

Final Year Design Project

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.	Team, DBS
1.5	01-10-2026	Updated work flow and timeline	FYDP Coordinators, HODs, DBS, Associate Dean FOC

Contents

Contents

POLICY,SOP,EVALUATION & WORKFLOW	1
FYP Policy, SoP & Workflow	1
1. Overview	1
2. Objectives	1
a. <i>Evaluation Structure</i>	1
b. <i>Credit Hour Alignment</i>	1
c. <i>Independent Academic Evaluation</i>	1
d. <i>Industry Integration</i>	1
e. <i>Advisor Governance Role</i>	1
3. Stakeholders	2
4. Evaluation Structure and Grade Distribution	3
a. <i>Overall Evaluation Distribution</i>	3
b. <i>Final Grade Computation</i>	3
5. Evaluation and Marks Allocation	5
a. <i>Marks Allocation</i>	5
b. <i>FYDP Supervision and Co-Supervision Count</i>	6
c. <i>Role of Evaluation Committee</i>	6
d. <i>Role of Advisory and Co-advisor</i>	6
6. Evaluation Outcomes	7
a. <i>Evaluation SoP</i>	7
b. <i>Re-evaluation SOP for Failed Activities</i>	7
7. Evaluation Rubric Structure for Software Engineering (SE) Department.....	8
a. <i>Proposal Defense Rubrics</i>	8
8. Evaluation Rubric Structure for Computer Science (CS) and Data Science (DS) Department	10
a. <i>Proposal Defense Rubrics</i>	10
9. Final Year Design Project (FYDP) Framework	12

FYP Policy, 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 simplify grading and strengthen 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.

2. Objectives

a. 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 determines the final FYDP grade.

c. Independent Academic Evaluation

Evaluation authority is shared between the advisor and the Evaluation 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, and monitoring technical progress.

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.
- **Advisor and Co-Advisor:** There is one compulsory Advisor and one optional Co-advisor. The Advisor should be a faculty member from SEECs. Any exception to this requirement shall be subject to approval by the relevant HoD or Associate Dean. The Co-advisor may be a faculty member from SEECs, another NUST department or school, or a qualified external academic or industry professional. The Advisor and Co-advisor (if any) supports the student team, monitors project progress, and helps ensure that the project is ready for evaluation.
- **Evaluation Committee:** A minimum two non-advisor faculty members that evaluate each project based on domain expertise.
- **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 primary authority for conflict resolution.

4. Evaluation Structure and Grade Distribution

a. Overall Evaluation Distribution

The Final Year Design Project grade is determined through four evaluation modules distributed across the two semesters. The evaluation of Complete Project Defense will proceed once the Advisor has certified project readiness through the Health Check Report.

No.	Stage	Evaluation Timing	Weight	Purpose	Grading and CGPA
1	Proposal Defense	Week 3/4 of Semester 7	20%	Validate problem, baseline, feasibility	FYDP-I
2	Mid Defense: MVS + Project Documentation	Week 14/15 of Semester 7	30%	Validate MVS, SRS, architecture	13% to FYDP-I 17% to FYDP-II
3	Open House: Industrial Evaluation	Week 12 of Semester 8	10%	Validate industry relevance	FYDP-II
4	Final Defense: Complete Project Defense	Week 14/15 of Semester 8	40%	Validate full system and improvement	FYDP-II

b. Final Grade Computation

The final FYDP grade shall be calculated by normalizing the rubric scores at each evaluation and applying the prescribed evaluator weights. For the Proposal Defense, Mid Defense and Final Defense, the Advisor, co-advisor (if any), and Evaluation Committee shall contribute equally to the score. The Industrial Evaluators shall independently determine the Open House Industrial Evaluation score. The resulting contributions shall be aggregated to obtain the final grade out of 100.

No.	Evaluation	Advisor & co-advisor (if any)	Evaluation Committee	Industry Evaluators	Total
1	Proposal Defense	10%	10%	—	20%
2	Mid Defense: MVS + Documentation	15%	15%	—	30%
3	Open House: Industrial Evaluation	—	—	10%	10%
4	Final Defense	20%	20%	—	40%
	Total	45%	45%	10%	100%

For each evaluation stage, the score of the evaluation committee will be calculated in a 50:50 ratio. Additionally, when a Co-advisor is appointed, the score shall be calculated in a 60:40 ratio between the Advisor and Co-advisor.

Rubric marks represent raw assessment scores. These scores shall be normalized and converted into the prescribed weights using the calculation method defined above.

i. Proposal Defense

Timing: 2nd-3rd week of 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. Mid Defense: MVS + Project Documentation

Timing: 14th - 15th week of FYDP-I semester

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. Open House: Industrial Evaluation

Timing: 12th - 13rd week of FYDP-II Semester

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 two/three Industry Evaluators shall determine the marks and evaluation outcome. The average of

their individual marks shall constitute the final 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. Final Defense

Timing: 14th - 15th week of FYDP-II Semester

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.

5. Evaluation and Marks Allocation

a. Marks Allocation

The Advisor, Evaluation Committee (derived from KG Committee) and Industry Evaluators are responsible for timely, effective, and fair grading of all FYDPs within their purview. As such the evaluation is based on the following divisions:

- 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 (derived from KG Committee)	At least 2	45%	Average of the all evaluators' marks.

Industry Evaluators	3	10%	Average of individual marks
---------------------	---	-----	-----------------------------

b. FYDP Supervision and Co-Supervision Count

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.

c. Role of Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee serves as the independent academic evaluation body for FYDPs, alongside the assessment conducted by the Advisor and Co-advisor. The FYDP Coordinators shall constitute multiple Evaluation Committees from the available faculty members and assign projects to each committee through TMS.

The Proposal Defense, Mid Defense, and Final Defense shall each be conducted on a designated day. Every Evaluation Committee shall be allocated a specific venue where its assigned projects will be presented and evaluated. A Committee Head shall be appointed to ensure that at least two committee members are present during each evaluation and that the evaluation workload is distributed equitably among the members.

Each committee member shall be responsible for conducting academic evaluations; ensuring fairness and consistency across projects; verifying claims of measurable improvement; and assessing the technical rigor and quality of project documentation.

The Evaluation Committees and project assignments shall be finalized and uploaded to TMS by the second week of Semester 7. Students and faculty members shall be notified at least two weeks before the Proposal Defense. The same committees shall ordinarily evaluate their assigned projects at the Proposal, Mid, and Final Defense stages to ensure continuity and consistency.

d. Role of Advisory and Co-advisor

Each FYDP shall have one mandatory Advisor and may have one Co-advisor. The Advisor and Co-advisor shall guide the students, monitor technical progress, review deliverables, and assess the project's readiness for the Final Défense (FD). They shall also ensure compliance with the University's regulations, SEECs documentation standards, plagiarism requirements, ethical principles, and the institutional policy on the use of artificial intelligence.

The Advisor shall be a regular faculty member of SEECs. Any exception shall require approval from the relevant HoD or Associate Dean. The Advisor shall have no personal, financial, or professional conflict of interest with the students; shall maintain confidentiality and respect intellectual property rights; and shall supervise projects within the approved workload limits. The Advisor shall receive supervision credit in accordance with the applicable NUST policy.

The Co-advisor may be a faculty member from any NUST school or department, or a suitably qualified academic or industry professional from a relevant field.

The Advisor and, where appointed, the Co-advisor shall:

- Assign evaluation marks within the prescribed timelines.
- Supervise the project's technical development and implementation.
- Verify the quality and maturity of the technical work.
- Validate the selected baseline and the proposed measurable improvements.
- Ensure that all required documentation meets SEECS standards.
- Monitor ethical compliance and the responsible use of artificial intelligence.
- Conduct plagiarism verification in accordance with the approved NUST policy.
- Verify the disclosure of AI-generated content and compliance with the applicable institutional policy.

6. Evaluation Outcomes

a. Evaluation SoP

The cumulative evaluation marks of the Proposal Défense (PD), Mid Défense (MD), and Final Défense (FD), shall determine and one of the following outcomes (based on pre-defined thresholds):

- **Approved:** The project meets the required academic and technical standards and may proceed to the next stage.
- **Approved with Observations:** Minor revisions are required. The Advisor shall ensure that all observations are addressed before the next evaluation.
- **Failed - Re-evaluation Required:** Major technical or methodological deficiencies have been identified. The team shall address these deficiencies and undergo one re-evaluation within the timeline approved by the relevant HoD. The marks obtained in the original evaluation shall be entered in TMS. In the case of MD, these marks shall contribute to the FYDP-I grade and may consequently affect the students' GPA. Re-evaluation is permitted only for PD and MD.
- **Rejected:** The project is fundamentally infeasible or academically invalid, has failed the permitted re-evaluation, or has failed the FD. The FYDP shall be terminated, and the students may register a new FYDP in accordance with the University regulations and with the approval of the relevant HoD.

For Industrial Evaluation, the outcome shall be determined by the panel of Industry Evaluators and formally recorded in TMS by the FYDP Coordinator.

b. Re-evaluation SOP for Failed Activities

An FYDP receiving a **Failed - Re-evaluation Required** outcome in PD or MD shall be permitted one re-evaluation. Unless otherwise approved by the relevant HoD, the re-evaluation shall be conducted within two weeks of the original evaluation. The FYDP team shall coordinate the re-evaluation with the Advisor, Co-advisor, where applicable, and the assigned Evaluation Committee.

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

7. Evaluation Rubric Structure for Software Engineering (SE)

Department

To ensure fair and consistent assessment across all evaluation stages, separate rubrics are provided for the four evaluation stages: Proposal Defense, Mid Defense, Open House and Final Defense. Each criterion is worth 5 marks.

a. Proposal Defense Rubrics

Total Marks: 50

#	Criterion	PLO	Not addressed (0)	Below Average (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
1	Problem Definition & Technical Context	PLO-2	Problem is not identified or defined.	Problem is unclear, overly broad, or lacks technical context.	Problem is defined but has gaps in scope, context, or analysis.	Problem is adequately defined and scoped with basic technical context.	Problem is clearly defined, appropriately scoped, and technically contextualized.	Problem is precisely formulated, well scoped, and comprehensively supported by technical/domain analysis.
2	Baseline + Measurable Improvement Identification	PLO-4	No baseline or measurable improvement is defined.	Baseline or improvement target is unclear or inappropriate.	Baseline and basic metrics are identified but lack sufficient justification.	Appropriate baseline and basic measurable targets are defined.	Relevant baseline, metrics, and measurable improvement targets are clearly defined and justified.	Multiple relevant baselines and rigorous metrics with explicit, well-justified improvement targets are defined.
3	Technical Solution Strategy	PLO-1	No viable technical solution is proposed.	Solution is largely inappropriate or technically weak.	Solution is partially feasible but has significant technical gaps.	Solution is feasible and addresses the problem with basic technical justification.	Solution is appropriate, feasible, and technically sound with good justification.	Solution demonstrates strong technical depth with well-justified and effective design choices.
4	System Architecture / Methodology	PLO-3	No architecture or methodology is presented.	Architecture /methodology is unclear or inappropriate.	Basic architecture /methodology is presented but has	Architecture /methodology is adequately defined and addresses the	Architecture /methodology is clear, coherent, and appropriate.	Architecture /methodology is comprehensive, technically rigorous, and

					significant gaps.	main requirements.		thoroughly justified.
5	Modern Tools & Technologies	PLO-5	No relevant tools or technologies are identified.	Tools/technologies are inappropriate or unjustified.	Appropriate tools are identified but justification is weak.	Suitable tools and technologies are identified with basic justification.	Appropriate tools, technologies, frameworks, and techniques are clearly selected and justified.	Tools and technologies are systematically evaluated and selected based on technical requirements and project needs.
6	Societal/ Professional Considerations	PLO-6	No societal relevance or impact is identified.	Societal relevance is mentioned but the problem or potential impact is unclear.	A societal problem is identified, but its relevance or potential impact is weakly explained.	A relevant societal problem is identified and its potential impact is reasonably explained.	The societal problem is clearly established and the potential impact of the proposed solution is well explained.	The project addresses a significant societal problem, with its potential impact clearly articulated and supported by strong evidence or justification.
7	Relevance to UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	PLO-7	No SDG or sustainability relevance is identified.	SDG is mentioned without a clear connection to the project.	Relevant SDG(s) are identified but the contribution is weakly justified.	Relevant SDG(s) are identified with a reasonable connection to the project.	Relevant SDG(s) and the project's contribution are clearly identified and justified.	Sustainability impact and contribution to relevant SDG(s) are comprehensively analyzed and supported by clear objectives or evidence.
8	Team Coordination & Collaboration	PLO-8	No evidence of team coordination.	Roles and responsibilities are unclear.	Roles are defined but coordination or workload distribution has gaps.	Roles and responsibilities are adequately defined.	Roles, responsibilities, and coordination are clearly defined and appropriate.	Team structure, communication, coordination, and workload distribution demonstrate strong and balanced collaboration.
9	Project Planning & Management	PLO-9	No meaningful project plan or management approach is presented.	Basic planning is presented, but tasks, timeline, responsibilities, or management approach are unclear. No appropriate project management	A basic plan and development methodology are identified, but important elements such as milestones, resources,	A reasonable project plan is presented with defined tasks, milestones, timeline, and development methodology. Appropriate project management tools are identified.	The project is realistically planned using appropriate project management tools and methodology, with clear tasks, milestones, responsibilities	The project demonstrates a comprehensive and well-justified management approach, with effective integration of project management tools, development methodology, task tracking, milestones,

				nt tool or methodology is identified.	risks, or project management tools are inadequately addressed.		ies, resources, timeline, and risk management.	dependencies, resources, timeline, and risk management.
10	Technical Presentation & Communication	PLO-10	Not presented or cannot adequately communicate the proposed work.	Presentation is unclear and responses show limited understanding.	Main ideas are communicated but with significant gaps in clarity or technical responses.	Proposed work is adequately communicated and basic questions are addressed.	Presentation is clear and well structured, with appropriate responses to technical questions.	Communication is clear, precise, technically strong, and demonstrates thorough understanding of the proposed work.

8. Evaluation Rubric Structure for Computer Science (CS) and Data Science (DS) Department

To ensure fair and consistent assessment across all evaluation stages, separate rubrics are provided for the four evaluation stages: Proposal Defense, Mid Defense, Open House and Final Defense. Each criterion is worth 5 marks.

a. Proposal Defense Rubrics

Total Marks: 50

#	Criterion	GA	Not addressed (0)	Below Average (1)	Average (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
1	Understanding of the Problem Domain	GA-2	Cannot explain the problem domain or its context when asked.	Vague/generic understanding; misses key concepts or constraints.	Correct basic understanding; misses some nuances or edge cases.	Clear, accurate understanding of domain, stakeholders, and constraints.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus shows awareness of edge cases and current standards/practices in the domain.
2	Preliminary Literature Review	GA-3	No literature review conducted or presented.	Few sources cited; mostly irrelevant or outdated; no synthesis.	Relevant sources cited; summarized but not critically compared.	Good range of relevant, recent sources; identifies gaps/limitations in existing work.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus compares sources and positions the proposed work against the current-state-of-the-art.

3	Problem Identification, Objectives and Scope	GA-3	No problem, objectives, or scope presented.	Vague or poorly scoped; problem, objectives, or scope unclear.	Problem and objectives stated but generic; scope not well justified.	Well-defined problem with clear, scoped objectives.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus justified significance/impact and measurable success criteria stated.
4	Validity and Novelty of the Proposed Solution	GA-4	No proposed solution presented.	Solution vague or infeasible; validity/novelty not addressed.	Feasible solution proposed; novelty or validity claims unsupported.	Feasible, valid solution; novelty claimed and compared to at least one existing approach.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus validity supported by evidence/reasoning and clear articulation of what is genuinely new.
5	Professional and Societal Considerations	GA-8	No discussion of professional or societal considerations.	Considerations mentioned only in passing; no real analysis.	Identifies relevant ethical/societal/legal factors; discussion is generic.	Identifies specific factors (e.g., privacy, safety, sustainability, accessibility) relevant to this project.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus explains how the design addresses/mitigates these.
6	Selection and Justification of Tools and Technologies	GA-5	No tools/technologies specified.	Tools listed without justification	Tools listed with basic justification (e.g., familiarity, availability).	Tools justified against project requirements (e.g., performance, scalability, compatibility).	In between.	All of Very Good, plus alternatives considered and trade-offs explicitly compared.
7	Presentation and Communication	GA-7	Presentation not delivered or incomprehensible.	Disorganized; poor clarity; heavy reliance on reading slides/notes.	Organized and understandable; limited engagement or confidence.	Clear, well-organized, confident delivery; answers questions adequately.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus engaging delivery and articulate, well-reasoned answers to challenging questions.
8	Project Planning and Organization	GA-6	No plan or team structure presented.	Vague timeline; roles/responsibilities unclear	Basic timeline and role division present; lacks milestones or contingencies.	Clear timeline with milestones; roles/responsibilities well distributed.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus contingency plans for delays/dependencies.

9	Risk Analysis and Mitigation	GA-4	No risk analysis presented.	Risks listed superficially ; no mitigation discussed.	Reasonable risks identified (e.g., via SWOT or other method); mitigation vague or generic	Well-reasoned risk analysis; specific mitigation strategies for key risks.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus risks prioritized (e.g., by likelihood/ impact) with actionable mitigation plans
10	Document Quality and Presentation	GA-7	Document not submitted.	Poor structure, grammar, or formatting; hard to follow.	Reasonably structured and readable; some formatting/ consistency issues.	Well-structured, clear writing; consistent formatting; free of major errors.	In between.	All of Very Good, plus tables/figures well integrated and captioned, and consistent citations.

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 and review	Week 1, Semester 7	Students + Advisor + co-advisor (if any)
	PD Presentation Activity	Week 2- 3 Semester 7	All Hands
	PD Grade Entry	Within three working days after the Proposal Defense	Evaluation Committee + Advisor + co-advisor (if any) + TMS
	Re-Evaluation Activity of PD	Week 4-5, Semester 7	Advisor + co-advisor (if any)+ Students
	Mid-Defense (MD) MVS & document submission and review	Week 13, Semester 7	Students + Advisor + co-advisor (if any)
	Mid-Defense Presentation Activity	Week 14-15, Semester 7	All Hands
	Mid-Defense Grade Entry	Within three working days after the Mid-Defense	Evaluation Committee + Advisor + co-advisor (if any)+ TMS

FYDP-2	Re-Evaluation Activity of Mid Defense	Week 1-2, Semester 8	Advisor + co-advisor (if any)+ Students
	Advisor Health Check	Week 11, Semester 8	Advisor
	Open House	Week 12 or 13, Semester 8	Industry + Students
	Final Defense (FD) Document Submission, Project Deployment	Week 13, Semester 8	Students
	FD Presentation Activity	Week 14-15, Sem 8	All Hands
	Final Grade Entry & Compilation	Week 17-18, Sem 8	Evaluation Committee + Advisor + co-advisor (if any)+ Coordinators

Scheduling Note: The exact dates of all evaluation activities shall be notified by the FYDP Coordinator according to the approved academic calendar. Marks shall be entered in TMS within three working days after the evaluation.