

GUIDANCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF A RESEARCH WORK

The term “research work” refers to: research work, creative work, intervention work or action research or any artistic, media or literary work, as the case may be.

This form must be completed and returned by the examiner along with his or her detailed critical comments to the following office:

- **If it is a doctoral thesis:** to the *Décanat* within a period not to exceed two months after receipt of the research work;
- **If it is a master thesis, an essay, a report or any other end-of-studies activity:** to the departmental offices of the program of studies within a period not to exceed one month after receipt of the research work.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Given the level of studies and the type of research work submitted, the examiner shall submit a grade taking the following evaluation criteria into account.

Content: Originality of the work (innovation in the subject matter, the approach or the methodology; contribution to the discipline or the field of study; and, if appropriate, the work’s interest to the field in question); appropriate and critical understanding of the theoretical and practical context of the research work; mastery of an appropriate and rigorous methodology in both the collection and treatment of the data; subtlety and rigour demonstrated in the interpretation of the results and their importance, coherent and rigorous arguments; quality of the summary; clear and precise writing; demonstration of having achieved an appropriate level of intellectual independence.

Form: Appropriate organization of the text, presented in a logical and well-integrated progression of its components (introduction, chapters, transition texts, titles, subtitles, tables, figures, illustrations, appendices, etc.); good style (grammar, spelling, syntax, careful treatment of citations and references, etc.); impeccable presentation that meets the relevant standards (cover, paper or electronic copy, word processing template, etc.). If need be, proper resolution of problems related to the production and presentation of the work.

RECOMMENDATION*

The examiner must make one of the following recommendations: accept the work (with or without minor corrections) **or** return the work to the student for major corrections **or** reject the work.

All corrections requested by the jury are done under the supervision of the Research Direction (or its academic equivalent). If major corrections are requested, the new text will be resubmitted to all the examiners. If minor corrections are requested, only the Research Direction will authorize resubmission of the requested text, without its reconsideration by members of the jury. **In the case of a doctoral thesis**, an examiner may, **by exception**, ask that the minor corrections be resubmitted to him or her for approval before the thesis defence. **In such a case, the examiner makes a de facto commitment that he or she will be quickly and easily accessible to reread the student’s revised text as soon as such corrections are completed.**

GRADING*

When the examiner makes a recommendation that the work be accepted, this recommendation must be accompanied by a grade (Excellent, Very Good, Good) given on the basis of the above evaluation criteria (content, form). **In the case of a doctoral thesis**, this grade is simply indicative, as the definitive grade is bestowed only after the thesis defence. Any research work that receives a recommendation of “Reject” is automatically accompanied by a grade of “Fail”.

COMMENTS

The examiner must attach to this form a detailed critical report of the work. A separate list of errors requiring correction may also be included. If the examiner decides that the work must be rejected, he or she must explain the reasons behind this decision.

Although generally speaking it is impossible to modify or retouch an artistic, media or literary work, the examiner is nevertheless required to provide a critical report of the accompanied theoretical text of the student work.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Evaluations remain confidential. This rule applies to any contact between the examiners as well as between the examiner and the student. It is prohibited for the student to contact any member of the jury.

Subject to the Quebec “*Act Respecting Access to Documents Held by Public Bodies and the Protection of Personal Information*”, only the comments of jury members are sent to the student, with no indication of who wrote them. However, the evaluations indicating the identity of each examiner may be consulted by the student once the final grade has been recorded by the Registrar. **In the case of a doctoral thesis**, the grade is only recorded after the thesis defence. Students wishing to take cognizance of their evaluations must submit a written request to the Registrar.

Property of the research work and its return after evaluation

Student research work sent for evaluation remains the property of the Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM). Subject to the last paragraph below, each examiner shall return the work at the same time as they submit his or her written evaluation. The external examiner should return the document by registered mail and by air mail, as the case may be.

In the case of a doctoral thesis, each examiner shall hold on to the work and bring it with them to the thesis defence. If the thesis defence does not take place, the work must be returned as quickly as possible to the *Décanat*.

* A request for corrections before oral defense, with or without approval, requires the student to submit a new version of the thesis, which will be sent to all members of the jury.

- First version
 Revised version: following minor corrections
 following major corrections

Please print

Examiner's name: _____

Student's name: _____

UQAM Permanent Code: _____ Academic Program: _____

TYPE OF RESEARCH

- Doctorate with Thesis Essay Master with Thesis Report on _____
 Activity of synthesis Other end-of-studies activity (please specify): _____

TITLE OF RESEARCH WORK:

Supervisor's name: _____

Co-supervisor's name: _____

RECOMMENDATION AND GRADE

(Examiner shall provide his or her assessment following the criteria presented on the first page.)

I recommend that the above-mentioned research work be:

- Accepted Without corrections with the following grade: } Excellent Good
 On the condition that minor corrections are made with the following grade: } Very good

- In the case of a doctoral thesis:** I am asking that these corrections be made after the thesis defence.
 I am asking that these corrections be made before the thesis defence (a new version of the thesis will be submitted for information).
 I am asking that these corrections be made before the thesis defence and submitted to me for approval (a new version of the thesis will be submitted for approbation).

- Returned to the student so that he or she can make major corrections.
 Rejected without the right to repeat, with a grade of Fail.
 Rejected without the right to repeat because of an academic infraction (**see other side**).

Summary of comments (please attach a detailed critical report)

SIGNATURE

Examiner's signature

Date

ACADEMIC INFRACTION

The University has passed regulations for the purposes of disciplining any act of plagiarism, fraud, falsification of documents or any other academic infraction. The following excerpts from Regulation No. 8 and Regulation No. 18 provide examiners with basic information from the regulations.

Examiners must report any student who commits anyone of the infractions listed below. As required, the examiner must:

- Check the appropriate box on this form if it is an infraction that, to the examiner's judgment, merits immediate rejection of the work and a grade of Fail;
- Contact the Program Director if the infraction does not merit immediate rejection of the work (and a grade of Fail), but still requires that appropriate corrections be made.

Excerpt from the Graduate Studies Regulation No. 8

www.instances.uqam.ca/ReglementsPolitiquesDocuments/Documents/REGLEMENT_NO_8.pdf

If, in evaluating a [report, dissertation, thesis], a member of the jury notices an academic infraction, he or she must suspend the evaluation and notify the program director by submitting a notice with supporting documents. The program director shall submit the whole to the Dean of the Faculty concerned, in accordance with Article 5.1.1 of Regulation 18 on academic infractions. Subsequently, the provisions thereof shall apply. Depending on the case: art. 6.6.5 or 7.3.2.1.4. or 8.3.2.1.4.

Excerpt from the Academic Infractions Regulation No. 18

www.instances.uqam.ca/ReglementsPolitiquesDocuments/Documents/REGLEMENT_NO_18.pdf

• 2.1 Infraction

Any act of plagiarism, fraud, copying, cheating, falsification of a document, or creation of a false document committed by a candidate or a student, as well as any participation in or attempt to commit such an act, during an examination, in a work or during an internship that is subject to evaluation, or under any other circumstances, constitutes an infraction under this regulation.

• 2.2 List of infractions, without limitation

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, constitutes an infraction namely the performance of or the attempt to perform any of the following acts, or any participation therein:

- a) the substitution of persons or impersonation;*
- b) plagiarism: using the work of another person, in full or in part, and representing it as one's own or omitting any acknowledgment or reference;*
- c) self-plagiarism: the submission for evaluation of any work that, in essence, has already been submitted for academic evaluation at this University or another educational institution, except with the prior agreement of the teacher;*
- d) the possession or procurement by theft, deception or corruption of examination questions or answers;*
- e) the possession or use of any document or material without prior authorization during an examination or during the execution of a work, including the use of computer tools or technological means;*
- f) the use during an examination of a copy of the examination or any other material obtained from another person;*
- g) obtaining any unauthorized assistance, whether collective or individual;*
- h) the procurement of an unmerited evaluation, notably by corruption, blackmail, intimidation or any form of harassment or the attempt to procure such an evaluation;*
- i) the falsification of a document or the creation of a false document, notably a document sent to the University or a University document, whether or not it is transmitted to a third party, whatever the circumstances;*
- j) the falsification of research data in a work, including a thesis, a dissertation, a creative dissertation, an internship report or a research report.*