Qatar University Thesis Award Rubric

Nominee’s Name: Program:

Thesis/Dissertation Title:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Number of points = 3** | **Number of points = 2** | **Number of points = 1** | **Score** |
| **Originality and Innovation** | * Providing a novel scientific contribution in the field of specialization.
* Proposing innovative ideas or unprecedented solutions to research problems.
* Demonstrating the distinctiveness of the research compared to previous studies.
 | * Partial development within the field of specialization
* Improving and enhancing existing solutions to research problems to make them more effective
* Critiquing and developing aspects of previous studies.
 | * Minor development within the field of specialization
* Slight improvement to existing solutions for current problems
* Weak review and analysis of previous studies, with little to no deviation from them.
 |  |
| **Methodology and Research Methods** | * Clarity of the research plan and methodology
* Use of advanced and appropriate research tools and methodologies
* Accuracy of scientific analysis and rigor of results.
 | * Use of some research tools and methodologies while overlooking others
* Scientific analysis and results require further clarification and refinement.
 | * Failure to use sufficient research tools and methodologies to reach scientific analyses and rigorous results.
 |  |
| **Scientific and Societal Impact** | * Full applicability of the results in academic or industrial fields.
* Contribution of the research to solving scientific or societal issues.
* Publishing one or more research papers from the project in peer-reviewed journals or registering a patent.
 | * Possibility of applying most results in academic or industrial fields.
* Partial contribution of the research to solving scientific or societal issues.
* Possibility of publishing in reputable scientific journals or registering patents.
 | * Difficulty in applying the results in academic or industrial fields.
* The research is theoretical and does not contribute effectively to solving scientific or societal issues.
* Weak or no possibility of publishing in reputable scientific journals or registering patent
 |  |
| **Quality of Writing and Presentation** | * Clarity of language and soundness of style.
* Organization of the project according to academic standards.
* Accuracy of referencing and absence of scientific errors.
 | * Minor language and style errors.
* Academic standards are partially applied in organizing the project.
* A few sources are not cited, and the project contains minor scientific errors.
 | * Significant language errors and weak writing style.
* The project does not follow the academic standards adopted by the university.
* Many sources are not cited, and the project contains numerous scientific errors.
 |  |
| **External Evaluation and Citations** | * Receiving positive evaluations from international reviewers.
* Having citations or references to the research in other works (if any).
 | * Receiving positive evaluations from international reviewers.
* No citations or references to the research in other works (if any).
 | * Receiving some positive evaluations from international reviewers.
* No citations or references to the research in other works (if any).
 |  |
| **Alignment with the University’s Research Priorities** | * Fully Aligned
 | * Partially Aligned
 | * Weakly Aligned
 |  |
| **Researcher’s Commitment to Research Ethics** | * Adherence to ethical standards in data collection and analysis.
* Accurate citation of sources and previous studies.
* Full adherence to obtaining all necessary approvals from research ethics committees.
 | * Adherence to ethical standards in data collection and analysis.
* Some issues with the accurate citation of sources and previous studies.
* Obtaining some of the necessary approvals from research ethics committees.
 | * Failure to adhere to ethical standards in data collection and analysis.
* Weak or no accurate citation of sources and previous studies.
* Failure to obtain all necessary approvals from research ethics committees.
 |  |

Evaluator (signature) Date