

FYDP SOP

POLICY, SOP, EVALUATION & WORKFLOW

FACULTY OF COMPUTING,
SCHOOL OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY
SECTOR H-12
ISLAMABAD

Revisions

Document Metadata

- Document Status: Approved
- Effective Date: Fall 2026

Version History

Version	Date	Description of Changes	Reviewed/Approved By
0.1	17-12-2025	Initial draft of FYDP evaluation SOP and stage-gate workflow.	Team
0.2	03-02-2026	Incorporated mathematical formulation for minimum and maximum faculty evaluation loads.	Team and HoDs
0.3	12-03-2026	Finalized G1–G4 milestone parameters. Submitted for Departmental Board of Studies review.	DBS
1.0	16-04-2026	Revisions based on DBS feedback regarding student group configurations.	DBS, Team
1.3	26-06-2026	Updated grading based on feedback from FBS	Team, FBS
1.4	27-07-2026	Revised governance framework based on committee feedback. Updated advisor roles, stage-gate governance, supervision policies, and evaluation procedures. Fixed Faculty workload alignment with advisory	Team, DBS
1.5	02-09-2026	Update in advisory board, evaluation marks and count in KG committee	FYDP Coordinators, HODs, DBS, Associate Dean FOC

Team

- Dr. Fahad Ahmed Satti
- Dr. Aimal Tariq Rextin
- Dr. Hafiz Syed Muhammad Bilal Ali
- Dr. Mehwish Fatima
- Dr. Gibrail Islam

Contents

1. Overview	1
2. Objectives	1
a. Unified Evaluation Structure	1
b. Credit Hour Alignment	1
c. Independent Academic Evaluation	2
d. Industry Integration	2
e. Advisor Governance Role	2
3. Stakeholders	2
4. Evaluation Structure and Grade Distribution	3
a. Stage-Gate Model: Key Concepts and Definitions	3
i. Stage	3
ii. Stage Deliverables	3
iii. Gate	3
iv. Advisor Health Check	3
v. Gate Decision	4
b. Stage-Gate Opening Mechanism	4
i. Extension and Escalation Protocols	4
c. Overall Evaluation Distribution	5
d. Final Grade Computation	5
i. G1: Proposal Defense	6
ii. G2: MVS + Project Documentation	7
iii. G3: Industrial Evaluation	7
iv. G4: Complete Project Defense	8
e. Minimum Technical Pass Requirement	8
5. Evaluation and Marks Allocation	8
a. Marks Allocation	8
b. FYDP Supervision and Co-Supervision Limits	9
c. Role of Evaluation Committee (KG Committee)	9
d. Role Advisory Committee	9
i. Explicit Advisor Activities	10
ii. Grading	10

iii.	Mandatory Health Check Report	11
6.	Progress Tracking Through TMS	11
a.	Monthly Updates	11
b.	Evaluation Visibility	12
7.	Evaluation Rubric Structure	12
a.	Proposal Defense Rubrics	12
b.	Mid Defense Rubrics	13
c.	Industrial Evaluation Rubrics	13
d.	Final Defense Rubrics	13
e.	Complete division of marks and their weights	14
8.	Defense Outcomes	14
a.	Evaluation SOP	14
b.	Re-Evaluation SOP	15
9.	Final Year Design Project (FYDP) Framework	15
10.	Student Guidelines - General Rules & Approach	16
a.	Core Principles	17
b.	Deliverables	18
i.	G1: Proposal Defense	18
ii.	G2: Mid-Defense / MVS + Documentation	18
iii.	G3: Industrial Evaluation	18
iv.	G4: Complete Project Defense	19
c.	Continuous Evaluation & Monthly Audits	19
11.	Conclusion	20

Evaluation SOP & Workflow

1. Overview

This document defines the evaluation structure for the two-semester Final Year Design Project (FYDP-I and FYDP-II). The evaluation framework is designed to align with the structured stage-gate governance model while simplifying grading and strengthening independent academic evaluation. The revised SOP introduces four formal evaluation modules distributed across the two semesters and incorporates external industry assessment to strengthen real-world relevance. The SOP ensures:

- Transparent and standardized grading
- Stronger independent committee evaluation
- Reduced evaluation fragmentation
- Clear alignment between academic progress and technical implementation
- Industry validation of final project outcomes

2. Objectives

a. Unified Evaluation Structure

The FYDP is evaluated through four major assessments:

1. Proposal Defense
2. Minimum Viable Solution (MVS) + Project Documentation Evaluation
3. Industrial Evaluation
4. Complete Project Defense

These assessments correspond to key technical maturity milestones in the project lifecycle.

b. Credit Hour Alignment

The evaluation model reflects the credit structure of the Final Year Design Project:

- FYDP-I: 2 Credit Hours
- FYDP-II: 4 Credit Hours

The weighted average of grades from all evaluation modules collectively determine the final FYDP grade.

c. Independent Academic Evaluation

Evaluation authority is shared between the Advisory Committee and the Evaluation Committee (aka KG Committee) to ensure fairness, academic rigor, technical supervision, and cross-project standardization.

d. Industry Integration

External industry experts contribute to project evaluation to validate real-world relevance, deployment feasibility, and innovation impact.

e. Advisor Governance Role

In addition to assigning the evaluation marks allocated under this policy, the Advisor is responsible for ensuring project quality, validating deliverables, monitoring technical progress, and formally certifying project readiness through Health Check Reports before stage-gate evaluations.

3. Stakeholders

- **Students:** Final-year undergraduate students within the Faculty of Computing academic programs (BESE, BSCS, BSDS, and BSAI) who transition from their Junior year to Senior year upon becoming eligible to initiate the FYDP process.
- **Faculty Members (FM):** Faculty who can serve as advisors or evaluation committee members. Their role is to guide, supervise, or assess FYDP work through the TMS. Each FoC faculty member must choose the Knowledge Groups most relevant to their expertise by updating their profile on the TMS.
- **Advisory Team:** The project supervisor team. It includes one compulsory Advisor and one optional Co-advisor. The Advisor must be a faculty member from SEECS. The Co-advisor may be a faculty member from SEECS, another NUST department or school, or a qualified external academic or industry professional. The Advisory Team supports the student team, monitors project progress, and helps ensure that the project is ready for evaluation.
- **Evaluation Committee:** (aka KG Committee), A panel of (minimum) two non-advisor faculty members assigned to each project based on domain expertise for unbiased evaluation.
- **External Industry Evaluators:** Subject matter experts from the industry who assess projects during the Open House.
- **Thesis Management System (TMS):** The centralized NUST digital portal for knowledge group management, project registration, submissions, and grade management.

- **FYDP Coordinator:** The administrative lead responsible for governance, timelines, and process oversight.
- **Program HoD / Associate Dean (AD):** The final approval authority for policies and the primary authority for conflict resolution.

4. Evaluation Structure and Grade Distribution

a. Stage-Gate Model: Key Concepts and Definitions

The Final Year Design Project evaluation follows a stage-gate governance model, a structured project management approach widely used in engineering and research development. In this model, projects progress through defined development stages, and advancement to the next stage is permitted only after passing an evaluation gate.

i. Stage

A stage represents a **development phase** in which the project team performs a set of technical and research activities. Each stage focuses on **achieving specific deliverables** such as problem definition, system design, prototype development, or final implementation.

ii. Stage Deliverables

Each stage requires the submission of defined technical artifacts and documentation, such as the Software Requirements Specification (SRS), system architecture design, prototype implementation, or evaluation results.

iii. Gate

Gate is a **formal evaluation checkpoint** at the end of a stage. At this point, the project is reviewed by the Evaluation Committee to determine whether the work meets the required academic and technical standards to proceed to the next stage.

iv. Advisor Health Check

Before a project appears at a gate evaluation, the advisor must submit a Health Check Report confirming that:

- The team has made adequate technical progress,
- The deliverables are complete,
- The project is ready for independent committee evaluation.
- At the Health Check stage, the Advisor validates project readiness only and does not assign evaluation marks.

- Evaluation marks are assigned once the gate is opened.

v. Gate Decision

At each gate, the committee issues one of the following decisions:

- **Approved:** Project satisfies all academic and technical requirements and may proceed to the next stage.
- **Approved with Conditions:** Minor revisions are required. The Advisor shall ensure completion before the next milestone.
- **Revise and Re-Defend:** Major technical or methodological deficiencies have been identified. The project must be revised and presented for re-evaluation.
- **Rejected:** The project fails to satisfy the minimum academic or technical requirements for the current stage.

b. Stage-Gate Opening Mechanism

Each evaluation stage is considered a formal stage-gate within the FYDP governance framework. A stage-gate opens only when the Advisor certifies project readiness through the Health Check Report. Evaluation cannot proceed if:

- Advisor approval is missing
- Documentation is incomplete
- Plagiarism verification is absent
- AI usage disclosure is missing
- Minimum stage-gate requirements are unmet

Once TMS has the required Health Check Report and documentation, the project is ready for scheduling any evaluation.

i. Extension and Escalation Protocols

- **Advisor Delays:** If the Advisor is unable to submit the Health Check Report by the deadline, a one-time extension of up to three (3) working days may be requested through the TMS, subject to the approval of the HoD and/or Associate Dean. If the Health Check Report is not submitted within the approved extension period, approval from the Principal, SEECs shall be required. Continued non-compliance may result in reassignment of the project Advisor upon the recommendation of the Associate Dean and approval of the Principal.
- **Student Delays or Report Rejections:** If students fail to submit the required material to the Advisor, or if the submitted work is returned for major revision, a one-time extension of up to seven (7) calendar days may be granted with the approval of the Associate Dean. Failure to submit within the approved extension

period may result in suspension or termination of the FYDP, subject to the decision of the Associate Dean.

- **Conflict Resolution:** In the event of a dispute between the Advisor and one or more students, the matter shall be reviewed by a committee comprising at least two HoDs and the Associate Dean. The committee's decision shall be final.

c. Overall Evaluation Distribution

The Final Year Design Project grade is determined through four evaluation modules distributed across the two semesters. The evaluation for each gate will open only after all mandatory gate checks have been successfully completed and the Advisor has certified project readiness through the Health Check Report.

Gate	Stage	Evaluation Timing	Weight	Purpose
G1	Proposal Defense	Week 3/4 of Semester 7	20%	Validate problem, baseline, feasibility
G2	MVS + Project Documentation	Week 2/3 of Semester 8	30%	Validate MVS, SRS, architecture
G3	Industrial Evaluation	Week 12 of Semester 8	10%	Validate industry relevance
G4	Complete Project Defense	Week 16 of Semester 8	40%	Validate full system and improvement

Each module corresponds to a major stage in the project development lifecycle. Progression to the next stage requires successful completion of the preceding gate and submission of the Advisor Health Check Report.

d. Final Grade Computation

The final FYDP grade shall be calculated by normalizing the rubric scores at each gate and applying the prescribed stage and evaluator weights. For G1, G2, and G4, the Advisory Committee and Evaluation Committee shall contribute equally to the stage

score. The Industrial Evaluators shall independently determine the G3 score. The resulting contributions shall be aggregated to obtain the final grade out of 100.

Gate	Advisory Committee	Evaluation Committee	Industry Evaluators	Total
G1: Proposal Defense	10%	10%	—	20%
G2: MVS + Documentation	15%	15%	—	30%
G3: Industrial Evaluation	—	—	10%	10%
G4: Complete Project Defense	20%	20%	—	40%
Total	45%	45%	10%	100%

For each academic gate, the Advisory Committee score and the average score of the two Evaluation Committee members shall first be normalized against the maximum rubric marks for that gate. Where a Co-advisor is appointed, the Advisory Committee score shall be calculated in a 60:40 ratio between the Advisor and Co-advisor. Where no Co-advisor is appointed, the Advisor's score shall constitute the complete Advisory Committee score.

Rubric marks represent raw assessment scores. These scores shall be normalized and converted into the prescribed stage weights using the calculation method defined under Final Grade Computation.

i. G1: Proposal Defense

Timing: FYDP-I semester

This stage evaluates the intellectual foundation, feasibility, and methodological clarity of the proposed project. Evaluation focuses on:

- Problem definition and scope clarity
- Identification of baseline system or methodology
- Definition of measurable improvement
- Initial system architecture and workflow
- Technical feasibility and implementation plan
- Ethical considerations and AI compliance

Successful completion of this stage confirms readiness to proceed to system development.

ii. G2: MVS + Project Documentation

Timing: Start of FYDP-II

This evaluation validates the technical foundation and early implementation maturity of the project. Teams must demonstrate a **Minimum Viable Solution (MVS)** and submit structured technical documentation. Required documentation typically includes:

- Software Requirements Specification (SRS) and Literature Review
- System Design Specification (Architecture / SDS)
- Test Plan definitions
- Baseline implementation verification
- Initial module implementation
- Version-controlled source code repository (e.g., GitHub)

Evaluation focuses on:

- System architecture coherence
- Baseline implementation correctness
- MVS functionality
- Documentation quality and completeness
- Testing preparation and traceability

This stage ensures the project is technically viable and ready for full implementation during FYDP-II.

iii. G3: Industrial Evaluation

Industry experts evaluate the practical impact and technology readiness of the project. Evaluation must occur during the Open House or an equivalent industrial review session, where each evaluation must remain single blind. The panel of three Industry Evaluators shall determine the G3 marks and evaluation outcome. The average of their individual marks shall constitute the final G3 score, while the FYDP Coordinator shall formally record the marks and outcome in TMS.

Industry evaluation focuses on:

- Real-world applicability

- solution usability and scalability
- Innovation potential
- Deployment feasibility
- Industry relevance

The industrial evaluation contributes **10% of the total FYDP grade**.

iv. **G4: Complete Project Defense**

Timing: End of FYDP-II

This evaluation validates full system implementation, experimental validation, and measurable improvement over the baseline. Evaluation focuses on:

- Complete system functionality
- Integration maturity
- Demonstrated measurable improvement
- Evaluation rigor and benchmarking
- System stability and deployment readiness
- Documentation completeness and reproducibility
- Well-written code base and its understandability by all members of the FYDP Group.

Teams must present a working system and demonstrate the project through real-time technical demonstration rather than presentation-only slides.

e. Minimum Technical Pass Requirement

A project must demonstrate a working system and measurable improvement over the baseline to pass Complete Project Defense.

5. Evaluation and Marks Allocation

a. Marks Allocation

The Advisor, Evaluation Committee (aka KG Committee) and Industry Evaluators are responsible for timely, effective, and fair grading of all FYDPs within their purview. Advisory Team and Evaluation Committee evaluate G1, G2 and G4; Industry Evaluators evaluate G3. As such the evaluation is based on the following divisions:

- Advisory Committee; Advisor (and Co-advisor, if applicable): 45% total
- Evaluation Committee: 45%

- Industry Evaluators: 10%

Evaluation By	Members	Weight	Consolidation Criteria
Advisor (& Co-advisor)	1 Advisor, or 1 Advisor + 1 Co-Advisor	45%	Advisor only: full 45%. With Co-advisor: marks combined in 60:40 ratio (Advisor : Co-advisor) .
Evaluation Committee aka (KG Committee)	2	45%	Average of the two evaluators' marks.
Industry Evaluators	3	10%	Average of Individual marks

b. FYDP Supervision and Co-Supervision Limits

A faculty member may supervise up to five projects as an advisor and five projects as a co-advisor. This arrangement provides all faculty members with an opportunity to participate in FYDP supervision. Any request to exceed these limits may be approved by the Associate Dean, Faculty of Computing, upon the recommendation of the relevant Head of Department. Diversity in advisor and co-advisor assignments is encouraged to promote broader collaboration among faculty members. For non-PhD faculty, the combined Advisor and Co-advisor load is capped at 12 projects.

c. Role of Evaluation Committee (KG Committee)

The Evaluation Committee serves as the primary academic evaluation authority, in addition to the advisory committee. Each project shall be evaluated by two Evaluation Committee members, appointed by the relevant FYDP Coordinator. Committee assignments should ensure an equitable distribution of the evaluation workload among faculty members while considering the number of projects each faculty member supervises or co-supervises. Accordingly, faculty members with heavier supervisory responsibilities may be assigned fewer evaluation duties. Responsibilities include:

- Conducting all academic evaluations and Ensuring evaluation fairness and cross-project consistency and verifying measurable improvement claims while ensuring technical rigor and documentation quality

d. Role Advisory Committee

The committee consists of one compulsory advisor and one optional co-advisor. Only one Co-advisor may be appointed to an FYDP. The committee guides the students throughout the project, checks technical progress, reviews deliverables, and confirms whether the project is ready for evaluation. The advisor also ensures that the work

follows university rules, documentation standards, plagiarism policy, and AI-use policy.

Before any evaluation stage, the advisor must submit a health check report in TMS.

- The Advisor must be a regular faculty member of SEECS.
- The advisor should not have any personal, financial, or professional conflict with the students.
- The advisor must maintain confidentiality and respect intellectual rights.
- The advisor should supervise within the approved workload limits.
- Co-advisor may be a Faculty Member (FM) from any NUST department / school and /or professional from a reputable company/industry/relevant field.
- The Advisor is credited as per applicable NUST policy.

i. Explicit Advisor Activities

To ensure project success and institutional compliance, the Advisor and, where appointed, the Co-advisor must::

- Timely grade, stage G1, G2, and G4 of the project.
- Supervise overall project development and technical execution.
- Verify implementation quality and the maturity of technical progress.
- Validate baseline identification and the definition of measurable improvements.
- Ensure that upon project creation, the FYDP is mapped to at least three (3) defined Knowledge Groups that most accurately represent the methodologies, technologies, and application domains of the proposed work.
- Ensure all documentation is prepared according to SEECS standards.
- Monitor ethical compliance and the responsible usage of AI.
- Conduct mandatory plagiarism verification (Similarity Index must be according to NUST approved policy)
- Verify disclosure of AI-generated content and compliance with institutional AI policies.
- Generate a failed health check report immediately if technical progress becomes unsatisfactory.

ii. Grading

A total of 45% advisory grade is awarded entirely by the Advisor unless a Co-advisor is assigned, in which case the marks are split in a 60:40 ratio (Advisor awards 27%, Co-advisor awards 18%).

iii. **Mandatory Health Check Report**

Before any evaluation stage—G1: Proposal Defense, G2: Mid-Defense, G3: Industrial Evaluation, or G4: Final Defense—is scheduled in the TMS, the Advisor must submit a formal Health Check Report. For G3, the report shall confirm that the project is sufficiently functional, demonstrable, and ready for evaluation by industry experts. This is a "Go/No-Go" certification and must include:

- Technical progress summary and implementation maturity assessment.
- Documentation readiness verification.
- Risk assessment and mitigation status.
- Verified plagiarism report and AI usage declarations.
- Formal recommendation for evaluation scheduling.

6. Progress Tracking Through TMS

All project progress must be documented through the **Thesis Management System (TMS)**. Students must update their project progress regularly through TMS. These updates should include work completed, remaining tasks, risks, and advisor feedback. The advisor and evaluation committee can view these updates. If progress is repeatedly unsatisfactory, the project may be suspended or terminated according to policy. The current SOP already includes monthly updates, feedback response, and suspension/termination rules for repeated unsatisfactory reports.

a. Monthly Updates

Teams must submit documented progress updates every 30 days through TMS. These updates must include:

- Implementation progress
- Documentation updates
- Identified risks
- Advisor feedback records

If an advisor marks two updates as unsatisfactory, the FYDP is suspended with immediate effect by TMS. First restart of the project will be done, only after approval by the Associate Dean. On submission of an additional unsatisfactory report, the project

will be terminated and a new FYDP with a new Advisor should be started with a new timeline, approved by the Associate Dean.

b. Evaluation Visibility

Every **45 days**, project progress summaries must be shared with the Evaluation Committee through TMS. This ensures:

- transparency of supervision
- early detection of project risks
- governance oversight without excessive evaluation overhead

If the Evaluation Committee provides comments or recommendations, the team must submit a **short Feedback Response Document** through TMS explaining how the comments will be addressed in subsequent development phases.

All advisor and committee comments remain permanently visible in the system.

7. Evaluation Rubric Structure

To ensure fair and consistent assessment across all evaluation stages, separate rubrics are provided for the four evaluation gates: G1 Proposal Defense, G2 Mid-Defense/MVS and Documentation, G3 Industrial Evaluation, and G4 Complete Project Defense.

a. Proposal Defense Rubrics

Total Marks: 25

#	Criterion	Marks	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
1	Problem Definition & Technical Context	5	Problem unclear or trivial	Weakly defined problem	Clear but narrow problem	Strong technical framing	Precise, well-scoped problem with strong domain grounding
2	Baseline Identification	5	No baseline identified	Weak baseline	Acceptable baseline	Strong baseline with justification	Multiple strong baselines or state-of-the-art comparison
3	Measurable Improvement Definition	5	No measurable goal	Improvement vague	Basic metric defined	Clear improvement metrics	Rigorous measurable improvement with success thresholds
4	Technical Solution Strategy	5	Infeasible solution	Weak or unrealistic method	Feasible solution approach	Strong technical method	Innovative and technically deep strategy

5	System Architecture / Methodology	5	No architecture defined	Weak design	Basic pipeline defined	Clear modular architecture	Comprehensive architecture with well-defined components
---	-----------------------------------	---	-------------------------	-------------	------------------------	----------------------------	---

b. Mid Defense Rubrics

Total Marks 35

#	Criterion	Marks	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
1	Requirements Engineering (FR/NFR)	5	Incomplete or inconsistent	Basic requirements	Clear FR/NFR defined	Structured and traceable requirements	Complete, verifiable requirements with traceability
2	Architecture & System Design	5	Architecture missing	Weak architecture	Basic system design	Clear modular architecture	Robust architecture with scalability considerations
3	Test Plan	5	Test Plan missing	Basic sections present but vague	Well-structured with clear objectives, scope,	Detailed and actionable; includes specific tools, measurable exit criteria,	Comprehensive, precise metrics, risk mitigation, and a realistic, data-driven schedule.
4	Technical Documentation Quality	5	Poor documentation	Weak structure	Acceptable documentation	Well-structured documentation	Professional, technically rigorous documentation
5	MVS Implementation	5	No MVS	Partial prototype	Working MVS	Stable MVS with core modules	Technically mature MVS
6	Code Structure & Engineering Practices	5	Poor coding practices	Weak organization	Basic modular code	Clean architecture and version control	Professional engineering practices
7	Technical Feasibility & Execution Roadmap	5	Project unrealistic	Major feasibility risks	Feasible with uncertainty	Clear execution roadmap	Strong feasibility with well-planned milestones

c. Industrial Evaluation Rubrics

Total Marks: 10 (Industry)

#	Criterion	Marks	Poor (0–1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
1	Industry Relevance & Practical Utility	5	Not relevant	Weak relevance	Moderate relevance	Useful solution	High industry impact
2	Deployment Feasibility & solution Potential	5	Not deployable	Limited deployability	Basic feasibility	Deployable system	Strong commercial potential

d. Final Defense Rubrics

Total Marks: 30

S.#	Criterion	Marks	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
1	System Implementation Completeness	5	System incomplete	Partial system	Functional system	Fully integrated system	Complete robust system
2	Technical Depth of Implementation	5	Superficial work	Limited complexity	Moderate technical depth	Strong technical implementation	Advanced technical complexity
3	Improvement over Baseline	5	No improvement	Weak improvement	Moderate improvement	Clear improvement	Significant validated improvement
4	Experimental / Performance Evaluation	5	Evaluation missing	Weak evaluation	Basic evaluation	Strong experimental validation	Rigorous benchmarking and statistical analysis
5	Code Quality & Reproducibility	5	Code unavailable	Weak repository	Acceptable repository	Structured and documented repository	Fully reproducible pipeline
6	System Robustness & Performance	5	System unstable	Limited reliability	Acceptable performance	Stable and efficient system	Highly optimized and scalable system

e. Complete division of marks and their weights

Stage	Weight	Rubric Marks
Proposal Defense	20%	25
MVS + Documentation	30%	35
Complete Project Defense	40%	30
Industrial Evaluation	10%	10

8. Defense Outcomes

a. Evaluation SOP

Following G1, G2, and G4, the Evaluation Committee shall issue one of the following outcomes. For G3, the outcome shall be issued by the panel of Industry Evaluators and formally recorded in TMS by the FYDP Coordinator. After evaluation, following outcomes may be issued:

- **Approved:** Project meets academic and technical requirements and may proceed to the next stage.

- **Approved with Conditions:** Minor revisions required. Advisor ensures closure before the next milestone.
- **Revise and Re-Defend:** Major technical or methodological deficiencies have been identified. The project shall be revised and presented for one re-evaluation within a timeline approved by the relevant HoD.
- **Rejected:** The project is fundamentally infeasible or academically invalid, or it has failed the permitted re-evaluation. The FYDP shall be terminated, and the students may register a new FYDP in accordance with University regulations, subject to the approval of the relevant HoD.

b. Re-Evaluation SOP

If a team receives a Revise and Re-Defend outcome, it shall be permitted one re-evaluation within a timeline approved by the relevant HoD. The maximum score obtainable in the re-evaluation shall be capped at 80% of the total marks allocated to that stage.

If the team fails the re-evaluation, the outcome shall be recorded as Rejected, and the FYDP shall be terminated. The students may register a new FYDP in accordance with University regulations and timelines, subject to the approval of the relevant HoD.

9. Final Year Design Project (FYDP) Framework

Phase	Activity	Deadline	Responsibility
Pre-FYDP	Student registration in TMS	Week 14, Spring (Junior Year)	Coordinator + TMS
	Faculty profile update in TMS (Selection of relevant Knowledge Groups)	Week 1, Summer Break	Faculty Members (FM) + TMS
	Advisor-Student matching & registration	Week 2, Summer Break	Advisor + Students
	Resolution of unassigned groups/FMs	Week 3, Summer Break	FYDP Coordinator + TMS
	Final group setup & threshold validation	Week 5, Summer Break	FYDP Coordinator
	Evaluation Committee formation	Week 6, Summer Break	FYDP Coordinator
FYDP-1	Requirement Engineering phase	Week 1, Semester 7	Students
	Proposal Defense (PD) documentation submission	Week 2, Semester 7	Students + Advisor
	Document review & Advisor feedback analysis	Week 3, Semester 7	Advisory Committee
	PD Presentation Activity	Week 2- 4 Sem 7	All Hands
	PD Grade Entry	Within three working days after the Proposal Defense	Evaluation Committee + Advisory Committee + TMS

	Monthly progress reporting & feedback	Every 30 Days	Advisor + Students
	Mid-Defense (MD) MVS & document submission	Week 17, Semester 7	Advisor + Students
FYDP-2	Review of MVS and progress reports	Semester Break	Advisory + Evaluation Committee
	MVS Presentation Activity	Week 1 or 2, Semester 8 or Week 16 or 17, Semester 7	All Hands
	MD Grade Entry	Within three working days after the Mid-Defense	Evaluation Committee + Advisory Committee + TMS
	Monthly progress reporting & feedback	Every 30 Days	Advisor + Students
	Open House	Week 12 or 13, Semester 8	Industry + Students
	Final Defense (FD) solution & Deployment submission	Week 15, Semester 8	Advisor + Students
	Review of Final solution & Industry feedback	Week 16, Semester 8	Evaluation Committee
	FD Presentation Activity	Week 16, Sem 8	All Hands
	Final Grade Entry & Compilation	Week 17–18, Sem 8	Evaluation Committee + Advisory Committee + Coordinators

Scheduling Note: The exact dates of all evaluation activities shall be notified by the FYDP Coordinator according to the approved academic calendar. In every case, the required submission, Advisor review, Health Check Report, and committee review must be completed before the corresponding evaluation. Marks shall be entered in TMS within three working days after the evaluation.

10. Student Guidelines - General Rules & Approach

This section is particularly addressed to the students. Students must follow the advisor's directions, keep their documents updated, respect plagiarism and AI-use rules, and submit only work that is ready for the current stage. They should also keep their problem statement focused, their code and documentation organized, and their claims supported by evidence. This is consistent with the current SOP's student principles and deliverable requirements.

a. Core Principles

Your marks and grades depend entirely on the quality of the artifacts you prepare, submit, and defend. You are advised to follow the following core principles throughout your FYDP lifecycle:

1. **Treat every stage as a formal checkpoint:** You should submit work that is complete and appropriate for that specific stage. Do not rely on verbal commitments or promises that incomplete work will be completed later.
2. **Keep the problem focused and manageable:** A well-scoped, technically meaningful project is generally stronger than an over-ambitious idea that cannot be fully implemented, tested, or evaluated within the available time.
3. **Define your technical boundaries clearly:** Every newly created project must adhere to at least three (3) defined Knowledge Groups. When registering your project, you must select the groups that most accurately reflect your project's core technologies and intended application domains.
4. **Support your claims with evidence:** If you claim that your system is faster, more accurate, more secure, or more usable, you must support the claim through measurable evidence such as metrics, experiments, test results, code, or a working demonstration.
5. **Show clear project progression:** Evaluators should be able to see how your initial proposal developed into a Minimum Viable System and how that system further evolved into a complete, tested, and functional project.
6. **Ensure your presentation reflects the actual work:** Your slides should clearly explain your project, but they cannot substitute for incomplete implementation. The working system, codebase, documentation, and submitted artifacts remain the primary evidence for evaluation.
7. **Align evidence with the nature of your project:** For **AI / Data Science projects**, you should clearly report datasets, baselines, evaluation metrics, experimental methods, results, and limitations. For **CS / SE projects**, you should highlight system design quality, correctness, testing, maintainability, robustness, code quality, and deployment considerations.

8. **Be prepared to defend your work:** You should be able to justify your design decisions, explain technical trade-offs, discuss limitations honestly, and demonstrate how your system can be reproduced, tested, or deployed.

b. Deliverables

i. G1: Proposal Defense

Present the problem, technical context, existing solutions, and a feasible technical direction.

- Proposal slides or synopsis.
- Written problem statement with technical context and clear scope.
- Baseline, related work, or existing-solution comparison.
- Measurable objectives, metrics, and success targets.
- Proposed technical solution strategy.
- High-level architecture, methodology, or workflow diagram.

ii. G2: Mid-Defense / MVS + Documentation

Submit structured documentation and a working MVS that proves the core idea can be built.

- Software Requirements Specification (SRS) or equivalent document covering FRs and NFRs.
- System Design (SDS) or architecture document.
- Test plan.
- Technical documentation for the MVS.
- Working MVS, prototype, or demo build.
- Source code repository (e.g., GitHub) or code snapshot showing reasonable structure.
- Execution roadmap or milestone plan for the remaining work.

iii. G3: Industrial Evaluation

Show practical utility, deployment readiness, and real-world value for an external user or industry setting.

- Industry or external evaluation form, feedback note, or review record.

- Artifact showing practical utility (e.g., a use-case demo or solution walkthrough).
- Deployment feasibility, productization, or implementation note.
- Any pilot, client, or user validation evidence available.

iv. G4: Complete Project Defense

Demonstrate the final integrated system, technical depth, validated improvement over the baseline, and a reproducible codebase.

- Final presentation slides.
- Final integrated system or end-to-end demo.
- Updated, complete source code repository.
- README, setup guide, or reproducibility instructions.
- Baseline comparison and improvement results.
- Experimental or performance evaluation results.
- Testing, robustness, or performance evidence.
- Final technical documentation and user documentation (where relevant).

c. Continuous Evaluation & Monthly Audits

- **Agile Process:** You are required to submit progress updates through the Thesis Management System (TMS) every 30 days.
- **Feedback Mandate:** Your Advisory Team will provide mandatory technical feedback on these reports. You must submit an Action Taken response in the TMS detailing exactly how you implemented their advice.
- **Transparency:** The Evaluation Committee has full access to your monthly reports, the Advisor feedback, and your responses. Consistent progress and responsiveness to feedback will directly strengthen your standing during the formal Gate defenses.
- **Governance Warning:** Receiving two unsatisfactory monthly reports from your Advisor will result in the **immediate suspension** of your FYDP. A further unsatisfactory report following reinstatement will result in project **termination**. Keep your repository clean, your documents current, and your Advisor informed.

11. Conclusion

In summary, this evaluation framework provides a vital standardization of the FYDP process, balancing rigorous academic milestones (G1-G4) with fair, mathematically derived faculty assessment loads. Effective immediately for the 2K23 intake (applicable to Fall 2026 onwards), these standardized procedures will be applied comprehensively across the BSDS, BSCS, BESE and BSAI programs. By adopting this unified approach, the Faculty of Computing ensures a transparent, equitable, and highly structured project experience for both students and evaluating faculty.