ADPU 6896 – SEMINARIO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

GUIDE FOR THE PREPARATION AND EVALUATION OF THE FINAL WORK

I.   **Description**

The course **ADPU 6896** *Seminario de Investigación* **(Research Seminar)** is designed to provide students with a research experience that covers the planning, design, execution, and writing phases of a monograph. Throughout the course, students will put into practice the theory, methods, and specialized knowledge learned throughout the program. Students may expand on research conducted for other courses. In such cases, the student will present and discuss the previous work with their instructor, and they will agree on the direction of the new research phase. However, papers submitted for other courses cannot be used to meet the requirements of this course.

II.   **Objectives**

The student will demonstrate their ability to:
1. Apply the concepts, theories, and values of public administration to the research problem developed.
2. Formulate alternative explanations to the research problem through the integration of ideas and knowledge.
3. Formulate public policy proposals whose feasibility arises from the discussion of previous ideas in the paper.
4. Locate, evaluate, and use the information necessary to rigorously and correctly develop the work and document it in the corresponding sections of references and notes.
5. Communicate their ideas orally and in writing clearly and correctly.
6. Analyze, synthesize, and think critically through the development and argumentation of their written work.

III.   **Connection with Universal Competencies and Institutional Learning Competencies**

24

The criteria established for the assessment of the research work are closely linked to the universal competencies of the accrediting body, NASPAA, as well as the institutional learning competencies of the Río Piedras Campus.

The connection is as follows:

TABLA 1. Relación entre las competencias universales (NASPAA), las competencias institucionales (UPR) y las competencias del Seminario de Investigación

NASPAA ➡ UPR ⬇	(1) To lead and manage in the public interest	(2) To engage in and contribute to public policy processes	((3) To analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make evidence-based decisions in a complex and dynamic environment	(4) To communicate and interact productively and culturally responsively with a diverse and evolving workforce and society at large	(5) To articulate, apply, and promote a public service perspective
Discipline Content (Technology Integration; Teamwork): Integrate theories, practical protocols, and ethical codes into your professional or research work by incorporating technology and engaging in collaborative actions through multi and interdisciplinary teamwork.			X		X

Information Competence: Manage information critically, effectively, and ethically			X	X	X
Research and Creation: Conduct research or projects with the aim of creating, providing solutions, or generating knowledge			X	X	X

NASPAA ➡ UPR ⬇	(1) To lead and manage in the public interest	(2) To engage in and contribute to public policy processes	((3) To analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make evidence-based decisions in a complex and dynamic environment	(4) To communicate and interact productively and culturally responsively with a diverse and evolving workforce and society at large	(5) To articulate, apply, and promote a public service perspective
Critical Thinking (Continuous Learning): Critically evaluate knowledge from a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches. Exercise independent judgment, demonstrate creativity and initiative, and engage in autonomous and continuous learning.		X	X		
Social Responsibility (Ethical Sensitivity; Leadership): Demonstrate commitment to the protection and enrichment of natural and cultural heritages, as well as respect for human rights through social inclusion actions and a commitment to diversity. While fostering leadership that contributes to individual		X	X		X

and collective transformations.					
Effective Communication: Effectively communicate knowledge from your field or discipline of study.		X	X	X	X

ADPU 6896 – *Seminario de Investigación*

GUIDE FOR THE PREPARATION AND EVALUATION OF THE FINAL PROJECT

I.   Description

The **ADPU 6896** *Seminario de Investigación (*Research Seminar) course is designed to provide students with a research experience that covers the phases of planning, design, execution, and report writing of a monograph. Throughout the course, students will put into practice the theory, methods, and specialized knowledge learned throughout the program. Students have the option to expand on research work carried out in other courses. In such cases, students will present and discuss their previous work with their professor and agree on the direction of the new research phase. However, previous coursework cannot be used to meet the requirements of this course.

II.   **Objectives**
        The student will demonstrate the ability to:
        1. Apply the concepts, theories, and values of public administration to the research problem developed.
        2. Formulate alternative explanations to the research problem through the integration of ideas and knowledge.
        3. Formulate public policy proposals whose feasibility arises from the discussion of previous ideas in the paper.
        4. Locate, evaluate, and use the necessary information to rigorously and accurately develop the work, documenting it in the relevant sections for references and notes.
        5. Communicate orally and in writing their ideas clearly and correctly.
        6. Analyze, synthesize, and think critically through the development and argumentation of their written work.

III.   **Link to Universal Competencies and Institutional Learning Competencies**

The criteria established for the evaluation of the research work are closely related to the universal competencies of the accrediting body NASPAA, as well as the institutional learning competencies of the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus.
The link is as follows:

TABLE 1. Relationship between Universal Competencies (NASPAA), Institutional Competencies (UPR), and Research Seminar Competencies.

NASPAA ➡ UPR ⬇	(2) Participate in and contribute to public policy processes;	(3) Analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions	(4) Communicate and interact productively with a diverse and evolving citizenry and workforce	(5) Public service perspective and program values
Discipline Content: The set of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are expected for the student to acquire through their experience in a specialized academic program.		X		X
Information Competencies: A set of skills that individuals require to recognize when information is needed and have the ability to effectively locate, evaluate, and use the necessary information, whether for qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method research on a scientific problem or social issue; the ability to create, develop, and		X	X	X

present a work of art or literature.				

NASPAA ➡ UPR ⬇	(2) Participate in and contribute to public policy processes;	(3) Analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions	(4) Communicate and interact productively with a diverse and evolving citizenry and workforce	(5) Public service perspective and program values
Critical Thinking: A thinking skill that allows the student to analyze and interpret the object of study through holistic judgments or constructive criticisms that enable the examination of different perspectives rigorously, with the purpose of developing their own criteria.	X	X		
Social Responsibility: The ability to apply knowledge and skills acquired through university experience to develop abilities and attitudes that promote ethical behavior and civic responsibility for the well-being and progress of society.	X	X	X	X

NASPAA ➡ UPR ⬇	(2) Participate in and contribute to public policy processes;	(3) Analyze, synthesize, think critically, solve problems, and make decisions	(4) Communicate and interact productively with a diverse and evolving citizenry and workforce	(5) Public service perspective and program values
Effective Communication: The ability to express oneself effectively, both orally and in writing, in order to achieve clear, coherent, and accurate communication.	X	X	X	X
Knowledge Integration: The ability to use the knowledge acquired through curricular and co-curricular experiences to make connections between ideas, topics, and experiences with the purpose of applying it in new contexts or expanding one's learning from them.	X	X	X	X

II. RUBRIC FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE MONOGRAPH OR RESEARCH ARTICLE

The rubric for evaluating the Seminar's product establishes the criteria that the work must meet, the elements that must be present, and the quality levels for each criterion.

The rubric is divided into two parts: a) the criteria for form, and b) the criteria for content. The form criteria are related to the visual quality of the document and compliance with the requirements of a monograph or article. In total, this section accounts for 40% of the final score. The content requirements refer to the quality of the research and are assigned 60% of the final score.

The final grade will be awarded based on the following scale:

- Passed with Outstanding (PS) – 90 to 100

- Passed with Good (PB) – 80 to 89

- Incomplete (INP) – 75 to 79 (has one semester to remove it without enrolling)

- Not Passed (NP) - 74 or less (can enroll in the course once more)

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory
Criteria for Format (40%)					
a. Abstract (4 pts.)	Paragraph that provides a general idea of the work in 150 - 200 words. Identification of relevant keywords.	Provides a general idea of the work without exceeding the word limit. Identifies at least four keywords (4)	Provides a general idea of the work but exceeds the word limit. Identifies at least three keywords (3-2)	Provides a partial idea of the scope of the work. (1)	Incomplete or inaccurate abstract. (0)

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory
b. Purpose (6 pts.)	A compelling and thought-provoking sentence that concisely states the research's purpose. It is grounded in the central argument or the main research question.	Clearly and concisely establishes the purpose of the work in a single sentence, which is interesting and thought-provoking. (6)	States the purpose of the work clearly in one sentence. (5-4)	States the purpose of the work clearly but it's either too long or too brief. (3-2)	The purpose is unclear. (1)
c. Introduction (8 pts.)	Between two and three initial paragraphs that contain the topic and the central idea of the work and announce its structure.	Contains between two and three initial paragraphs that introduce the topic and the central idea of the work in an interesting manner. Includes a preview of the structure that the work follows. (8)	Contains several paragraphs introducing the topic and the central idea of the work. Includes a preview of the structure that follows the work. (7-5)	Introduces the topic and the central idea of the work. (4-2)	There is no clear introduction to the topic or central idea of the work. (1)
d. Spelling and Grammar (8 pts.)	Correct use of grammar and spelling rules.	The final work contains no grammatical or spelling errors. (8)	The final work contains a minimum of grammatical or spelling errors. (7-5)	The final work contains more than 10 grammatical or spelling errors. (4-3)	The final work contains more than 20 grammatical or spelling errors. (2-1)

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory
e. Reference Sources (Information Literacy) (8 pts.)	Contains an appropriate number of recent information sources (at least 75%), of which at least half are peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. Uses sources of both general and specialized knowledge. The internet sites cited in the references have the rigor required for an academic work.	It contains at least 8 recent sources of information, of which at least 4 are peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It uses some sources of general knowledge (encyclopedias, dictionaries, introductory books on public administration or public policy) and specialized knowledge (books and articles on the central theme of the work). The internet sites cited in the references meet the necessary rigor. (8-7)	It contains at least 6 recent sources of information, of which at least 3 are peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It uses sources of general knowledge (encyclopedias, dictionaries, introductory books on public administration or public policy) and specialized knowledge (books and articles on the central theme of the work). The internet sites cited in the references meet the necessary rigor. (6-4)	It contains at least 6 recent sources of information, although most of them are not peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It uses sources of general knowledge (encyclopedias, dictionaries, introductory books on public administration or public policy) and specialized knowledge (books and articles on the central theme of the work). The internet sites cited in the references meet the necessary rigor. (3)	The quality and quantity of information sources are inadequate. (2-1)

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory
f. Attributions (6 pts.)	All data and information obtained from other sources are correctly cited, both in the text and in the references section. APA 6th Ed format is used.	All ideas from other authors are properly referenced in the text and in the references section. Uses APA 6th Ed format. (6)	Data and information from other sources are referenced in the text and in the references. (5-4)	Some data, ideas, and information are not referenced in the text or in the references section. (3-1)	Incorporates ideas and data from other authors and does not attribute them to their authors. (0)
Criterios de contenido (60%)					
Depth of Discussion (Critical Thinking) (20 pts)	The discussion of ideas is elaborated clearly and organized, starting from the central idea and breaking down into two or three main elements, supported by research evidence or existing knowledge.	The central idea or thesis of the study is clearly identified; the main elements that shape or form the central idea are stated, defined, and discussed. The discussion is documented by academic research evidence on the topic. (20-16)	The central idea is identified, and some of its main elements are discussed. The discussion contains evidence from academic research. (15-10)	The central idea is not clearly expressed. The main elements that shape the central idea are not adequately discussed. (9-5)	No central idea is expressed. Some elements that could suggest a central idea are included, but it is not established clearly. (4-1)

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory
Cohesion (Knowledge Integration) (10 pts.)	Integrates information from various sources. Ideas flow from one element to another without the need for headings. Understanding of the relationship between the various materials used is evident.	Integrates ideas from various reference sources smoothly, providing cohesion to the discussion and demonstrating mastery of the topics. 10-8)	Presents information from various sources. However, in the discussion, each one remains isolated from the others. (7-5)	Relies on very few sources to discuss a topic. (4-2)	Ideas are not developed in an integrated manner. They are discussed as bibliographic entries. (1)
Public Service Perspective (15 pts.)	In the work, the research problem is discussed from a public administration perspective. a) Incorporates program values (diversity, equity, accountability, ethics, or merit - at least three values) clearly and coherently with the research problem. b) Identifies the public policies that address the research problem locally and internationally.	The work addresses a public administration issue. At least three program values are appropriately and pertinently discussed. The current public policy on the problem under study is clearly identified. (15-13)	The work addresses a public administration issue. At least two program values are appropriately and pertinently discussed. The current public policy on the problem under study is identified. (12-8)	The work addresses a public administration issue. At least one of the program's values is discussed in a general and superficial manner. The current public policy on the problem under study is identified. (7-3)	The work does not demonstrate a public administration perspective or program values. (2-0)

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory
Conclusions (15 pts.)	It is a summary of the body of work in one or two paragraphs. It restates the central idea and summarizes the most important aspects. It discusses the implications for government, society, or some sector of society.	Summarizes the body of work in one or two paragraphs. Restates the central idea and summarizes the most important aspects. Briefly discusses the implications of the research problem for various stakeholders. 15-13)	Summarizes the work in one or two paragraphs. Elaborates on some implications of the problem for various stakeholders. (12-8)	Includes information that has not been presented before or concludes with proposals that do not derive from the previous discussion. (7-3)	Does not outline clear conclusions or does not contain a conclusions section. (2-0)

UNIVERSIDAD DE PUERTO RICO
RECINTO DE RÍO PIEDRAS
FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES
ESCUELA GRADUADA DE ADMINISTRACIÓN PÚBLICA
ROBERTO SÁNCHEZ VILELLA

RUBRIC FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH MONOGRAPH OR ARTICLE

ADPU 6896 – SEMINARIO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

NAME: _____ **DATE:** _____

The rubric for evaluating the product of the seminar establishes the criteria that the work must meet, the elements that should be present, and the quality levels for each criterion. The rubric is divided into two parts: a) the criteria for format, and b) the criteria for content. The format criteria are related to the visual quality of the document and compliance with the requirements specific to a monograph or article. In total, this section carries a 30% weight in the final score.

The content requirements pertain to the quality of the research and account for 70% of the final score.

The final grade will be assigned based on the following scale:

Outstanding Pass (PS) – 90 to 100
Good Pass (PB) – 80 to 89
Incomplete (INP) – 75 to 79 (a semester is allowed for removal without re-enrollment)
Not Passed (NP) - 74 or less (can enroll in the course again).

Criterion	Description	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Score
Formatting Criteria (30%)						
a.Summary (4 pts.)	A paragraph that provides a general idea of the work in 150-200 words. Identification of relevant keywords.	Provides a general idea of the work without exceeding the established word limit. Identifies at least four keywords. (4)	Provides a general idea of the work but exceeds the established word limit. Identifies at least 3 keywords. (3-2)	Provides a partial idea of the scope of the work. (1)	Incomplete or inaccurate summary. (0)	
b. Introduction (10 pts.)	Between two and three opening paragraphs that provide the background of the problem, the central idea of the work, and announce its structure. It should include an engaging and thought-provoking sentence that succinctly states the research purpose. Grounded in the central argument or primary research question.	It includes two to three opening paragraphs that introduce the problem's background, the central idea of the work, and the purpose in a clear and concise manner. It provides a preview of the structure that the work follows. (10-8)	It contains several paragraphs introducing the problem's background, the central idea of the work, and the purpose clearly. It includes a preview of the structure the work follows. (7-5)	Introduces the problem's background and the central idea of the work, but the purpose is ambiguous or not included. (4-2)	Does not provide a clear introduction about the problem, the central idea of the work, or the purpose. (1-0)	

c. Reference Sources (Information Literacy) (6 pts.)	Contains at least 75% recent information sources (5 years or less), with at least half being peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It utilizes sources from both general and specialized knowledge. The websites cited in the references meet the scholarly rigor for an academic work.	75% of the references are recent, with 50% of these being peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It uses some sources of both general knowledge (encyclopedias, dictionaries, introductory books on public administration or public policy) and specialized knowledge (books and articles on the central theme of the work). The websites cited in the references meet the necessary rigor. (6)	50% of the references are recent, with 50% of these being peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It uses sources of both general knowledge (encyclopedias, dictionaries, introductory books on public administration or public policy) and specialized knowledge (books and articles on the central theme of the work). The websites cited in the references meet the necessary rigor. (5-4)	75% of the references are recent, although most of them are not peer-reviewed journal articles or academic books. It uses sources of both general knowledge (encyclopedias, dictionaries, introductory books on public administration or public policy) and specialized knowledge (books and articles on the central theme of the work). The websites cited in the references meet the necessary rigor. (3-1)	The quality and quantity of information sources are inadequate. (0)

Criterion	Description	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Score
d.Attributions (6 points)	All data and information obtained from other sources are properly cited in both the text and the references section. The APA seventh edition format is used.	All ideas from other authors are correctly referenced in the text and the references section. The APA seventh edition format is used. (6)	The data and information from other sources are referenced in the text and in the references. (5-4)	Some data, ideas, and information are not referenced in the text or in the references. (3-1)	Incorporates ideas and data from other authors and does not attribute them to the authors. (0)	
Spelling and grammar (4 pts.)	Correct use of grammar and spelling rules.	The final work does not contain grammatical or spelling errors. (4)	The final work contains a minimum of grammatical or spelling errors. (3)	The final work contains more than 10 grammatical or spelling errors. (2)	The final work contains more than 20 grammatical or spelling errors. (1-0)	

Content Criteria (70%)						
a. Depth of Discussion (Critical Thinking) (20 pts.)	The discussion of ideas is elaborated in a clear and organized manner in the literature review, starting from the central idea and breaking down into two or three main elements, supported by research evidence or existing knowledge.	The central idea or thesis of the study is clearly identified, and the main elements that shape or form the central idea are stated, defined, and discussed. The discussion is supported by evidence from academic research on the topic. (20-16)	The central idea is identified, and some of its main elements are discussed. The discussion includes evidence from academic research. (15-10)	The central idea is not clearly expressed, and the main elements that shape the central idea are not adequately discussed. (9-5)	There is no central idea expressed. Some elements that could suggest a central idea are included, but they are not clearly established. (4-0)	

Criterion	Description	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Score
b. Knowledge Integration (10 points)	Integrates information from various sources in the literature review, expressing knowledge in the specialized area. Ideas flow from one element to another without the need for headings. There is evidence of an understanding of the relationship between the various materials used.	Integrates ideas from various reference sources in a seamless manner, providing cohesiveness to the discussion and demonstrating mastery of the topics covered. (10-8)	Presents information from various sources. However, in the discussion, each source remains isolated from the others. Demonstrates a good understanding of the topics, though there is room for improvement in some aspects. (7-5)	Relies on very few sources to discuss a topic. Needs to improve knowledge of the topics discussed in the paper. (4-2)	The ideas are not developed in an integrated manner. They are discussed as bibliographic notes. Does not reflect knowledge of the topics discussed in the paper. (1-0)	

| c. Public Service Perspective (15 points) | In the paper, the research problem is discussed from a public administration perspective.
 a) Incorporates the program's values (diversity, equity, accountability, ethics, or merit) clearly and coherently with the research problem.
 b) Identifies public policies that address the research problem both locally and internationally. | The paper addresses an issue in public administration. At least 2 of the program's values are appropriately and pertinently discussed. The existing public policy on the issue under study is clearly identified. (15-13) | The paper deals with a public administration problem. At least one of the program's values is appropriately and pertinently discussed. The existing public policy on the issue under study is identified. (12-8) | The paper addresses a public administration issue. The existing public policy on the problem under study is identified. (7-3) | The paper does not demonstrate a perspective related to public administration or the values of the Program. (2-0) | |

Criterion	Description	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Score
d. Research (15 pts.)	The writing reflects that research was conducted using an appropriate and well-defined methodology for the problem.	The writing demonstrates that research was conducted using a clearly synthesized methodology. The results align perfectly with the research questions and are critically analyzed. (15-13)	The writing shows that research was conducted with a partially defined methodology. The results somewhat align with the research questions and are partially analyzed. (12-8)	The writing includes elements of research, but some aspects of the methodology remain unclear. It conducts a weak analysis of the results. (7-3)	It does not demonstrate that research was conducted. (2-0)	
e. Conclusions (10 pts.)	It is a summary of the main body of work in one or two paragraphs. The central idea is revisited, and the most important aspects are summarized. Implications for the government, society, or a specific sector of society are discussed.	Summarize the main body of work in one or two paragraphs. Revisit the central idea and highlight the most important aspects. Briefly discuss the implications of the study's problem for various stakeholders. (10-8)	It provides a summary of the work in one or two paragraphs. It elaborates on some implications of the problem for various stakeholders. (7-5)	Brings in some information that has not been presented before or concludes with proposals that do not derive from the previous discussion. (4-2)	It does not outline clear conclusions or does not contain a conclusions section. (1-0)	
score	format criteria		content criteria			Total:

Rev. 12/2022