



# **Theveli International Conference Award Guideline**

Research Development Office

The Maldives National University

## **Theveli Awards**

Theveli Awards are a key feature of the annual Theveli Research Conference, organized by the Maldives National University, designed to celebrate excellence in research and scholarly contribution. These awards aim to promote original research, elevate the quality of academic output, and position Theveli as the leading international research event in the Maldives. By recognizing exceptional work across different categories, the awards seek to encourage participation from both seasoned scholars and emerging researchers, foster a vibrant research culture, and enhance the visibility of research by Maldivians at a global stage.

Each award category reflects Theveli's commitment to academic rigor, inclusivity, and capacity building, with a clearly defined eligibility criteria and transparent selection processes. The awards are conferred in collaboration with the Maldives National Journal of Research (MNJR), further reinforcing the academic credibility and impact of the conference.

### **1 Theveli Award Categories and Eligibility**

#### **1.1 Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC)**

- ***Eligibility Criteria:***

- ✓ Full papers submitted to MNJR during Theveli.
- ✓ Full papers submitted before the deadline.
- ✓ Papers presented at the Theveli conference.
- ✓ Papers scoring 70% or above.
- ✓ Authors above 35 years of age.

- ***Recognition***

- ✓ The top 5 papers will be awarded and published in the Theveli Special Issue of MNJR.

#### **1.2 Early Career Researcher (ECR)**

- ***Eligibility Criteria:***

- ✓ Full papers submitted to MNJR during Theveli.
- ✓ Full papers submitted before the deadline.
- ✓ Papers presented at the Theveli conference.
- ✓ Papers scoring 70% or above.
- ✓ Authors of age 35 years and below. . (As of January 1<sup>st</sup> of the year of conference).

- ***Recognition:***

- ✓ The top 5 papers will be awarded and published in the Theveli Special Issue of MNJR.

#### **1.3 Undergraduate Research Excellence (URE) Award**

- ***Eligibility Criteria:***

- ✓ Research presented at the Undergraduate Student Research Symposium.
- ✓ Abstracts submitted on CMT before the deadline.
- ✓ Presentations scoring 70% or above.
- ✓ Open only to students enrolled on a MNU Bachelor's Degree programme.
- **Recognition:**
  - ✓ The top 5 presentations will be awarded.

#### 1.4 Best Faculty Award (BFA)

- **Objective:**
  - ✓ Recognize outstanding submissions of undergraduate researchers and faculty mentors.
- **Eligibility: and Evaluation Criteria:**
  - ✓ Students presenting in the Student Research Symposium.
  - ✓ Student presentations scoring 70% or above.
  - ✓ Evaluated based on the number of mentored students who score 70% or above.
- **Recognition:**
  - ✓ One faculty will be recognized as the Best Faculty.

## 2 Award Committee Structure and Responsibilities

### 2.1 Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC) and Early Career Researcher (ECR)

- **Committee Composition:**

The committee will be composed of seven members. They are:

  - ✓ TWO persons selected from paper reviewers.
  - ✓ THREE persons selected from MNU researchers.
  - ✓ TWO persons from the MNJR international editors.
- **Committee Secretariat:**
  - ✓ Publication and Organization Chair
- **Roles and Responsibilities:**
  - ✓ **Reviewers:**
    - Evaluate papers using a standardized rubric (Appendix 1).
    - Provide objective scores and constructive comments.
  - ✓ **Abstract Reviewer:**
    - Perform initial screening to ensure abstracts meet quality and thematic standards.
  - ✓ **Committee Secretariat:**
    - Compile scores, identify top papers, and finalize scoring sheets.
  - ✓ **Theveli Conference Chair:**

- Oversee the awards process to ensure fairness and approve top selections.

## 2.2 Undergraduate Research Excellence (URE) and Best Faculty Award (BFA)

- ***Committee Composition:***

The committee will be composed of five members. They are:

- ✓ Dean of Research (Chair)
- ✓ Dean of Students
- ✓ Postgraduate Research Student Support Department HOD (Committee Secretariat)
- ✓ ONE Dean or Academic Head
- ✓ ONE Student Representative

- ***Roles and Responsibilities:***

- ✓ ***Moderator and Evaluator Selection:***

- Identify and assign moderators and evaluators for each session of the Undergraduate Research Excellence (URE) category.
- Ensure that moderators and evaluators are briefed on their roles and provided with the evaluation criteria prior to the conference.

- ✓ ***Preparation of Evaluation Materials:***

- Print the evaluation sheets for each presenting student in advance.
- Ensure that evaluation sheets are distributed and ready for use in each session.

- ✓ ***Committee Secretariat:***

- Compile scores, identify top papers, and finalize scoring sheets.

- ***Evaluation Process:***

- ✓ ***Multiple Evaluators:***

- Each student presentation will be assessed by two evaluators to ensure balanced and unbiased scoring.

- ✓ ***Scoring System:***

- Evaluators will assign scores to each presentation based on the Research Symposium Evaluation Rubric (Appendix 1).

- ✓ ***Session Management:***

- Ensure moderators collect the evaluation score sheets from evaluators at the end of each session.

- ✓ ***Scoring and Ranking:***

- Calculate the total scores for each presentation.
- Identify and rank the presentations that score 70% or above.

- ✓ ***Approval Process:***

- Ensure all score sheets are signed by the chair of the committee and the Conference Chair for final validation.

✓ ***Final Selection and Reporting:***

- Select the top 5 presentations based on the scores and share with the Dean of Research and the Conference Chair for final validation.
- Share a detailed report of URE awardees including:
  - ***Student name***
  - ***Student number***
  - ***Title of presentation***
  - ***Faculty***
- Select top-ranked faculty and share the detailed of the BFM awardee including the following information.
  - ***Faculty Name***

### **3 Theveli Award Selection Procedure**

#### **3.1 OPC and ECR Selection:**

- ***Receipt of Papers:***
  - ✓ Collect full papers submitted through MNJR. Verify eligibility before forwarding to reviewers.
- ***Assignment of Reviewers:***
  - ✓ Assign each paper to one internal and one external reviewer with expertise in the subject area.
- ***Evaluation:***
  - ✓ Reviewers assess papers using a rubric (Appendix 1).
- ***Compilation and Categorization:***
  - ✓ Compile scores and categorize papers into OPC or ECR.
- ***Selection of Top Papers:***
  - ✓ The top 5 papers in each category with the highest scores are ranked and selected.

#### **3.2 Undergraduate Research Excellence Award Selection**

- ***Receipt of Presentation Submissions:***
  - ✓ Students must submit their presentation details (title, abstract, and supporting materials) by the deadline.
  - ✓ Verify eligibility and adherence to submission guidelines before confirming their slot in the symposium.
- ***Assignment of Evaluators:***
  - ✓ Assign two evaluators with relevant expertise.
- ***Presentation Evaluation:***
  - ✓ Evaluators assess presentations based on the Student Research Symposium Presentation Evaluation Rubric (Appendix 2) during the symposium.
- ***Compilation and Categorization:***
  - ✓ Compile scores from all evaluators for each participant.

- ✓ Categorize participants who score above 70%
- **Ranking and Selection:**
  - ✓ Qualifying presentations (those scoring above 70%) will be ranked based on their total scores.
  - ✓ Select the top 5 ranked presentations as the Undergraduate Research Excellence Awardees.

**3.3 Best Faculty Award Selection** The Best Faculty Mentor Award (BFA) recognizes the best faculty fostering students' research skills and academic growth. The selection process emphasizes faculty level impact and student success during the Student Research Symposium.

- **Eligibility Check:**
  - ✓ Faculties with students selected for the Undergraduate Research Excellence (URE) Award.
- **Ranking and Final Selection**
  - ✓ The best faculty will be selected based on the highest number of presentations scoring 70% or above, attributed to students from that faculty.

## **4 Misconduct and Penalties**

### **4.1 Academic Misconduct:**

- Complaints about plagiarism or ethical misconduct must be submitted in writing to the Awards Committee.
- Proven misconduct will result in disqualification or revocation of awards.

### **4.2 Investigation**

- The Awards Committee will investigate complaints and may request evidence from the complainant.

### **4.3 Penalties:**

- Awards for proven misconduct will be revoked, and the recipient must return any rewards.

### **4.4 Appeals**

- **Right to Appeal:**
  - ✓ Affected authors may appeal decisions in writing to the Appeals Committee, within 48 hours of the award being conferred.
- **Appeals Committee Composition:**
  - ✓ TWO MNU researchers.
  - ✓ ONE member from the MNU Ethics Committee.
  - ✓ ONE member from the MNU Academic Senate.
- **Process:**

- ✓ The Appeals Committee reviews decisions and may seek clarifications from the Awards Committee.
- ✓ The Appeals Committee should inform, in writing, the decision of the appeal within 5 working days to the Awards Committee.
- ✓ The award committee should finalize a decision based on the decision of the Appeals Committee and inform it to the appealing author and also publisize it within 5 days of receving the decision of the appeal committee.

## **5 Exceptions and Review of Guidelines**

- 5.1
- ***Exceptions***
    - ✓ Must be documented and approved by the Dean of Research.
  - ***Review:***
    - ✓ Guidelines should be reviewed annually and updated to reflect changes.
  - ***Approval:***
    - ✓ The Research Dean serves as the final approving authority.

**Appendix 1*****Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC) and Early Career Researcher (ECR)  
Evaluation Rubric***

<b>Category</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Introduction and Research Framing</b>	<b>20</b>	<i>The paper should have a clear and informative title (max 20 words) and a well-structured abstract (250–300 words) that summarizes the aim, significance, methodology, key findings or expected outcomes, and includes keywords. It must provide relevant context, theoretical grounding, and rationale for the study; clearly articulate the research problem and purpose; present research questions or objectives aligned with the problem; and identify a literature gap, explaining the study's academic or practical significance.</i>
<b>Quality of Research Design and Methodology</b>	<b>20</b>	<i>The study must critically engage with relevant scholarly literature, clearly describe and justify the research design, methods, and sampling techniques aligned with the objectives. It should explain data collection procedures and instruments, justify their use, address potential researcher bias, and demonstrate ethical considerations such as informed consent and confidentiality.</i>
<b>Analysis and Argumentation</b>	<b>20</b>	<i>Papers should demonstrate critical thinking through systematic, theory-grounded analysis using relevant data or sources. Arguments must be well-integrated, clearly developed, and logically structured, directly addressing the research questions. Where applicable, hypotheses should be tested and validated or refuted through coherent analysis linked to theoretical perspectives.</i>
<b>Findings, Conclusion, and Contribution</b>	<b>20</b>	<i>Findings should be clearly summarized and well-supported by the analysis. The study must identify its limitations without diminishing its value and offer practical, evidence-based recommendations for future research, practice, or policy.</i>
<b>Writing Quality and Presentation</b>	<b>10</b>	<i>The paper should demonstrate academic tone, clarity, and precision in language, with content that is logically organized and easy to follow. Formatting must be consistent, with appropriate use of headings, paragraph structure, spacing, and font.</i>
<b>Referencing and Presentation of Visuals</b>	<b>10</b>	<i>All citations and references must follow the most recent version of the APA author–date style, using correct punctuation, capitalization, and formatting conventions. Tables and figures, if included, should be properly titled, labeled, numbered, and formatted in accordance with APA guidelines, without vertical lines.</i>
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>100</b>	



## Appendix 2

### *Undergraduate Research Excellence Award Evaluation Rubric*

Criteria		Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Attained Score
Research Component	Research problem/question	Clearly stated, well-defined, and addresses a significant gap in research.	Stated but could be more precise or impactful.	Somewhat vague, lacks depth or clear focus.	Poorly defined, unclear, or missing research problem/questions.	
	Research objective	Objectives are specific, measurable, and aligned with the research problem.	Clearly stated but lacks precision or measurable aspects.	Stated but somewhat unclear or not well-aligned with the problem.	Unclear, vague, or missing research objectives.	
	Method	Clearly describes study design, sample, and procedures with strong justification.	Mostly clear, but missing minor details or justifications.	Methods are mentioned but lack clarity or justification.	Poorly described, inappropriate, or missing methodology details.	
	Result	Results are concisely summarized, well-interpreted, and relevant to objectives.	Results are presented but could be more clearly explained.	Basic mention of results with limited explanation.	Results are unclear, missing, or poorly interpreted.	
	Implication	Effectively connects findings to real-world applications or theoretical contributions.	Some connection to applications but lacks depth.	Limited discussion of study implications.	No clear connection between findings and their applications.	
Presentation and Delivery	Clarity & logical flow	Clear, logical, and easy to follow	Mostly clear and logical	Somewhat unclear	Unclear and hard to follow	
	Visual Aids	High quality, engaging, and supportive	Good quality, supportive	Minimal or basic contribution	Poor quality or missing	
	Delivery & Engagement	Confident, engaging, and professional	Mostly engaging and professional	Somewhat disengaging or nervous	Monotone or lacks confidence	
	Understanding & Mastery of Topic	Demonstrates strong understanding	Good understanding	Basic understanding	Limited understanding	

**END OF DOCUMENT**

*Last Updated: For Theveli 2025*