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