Humphreys/Demarco, seminar 2 (CJH)	Opalen
Oct. 15	10-15	Humphreys/Demarco, seminar 3 (CJH)	Opalen
Oct. 18	8-12	Extra, extra time if needed. (CJH/AWA/PBA)	Venus
Oct. 25	8-17	Process Model Seminar (PBA)	Opalen
Oct. 27	13-17	Final meetings with the teams. Walk-through of the reports in Process Model - clarifications and discussions. (PBA)	Leda
Oct. 29	13-16	Final seminar - Project management evaluation (AWA)	Rubinen
Oct. 29	16-18	Course Conclusion (CJH)	Rubinen

All lectures are mandatory.

5. Deadlines

5.1 Mandatory reports and report deadlines

Table 2: Mandatory reports and report deadlines

Report	Deadline
Project Management, part 1	4 p.m., Sept. 11
Project Management, part 2	4 p.m., Sept. 24
Audience report Humphrey/Demarco, seminar 1	4 p.m., Oct. 1
Audience report Humphrey/Demarco, seminar 2	4 p.m., Oct. 14
Audience report Humphrey/Demarco, seminar 3	4 p.m., Oct. 19
Process Model/Development Method, the report	4 p.m., Oct. 21
Process Model/Development Method, one-page opposition	4 p.m., Oct. 24
Improvement approach, report	12 a.m. Oct. 27

NOTE: The reports shall be distributed both electronically, and by paper - copies shall be put in the teachers post-box.

5.2 Other Deadlines

Table 3: Other deadlines

Point	Deadline
Model/Method selection, Process Model/Development Method One-page summary of the proposed method should be delivered to the teacher	Sept. 23
Humphrey/Demarco seminar 1, slides and notes	4 p.m., Sept. 23
Approval of questionnaire	Oct. 6
Execution of interviews	Start Oct. 6 ->
Humphrey/Demarco seminar 2, slides and notes	4 p.m., Oct. 8
Humphrey/Demarco seminar 3, slides and notes	4 p.m., Oct. 13
Distribution of interview results to the other students	12 a.m., Oct. 20
Deadline, update of Process Model/Development Method	Nov. 5

6. Reading reference

Point	Reference
Project Management, part 1	(i) Part IV. + Reference literature list, see section 11.
Project Management, part 2	(i) Part III. + Reference literature list, see section 11
Process Model/Development Method	(i) Part II. + Own material about the model chosen + Reference literature list, see section 11
Humphrey and Demarco examination	(ii) and (iii)
Project management evaluation	(i), (ii) and (iii). + all you can find

General reference for arranging, structuring and referring of formal reports: Chapter-The Formal report and the extract from Dawson .

(i) John M. Nicholas:
Project Management for Business and Engineering, Second edition,
Elsevier Inc. (2004), ISBN 0-7506-7824-0

(ii) Humphrey Watts S
Managing technical people
Addison-Wesley (1997), ISBN 0-201-54597-2

(iii) Demarco Tom, Lister Timothy
Peopleware: Productive projects and teams, 2nd Edition
Dorset House (1999), ISBN: 0-932-63343-9

7. Course Plan

See www.

8. Description of mandatory assignments

The contents of each report is described below. Note that the instructions in this section are used as check-points when the reports are graded!

8.1 General

- In general: Most important is that your statements are well motivated. This means that the statements should primarily be based on facts. Facts in our case are defined as statements from books and articles which are primarily based on empirical research/investigations. Refer to the facts as you analyse and describe your own experiences from project work. In order to get higher degrees, you have to refer to additional sources of literature in addition to the mandatory literature presented in section 6.

- Each report shall clearly state the author/s and their mailing addresses.
- Review the reports! Try to avoid unnecessary spelling errors.
- All reports shall be distributed both electronically and by in paper.
- The maximum number of pages in the reports shall not be exceeded. Do not manipulate with font size, line width etc., in order to not exceed the number of pages (cover sheet and table of contents pages excluded). Remember that the most important thing is the *content*.

8.2 Project Management, part 1: Organisational Aspects an Structures

Managed by Conny.

The goal of this assignment is to study how organisational issues may hinder/help the success of a software project and a software organisation. **Note: Only studies related to organisational issues, (defined by the content in Nicholas book), shall be included in this part.** Both formal and informal structures/aspects shall be considered when the proposal for an organisation for improvement is presented.

The report shall include:

- A summary of the chapters. What does the author's state? You shall prove your ability to read the text and to make a summary of it. Describe the authors opinions! Have the authors missed/neglected something? Emphasise the important aspects related to Software Engineering.
- What is your opinion about the content? What do you agree upon and what do you not agree upon? You shall reflect on your own experience within the subject, and how the content relate to this. Refer to your experience from projects, big and/or small ones. You shall criticise the content, both positively and negatively, and discuss risks, problems, opportunities, improvements, etc. Be sure to clearly state and separate what the authors state and what you yourself state.
- What is the formal/informal organisational structure? Give examples from a project/organisation you have experienced. Can you reinforce and utilize the positive aspects from the informal organisation without making the organisation formal?
- Describe your opinion on how the most important aspects are applicable to large and small companies. Motivate your statements.
- Are all things applicable for Software Engineering projects? If not, specify what and why. Motivate.
- Describe shortly the organisation in a project which you have participated in. Describe strengths and weaknesses of this organisation. Describe if the size (No of hours, No of persons, etc.) of the project affects the choice of organisation.
- Specify a proposal for organisation for Software Development and Software Maintenance. Define, yourself, the kind of project, number of persons involved, budget available etc. Specify roles, responsibilities, authorities, information/communication routines, reporting and tasks. What aspects (roles) should be formal/informal? What formal/informal aspects described in Nicholas could you use? Focus on the **organisational** aspects which you find most important. Motivate why you think your organisation proposal will solve these problems, and identify strengths and weaknesses.

Estimated size: 6-8 pages (Note 1: 8 pages is absolute maximum) (Note 2: normal font size please) (Note 3: The summary of chapters (a) shall be maximum 2 pages). Work individually.

Seminar/Feedback: Each student shall prepare a discussion of their selected organisation. Some students will be selected for leading discussions.

8.3 Project Management, part 2: Systems and Procedures

Managed by Anna.

The goal of the assignment is to make a professional evaluation and improvement proposal of the systems and procedures in a project were you have participated in. You are expected to understand and reflect on how the systems and procedures described in the book could be used in practice, and what kind of problems you could avoid. **Note: Only studies related to systems and procedures shall be included in this part.**

The reports shall cover the following parts:

a. An executive's summary of your report. Max 25 lines.

b. A problem description of at least five areas you think you could have improved during the projects. By discussions (there are no problem if you have not participated in the same project), select problems you think had or could have had the most negative impact on the projects related to project management. You have to motivate why exactly these problems where most problematic and what impact you think they had. The scope of the problem area is limited to the contents of the chapters in the reading reference described above. If you decide to choose a narrow scope, you are expected to go deeper into the problem.

c. One purpose of establishing a well-defined process is to make the success rest on the procedures and activities described in a quality system rather than on one single person's experiences. Therefore, you shall select and describe in your own words the techniques described in Nicholas', that would have improved the overall quality and prevented the problems (b) from occurring. If you used similar techniques and it still caused severe problems, you shall explain what was wrong with these. If you did not use similar techniques, it shall be pointed out.

d. You shall describe how the techniques (c) could have been used within your organization. You shall also describe how you think you would have benefited from using the techniques and in what amount (well motivated and estimated figures).

Estimated size: 12 pages. You shall work in teams of two persons - you shall help each other in finding solutions to problems that occurred during your project. Do not forget to make references to Nicholas when you are presenting your solutions!

Seminar/Feedback. You will receive feedback on your report by e-mail and during a meeting with the teacher where you should be prepared to defend your report. (Good report => short defence, Bad report => long defence).

8.4 Process Model/Development method

Managed by Patrik.

The model/method may be any model/method related to Software Development or Software Process improvement. Note, however, that the selection of model/method must be approved by the teacher.

The report shall contain:

- An overview and an evaluation of a selected model/method. The model/method may be a model/method used at a company, or described in the course plan, (Extreme programming, MSF, DSDM (including RAD), Cleanroom, SCRUM, RUP/UPetc.). The requirements on the content are:
    - You shall write a summary of the method.
    - You shall identify characteristics for the method. Focus primarily on topics which have been covered in this course, i. e. organisational aspects and structures, systems and procedures. Do not, however, neglect other important aspects such as activities, goals, quality assurance aspects etc.?
    - Why, do you think, does the method have this focus on specific organisational aspects

and structures, systems and procedures, activities and goals?

- Relate your analyse to the literature, especially Nicholas book.
- How does the model correspond to commercial (market-driven), in-house, and contract-driven software development?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses with this method? What do you think? Base your conclusions on references to literature, own experiences from projects and discussions within the team.

The following rules shall be followed:

- Only one team per method.
- Mail the teacher a one-page summary describing the method and a list of the sources (references) as soon as you have a proposal for a model/method. Please note the deadline for this mail.
- The teacher must confirm your choice.
- The model/method must be chosen no later than the given deadline. See www for actual list of teams and methods.
- Write with your own words. It is not allowed to copy evaluations already done.
- Include reading references in the report.
- You shall act opponent/reviewer on one report. The authors of the report will provide you with a copy of the report. The teacher selects opponents/reviewers.
- As an opponent/reviewer you shall write a one-page summary, which describes your opinion about the report. The one-page report shall be written individually.
- Hints for the opposition: Concentrate on unclear descriptions/statements and poor motivation. All statements that the authors do shall be clearly motivated, by literature references or references to own experiences. Opinions about strengths in the report shall also be presented.
- You shall defend your own report at the presentation.

Estimated size: 13-15 pages (15 pages are absolute maximum). Work in teams of 3-4 persons.

Seminar/Feedback: Each team shall prepare and give a presentation of their study, approximately 20-30 minutes for each team. The opponents will get 5 minutes each.

8.5 Humphrey and Demarco examination

8.5.1 Realization

This part concerns Part 1 to 7, and chapter 26, in the book by Humphrey. You shall relate, when applicable, to the corresponding parts of Demarcos book (try i.e. to find some anecdote in Demarco regarding a topic presented in Humphrey). The responsible team for each part shall be very well familiar with their specific part. This means a selected amount of references, and/or relating books and articles, **shall** be studied.

The realization of this part shall be done according to:

1. One or several student/s presents one selected part. The criteria for the presentations are listed below.
   - A walk-through of the content in the book shall be done.
   - Relate to a corresponding part/anecdote in Demarco, if applicable.

- How does the content related to your own experiences?
- What is new? (what have you not thought about previously).
- What do you agree and disagree on? Focus on a reasonable (limited) amount of issues.
- Which opportunities do exist based on the content in the material.
- A comparison between American and European (Swedish or other) situations shall be made.
- Uncertainties, i. e. unclear matters shall be analyzed.

Note that the team (divide the responsibility within the team!) shall manage (lead) the following discussion (see next point), concerning the issues they are responsible for. Invite to discussions!

2. The remaining students shall prepare themselves, e.g. with additional questions at issue, for the presentation according to the criteria described previously.

8.5.2 Graduation

1. The team shall hand in slides and notes, preferably according to the Microsoft Powerpoint principle. If the team want to exclude slides and/or notes, it shall be handshaked with the course responsible at the deadline specified in section 5.2. Slides and notes shall be sent to the course responsible at least two days before the presentation. Do not forget to write down the additional references that you have studied.
2. The audience shall hand in individual written reports describing interesting and questionable issues according to section 1.1 point 1-2 above. Maximum 3 A4 for each **occasion** shall be delivered to the teacher at the latest 4 days after the lecture.

The grade will be judged based on both the oral and the written part for all the points above.

8.5.3 Lecturer schedule

Seminar 1: Part 1:	Part 2:
Seminar 2: Part 3:	Part 4, 5:
Seminar 3: Part 6	Part 7: .

8.6 The empirical part - Project management evaluation

Each pair of students shall interview two project managers within two different software companies.

The goal with the interviews and the subsequent work are listed below.

- In which areas within project management are there most lacks and flaws? (the areas are limited to the scope included for the PM course).
- How shall an approach for improvement look like, and what shall it contain? Base the approach on this **empirical study**, and on the **literature** you have **studied** especially within this course, and own **experience**. Do not forget to make references to what you base the items in your approach on.

8.6.1 Questionnaire

The students shall jointly design a questionnaire which could be used during an oral interview. The purpose is to, as objectively as possible, identify lacks within the project management area. The questionnaire shall be ready, and approved by the course responsible, see deadline specified in section 5.2. Use the ideas about open-ended questions in the design of the questionnaire - and study simple research techniques when preparing the interview. The interviewees shall be identified at the deadline specified in

section 5.2. The students shall be coordinated in order to avoid interviewees from the same company. (Use the mailing list for pad005 in order to notify other student about your interview).

When designing the questionnaire, please consider:

- the questions should be open-ended,
- the questions shall be connected to the issues which is a part of this course,
- that you, as students, have a common understanding of how to use the questionnaire.

A discussion seminar regarding interview-techniques will be held.

8.6.2 Interviews

The interviews shall be carried out during the time specified in section 5.2. The interview should last for about 30 to 45 minutes. As interviewers you should not influence the interviewee in any positive or negative way - be sure to stay neutral in your opinion. **The results from the interviews shall be distributed to ALL students and the teacher at the deadline specified in section 5.2.**

Be sure to make a distinct documentation of the interview.

8.6.3 Design of the improvement approach

Each pair of students shall commit to the things described below.

Put together the results from **ALL** interviews. Define what the **criteria** (each pair of students should define their own) is for selecting an issue as a general finding. Identify the three areas which can be regarded as general based on this criteria. Try to categorize your finding, e. g. in a table, in order to clarify and motivate your analysis and findings.

Design your approach. Consider the short as well as the long term view. Which improvements shall be prioritized and implemented first on short term bias? Which shall be considered as long term improvements? Give your recommendations to the companies about how to approach the most serious problems that exist. Do not forget to base your recommendations on facts, i. e. make references to literature. Describe your approach, **including the method for your analysis, the criteria for selection, and which areas you have identified**. Use four to five A4.

The approach shall be discussed orally on the day below, and distributed in written form to the teacher at least two days in advance before the presentation. The presentation method will be decided later on.

8.6.4 Graduation

Approval on both oral and written parts concerning individual work, team work, and design of improvement approach.

9. Web links

- The Software Engineering Institute Home Page. (A lot of papers), http://www.sei.cmu.edu/
- CMMI Web site, http://www.sei.cmu.edu/cmmi/cmmi.html
- Software Assurance Technology Centre (NASA). (A lot of papers), http://satc.gsfc.nasa.gov/
- The Consummate Design Centre web pages, http://www.tcdc.com/default.htm
- Artemis Project Management, http://www.artemispm.com/
- Encyclopedie of Software Engineering, http://www.mrw.interscience.wiley.com/ese/index.html

- D. Farthings Software Project Management Page, http://www.comp.glam.ac.uk/pages/staff/dwfar-thi/projman.htm
- Edward Yourdon's Web site, http://www.yourdon.com/index.htm
- Gerald M Weinbergs Web site, http://www.geraldmweinberg.com/
- HMS Software - Project Management articles, http://www.hmssoftware.ca/articles/art_list.html
- Journal of the Software Professional, http://hometown.aol.com/lhohmann/aboutmybook.htm
- Luke Hohmann's Home Page, http://hometown.aol.com/lhohmann/index.htm
- Society for Software Quality, http://www.ssq.org/
- Software Formal Inspections, http://satc.gsfc.nasa.gov/fi/fipage.html
- Software Engineering Management Research Laboratory, http://www.lrgl.uqam.ca/
- Software Program Managers Network, http://spmn.com/
- Software Quality Group, http://www.nist.gov/itl/div897/sqg/sqg.htm
- Software Quality Institute, http://www.welcom.com/library/
- Software Quality Journal, http://www.wkap.nl/journalhome.htm/0963-9314
- Project Management Repository, http://www.4pm.com/
- Project Net, http://www.projectnet.co.uk/
- Quality Today - The Quality Worlds Home Page, http://home.sprynet.com/~crawfo03/quality1.htm
- The WWW Formal Technical Review Archive, http://www.ics.hawaii.edu/~johnson/FTR/
- CMM Level 2 Focus Group, http://home.okstate.edu/homepages.nsf/toc/level2.index.html
- Design management: Project Management, http://www.tcdc.com/dmgmts/dmgmt1.htm
- Earned Value Web site, http://www.nnh.com/
- WWW Guide to Project Management Research, http://www.fek.umu.se/irnop/projweb.html
- Tom Gilb: Result-planning, http://www.result-planning.com/
- Encyclopedia of Software Engineering, http://www.mrw.interscience.wiley.com/ese/index.html
- Elin@Blekinge, http://bth.lub.lu.se/elin/loadf/?f=search
- Karl Wieger: Process Impact, http://www.processimpact.com/
- Sticky Minds, http://www.stickyminds.com/index.asp
- The formal review archive, http://www.ics.hawaii.edu/~johnson/FTR/Bib/urls.html

More interesting links? Contact us please!

10. Reading References

Ahern D.M., Clouse A, Turner R
CMMI Distilled
Addison-Wesley (2001)
ISBN 0-201-73500-8

Beck Kent
Extreme Programming Explained: Embrace Change

Addison-Wesley (1999)
ISBN: 0-201-61641-6

Ben-Menachem M
Software Configuration Management Guidebook
McGraw-Hill (1994)
ISBN 0-07-709013-6

Bennatan E.M
On Time Within Budget: Software Project Management Practices and Techniques
3rd Edition
Wiley & Sons (2000)
ISBN 0471376442

Blanchard K.H, Zigarmi D, Zigarmi P
Leadership and the One Minute Manager:
Increasing Effectiveness Through Situational Leadership
William Morrow & Co (1985)
ISBN: 0688039693

Cockburn Alistair
Agile Software Development
Addison-Wesley Pub Co (2001)
ISBN: 0201699699

Curtis B, Hefley W, Miller S
People Capability Maturity Model
Addison-Wesley Pub Co (2001)
ISBN: 0201604450

DeMarco Tom
Controlling Software Projects
Yourdon Press (1982)
ISBN 0-917072-32-4

DeMarco Tom, Lister Timothy
Peopleware: Productive projects and teams, 2nd Edition
Dorset House (1999)
ISBN: 0-932-63343-9

Drucker Peter Ferdinand
Management Challenges for the 21st Century
HarperBusiness (2001)
ISBN: 0887309992

Dunn Robert H
Software Quality, Concepts and Plans
Prentice-Hall (1990)
ISBN 0-13-820283-4

Dyer Michael
The Cleanroom approach to Quality Software Engineering
Wiley & sons (1992)
ISBN 0-471-54823-5

Freedman Daniel P., Weinberg Gerald M
Handbook of walkthroughs, inspections and technical reviews
Dorset House Publishing (1990)
ISBN 0-932633-19-6

Futrell Robert T, Shafer Donald F, Shafer Linda I
Quality Software Project Management
Prentice Hall (2002)
ISBN: 0-13-091297-2

Gilb Tom
Principles of Software Engineering Management
Addison-Wesley (1988)
ISBN 0-201-19246-2

Gilb Tom, Graham Dorothy
Software Inspection
Addison-Wesley (1993)
ISBN 0-201-63181-4

Gillies Alan C
Software Quality, Theory and Management
Chapman and Hall (1992)
ISBN 0-412-45130-1

Ginac Frank P
Customer Oriented Software Quality Assurance
Prentice Hall (1997)
ISBN: 0135714648
Grady R B
Successful Software Process Improvement
Prentice Hall (1997)
ISBN: 0136266231

Humphrey Watts S
A Discipline for Software Engineering
Addison-Wesley (1995)
ISBN 0-201-54610-8

Humphrey Watts S
Managing the Software Process
Addison-Wesley (1990)
ISBN 0-201-18095-2

Humphrey Watts S
Introduction to the Team Software Process
Addison-Wesley (2000)
ISBN 0-201-47719-X

Humphrey Watts S
Winning with Software: An Executive Strategy
Addison-Wesley (2001)
ISBN: 0201776391

Hunter R B, Thayer R H, Paulk M C

Software Process Improvement
Inst of Elect & Electronic (2001)
ISBN: 0769509991

Jones Capers
Software Quality; Analysis and Guidelines for Success
Int. Thomson Computer press (1997)
ISBN 1-85032-867-6

Jones Capers
Software Assessments, Benchmarks, and Best Practices
Addison-Wesley Pub Co (2000)
ISBN: 0201485427

Lientz B P, Rea K P
2001 Professional's Guide to Process Improvement:
Maximizing Profit, Efficiency, and Growth
Harcourt Brace Professional Pub (2000)
ISBN: 0156072394

Lowell Arthur J
Improving Software Quality An insiders guide to TQM
Wiley & Sons (1993)
ISBN 0-471-57804-5

Magnusson K, Kroslid D, Bergman B
Six Sigma: The Pragmatic Approach
Studentlitteratur (2000)
ISBN 91-44-01637-9

Mantel S.J., Meredith, J.R., Shafer S.M, Sutton, M.M
Project Management in Practice
Wiley & Sons (2001)
ISBN: 0-471-37162-9

Marciniak John J. (Editor in chief)
Encyclopedia of Software Engineering
Two Volume Sets
Wiley-Interscience (1994)
ISBN 0-471-54001-8

Martin James
Rapid Application Development
Prentice-Hall (1991)
ISBN 0-02-376775-8

Maylor Harvey
Project Management
Financial Times management (1999)
ISBN 0-273-63829-7

McBreen Pete
Software Craftsmanship: The New Imperative
Addison-Wesley Pub Co (2001)
ISBN: 0201733862

McConnell Steve C
Rapid Development
Microsoft Press: Taming wild Software Schedules (1996)
ISBN 1-55615-900-5

Pande P S, Neuman R P, Cavanagh R R
The Six Sigma Way: How GE, Motorola, and Other Top Companies are Honing Their Performance
McGraw-Hill Professional Publishing (2000)
ISBN: 0071358064

Paulk M, Weber C. V., Curtis B, Chrissis M. B
The Capability Maturity Model: Guidelines for Improving the Software Process
Addison-Wesley (1995)
ISBN 0-201-54664-7

Pirzig Robert
Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance: An Inquiry into Values
Bantam Books (1984)
ISBN: 0553277472

Potter N S, Sakry M E
Making Process Improvement Work: A Concise Action Guide for Software Managers and Practitioners
Addison-Wesley Pub Co (2002)
ISBN: 0201775778

Royce Walker
Software Project Management; A united framework
Addison-Wesley (1998)
ISBN: 0-201-30958-0

Schulmeyer Gordon G, McManus James I
Handbook of Software Quality Assurance - 3rd edition
Prentice Hall (1999)
ISBN: 0-13-010470-1

Schwaber Ken, Beedle Mike, Martin Robert C
Agile Software Development with SCRUM
Prentice Hall (2001)
ISBN: 0130676349

Turner J.R
The Handbook of Project-Based Management
McGraw-Hill (1993)
ISBN: 0-07-707656-7

Whitten Neil
Managing Software Development Projects,
Wiley & Sons (1995)
ISBN 0-471-07683-X

Wiegers Karl E
Peer Reviews in Software: A Practical Guide
Addison Wesley Professional (2001)
ISBN: 0201734850

Yourdon Edward
Death March: The Complete Software Developer's Guide to Surviving 'Mission Impossible' Projects (Yourdon Computing Series)
Prentice Hall (1999)
ISBN: 0130146595