



Evaluation of Design Project Administrative Processes

A Strategic Framework for Design Institutions

Mr. Shaikh Tajuddin Gulamrasul

Research Scholar, JG University, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

ABSTRACT

Design projects within institutional contexts frequently experience schedule delays, cost escalations, and governance inefficiencies despite the widespread adoption of formal project management methodologies. Existing research predominantly evaluates such failures through post-hoc outcome analysis, focusing on implementation-phase overruns rather than examining the administrative processes that shape project trajectories from the front-end stage. This study critically reviews interdisciplinary literature spanning design methodology, project management, cost estimation, temporal structuring, and contractual governance to identify systemic gaps in the evaluation of design project administration. Through a cross-paper synthesis, the study reveals recurring deficiencies, including the decoupling of formal procedures from practitioner behaviour, the absence of real-time administrative evaluation, limited ecological validity of temporal studies, and inadequate assessment of cognitive heuristics in estimation practices. Building on these findings, the paper argues for the necessity of a strategic evaluation framework that examines administrative “vital signs” throughout the design project lifecycle. The proposed research positions administrative evaluation as a proactive, real-time mechanism capable of improving decision-making, coordination, and process alignment within design institutions, thereby reducing the likelihood of strategic and operational failure.

Keywords: Design project administration; Process evaluation; Design institutions; Project governance; Cost and time management; Strategic framework

1. Introduction

Design institutions routinely manage complex, multi-stakeholder projects that require coordination across creative, administrative, and regulatory domains. While formal project management methodologies (PMMs) are widely adopted, evidence suggests that project performance—particularly with respect to cost and schedule—has not significantly improved over the past two decades. Much of the existing research concentrates on analysing project



outcomes after completion, offering limited insight into the administrative processes that influence decision-making during project execution.

This paper argues that design project failures are not solely the result of technical or creative deficiencies but are deeply rooted in administrative processes governing the front-end and execution phases. By systematically reviewing and synthesising relevant literature, this study establishes the conceptual foundation for evaluating design project administrative processes as a distinct and under-examined research domain.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Design Project Administration and Scope Definition

Studies on project scope and deliverables highlight the importance of clarity in design briefs and work breakdown structures. However, while these studies acknowledge administrative tools, they rarely evaluate how such tools are interpreted, modified, or bypassed in real-time institutional settings. This gap suggests a need to move beyond the presence of administrative mechanisms toward evaluating their actual application.

2.2 Methodological Frameworks and Governance

Research on design methodology and project governance demonstrates that structured methodologies can influence project success. Nevertheless, empirical evidence indicates a persistent decoupling between formal procedures and practitioner behaviour, particularly in decentralised or institutional contexts. Longitudinal evaluation of this decoupling remains largely absent from the literature.

2.3 Temporal Structuring and Project Timeframes

Temporal studies emphasise the role of time-boxing, milestones, and framing effects in creative and design projects. However, many such studies rely on laboratory or educational settings, limiting their ecological validity. The administrative implications of temporal control mechanisms in high-stakes institutional environments remain under-researched.

2.4 Cost Estimation and Front-End Decision-Making

Cost escalation research consistently identifies the front-end phase as the primary source of budget overruns. While technical estimation models are well developed, existing literature inadequately addresses the cognitive heuristics and subjective



judgment applied by practitioners during early administrative decision-making, creating a disconnect between formal models and actual practice.

2.5 Contractual Terms, Conditions, and Administrative Transparency

Studies on contract design and terms and conditions highlight increasing complexity in administrative documentation. However, limited attention is given to how linguistic complexity, socio-cultural context, and accessibility affect informed consent and administrative transparency within design institutions.

3. Cross-Paper Synthesis of Research Gaps

The literature reveals several recurring unresolved issues:

- **Cognitive Subjectivity:** Absence of real-time evaluation of judgment and heuristic use in estimation and scheduling.
- **Process–Behaviour Decoupling:** Persistent divergence between formal PMMs and actual administrative practice.
- **Front-End Strategic Deficit:** Insufficient evaluation of administrative decisions made before formal project approval.
- **Ecological Validity Limitations:** Overreliance on artificial or educational research settings.
- **Fragmented Systemic Assessment:** Separation between activity-focused and outcome-focused evaluations.

These gaps collectively indicate a lack of comprehensive administrative process evaluation within design project research.

4. Conceptual Framework and Research Direction

This study adopts a conceptual analogy in which existing research functions as a post-hoc diagnostic tool, comparable to an autopsy report. In contrast, the proposed research advances a real-time evaluative perspective, akin to continuous physiological monitoring during execution. By identifying and monitoring administrative “vital signs”—such as coordination mechanisms, approval workflows, decision hierarchies, and procedural compliance—the proposed framework enables timely interventions and corrective actions.



5. Implications for Design Institutions

Evaluating design project administrative processes has significant implications for institutional governance. By shifting focus from outcomes to ongoing administrative dynamics, institutions can enhance transparency, reduce optimism bias, and improve strategic alignment between design intent and organisational objectives.

6. Conclusion

The reviewed literature establishes a strong conceptual basis for investigating design project administration while simultaneously revealing critical gaps in process-level evaluation. This paper argues that without systematic evaluation of administrative processes, design institutions remain vulnerable to recurring inefficiencies and strategic failure. The proposed research responds to this deficiency by advancing the development of a strategic evaluation framework tailored to design project administration.

References:

1. Project Management for New Product Development Jamal Moustafaev, MBA, PMP 2008 Pons, D. (2008). Project Management for New Product Development. Project Management Journal, 39(2), 82-97. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20052>
2. Integrated Product and Process Design and Development Edward B. Magrab, Satyandra K. Gupta, F. Patrick McCluskey, Peter Sandborn 2009 Magrab, E.B., Gupta, S.K., McCluskey, F.P., & Sandborn, P. (2009). Integrated Product and Process Design and Development: The Product Realization Process, Second Edition (2nd ed.). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420070613>
3. Project Scope Management Asadullah Khan 2006 Cost Engineering Vol. 48/No. 6 JUNE 2006
4. When good Projects go Bad Nancee James 2006 QAI 3rd Quarter Journal
5. Project Portfolio Management Theory and Practice Jamal Moustafaev, MBA, PMP 2017 "Moustafaev, Jamal, 1973- author.CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group
6. International Standard Book Number-13: 978-1-4987-6924-2 (Hardback)"
7. 45 Years with design methodology Mogens Myrup Andreasen 2011 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09544828.2010.538040>



8. Design Methodology M. Myrup Andreasen 2007,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09544829108901689>
9. The COMBREX Project: Design, Methodology, and Initial Results Brian P. Anton
2013 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1001638>
10. Design Methodology in Practice LARS HEIN 2007
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09544829408907880>
11. Relationships between a project management methodology and project success in
different project governance contexts Robert Joslin a,1, Ralf Müller b 2015
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2015.03.005>
12. It's Only Temporary: Time Frame and the Dynamics of Creative Project Teams
"René M. Bakker, Smaranda Boros,1 Patrick Kenis2 and Leon A.G.
Oerlemans3" 2013 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2012.00810.x>
13. Project time boxing and milestones as drivers for open design projects Christian
TOLLESTRUP 2015 https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.502open_in_new
14. Looking Back versus Looking Ahead: Framing of Time and Work at Different Stages
of a Project KARL HALVOR TEIGEN* and KNUT IVAR KAREVOLD
2005 Journal of Behavioral Decision Making J. Behav. Dec. Making, 18: 229–
246 (2005) Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com).
DOI: 10.1002/bdm.502
15. The effects of the framing of time on delay discounting William Brady DeHart,
Amy L. Odum 2015 https://doi.org/10.1002/jeab.125open_in_new
16. Schedule delays of major projects: what should we do about it? Jung Eun Park
2021 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2021.1915897>
17. Cost escalations in the front-end of projects – empirical evidence from Norwegian road
projects Morten Welde 2016 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2016.1278285>
18. What Causes Cost Overrun in Transport Infrastructure Projects? BENT
FLYVBJERG, METTE K. SKAMRIS HOLM & SØREN L. BUHL 2011
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0144164032000080494a>
19. Analysis of factors influencing project cost estimating practice Akintola Akintoye
2010 <https://doi.org/10.1080/014461900370979>



20. Quantitative and qualitative cost estimating for engineering design Rajkumar Roy, Sara Kelvesjo, Sara Forsberg & Chris Rush 2010
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09544820110038997>
21. Product Costing and Pricing Rajiv D. Banker and John S. Hughes 1994
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/248235>
22. Contract Design Process as a Learning Path to Proactive and Sustainable Contracting Hannele Korhonen Nina Toivonen 2025 International Journal of Commerce and Contracting 2025, Vol. 9(3-4) 178–197 © The Author(s) 2025 - sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/29768829251397972 journals.sagepub.com/home/jsc
23. Risk Management in the Conceptual Design Phase of Building Projects JOANNA GORAL 2007 Master's Thesis 2007:124
24. Consent for all: revealing the hidden complexity of terms and conditions EWA A Luger 2013 <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2470654.2481371>
25. Project monitoring and evaluation: a method for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation Paul Crawford, Paul Bryce 2001
International Journal of Project Management 21 (2003) 363–373
26. Analysis of design projects "Petra Badke-Schaub," 1999 "Design Studies Vol 20 No 5 September 1999"