



Theveli International Conference Award Guideline 2026

Research Development Office
The Maldives National University

Theveli International Conference Awards

Theveli International Conference Awards are a key feature of the annual Theveli International Conference, organized by The Maldives National University, designed to celebrate excellence in research and scholarly contributions. These awards aim to promote original research, elevate the quality of academic output, and position Theveli International Conference 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 International Conference'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 International Conference Award Categories and Eligibility

1.1 Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC) Award

- **Eligibility Criteria:**
 - ✓ Full papers submitted to the Theveli International Conference by the given deadline.
 - ✓ Similarity Index should be 25% or below.
 - ✓ AI-generated content should be 25% or below.
 - ✓ Papers must be presented at the Theveli International Conference.
 - ✓ Papers must achieve a score of 70% or above.
 - ✓ Authors must be 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) Award

- **Eligibility Criteria:**
 - ✓ Full papers submitted to the Theveli International Conference by the given deadline.
 - ✓ Similarity Index should be 25% or below.
 - ✓ AI-generated content should be 25% or below.
 - ✓ Papers must be presented at the Theveli International Conference.
 - ✓ Papers must achieve a score of 70% or above.
 - ✓ Primary author and co-authors must be 35 years of age or below (as of January 1st of the conference year).
 - **Exception:** For the Early Career Researcher (ECR) Award, the primary author must be below 35 years of age. Co-authors or supervisors above 35 years (if applicable)

will be included in the published article; however, they will not be considered for acknowledgment under the ECR award category.

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 by the deadline.
- ✓ Abstracts must be accepted for presentation at the Undergraduate Student Research Symposium.
- ✓ Presentations scoring 70% or above.
- ✓ Open only to students enrolled in an 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 at the Student Research Symposium.
- ✓ Student presentations scoring 70% or above.
- ✓ Evaluation will be based on the number of presentations from each faculty that score 70% or above.

• **Recognition:**

- ✓ One faculty will be recognized as the Best Faculty.

1.5 By submitting a full paper to Theveli International Conference, the author(s) acknowledge and agree that, once the review process has commenced, the paper cannot be withdrawn or retracted.

2 Verification of Author Eligibility for ECR and OPC Categories

2.1 After the review process and categorization of a paper under the Early Career Researcher (ECR) or Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC), the ages of all authors and co-authors will be verified to ensure alignment with the eligibility criteria.

- Authors and co-authors will be requested to submit a copy of their National ID or Passport for age verification.
- This ensures that the categorization reflects both the eligibility of the authors and the integrity of the award process.

3 Award Committee Structure and Responsibilities

3.1 Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC) Award and Early Career Researcher (ECR) Award

- **Committee Composition:**

The committee will be composed of seven members as follows:

- ✓ TWO paper reviewers.
- ✓ THREE MNU researchers.
- ✓ TWO persons from MNJR international editors.

- **Committee Secretariat:**

- ✓ Program and Publication Committee Chair.

- **Roles and Responsibilities:**

- ✓ **Reviewers:**

- Evaluate papers using a standardized rubric (Appendix A).
- 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 International Conference Chair:**

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

3.2 Undergraduate Research Excellence (URE) Award 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 B).
 - ✓ **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 the 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 the 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 details of the BFM awardee, including the following information.
 - **Faculty Name**

4 Theveli International Conference Award Selection Procedure

4.1 OPC and ECR Selection:

- **Receipt of Papers:**
 - ✓ Collect full papers submitted through MNJR, and 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 A).
- **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.

4.2 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 B) 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.

4.3 Best Faculty Award Selection

The Best Faculty Mentor Award (BFA) recognizes the best faculty, which fosters the 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.

5 Misconduct and Penalties

5.1 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.

5.2 Investigation

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

5.3 Penalties:

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

5.4 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 publish it within 5 days of receiving the decision of the appeal committee.

Appendix A

Outstanding Paper of the Conference (OPC) Award and Early Career Researcher (ECR) Award Evaluation Rubric

Category	Weight	Description
Introduction and Research Framing	20	<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>
Quality of Research Design and Methodology	20	<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>
Analysis and Argumentation	20	<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>
Findings, Conclusion, and Contribution	20	<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>
Writing Quality and Presentation	10	<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>
Referencing and Presentation of Visuals	10	<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>
Total Marks	100	

Appendix B

Undergraduate Research Excellence Award Evaluation Rubric

Criteria		Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Fair (3)	Needs Improvement (1-2)	Attained Score
Research Component	Introduction and Background	Provides a comprehensive, clear, and well-contextualized introduction.	Clear introduction with adequate context, minor details missing.	Introduction is somewhat vague or lacks sufficient context.	Introduction is unclear, incomplete, or missing.	
	Problem and Objectives / Questions	Clearly stated, well-defined, and aligned with research purpose.	Stated but could be more precise or better aligned.	Somewhat unclear or partially aligned.	Unclear, vague, or missing.	
	Significance	Demonstrates strong importance and relevance of the research to the field or real-world applications.	Shows some relevance and importance; minor gaps in explanation.	Limited explanation of significance or relevance.	No clear significance or relevance provided.	
	Method	Clearly describes study design, sample, and procedures with strong justification.	Mostly clear, minor details or justifications missing.	Methods mentioned but lack clarity or justification.	Poorly described, inappropriate, or missing methodology.	
	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 interpretation.	Results unclear, missing, or poorly interpreted.	
	Implication	Effectively connects findings to theoretical contributions or practical applications.	Some connection to implications; lacks depth.	Limited discussion of implications.	No clear connection between findings and their implications.	
Presentation and Delivery	Clarity & Logical Flow	Presentation is clear, logical, and easy to follow.	Mostly clear and logical.	Somewhat unclear or disorganized.	Unclear, hard to follow, or disorganized.	
	Visual Aids	High quality, engaging, and supportive of presentation.	Good quality, supportive, minor improvements possible.	Minimal or basic contribution.	Poor quality, missing, or distracting.	
	Delivery, Understanding & Engagement	Confident, engaging, demonstrates strong understanding of the topic, and responds effectively to questions.	Mostly engaging, shows good understanding, responds adequately to questions.	Somewhat disengaging, basic understanding, responds partially to questions.	Monotone, lacks confidence, limited understanding, or unable to respond to questions.	

END OF DOCUMENT

Last Updated: For Theveli International Conference 2026