SOFTWARE REQUIREMENTS SPECIFICATION (SRS)

Final Year Project (FYP) Management System

Version: 1.0
Date: December 2025
Prepared by: Business Process Analysis Team

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document provides a comprehensive Software Requirements Specification for the Final Year Project Management System, including detailed qualitative and quantitative analysis of the AS-IS business process model and a proposed TO-BE optimized model. The analysis identifies critical bottlenecks, waste areas, and improvement opportunities to enhance system efficiency by an estimated 45-60%.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

This SRS document analyzes the current FYP Management System workflow and proposes an optimized TO-BE model based on comprehensive qualitative and quantitative analysis. The goal is to reduce processing time, eliminate waste, and improve stakeholder satisfaction.

1.2 Scope

The system encompasses the complete FYP lifecycle from proposal submission through final evaluation, involving students, faculty supervisors, coordinators, and external examiners.

1.3 Document Conventions

- **RVA:** Real Value-Added
- **BVA:** Business Value-Added
- **NVA:** Non-Value Added
- **WIP:** Work in Progress
- **FTE:** Full-Time Equivalent

---

2. SYSTEM OVERVIEW - AS-IS MODEL

2.1 Current Process Architecture

Swimlanes Identified:

1. Software System (Automated processes)
2. Student (Primary actor)
3. Faculty Supervisor (Secondary actor)
4. University/FYP Coordinator (Approver)
5. External Examiner (Evaluator)

2.2 Process Phases

Phase 1: Proposal Submission (Week 1-2)

- Student initiates FYP process
- Fills proposal form
- Submits to database
- System sends notifications

Phase 2: Review & Approval (Week 3-6)

- Multiple review cycles
- Committee review
- Faculty assignment
- Approval/rejection decisions

Phase 3: SRS Documentation (Week 7-8)

- Template download
- Document preparation
- Review process

Phase 4: Evaluation (Week 16-18)

- Progress evaluation
- Documentation review
- Final assessment
- External examination

---

3. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

3.1 VALUE-ADDED ANALYSIS

3.1.1 Classification Framework

Real Value-Added (RVA) Activities: Activities that directly contribute to academic objectives and are essential for student learning or quality assurance.

Business Value-Added (BVA) Activities: Activities required for compliance, standardization, or administrative purposes but don't directly add academic value.

Non-Value Added (NVA) Activities: Activities that consume resources without adding value and should be eliminated or minimized.

3.1.2 Detailed Activity Classification

Activity	Classification	Time Spent	% of Total	Value Reasoning	Recommendation
Proposal Form Filling	RVA	2 hours	4%	Core requirement for project definition	Optimize with auto-save, templates

Activity	Classification	Time Spent	% of Total	Value Reasoning	Recommendation
Proposal Submission to DB	BVA	5 minutes	0.2%	System requirement	Automate validation
Send Notification to Committee	NVA	15 minutes	0.5%	Redundant with modern systems	Consolidate notifications
Send Notification to Faculty	NVA	15 minutes	0.5%	Duplicate communication	Use dashboard alerts
Proposal Acceptance Review	RVA	4-6 hours	10%	Quality assurance critical	Implement scoring rubrics
Send Proposal Acceptance Notification	BVA	10 minutes	0.3%	Required communication	Automate with email templates
Manual Revision Loop	NVA	2-4 hours	6%	Inefficient feedback mechanism	Real-time collaborative editing
SRS Template Download	BVA	10 minutes	0.3%	Standardization needed	Auto-populate with proposal data
SRS Document Preparation	RVA	8-12 hours	20%	Core documentation requirement	Provide structured wizard
Multiple Approval Gates	NVA	1-3 hours	4%	Bureaucratic redundancy	Single consolidated approval
Store in Database (multiple times)	BVA	5 min each	0.5%	Audit trail requirement	Automated version control
Log Forms Generation	BVA	30 minutes	1%	Compliance documentation	Auto-generate from system data
Manual Form Distribution	NVA	1 hour	2%	Outdated paper process	Digital distribution
External Examiner Login	BVA	10 minutes	0.3%	Security requirement	SSO integration
Board Meeting Coordination	RVA	2 hours	4%	Decision-making forum	Virtual meeting support
Submit Log Forms	BVA	20 minutes	0.7%	Record keeping	Auto-submission
Student Evaluation	RVA	3-5 hours	9%	Assessment of learning outcomes	Standardized rubrics
Marks Compilation	BVA	1-2 hours	3%	Grade calculation	Automated calculation

3.1.3 Value-Added Summary

Current Process Breakdown:

- **RVA Activities:** 40% (19-25 hours)
- **BVA Activities:** 25% (7-9 hours)
- **NVA Activities:** 35% (9-12 hours)

Target TO-BE Breakdown:

- **RVA Activities:** 70% (maintain academic rigor)
- **BVA Activities:** 25% (streamline compliance)
- **NVA Activities:** 5% (eliminate waste)

3.2 WASTE ANALYSIS

3.2.1 Seven Wastes Framework (Adapted for Administrative Processes)

WASTE 1: WAITING TIME

Identified Instances:

1. **Waiting for Committee Review**
    - Average wait time: 5-7 business days
    - Impact: 120 students × 6 days = 720 student-days lost per semester
    - Root cause: Manual assignment, no prioritization system
2. **Waiting for Faculty Approval**
    - Average wait time: 3-5 business days
    - Impact: Delays project start by 1 week
    - Root cause: Email-based notification system, no urgency indicators
3. **Waiting for SRS Template Approval**
    - Average wait time: 4-6 business days
    - Impact: Delays documentation phase
    - Root cause: Sequential approval process

Total Waiting Waste: ~35% of total process time

WASTE 2: OVERPROCESSING

Identified Instances:

1. **Multiple Notification Sends**
    - System sends 3-5 separate notifications per proposal
    - Wastes: Server resources, recipient attention
    - Better approach: Single consolidated dashboard update
2. **Redundant Approval Gates**

    - Proposal goes through 4 separate approval stages
    - Many approvals are rubber-stamp formalities
    - Better approach: Risk-based approval (only flag exceptional cases)
3. **Manual Data Re-entry**
    - Student data entered 3-4 times across different forms
    - Error-prone and time-consuming
    - Better approach: Single data entry with propagation

Overprocessing Impact: 15-20% unnecessary work

WASTE 3: REWORK/DEFECTS

Identified Instances:

1. **Proposal Revision Cycles**
    - 60% of proposals require at least one revision
    - Average: 1.8 revision cycles per proposal
    - Cause: Unclear requirements, poor initial guidance
2. **SRS Document Corrections**
    - 45% require formatting corrections
    - 30% require content revisions
    - Cause: Inadequate templates, lack of examples
3. **Form Submission Errors**
    - 25% of submissions have incomplete data
    - Require resubmission and delay processing
    - Cause: Poor form validation

Rework Impact: 12-18 hours per student on average

WASTE 4: MOTION

Identified Instances:

1. **Multiple System Logins**
    - Users switch between 3-4 different systems
    - Email → LMS → FYP Portal → Document Repository
2. **Manual Document Downloads/Uploads**
    - Students download templates, fill, re-upload
    - Coordinators download to review, re-upload with comments
3. **Physical Document Handling** (if applicable)
    - Printing forms for signatures
    - Scanning back to system

Motion Waste: 2-3 hours per student, 5-8 hours per coordinator

WASTE 5: INVENTORY (Work in Progress)

Identified Instances:

1. **Proposals in Review Queue**
    - Average WIP: 40-50 proposals waiting for review at any time
    - Peak WIP: 80-90 during submission deadlines
    - Impact: Extended lead times, student anxiety
2. **Pending Approvals Backlog**
    - Average: 15-20 documents awaiting coordinator approval
    - Some documents wait 2-3 weeks in queue

Inventory Waste Impact: Increases cycle time by 300%

WASTE 6: TRANSPORTATION

Identified Instances:

1. **Email-based Document Sharing**
    - Documents passed via email chains (4-6 hops)
    - Version confusion, lost attachments
    - Time spent searching for "latest version"
2. **Between-System Data Transfer**
    - Manual copy-paste between systems
    - Export/import operations
    - Data synchronization delays

Transportation Waste: 3-5 hours per stakeholder per semester

WASTE 7: UNDERUTILIZED TALENT

Identified Instances:

1. **Faculty Time on Administrative Tasks**
    - 40% of supervisor time spent on paperwork vs. mentoring
    - Manual form filling, status updates, report generation
2. **Student Time on Process Navigation**
    - 20% of project time spent understanding/following procedures
    - Should focus on actual research and development
3. **Coordinator Time on Manual Coordination**
    - 60% on administrative coordination vs. strategic oversight
    - Manual scheduling, notification management

Talent Underutilization: Estimated 200+ hours of professional time per semester

3.2.2 Waste Quantification Summary

Waste Type	Percentage of Total Process	Hours per Student	Annual Impact (150 students)	Cost Estimate
Waiting	35%	45 hours	6,750 hours	$202,500
Over processing	20%	26 hours	3,900 hours	$117,000
Rework/Defects	15%	19 hours	2,850 hours	$85,500
Motion	10%	13 hours	1,950 hours	$58,500
Inventory	12%	15 hours	2,250 hours	$67,500
Transportation	5%	6 hours	900 hours	$27,000
Underutilized Talent	3%	4 hours	600 hours	$18,000
TOTAL WASTE	**100%**	**128 hours**	**19,200 hours**	**$576,000**

Cost calculated at $30/hour blended rate for student/faculty time

---

3.3 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

3.3.1 Stakeholder Identification & Classification

PRIMARY STAKEHOLDERS

1. STUDENTS

- **Number:** 120-150 per academic year
- **Primary Goals:** Complete FYP successfully, learn effectively, minimize administrative burden
- **Current Pain Points:**
    - Unclear process steps and requirements (78% report confusion)
    - Long waiting times for feedback (avg 6-8 days)
    - Multiple system logins required (3-4 systems)
    - Lack of visibility into approval status
    - Difficult to track deadlines and requirements
- **Satisfaction Level:** 3.2/5 (from student surveys)
- **Power/Interest:** High Interest, Low Power
- **Engagement Strategy:** Keep informed, provide self-service tools

2. FACULTY SUPERVISORS

- **Number:** 40-50 active supervisors
- **Primary Goals:** Guide student research, ensure quality, manage time efficiently
- **Current Pain Points:**
    - Excessive administrative tasks (40% of time)

    - No consolidated view of all supervisees
    - Manual notification management
    - Difficult to track multiple student timelines
    - Paper-based evaluation forms
- **Satisfaction Level:** 3.5/5
- **Power/Interest:** High Interest, Medium-High Power
- **Engagement Strategy:** Consult regularly, empower with tools

3. FYP COORDINATORS

- **Number:** 2-3 per department
- **Primary Goals:** Smooth process flow, quality assurance, compliance, resource allocation
- **Current Pain Points:**
    - Manual coordination of 100+ projects
    - No real-time visibility into bottlenecks
    - Difficult to balance faculty workload
    - Time-consuming report generation
    - Reactive rather than proactive management
- **Satisfaction Level:** 2.8/5 (high stress reported)
- **Power/Interest:** High Interest, High Power
- **Engagement Strategy:** Manage closely, involve in decision-making

SECONDARY STAKEHOLDERS

4. EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

- **Number:** 15-20 per year
- **Primary Goals:** Fair evaluation, efficient process, clear documentation
- **Current Pain Points:**
    - Cumbersome login process
    - Lack of prior context/documentation access
    - Unclear evaluation criteria
    - Manual form submission
- **Satisfaction Level:** 3.0/5
- **Power/Interest:** Medium Interest, Medium Power
- **Engagement Strategy:** Keep informed

5. DEPARTMENT HEAD/ADMINISTRATION

- **Number:** 3-5 decision makers
- **Primary Goals:** Quality education, compliance, efficiency, reputation
- **Current Pain Points:**
    - Limited analytics/reporting
    - No early warning system for problems
    - Resource allocation challenges
- **Satisfaction Level:** 3.3/5

- **Power/Interest:** Low-Medium Interest, High Power
- **Engagement Strategy:** Keep satisfied with reports

6. IT SUPPORT STAFF

- **Number:** 2-3 staff members
- **Primary Goals:** System stability, minimize support tickets, ease of maintenance
- **Current Pain Points:**
    - Multiple disconnected systems
    - Frequent user issues due to complexity
    - Manual data fixes required
- **Power/Interest:** Low Interest, Low-Medium Power
- **Engagement Strategy:** Monitor

3.3.2 Stakeholder Requirements Matrix

Stakeholder	Functional Requirements	Non-Functional Requirements	Priority
Students	Status tracking, deadline alerts, template access, feedback viewing	Intuitive UI, mobile access, 24/7 availability	Critical
Faculty	Student portfolio view, quick approval, evaluation tools	Fast response time (<2s), minimal clicks	Critical
Coordinators	Dashboard analytics, workload balancing, bulk actions	Real-time data, reporting tools	Critical
External Examiners	Easy access, evaluation forms, document repository	Simple authentication, clear instructions	High
Administration	Compliance reports, quality metrics, trend analysis	Data security, audit trails	High
IT Staff	Centralized system, automated backups, error logging	Maintainability, scalability	Medium

Low Interest High Interest

3.4 ISSUE DOCUMENTATION

3.4.1 Critical Issues (P0 - Immediate Action Required)

ISSUE #1: Excessive Process Cycle Time

- **Severity:** Critical
- **Frequency:** Affects 100% of projects
- **Description:** Average cycle time from proposal to final evaluation is 16-18 weeks when it should be 12-14 weeks
- **Impact:** Delays graduation, reduces time for quality work

- **Evidence:** Process mining data shows 30% of time in waiting states
- **Stakeholders Affected:** Students (primary), Faculty, Coordinators
- **Current Workaround:** Students start unofficially before approval
- **Risk of Inaction:** Student dissatisfaction, quality degradation

ISSUE #2: No Real-Time Visibility

- **Severity:** Critical
- **Frequency:** Continuous
- **Description:** Stakeholders cannot see current status, bottlenecks, or next steps
- **Impact:** Anxiety, duplicate inquiries, missed deadlines
- **Evidence:** 45% of coordinator time spent answering status queries
- **Stakeholders Affected:** All
- **Current Workaround:** Email inquiries, manual tracking
- **Risk of Inaction:** Continued inefficiency, stakeholder frustration

ISSUE #3: High Rework Rate

- **Severity:** Critical
- **Frequency:** 60% of proposals, 45% of SRS documents
- **Description:** Poor guidance leads to multiple revision cycles
- **Impact:** Wasted time, student demoralization
- **Evidence:** Average 1.8 revisions per proposal
- **Stakeholders Affected:** Students, Faculty, Coordinators
- **Current Workaround:** Students seek informal pre-feedback
- **Risk of Inaction:** Quality issues, extended timelines

3.4.2 Major Issues (P1 - Action Required Soon)

ISSUE #4: Fragmented Systems

- **Severity:** Major
- **Frequency:** Every interaction
- **Description:** Users must navigate 3-4 disconnected systems
- **Impact:** User frustration, data inconsistency, learning curve
- **Stakeholders Affected:** All
- **Recommendation:** Integrated platform or SSO at minimum

ISSUE #5: Manual Coordination Overhead

- **Severity:** Major
- **Frequency:** Daily
- **Description:** Coordinators spend 60% time on manual tasks
- **Impact:** Talent underutilization, reactive management
- **Stakeholders Affected:** Coordinators primarily
- **Recommendation:** Automation of routine coordination tasks

ISSUE #6: Inadequate Analytics

- **Severity:** Major
- **Frequency:** Monthly reporting cycles
- **Description:** No proactive identification of at-risk projects
- **Impact:** Late interventions, failures discovered too late
- **Stakeholders Affected:** Coordinators, Administration
- **Recommendation:** Real-time dashboard with alerts

3.4.3 Minor Issues (P2 - Plan for Resolution)

ISSUE #7: Poor mobile experience **ISSUE #8:** Lack of version control for documents **ISSUE #9:** No automated reminders for deadlines **ISSUE #10:** Limited search functionality **ISSUE #11:** Insufficient audit trails **ISSUE #12:** No template library for common project types

3.4.4 Issue Priority Matrix

Issue	Frequency	Severity	Affected Users	Business Impact	Priority
#1 Cycle Time	High	High	100%	$200K annual	P0
#2 Visibility	High	High	100%	$150K annual	P0
#3 Rework	High	High	60%	$85K annual	P0
#4 Fragmentation	Medium	High	100%	$100K annual	P1
#5 Manual Overhead	High	Medium	20%	$120K annual	P1
#6 Analytics	Low	High	10%	$50K annual	P1
#7-12	Varies	Low-Medium	Varies	<$20K each	P2

3.5 ROOT-CAUSE ANALYSIS

3.5.1 Fishbone Diagram Analysis

PROBLEM STATEMENT: Excessive FYP process cycle time (16-18 weeks vs. target 12-14 weeks)

CATEGORY 1: PEOPLE

Root Causes:

1. **Insufficient Training**
    - Students don't understand process requirements
    - Faculty unfamiliar with system features
    - Leading to: Errors, rework, inquiries
2. **Unclear Roles & Responsibilities**

    - Overlap between coordinator and committee roles
    - Students don't know whom to contact
    - Leading to: Delays, miscommunication
3. **High Workload/Low Capacity**
    - Coordinators managing 100+ projects manually
    - Faculty supervising 5-8 students simultaneously
    - Leading to: Bottlenecks, rushed reviews
4. **Lack of Accountability**
    - No SLAs for review times
    - No consequences for delays
    - Leading to: Variable processing times

CATEGORY 2: PROCESS

Root Causes:

1. **Sequential vs. Parallel Processing**
    - Approvals done one-at-a-time
    - Could be done simultaneously
    - Leading to: Waiting time accumulation
2. **Too Many Handoffs**
    - 12+ handoffs from start to finish
    - Each handoff adds 0.5-2 days delay
    - Leading to: Extended cycle time
3. **No Standardized Procedures**
    - Each coordinator has different approach
    - Informal rules not documented
    - Leading to: Inconsistency, confusion
4. **Approval Bottlenecks**
    - Single point of failure (one coordinator)
    - No escalation mechanism
    - Leading to: Queue buildup
5. **Lack of Process Automation**
    - Manual notifications, routing, tracking
    - Human intervention for routine tasks
    - Leading to: Delays, errors

CATEGORY 3: TECHNOLOGY

Root Causes:

1. **Legacy System Architecture**
    - Built 10+ years ago
    - Not designed for current scale
    - Leading to: Performance issues, limitations
2. **No Integration Between Systems**

    - Data silos across platforms
    - Manual data transfer required
    - Leading to: Inefficiency, errors
3. **Poor User Interface**
    - Non-intuitive design
    - Many clicks to complete tasks
    - Leading to: User frustration, errors
4. **Lack of Real-Time Updates**
    - Batch processing overnight
    - Status updates delayed
    - Leading to: Information lag
5. **No Mobile Support**
    - Desktop-only access
    - Students expect mobile-first
    - Leading to: Adoption resistance

CATEGORY 4: MATERIALS/INFORMATION

Root Causes:

1. **Poor Quality Templates**
    - Generic templates don't fit all project types
    - Lack examples and guidance
    - Leading to: Rework, low quality submissions
2. **Inadequate Documentation**
    - Process guidelines outdated
    - FAQs not comprehensive
    - Leading to: Confusion, inquiries
3. **Missing Information Requirements**
    - Unclear what information is needed when
    - Students gather information late
    - Leading to: Delays, incomplete submissions
4. **Version Control Issues**
    - Multiple versions of same document
    - Confusion about "latest" version
    - Leading to: Review of wrong documents

3.5.2 Five Whys Analysis

PROBLEM: 60% of proposals require revision

Why #1: Why do proposals require revision?

- Because they don't meet quality or format standards

Why #2: Why don't they meet standards?

- Because students aren't clear on requirements before submission

Why #3: Why aren't students clear on requirements?

- Because guidelines are generic and lack specific examples

Why #4: Why are guidelines generic?

- Because they're written to cover all project types broadly

Why #5: Why aren't there project-type-specific guidelines?

- Because creating and maintaining multiple guideline sets was deemed too resource-intensive

ROOT CAUSE: Lack of investment in differentiated guidance materials due to perceived resource constraints

SOLUTION: Create template wizard that guides students through project-type-specific requirements with examples

---

3.5.3 Pareto Analysis (80/20 Rule)

Analysis of Time Delays:

Delay Source	Frequency	Avg Delay	Total Impact	Cumulative %
Waiting for coordinator review	95%	6 days	570 days	42%
Proposal revision cycles	60%	5 days	300 days	64%
Faculty assignment delays	85%	3 days	255 days	83%
SRS review waiting	75%	2 days	150 days	94%
System access issues	30%	1 day	30 days	96%
Other delays	Various	Various	55 days	100%

Key Insight: 3 root causes (coordinator review, revisions, faculty assignment) account for 83% of all delays

Recommendation: Focus improvement efforts on:

1. Automating coordinator reviews where possible
2. Providing better upfront guidance to reduce revisions
3. Implementing auto-assignment algorithms for faculty

3.5.4 Root Cause Priority Matrix

Root Cause	Impact	Ease of Fix	Priority Score	Action
Sequential approvals	High	Medium	8/10	Implement parallel workflows
Manual coordination	High	High	9/10	Automate routine tasks
Poor templates	Medium	High	7/10	Create guided wizards
System fragmentation	High	Low	6/10	Long-term integration project
Inadequate training	Medium	High	7/10	Create video tutorials
No SLAs	Medium	High	7/10	Define and enforce SLAs
Lack of analytics	Medium	Medium	6/10	Implement dashboard

---

4. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

4.1 FLOW ANALYSIS

4.1.1 Process Flow Metrics - AS-IS

Overall Process Metrics:

Metric	Value	Target	Gap
Total Cycle Time	16-18 weeks	12-14 weeks	+4 weeks (29%)
Processing Time	52 hours	45 hours	+7 hours (13%)
Waiting Time	285 hours	100 hours	+185 hours (185%)
Cycle Efficiency	15.4%	31%	-15.6%
First-Time-Right %	40%	80%	-40%
Touch Time Ratio	1:5.5	1:2	Poor

Cycle Efficiency = Processing Time / Total Cycle Time

4.1.2 Detailed Phase Analysis

PHASE 1: Proposal Submission & Initial Review

Activity	Processing Time	Wait Time	Total Time	Value Type
Fill Proposal Form	2 hours	0	2 hours	RVA
Submit to Database	0.1 hours	0	0.1 hours	BVA
Wait in Queue	0	48 hours	48 hours	NVA

Activity	Processing Time	Wait Time	Total Time	Value Type
Committee Review	4 hours	0	4 hours	RVA
Decision Making	1 hour	24 hours	25 hours	RVA
Send Notifications	0.25 hours	0	0.25 hours	NVA
Phase Total	**7.35 hours**	**72 hours**	**79.35 hours**	**9% efficient**

PHASE 2: Revision & Approval

Activity	Processing Time	Wait Time	Total Time	Value Type
Receive Feedback	0.25 hours	0	0.25 hours	BVA
Make Revisions	3 hours	0	3 hours	RVA (if needed)
Resubmit	0.1 hours	24 hours	24.1 hours	BVA
Second Review	2 hours	48 hours	50 hours	RVA
Final Approval	0.5 hours	24 hours	24.5 hours	BVA
Faculty Assignment	0.5 hours	72 hours	72.5 hours	BVA
Phase Total	**6.35 hours**	**168 hours**	**174.35 hours**	**3.6% efficient**

PHASE 3: SRS Documentation

Activity	Processing Time	Wait Time	Total Time	Value Type
Download Template	0.2 hours	0	0.2 hours	BVA
Prepare SRS	10 hours	0	10 hours	RVA
Submit SRS	0.2 hours	24 hours	24.2 hours	BVA
Supervisor Review	3 hours	48 hours	51 hours	RVA
Coordinator Review	2 hours	48 hours	50 hours	BVA
Phase Total	**15.4 hours**	**120 hours**	**135.4 hours**	**11.4% efficient**

PHASE 4: Evaluation & Completion

Activity	Processing Time	Wait Time	Total Time	Value Type
Progress Evaluation	4 hours	0	4 hours	RVA
Document Review	3 hours	96 hours	99 hours	RVA
External Exam Setup	1 hour	72 hours	73 hours	BVA
Final Evaluation	5 hours	48 hours	53 hours	RVA
Marks Compilation	2 hours	24 hours	26 hours	BVA
Phase Total	**15 hours**	**240 hours**	**255 hours**	**5.9% efficient**

4.1.3 Flow Analysis Visualization

Time Distribution:

- Actual Work (Processing): 52 hours (15.4%)
- Waiting: 285 hours (84.6%)

Value Distribution:

- Real Value-Added: 41 hours (79% of processing time)
- Business Value-Added: 8 hours (15% of processing time)
- Non-Value-Added: 3 hours (6% of processing time)

4.1.4 Throughput Analysis

System Capacity:

- Students per semester: 120
- Weeks per semester: 18
- Average concurrent projects: 85-100

Throughput Metrics:

Metric	Current	Theoretical Max	Utilization
Projects per week	6.7	15	45%
Coordinator capacity	5 reviews/day	15 reviews/day	33%
Faculty capacity	2 reviews/week	5 reviews/week	40%

Bottleneck Identification:

- Primary bottleneck: Coordinator review (utilization rate 85% during peaks)
- Secondary bottleneck: Faculty assignment process
- Tertiary bottleneck: External examiner coordination

4.1.5 Little's Law Application

Formula: WIP = Throughput × Cycle Time

Current State:

- WIP (Work in Progress): 85 projects
- Throughput: 6.7 projects/week
- Cycle Time: 12.7 weeks (actual from data)

Validation: $6.7 \times 12.7 \approx 85$ ✓ (matches observation)

TO-BE Target:

- Target Cycle Time: 8 weeks
- Same Throughput: 6.7 projects/week
- Required WIP: 6.7 × 8 = 53.6 projects

Implication: Need to reduce WIP by 37% through faster processing and reduced waiting

---

4.2 QUEUING ANALYSIS

4.2.1 Queue Theory Application

System Type: M/M/c (Multiple servers, Poisson arrivals, Exponential service)

QUEUE 1: Coordinator Review Queue

Parameters:

- Arrival rate (λ): 12 proposals/week (Poisson distributed)
- Service rate (μ): 3 proposals/day × 5 days = 15 proposals/week per coordinator
- Number of servers (c): 2 coordinators
- Combined service rate: 30 proposals/week

Analysis:

- Utilization (ρ): λ/(c×μ) = 12/30 = 0.4 (40%)
- Average queue length (Lq): 0.23 proposals
- Average time in queue (Wq): 0.46 hours (27 minutes)
- Average time in system (Ws): 4.46 hours

BUT... Reality Check: Actual observed wait time: 48-72 hours (not 27 minutes!)

Why the discrepancy?

1. **Batching behavior**: Coordinators review in batches, not continuously
2. **Priority variations**: Some proposals require more time
3. **Non-work time**: Meetings, other duties reduce available time
4. **Uneven arrival**: Peaks during submission deadlines

Adjusted Analysis (with batch processing):

- Effective service rate: 5 proposals/week per coordinator
- Utilization: 12/10 = 1.2 (120% - SYSTEM OVERLOADED during peaks!)
- Queue length during peaks: 15-20 proposals

- Wait time during peaks: 72-96 hours

4.2.2 Queue Performance by Phase

QUEUE 2: Faculty Review Queue

Parameter	Value
Arrival rate	10 students/week per faculty
Service time	3 hours per review
Utilization	75% (manageable)
Avg wait time	24-36 hours
Peak wait time	72 hours

Problem: Uneven distribution (some faculty have 8 students, others have 2)

QUEUE 3: External Examiner Assignment Queue

Parameter	Value
Arrival rate	5 exams/week (end of semester)
Service time	4 hours per exam
Utilization	50%
Avg wait time	12 hours
Peak wait time	48 hours

Problem: Scheduling coordination delays, not processing capacity

4.2.3 Queuing Metrics Summary

Queue Point	Avg Length	Max Length	Avg Wait	Max Wait	Utilization
Initial Submission	8	25	48 hrs	120 hrs	40% avg, 120% peak
Revision Review	5	15	36 hrs	96 hrs	60%
SRS Review	6	18	48 hrs	120 hrs	45% avg, 100% peak
Faculty Assignment	12	30	72 hrs	168 hrs	35% (coordination issue)
External Exam	3	10	48 hrs	96 hrs	50%

4.2.4 Economic Analysis of Queuing

Cost of Waiting:

- Student time value: $15/hour

- Average wait

System (Automated):

1. **Faculty Matching Algorithm:**
    - Match based on expertise tags (from proposal keywords)
    - Balance workload (max 5 students per faculty)
    - Consider faculty preferences/availability
    - Send top 3 matches to coordinator
2. **Parallel Processing:**
    - Committee review happens simultaneously with matching
    - No sequential dependencies
3. **Smart Notifications:**
    - In-app notifications only (no email spam)
    - Aggregated daily digest option
    - Mobile push for urgent items

Coordinator:

1. Review algorithm suggestions on dashboard
2. One-click confirm or adjust assignment
3. System sends acceptance to faculty with student details

Faculty:

1. Receive notification with student profile
2. One-click accept (or delegate if unavailable)
3. Automatic calendar invite for first meeting

Student:

1. Real-time dashboard shows: "Proposal Approved ✓ Faculty Assigned: Dr. Smith"
2. Automated meeting scheduler suggests times
3. Access to project workspace activated

Time Reduction: 174 hours → 48 hours (72% reduction)

PHASE 3: Collaborative Documentation (Week 3-6)

Student:

1. Access pre-populated SRS template (data from proposal)
2. Collaborative editing environment (Google Docs-like)
3. Faculty can provide inline comments in real-time

4. Checklist shows completion progress
5. Submit when checklist 100% complete

Faculty (Concurrent):

1. Review document asynchronously via shared workspace
2. Add comments/suggestions inline
3. Mark sections as "Approved" progressively
4. No need for formal "review meeting" for minor changes

System:

1. Version control automatic
2. Plagiarism check on submission
3. Format validation (auto-fix common issues)
4. If all sections approved: Auto-advance
5. If issues: Specific actionable feedback to student

Coordinator:

1. Receives only final-approval request (not intermediary steps)
2. Can see faculty review trail
3. Quick approval for standard projects
4. Deep review only for flagged cases

Time Reduction: 135 hours → 40 hours (70% reduction)

PHASE 4: Streamlined Evaluation (Week 14-16)

System:

1. Auto-schedule evaluation based on project timeline
2. Send reminders at key milestones (2 weeks before, 1 week, 3 days)
3. Pre-fill evaluation forms with project metadata
4. Auto-assign external examiner based on expertise/availability

Faculty:

1. Online evaluation form with rubric
2. Can attach files, provide detailed feedback
3. Submit scores electronically

External Examiner:

1. Single sign-on access
2. All documents available in one place
3. Digital evaluation form
4. Virtual meeting option (no travel needed)

System:

1. Auto-calculate final scores
2. Generate transcript entries
3. Flag anomalies (score discrepancies > 10%)
4. Archive all documents automatically

Coordinator:

1. Dashboard shows all evaluations
2. Intervention only for flagged cases
3. One-click bulk approve final scores
4. Automated report generation

Time Reduction: 255 hours → 72 hours (72% reduction)