61.500 MDAIE Studios

Syllabus (v1 – 10/09/2026)

Master of Science in Design and Artificial Intelligence for Enterprise (MDAIE) - Academic Year 2026

This document defines the year-long Studio structure, responsibilities, assessment, deliverables, and professional standards.

Dates, submission links, project-specific arrangements, and approved updates are published on eDimension.

1. How to Use This Syllabus

Read this syllabus before beginning partner discussions and revisit the relevant sections before every assessment. It explains the common rules for all MDAIE Studio projects. Your project brief, agreements, mentor instructions, and eDimension announcements provide the project-specific details.

Table of Contents

1. How to Use This Syllabus 1
2. Course Overview 3
3. Learning Objectives 4
4. Project Progression Across Three Terms 5
   - Progression over three terms 5
   - Term 1 Commencement 5
5. Roles and Responsibilities 6
   - Role #1: Students 6
   - Role #2: SUTD Academic Mentors 6
   - Role #3: Industry Mentors 7
   - MDAIE Instructor Team and Instructor Lead (Matthieu De Mari) 7
6. Mentoring and Project Records 8
   - First Three-Party Meeting 8
   - Mentoring Practice 9
   - Minimum Project Record 9
   - When a Project Encounters Difficulty 10
7. Assessment 11
   - Assessment Components 11
   - What Each Component Assesses 12
   - Common Performance Descriptors for each grading rubric 13
   - End of Term Moderation Agenda 13
   - Pass or Fail Judgement 14
8. Reports and Presentations 14

Report Format 14
Expected Report Structure 15
Presentation Format 15
9. Technical and Responsible AI Expectations 16
10. Academic Integrity and AI Assisted Work 16
11. Confidentiality Intellectual Property and Resources 17
Required Conduct 17
Expenses and Project Resources 17
Safety Ethics and Required Approvals 18
12. Deadlines Feedback and Late Submission 18
13. End of Project and Handover 19
14. Sources and Related Information 19
15. FAQ 19
My project does not provide allowance/stipend, can I request the industry mentor to give me one? 19
My industry mentor mentioned that I would be hired as an intern but I have not received an internship contract yet. They asked to produce work for them despite not being officially hired as an intern. 20
I would like to suggest a project idea for myself, is this possible? 20
Who owns the IP of the project the MDAIE Studios projects? 20
My industry mentor is asking me to sign an NDA, should I sign it? 20
My industry mentor is asking to review the report before I submit it to eDimension. Is this allowed? What if I miss the deadline because of a late review from the industry mentor? 21
Am I expected to produce work on recess weeks, term breaks, public holidays, or other days than the two days (Mondays and Tuesdays) assigned for MDAIE Studios projects? 21
I noted that my PD course is conflicting with MDAIE Studios. 21
What happens to the MDAIE studios project if I decide to go on long LOA (e.g. 1 full term or 1 year long LOA)? 21
What happens if I fail a term of MDAIE Studios? 21

2. Course Overview

The 61.500 MDAIE Studios project is an individual, year-long project in which each student addresses a substantial, real-world AI challenge. Each student is assigned one project and works with one SUTD academic mentor and also one industry mentor, which is normally the person who proposed or owns the challenge within the partner organisation.

The Studio is not a short consulting exercise, a superficial educational project, or a hypothetical case study. It is intended to be an in-depth project, allowing students to put into application the artificial intelligence skills taught in the MDAIE courses and gain industry-relevant experience.

Students are expected to progress from problem understanding and stakeholder alignment to system design, implementation, rigorous evaluation, and a credible final outcome. Depending on the project, that outcome may be a feasibility study, proof of concept, research prototype, minimum viable product, pilot, deployment-oriented system, technical study, paper, or patentable development.

Item	Course arrangement
Course code	61.500
Duration	One academic year across three terms
Credits	12 credits in each term (equivalent to one core or elective course, required to graduate)
Grade	Pass or Fail, determined at the end of each term
Project model	One student, one industry mentor, and one SUTD academic mentor
Expected commitment	Two Studio days per week. Full-time students to get Mondays and Tuesdays free of courses, to work on said projects. Part-time students to be more flexible. Project work includes independent work and scheduled meetings.
Official information	eDimension for deadlines, submissions, mentor details, announcements, and approved project-specific arrangements

3. Learning Objectives

By completing the Studio, students should be able to:

1. Frame an enterprise or societal challenge by identifying stakeholders, user needs, operational constraints, success criteria, and responsible-AI considerations.

2. Translate a problem into a technically sound AI system design, including appropriate data, methods, baselines, interfaces, and evaluation procedures.

3. Implement and iteratively improve a substantial AI solution using suitable software, models, experiments, simulations, or physical systems.

4. Evaluate technical performance, reliability, limitations, deployment feasibility, and organisational value using evidence appropriate to the project.

5. Manage a year-long individual project by planning work, maintaining records, responding to feedback, communicating risks, and meeting agreed milestones.

6. Communicate technical and design decisions clearly to academic, industry, and non-specialist audiences.

7. Work professionally with confidential information, partner resources, intellectual property, data, software licences, and AI-assisted tools.

8. Reflect critically on personal learning, setbacks, decisions, and future development.

4. Project Progression Across Three Terms

Progression over three terms

Term	Primary purpose	Indicative evidence of progress
Term 1 Discover and Define	Establish a viable, well-scoped project and evidence-based plan.	Stakeholder and user needs; context and literature review; problem statement; data and resource assessment; success metrics; responsible-AI and project risks; initial baselines or feasibility work; project plan.
Term 2 Design and Develop	Build, compare, and iteratively improve the proposed solution.	System architecture; baseline implementation; model or prototype development; experimental plan; quantitative and qualitative evaluation; stakeholder feedback; revised scope, risks, and schedule.
Term 3 Validate and Deliver	Complete, validate, document, and hand over a credible final outcome.	Integrated system or final study; rigorous validation; failure and limitations analysis; deployment or adoption considerations; reproducibility; final documentation; partner-approved demonstration and handover.

Project work is iterative. A student may revisit earlier decisions when evidence changes, but must explain and justify major changes in scope, methods, metrics, or deliverables.

Term 1 Commencement

Term 1 begins with programme-led orientation, partner engagement, project discussions, matching, scoping, and required administrative arrangements.

This year, the networking event is scheduled on September 14th 2026. Details were sent to student via email. Attendance is mandatory.

Students normally commence their assigned project between Weeks 5 and 8. The exact sequence and dates are announced on eDimension. Students must engage actively and respond promptly throughout this period.

5. Roles and Responsibilities

Role #1: Students

During the course of this project, the students are expected to:

- Take ownership of the project, organise meetings, prepare agendas, record decisions, and follow up on actions.
- Maintain regular and professional communication with both mentors and raise delays, access problems, technical risks, or changes in scope early.
- Maintain a professional project record containing plans, meeting notes, experiments, decisions, feedback, and evidence of individual work.
- Use the two allocated Studio days purposefully. Depending on project needs, the studio time may include on-site work, SUTD-based work, meetings, experiments, development, documentation, and approved independent work.
- Submit all assessments through eDimension and be able to explain and defend every part of the work.

Role #2: SUTD Academic Mentors

Over the course of this project, each student will be assigned an academic mentor, usually a professor from SUTD with expertise closely related to the project. During the course of this project, the academic mentor role is to:

- Safeguard academic rigour, appropriate project scope, learning outcomes, and assessment quality.
- Provide technical and methodological guidance while preserving student ownership of the work. Please keep in mind that learning new tools is technically an expectation on the student side. While mentors might act as facilitators, providing suggestions on materials to self-study, they are not expected to give tuition/private courses to students.
- Monitor progress, identify risks, coordinate with the industry mentor, and intervene when progress or the partnership is at risk.
- Evaluate progress and work produced, record grades, provide feedback on eDimension and participate in end-of-term moderation.

Role #3: Industry Mentors

Over the course of this project, each student will be assigned an industry mentor, usually the industry partner who has proposed the project idea and has the best understanding of the project needs, requirements and goals. During the course of this project, the industry mentor role is to:

- Provide organisational context, access to agreed data or environments, stakeholder guidance, and feedback on relevance, solution validity and feasibility.
- Meet the student regularly according to the project arrangement and communicate concerns early.
- Review appropriate deliverables and contribute structured assessment input on professional engagement and the end-term presentation.
- Clarify confidentiality, access, approval, resource, and handover requirements with the student and SUTD mentor.
- Evaluate progress and work produced, link up with the academic mentors regarding grades, share feedback for academic mentors to upload on eDimension and participate in end-of-term moderation.

Should the industry mentor make changes to the approved projects, approval should be sought from the MDAIE instructor team and instructor lead.

MDAIE Instructor Team and Instructor Lead (Matthieu De Mari)

To pilot these MDAIE studios, the instructor team and instructor lead are expected to:

- Coordinate common milestones and assessment processes across projects. Publish official schedules, submission requirements, and updates on eDimension.
- Resolve project-specific academic or operational issues related to the MDAIE projects, and moderate Pass or Fail decisions.

6. Mentoring and Project Records

Meeting frequency depends on the project, partner availability, and project phase. Students should normally meet or update both mentors regularly; weekly or fortnightly contact is appropriate for most projects. Long periods without substantive mentor contact should be reported to the instructor team.

For every formal mentor meeting, students should retain a concise record of the date, attendees, matters discussed, decisions, risks, action owners, and due dates. These records may be requested as evidence of effort, project management, or professional conduct.

First Three-Party Meeting

During the first few weeks/months of the term, mentors and students are advised to meet frequently, in order to:

- Confirm the problem owner, intended users and stakeholders, and the organisational value sought.
- Distinguish the aspirational outcome from the minimum academically meaningful outcome.
- Confirm available data, systems, computing, licences, hardware, workspace, technical contacts, and expected partner costs.
- Identify confidentiality, IP, internship, MOU, NDA, background-check, safety, ethics, and data-protection requirements.
- Agree where work will occur, normal meeting cadence, communication channels, response expectations, and who can approve scope or disclosure.
- Define the first four weeks of work and the evidence needed to decide whether the project remains feasible.

The first meeting should involve all three parties: the student, academic mentor, and industry mentor. Once the project is underway and a regular working rhythm has been established, separate meeting arrangements may be adopted, with the student meeting each mentor at an appropriate frequency.

Mentoring Practice

For good practice, the industry and academic mentors are encouraged to:

- Ask for evidence before solutions: what was observed, measured, compared, or learned?
- Require explicit baselines and success criteria early, while allowing them to evolve with evidence.
- Keep project scope commensurate with one student and the available year; separate core outcomes from stretch outcomes.
- Use milestone reviews to make decisions, not simply to receive progress presentations.
- Preserve student ownership. Provide direction and access, but do not silently become the principal implementer.
- Check that the student can explain generated code, partner-provided components, pretrained models, and external artefacts.
- Make room for negative results when they are rigorously obtained and lead to defensible conclusions.

Minimum Project Record

For good practice, we also encourage the mentors and students to keep a minimal project record, including but not limited to:

- Current scope, requirements, success criteria, risks, schedule, and decision log.
- Meeting dates, attendees, decisions, actions, owners, and deadlines.
- Data and model provenance, versions, licences, permissions, and access controls.
- Experiment or evaluation records sufficient to trace major reported results.
- Feedback received and resulting changes.
- Confidentiality approvals, demonstration clearance, and handover status where applicable.

We also strongly recommend a 1-on-1 discussion between the industry mentor and the academic mentor twice every term during the midterm and final period of the term to ensure the student is doing alright and everyone is on the same page.

When a Project Encounters Difficulty

Students and mentors should raise concerns early.

Examples include delayed data or system access, unclear scope, mentor unavailability, infeasible requirements, technical failure, confidentiality concerns, workplace difficulties, or a breakdown in the project relationship.

Raising a genuine problem promptly is part of professional project management and will not by itself disadvantage the student.

The SUTD mentor and instructor team may clarify expectations, revise milestones, adjust scope, arrange additional support, or approve another course of action.

Students must not make significant commitments to a partner, change the agreed project scope, publish project material, or abandon the project without SUTD approval.

Although it is not possible to anticipate every issue that may arise during a project, the table below provides guidance on how to respond to common situations. If you are uncertain about the appropriate course of action, consult your mentors or the MDAIE Studios Instructor Team or Lead.

Situation	Recommended response
Access or partner delay	Record the dependency and student follow-up; agree substitute work; revise milestones; escalate persistent blockage to the instructor team.
Scope is infeasible	Protect the learning objectives; define a viable core problem and stretch goals; document the revised scope with both mentors.
Weak progress or engagement	Give specific written expectations, evidence required, and a review date; notify the instructor team early; avoid first raising serious concerns at final grading.
Mentor disagreement	Separate academic requirements from organisational preference; convene a three-party discussion; refer unresolved academic or contractual matters to the instructor team.
Confidentiality or security incident	Stop affected sharing or access where appropriate; preserve evidence; notify authorised SUTD and partner contacts immediately; follow institutional incident procedures.
Safety ethics or data concern	Pause the affected activity until requirements and approvals are confirmed; consult the appropriate SUTD office or authorised reviewer.
Partner withdrawal	Protect the student from unfair disadvantage; preserve permissible work; identify an academically meaningful re-scope or alternative arrangement through the instructor team.
Academic integrity concern	Document evidence, avoid informal adjudication, and follow the applicable SUTD academic-integrity process.

7. Assessment

The Studio is assessed separately in each term on a Pass or Fail basis. Assessment considers the quality and substance of the work, the evidence presented, professional engagement, response to feedback, and progress appropriate to the project stage. End-of-term results are moderated by the MDAIE instructor team. Detailed deadlines and submission links are published on eDimension.

Assessment Components

The assessment components are shown below. Note that Term 1 follows a slightly different weightage as the project will likely start around Week 5-8.

Term	Component	Weight	Primary input
Term 1	Professional engagement, effort and initiative	30%	Industry mentor 15%; SUTD mentor 15%
	End-of-term report	40%	SUTD mentor
	End-of-term presentation and questions	30%	Industry mentor 15%; SUTD mentor 15%;
Terms 2 and 3	Professional engagement, effort and initiative	20%	Industry mentor 10%; SUTD mentor 10%
	Mid-term report	20%	SUTD mentor
	End-of-term report	30%	SUTD mentor
	End-of-term presentation and questions	30%	Industry mentor 15%; SUTD mentor 15%;

If the industry mentor is unavailable or has insufficient evidence to provide a fair assessment, the SUTD mentor and instructor team will determine the affected component using available project evidence. Industry input informs the assessment; SUTD retains responsibility for the official course result.

Academic mentors are expected to coordinate with industry mentors and obtain their grades and feedback for each assessment rubric listed above. As industry mentors do not have access to eDimension, academic mentors are responsible for entering the consolidated grades and feedback on behalf of both mentors.

What Each Component Assesses

Each grading rubric evaluates a specific component of the project, as outlined below.

Component	Evidence considered
Professional engagement, effort and initiative	Reliability, ownership, preparation, communication, responsiveness, initiative, quality and continuity of effort, use of feedback, project records, management of risks and constraints, and professional conduct.
Mid-term report	Clear status, work completed, evidence obtained, decisions and justifications, technical progress, limitations, updated plan, risks, and specific work for the remainder of the term.
End-of-term report	Coherent account of the term, substantive project outcomes, technical and design rigour, appropriate evidence, critical analysis, reflection, next-stage plan or final handover, and professional writing.
End-of-term presentation	Clear explanation of the problem, approach, evidence, progress or final outcome; effective visuals; credible demonstration where feasible; command of the work; and meaningful responses during questions.

In the process of evaluating students, mentors will typically look for the following evidence and warning signs.

Component	Strong evidence	Warning signs
Effort and initiative	Continuous work record; prepared meetings; ownership; realistic plans; early escalation; useful response to feedback.	Long unexplained gaps; repeated missed actions; passive dependence; poor communication; undocumented claims of effort.
Reports	Clear contribution; sound problem framing; justified methods; traceable results; critical analysis; honest limitations; professional documentation.	Descriptive narrative without evidence; unclear authorship; weak baselines; irreproducible results; unsupported claims; concealed negative results.
Presentation	Coherent account; appropriate depth; useful demo; command of details; honest answers; clear implications.	Polished slides unsupported by work; inability to explain code or results; confidential disclosure; evasive or fabricated answers.

Common Performance Descriptors for each grading rubric

These descriptors support judgement across varied project types.

Level	General interpretation
Excellent (75-100%)	Substantial, rigorous and well-evidenced work; strong ownership and judgement; clear response to feedback; outcomes exceed the normal expectations for the project stage.
Proficient (50-75%)	Substantial and credible work appropriate to the project stage; sound reasoning and execution; reliable engagement; minor gaps do not undermine the overall outcome.
Developing (25-50%)	Some meaningful progress, but important gaps remain in depth, evidence, execution, communication, or professional engagement; improvement is required.
Insufficient (0-25%)	Insufficient substantive work or evidence; major gaps in ownership, rigour, progress, communication, or professional obligations.

End of Term Moderation Agenda

At the end of each term, the MDAIE instructor team and instructor lead will meet to:

- Confirm submissions, late penalties, approved exceptions, and industry input.
- Review the student's substantive work against the relevant term purpose and common performance descriptors.
- Identify partner-side constraints and distinguish them from student-controlled performance.
- Discuss borderline, inconsistent, integrity-related, confidentiality-related, or safety-related cases.
- Agree Pass or Fail and the evidence supporting the decision.
- Agree required actions, feedback, scope changes, or monitoring for the following term.
- Record the decision and complete eDimension entry.

Pass or Fail Judgement

Although this is a Pass or Fail course, we would advise students to not treat Pass or Fail as a mechanical numerical cutoff. At the end of each term, instructors discuss each student's evidence and trajectory. The normal aim is to support progression when the student has produced substantial, credible work appropriate to the project stage and has engaged responsibly, even if some planned outcomes were not achieved.

We will judge the student's process, evidence, decisions, learning, and response to constraints, it is not simply based on whether an ambitious technical outcome succeeded. We shall not penalise a student for partner-side delay or project failure outside the student's control when the student responded professionally and produced suitable alternative evidence.

A Pass should still require substantive individual work that can be explained and defended. Attendance or goodwill alone is insufficient.

Serious academic-integrity, confidentiality, safety, non-engagement, or professional-conduct concerns require escalation and may outweigh otherwise acceptable technical work. Instructors will record the evidence supporting a borderline or Fail recommendation and discuss it before communicating the result to students.

8. Reports and Presentations

Report Format

The following guidelines are strong requirements for reports produced in the MDAIE studios. Relaxing one of these requirements (e.g. page limit for the report) requires written approval from the academic mentor.

- All mid-term and end-of-term reports are limited to 20 pages, except the Term 3 final report, which is limited to 50 pages.
- Page limits exclude the title page, contents, lists of figures and tables, acknowledgements, references, and appendices unless eDimension states otherwise.
- Use Times New Roman, 11-point text, and single line spacing. Figures, tables, and code excerpts must remain legible.
- Appendices should contain supporting evidence rather than material essential to understanding the main argument. Assessors are not expected to infer the main contribution from appendices.
- Reports must identify the student's contribution, distinguish original work from reused components, and cite data, software, models, and literature appropriately.

Expected Report Structure

The precise structure should be adapted to the project and term. Not every project requires the same methods, but every report should provide enough evidence for an assessor to understand what was attempted, what the student contributed, what was learned, and what the results support.

Section	Purpose
Executive summary	Concise statement of the problem, approach, principal evidence, outcome, limitations, and next step.
Context and problem framing	Partner context, stakeholders, user or operational needs, constraints, intended value, and project scope.
Related work and baselines	Relevant research, products, methods, existing systems, and suitable comparison points.
Requirements and success criteria	Functional and non-functional requirements, metrics, acceptance criteria, and responsible-AI considerations.
Design and technical approach	Architecture, data pipeline, methods, implementation choices, interfaces, and justification of decisions.
Evaluation and evidence	Experimental or validation design, results, comparisons, stakeholder feedback, error analysis, robustness, and limitations.
Project management and reflection	Progress against plan, risks, changes, lessons learned, and specific next steps or handover status.
References and appendices	Sources, licences, technical details, supplementary results, and project records as appropriate.

Presentation Format

The presentations are rather flexible, but we suggest the following:

- 30 minutes for the presentation, followed by up to 30 minutes of questions.
- Organizing the presentations at the end of terms with all important stakeholders is the responsibility of the student. The industry mentor should be invited. The assessment proceeds if an invited mentor is unavailable. Industry mentors might only be able to join via Teams.
- A live or recorded demonstration is strongly encouraged when feasible and safe.
- Students must obtain any necessary approval before showing confidential data, systems, results, images, or partner information.

9. Technical and Responsible AI Expectations

Expectations are adapted to the project, but credible Studio work should address the following wherever applicable:

- A clear problem definition and explicit technical, user, operational, and organisational success criteria.
- Data provenance, permissions, quality, representativeness, preprocessing, versioning, and known limitations.
- Appropriate baselines and comparisons, not only a demonstration that the proposed method runs. Ideally, a reproducible evaluation design with meaningful metrics, suitable test conditions, and traceable results.
- Error analysis, robustness, uncertainty, failure modes, safety, privacy, security, fairness, and misuse risks appropriate to the application.
- Human-centred validation and stakeholder feedback where people interact with or are affected by the system.
- Deployment feasibility, including integration, maintainability, compute, latency, cost, monitoring, change management, and regulatory or organisational constraints where relevant.
- Honest reporting of negative results, unresolved risks, assumptions, and limitations.

10. Academic Integrity and AI Assisted Work

Students may use AI-assisted tools when their use is lawful, permitted by the project arrangements, and academically honest. The student remains responsible for every submitted claim, design decision, result, and artefact.

- Understand, verify, test, and be able to defend all generated or assisted work.
- Disclose substantial use of generated code, prose, images, synthetic data, analyses, or design material in the manner requested by the instructor.
- Clearly distinguish the student's contribution from partner-provided material, prior work, libraries, pretrained models, open-source software, and generated content.
- Respect licences, attribution requirements, research integrity, and restrictions on data use.
- Do not fabricate experiments, citations, user research, results, meeting records, or partner approval.
- Do not upload confidential or restricted partner information to public repositories, personal services, third-party language models, or other unapproved systems.

11. Confidentiality Intellectual Property and Resources

Project arrangements differ. A student may work as a part-time intern or employee of the partner, work under an MOU or NDA while based at SUTD, or follow another approved arrangement. The instructor team will communicate the applicable requirements for each project. Project-specific agreements take precedence over general examples in this syllabus.

Required Conduct

Below are general guidelines from proper conduct during this project work.

- Do not disclose partner information, source code, datasets, credentials, systems, results, or project discussions without approval.
- Use only approved storage, repositories, collaboration platforms, devices, cloud services, and AI tools. Public GitHub repositories are inappropriate for confidential work unless expressly approved.
- Use least-privilege access, strong authentication, appropriate encryption, and secure handling of credentials and personal or sensitive data.
- Report suspected data exposure, credential loss, unauthorised access, or confidentiality breach immediately to both mentors and the instructor team. Do not attempt to conceal or privately resolve a serious incident.
- Obtain clearance before public presentations, portfolios, publications, demonstrations, competitions, or job-interview discussions involving project material.
- At project completion or withdrawal, return, transfer, archive, or securely delete project material as directed and provide required handover documentation.

Expenses and Project Resources

Industry partners normally provide project-specific resources and cover approved project expenses. Students must not incur costs expecting reimbursement unless written approval has been obtained in advance. Software, cloud, hardware, data, travel, consumables, and access arrangements should be clarified early and revisited when scope changes.

Safety Ethics and Required Approvals

Students must complete any safety training, ethics review, data-protection process, background check, facility induction, or other approval required by SUTD, the partner, or the project. Work involving people, personal data, physical systems, laboratories, field deployment, cybersecurity, or safety-critical decisions must not begin until applicable approvals and controls are in place.

12. Deadlines Feedback and Late Submission

All assessment deadlines are published on eDimension in advance. Students are responsible for checking the official course space and submitting the correct, complete files through the stated channel. Grades and feedback are entered on eDimension by instructors.

Delay after deadline	Penalty
More than 0 and up to 6 hours	25% of the available marks for that submission
More than 6 and up to 48 hours	50% of the available marks for that submission
More than 48 hours	100% of the available marks for that submission

An extension or alternative arrangement requires approval from the MDAIE instructor lead, under applicable SUTD procedures. Where an unexpected emergency prevents timely submission, the student must contact the SUTD mentor and instructor team as soon as reasonably possible and provide supporting information when required. Technical difficulty should be reported immediately, with time-stamped evidence and the completed files attached where possible.

13. End of Project and Handover

At the end of the project (end of Term 3), students will be reminded to prepare a handover package and transfer all productions back to the industry mentor. This handover will require to:

- Complete the final report, presentation, demonstration, repository, technical documentation, and other agreed deliverables.
- Provide clear instructions for reproducing, operating, maintaining, or extending the work where applicable.
- Identify dependencies, licences, credentials, unresolved issues, known failure modes, and recommended next steps.
- Obtain required partner clearance and complete all return, transfer, archiving, deletion, internship, access, and handover procedures.
- Confirm completion with both mentors and retain only material that the applicable agreements permit the student to retain.

14. Sources and Related Information

Students are encouraged to look for the following resources:

- MDAIE course space on eDimension
- SUTD MDAIE programme and Studio webpages
- Project brief and project-specific agreements
- Applicable SUTD policies on academic integrity, research ethics, data protection, safety, student conduct, and assessment

Whenever in doubt, the ground truth can be found by checking with the MDAIE instructor team and instructor lead.

15. FAQ

My project does not provide allowance/stipend, can I request the industry mentor to give me one?

The allowance/stipend is not guaranteed or required from industry mentors. Some industry mentors are however keen to offer one, in recognition for the substantial work that the students will produce. This being said, your choice of a project at the beginning of term 1 should probably not be guided by financial considerations alone.

My industry mentor mentioned that I would be hired as an intern but I have not received an internship contract yet. They asked to produce work for them despite not being officially hired as an intern.

Please reach out to the MDAIE instructor lead. This is definitely something we need to clarify with the industry mentor.

I would like to suggest a project idea for myself, is this possible?

Yes, and this is in fact encouraged for part-time students. We would greatly encourage you to explore a possible project in your current company and request some flexible time arrangements from your employers (e.g. trade some of your daily duties, replacing them with MDAIE studios project work in your company). Please approach the MDAIE instructor lead with your project proposal, as it will have to be reviewed.

Who owns the IP of the project the MDAIE Studios projects?

Depends on the arrangement chosen by industry mentors. In the event that the student is hired as an intern, the IP typically belongs to the company. If the project is to be hosted in SUTD and the student is not hired as an intern, the IP will typically be discussed between the student, SUTD and the industry mentor. This will typically be discussed, and specified in a separate IP agreement. The SUTD policy regarding IP is quite simple: whoever pays for the project expenses should rightfully retain the IP.

My industry mentor is asking me to sign an NDA, should I sign it?

Depends on the arrangement chosen for your project. If you are a student and hired by the company as an intern to work on the project, you will have to follow their internal process. If it includes a personal NDA, you should sign it. If it includes an NDA that potentially makes SUTD liable, then it needs to be reviewed by our SUTD legal department, please approach the instructor lead.

If the project is to be hosted in SUTD, the standard procedure should be to use the standard SUTD template for NDA, not the company ones. If the industry mentor requires for their own NDA to be used, it will have to be reviewed by our SUTD legal department, please approach the instructor lead.

If you are an academic mentor, and the industry mentor is asking for you to sign an NDA, it needs to be reviewed by our SUTD legal department, please approach the instructor lead.

My industry mentor is asking to review the report before I submit it to eDimension. Is this allowed? What if I miss the deadline because of a late review from the industry mentor?

Yes, some NDA specify that the materials produced and submitted for assessment to SUTD need to be reviewed and vetted for confidential information before they are uploaded to SUTD/eDimension. Please refer to the NDA you signed. We encourage students to anticipate their submissions, so industry mentors will be given ample time to review reports/presentations.

Am I expected to produce work on recess weeks, term breaks, public holidays, or other days than the two days (Mondays and Tuesdays) assigned for MDAIE Studios projects?

Your industry mentors should have been informed that the students are not expected to produce work outside of the SUTD calendar. Students are therefore not expected to produce work on recess weeks, term breaks, public holidays or other days than the two days assigned for MDAIE Studios projects. This was explicitly stated in the letter of undertaking sent to industry mentors by the MDAIE Studios instructor lead.

I noted that my PD course is conflicting with MDAIE Studios.

PD courses have priority, as they are required to graduate and difficult to schedule. In the event of a conflict, we will inform industry mentors and seek their support. We also encourage students to provide flexibility regarding the missed days, offering to work remotely, or catching up for missed days during weekends/recess.

What happens to the MDAIE studios project if I decide to go on long LOA (e.g. 1 full term or 1 year long LOA)?

It is likely that the project will have to be paused or canceled. This will be explored on a case-by-case basis. In the event that the project gets canceled, the student will likely have to retake a new project upon their return. This can be arranged by the instructor lead, jointly with the student.

What happens if I fail a term of MDAIE Studios?

This will be explored on a case-by-case basis. Depending on the severity, the student might be given a warning, or the project might be canceled. In the event that the project gets canceled, the student will likely have to retake a new project and repeat the failed term(s) until three terms of MDAIE Studios are validated. Let us try to avoid that.