



S2.08 RUBRIC FOR ASSESSMENT OF LITERATURE REVIEW 1 BY SUPERVISOR
FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA

Student name :
 NPM :

| NO | ASPECT | EVALUATION | | | | | SCORE |
|----|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | INADEQUATE | NOT ENOUGH | ENOUGH | GOOD | VERY GOOD | |
| | | < 70 | (70 - 74.9) | (75 - 79.9) | (80 - 84.9) | (85 - 100) | |
| 1. | Consistency of attendance in discussions | <input type="checkbox"/> Students do not consistently attend discussions. | <input type="checkbox"/> The presence of students is less consistent in attending discussions. | <input type="checkbox"/> The presence of students is quite consistent in attending discussions. | <input type="checkbox"/> The presence of students is consistent in attending discussions. | <input type="checkbox"/> Student attendance exceeds the minimum requirement for attending discussions. | |
| 2 | Selection and Number of Literature | <input type="checkbox"/> Students do not select literature that is by the research topic <input type="checkbox"/> The number of suitable literature to be selected is less than 5 pieces | <input type="checkbox"/> Less skilled students make the selection of literature that is following the research topic <input type="checkbox"/> The number of suitable literature to choose is less than 10 pieces | <input type="checkbox"/> Students are quite skilled in selecting literature that is appropriate to the research topic <input type="checkbox"/> The number of suitable literature to choose is less than 20 pieces | <input type="checkbox"/> Skilled students make the selection of literature that is following the research topic <input type="checkbox"/> The number of suitable literature to choose from 25-30 pieces | <input type="checkbox"/> Students are very skilled in selecting literature that is following the research topic <input type="checkbox"/> The number of suitable literature to be selected is much greater than 25 pieces. | |
| 3 | Presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> unstructured presentation, <input type="checkbox"/> not focus on the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> weak presentation material preparation. | <input type="checkbox"/> unstructured presentation, <input type="checkbox"/> use poor sentence structure and language, <input type="checkbox"/> have a bad attitude <input type="checkbox"/> less focusing the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is not good. | <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation is quite structured, <input type="checkbox"/> use sentence structure and language quite well, <input type="checkbox"/> have a good attitude, <input type="checkbox"/> enough focusing the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation is quite structured, <input type="checkbox"/> use good sentence structure and language, <input type="checkbox"/> have a good attitude, <input type="checkbox"/> enough focusing the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly structured presentation <input type="checkbox"/> use good sentence structure and language, <input type="checkbox"/> have a good attitude, <input type="checkbox"/> very focused on the research carried out, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is excellent. | |
| 4 | Attitude in discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> Does not answer most or all of the questions <input type="checkbox"/> not argue. | <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough to answer questions, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> a little argue based on data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> Enoughable to answer questions, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> Can answer questions, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> argue based on data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> Can answer questions, straightforwardly, precisely, very well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> argue based on data evidence. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 5 | The process of making Literature Review and scientific attitude *(addition for mentors) | <input type="checkbox"/> Following a few instructions from the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> less effective communication, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is not good. | <input type="checkbox"/> follow a small part of the guidance of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> less effective communication, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is not good. | <input type="checkbox"/> follow most of the supervisor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> follow all directions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> follow all the instructions of the supervisor and independently take more initiative than expected. <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is very good. | |
| Total value | | | | | | | |
| Average score | | | | | | | |
| Comments/Suggestions for Improvement | | | | | | | |

Depok, 20..

(Supervisor/Assessor)

*Information:

1. Rating: 0 - 100
2. Value range:

- A : 85 - 100
- A- : 80 - 84.9
- B+ : 75 - 79.9
- B : 70 - 74.9
- B- : 65 - 69.9
- C+ : 60 - 64.9
- C : 55 - 59.9
- D : 40 - 44.9

3. If the average value < 70, then the student repeats trial
4. Supervisors fill in Aspects 1-6, and Assessors fill in Aspects 1-4, 6



TERMS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

PERIODIC DISCUSSION

1. Regular meetings led by supervisors or facilitators, at least 8 times and recorded in SIAK NG
2. Periodic discussions are filled with student presentations on understanding articles/book chapters related to the planned research topic.
3. Articles from reputable international journals
4. The number of articles discussed is at least 1 (one) article per meeting.

REVIEW ARTICLE

1. A Review Article is a summary and evaluation of previously published literature or data.
2. The review article aims to evaluate, synthesize and recommend a new research area.
3. A logical evaluation of the main theme of the article, supporting arguments, and implications for further research is an important element in a review article.
4. a Minimum number of articles is 50 (fifty)
5. Review Article Components:
 - a. Title
 - b. Writer
 - c. Abstract
 - d. List of contents
 - e. Background
 - f. Main Section /Discussion
 - g. Conclusion
 - h. Reference

PRESENTATION

1. Students present their papers and ask questions for a maximum of 60 minutes in front of the assessor team
2. The test team consists of supervisors and other lecturers totaling 2-3 people who are determined by the Head of the Study Program
3. Assessment of Papers and Presentations is carried out by Supervisors and Assessors.
4. Presentations are held at the end of the semester at a time determined by the Head of the Study Program.



S2.09 LITERATURE REVIEW ASSESSMENT RUBRIC 2
FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA

Student Name :
 STUDENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER :

| NUMBER | ASPECT | EVALUATION | | | | | SCORE |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | INADEQUATE | KURANG | ENOUGH | GOOD | VERY GOOD | |
| | | < 70 | (70 - 74,9) | (75 - 79,9) | (80 - 84,9) | (85 - 100) | |
| 1. | Systematics and writing techniques according to the guidelines | <input type="checkbox"/> Does not contain most aspects. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing (abstract - reference) is less systematic; ▪ introduction does not contain background, ▪ literature review, theories and concepts less relevant to the research problem, ▪ the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, ▪ less relevant and less credible references (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites) ▪ Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) but inconsistent and unrelated. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing (abstract - reference) systematically according to writing guidelines; ▪ introduction contains background, ▪ review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, ▪ the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, ▪ references are less relevant and less credible (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites). ▪ Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing (abstract - reference) systematically according to writing guidelines; ▪ introduction contains background, ▪ review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, ▪ research methods support research objectives, ▪ less relevant but credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). ▪ Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Writing (abstract - reference) systematically according to writing guidelines; ▪ introduction contains background, ▪ review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, ▪ research methods support research objectives, ▪ relevant and credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). ▪ Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 2 | Selection and Number of Literature | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Does not contain most aspects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of literature is less than 50 articles. ● The selection of literature is less relevant to the research topic. ● Insufficient amount of literature from reputable international journals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total literature is about 50 articles ● Literature selection is quite relevant to the research topic. ● Sufficient amount of literature from reputable international journals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The number of literature is more than 50 articles ● Selection of literature relevant to the research topic. ● Most of the literature comes from reputable international journals. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of literature is much greater than 50 articles ▪ The selection of literature is highly relevant to the research topic. ▪ All literature comes from reputable international journals. | |
| 3 | Contents of Literature Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Does not contain most aspects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The description of the study is written in a clear and unsystematic way ● Explanation of the results of the analysis of the literature review with unrelated research topics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The description of the study is written quite clearly and is not systematic. ● Explanation of the results of the analysis of the literature review with related research topics. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The description of the study is written in a clear and yet not systematic manner. ● Explanation of the results of the analysis of the literature review with the research topic is quite clearly related. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The description of the study is written clearly and systematically. ▪ A clear explanation of the results of the analysis of the literature review with related research topics. | |
| 4 | Presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unstructured presentation, ▪ does not focus on the research being conducted, ▪ weak presentation material preparation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less structured presentation, ▪ use poor sentence structure and language, ▪ have a bad attitude, ▪ lack of focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is not good. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The presentation is quite structured, ▪ use sentence structure and language quite well, ▪ has a pretty good attitude, ▪ enough focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The presentation is quite structured, ▪ use good sentence structure and language, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ enough focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highly structured presentation, ▪ use good sentence structure and language, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ very focused on the research carried out, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is very good. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 5 | Attitude in discussion | <input type="checkbox"/> Did not answer most or all of the questions does not argue. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, Little argument based on data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficiently able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, very well/politely, argue based on data evidence. | |
| 6 | The process of making Literature Review and scientific attitude *(addition for supervisor) | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, less effective communication, the quality of the revisions made is not good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, less effective communication, the quality of the revisions made is not good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, communicate quite effectively, The quality of the revisions carried out is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> follow the instructions of the supervisor, communicate effectively, The quality of the revisions carried out is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> follow the instructions of the supervisor, communicate effectively, The quality of the revisions made is very good. | |
| Total score | | | | | | | |
| Average score | | | | | | | |
| Comments/Suggestions for Improvement | | | | | | | |

Depok,

20

(Supervisor/Examiner)



*Information:

1. Rating: 0 - 100
2. Value range:

| | |
|----|-------------|
| A | : 85 - 100 |
| A- | : 80 - 84,9 |
| B+ | : 75 - 79,9 |
| B | : 70 - 74,9 |
| B- | : 65 - 69,9 |
| C+ | : 60 - 64,9 |
| C | : 55 - 59,9 |
| D | : 40 - 44,9 |

3. The average value < 70 , then the student repeats the trial
4. Supervisors fill in Aspects 1-6, and Examiners fill in Aspects 1-4, 6

TERMS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

PERIODIC DISCUSSION

1. Regular meetings led by supervisors or facilitators, at least 8 times and recorded in SIAK NG
2. Periodic discussions are filled with student presentations in understanding articles/book chapters related to the planned research topic.
3. Articles from reputable international journals
4. The number of articles discussed is at least 1 (one) article per meeting.

MAKALAH REVIEW ARTICLE

1. A Review Article is a summary and evaluation of previously published literature or data
2. The review article aims to evaluate, synthesize and recommend a new research area.
3. A logical evaluation of the main theme of the article, supporting arguments, and implications for further research is an important element in a review article.
4. Minimum number of articles is 50 (fifty)
5. Component Review Article:
 - a. Title
 - b. Writer
 - c. Abstract
 - d. List of contents
 - e. Background
 - f. Main Section /Discussion
 - g. Conclusion
 - h. Reference



UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA
FAKULTAS MATEMATIKA DAN
ILMU PENGETAHUAN ALAM

Gedung Dekanat Fakultas Matematika dan
Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam
Kampus UI Depok 16424
Telp. +62.21.7270013, 7863436, 7863437, Fax. +62.21.7270012
www.sci.ui.ac.id

PRESENTATION

1. Students present their papers and ask questions for a maximum of 60 minutes in front of the examiner team
2. The testing team consists of 2-3 supervisors and other lecturers who are determined by the Head of the Study Program
3. Assessment of Papers and Presentations is carried out by Supervisors and Examiners.
4. Presentations are held at the end of the semester at the time determined by the Head of the Study Program.



RECAPITULATION OF LITERATURE REVIEW 1/2

Name : _____

Student ID Number : _____

Research Topic : _____

| NAME OF SUPERVISOR / TESTERS | SCORE | AVERAGE VALUE | LETTERS VALUE |
|------------------------------|-------|---------------|---------------|
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |

FINAL SCORE :

| SCORE | LETTERS VALUE | VALUE |
|----------|---------------|-------|
| 85 - 100 | A | 4.0 |
| 80 - 84 | A - | 3.7 |
| 75 - 79 | B+ | 3.3 |
| 70 - 74 | B | 3.0 |
| 65 - 69 | B - | 2.7 |
| 60 - 64 | C+ | 2.3 |
| 55 - 59 | C | 2.0 |
| 40 - 54 | D | 1.0 |
| 0 - 39 | E | 0 |

Depok,

Head of Literature Review

(_____)

NIP/NUP.



TERMS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

PERIODIC DISCUSSION

1. Regular meetings led by supervisors or facilitators, at least 8 times and recorded in SIAK NG
2. Periodic discussions are filled with student presentations in understanding articles/book chapters related to the planned research topic.
3. Articles from reputable international journals
4. The number of articles discussed is at least 1 (one) article per meeting.

REVIEW ARTICLE

1. A Review Article is a summary and evaluation of previously published literature or data.
2. The review article aims to evaluate, synthesize and recommend a new research area.
3. A logical evaluation of the main theme of the article, supporting arguments, and implications for further research is an important element in a review article.
4. Minimum number of articles is 25 (twenty five) for Literature Review
5. Review Article Components:
 - a. Title
 - b. Writer
 - c. Abstract
 - d. List of contents
 - e. Background
 - f. Main Section /Discussion
 - g. Conclusion
 - h. Reference

PRESENTATION

1. Students present their papers and ask questions for a maximum of 60 minutes in front of the examiner team
2. The test team consists of supervisors and other lecturers totaling 2-3 people who are determined by the Head of the Study Program
3. Assessment of Papers and Presentations is carried out by Supervisors and Examiners.
4. Presentations are held at the end of the semester at a time determined by the Head of the Study Program.



**THESIS PROPOSAL EXAM ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY FMIPA UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA**

Student name :

Student ID Number :

| NO | ASPECT | EVALUATION | | | | | SCORE |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | INADEQUE | NOT ENOUGH | ENOUGH | GOOD | VERY GOOD | |
| | | < 70 | (70 - 74,9) | (75 - 79,9) | (80 - 84,9) | (85 - 100) | |
| 1. | Systematics and writing techniques according to the guidelines | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Does not contain most aspects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Writing (abstract – reference) is less systematic; ▪ introduction does not contain background, ▪ literature review, theories and concepts are less relevant to the research problem, ▪ the research method is notin accordance with the research objectives, ▪ less relevant and less credible references (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites) ▪ Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) but inconsistent and unrelated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Systematic (abstract – reference) writing according to writing guidelines; ▪ introduction contains background, ▪ review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, ▪ the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, ▪ references are less relevant and less credible (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites). ▪ The use of formal language and terms is understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Systematic (abstract – reference) writing according to writing guidelines; ▪ introduction contains background, ▪ review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, ▪ research methods support research objectives, ▪ less relevant but credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). ▪ Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Systematic (abstract – reference) writing according to writing guidelines; ▪ introduction contains background, ▪ review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, ▪ research methods support research objectives, ▪ relevant and credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). ▪ The use of formal language and terms is understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 2. | Introduction (title, problem formulation, objectives) and research hypotheses | <input type="checkbox"/> There is no relation to each other. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear background raises problems, ▪ the objective has not answered the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with a hypothesis that is less related to the problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear background raises problems, ▪ The aim is to answer some of the problems (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses that are less related to the problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The background clearly raises the problem, ▪ the purpose of answering the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses that are less related to the problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The background clearly raises the problem, ▪ the purpose of answering the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses related to the problem. | |
| 3. | Research proposal presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ unstructured presentation, ▪ not focus on the research conducted, ▪ weak presentation material preparation. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ unstructured presentation, ▪ use poor sentence structure and language, ▪ have a bad attitude ▪ lack of focus on research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is not good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The presentation is quite structured, ▪ use sentence structure and language quite well, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ enough to focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The presentation is quite structured, ▪ use good sentence structure and language, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ enough to focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Highly structured presentation ▪ use good sentence structure and language, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ very focused on the research carried out, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is very good. | |
| 4. | Attitude in research proposal discussions | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not answer most or all of the questions ▪ not argue. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, ▪ little argument based on data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sufficiently able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, ▪ argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, ▪ argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, very well/politely, ▪ argue based on data evidence. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 5. | Process of making research proposals and scientific attitude *(additional for supervisor) | <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate less effectively <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is not good . | <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate less effectively <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is not good . | <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively , <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the revisions made is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> follow the instructor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the revisions made is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> follow the instructor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is very good. | |
| 6. | Dissemination potential | <input type="checkbox"/> cannot be disseminated | <input type="checkbox"/> most likely to be disseminated in unreviewed forums | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce one dissemination reviewed | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce two disseminations reviewed | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce one reviewed publication and one reviewed dissemination | |
| Total score | | | | | | | |
| Average score | | | | | | | |
| Comments/Suggestions for Improvement | | | | | | | |

Depok, 20

()

Supervisor/Examiner



UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA
FAKULTAS MATEMATIKA DAN
ILMU PENGETAHUAN ALAM

Gedung Dekanat Fakultas Matematika dan
Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam
Kampus UI Depok 16424

Telp. +62.21.7270013, 7863436, 7863437, Fax. +62.21.7270012

www.sci.ui.ac.id

*Information:

1. Grading: 0 – 100
2. Score range:

| | |
|----|-------------|
| A | : 85 - 100 |
| A- | : 80 - 84,9 |
| B+ | : 75 - 79,9 |
| B | : 70 - 74,9 |
| B- | : 65 - 69,9 |
| C+ | : 60 - 64,9 |
| C | : 55 - 59,9 |
| D | : 40 - 44,9 |

3. Average score < 70 , then the student repeats the Proposal Exam
4. Supervisor fills Aspect: 1-6, and Examiners fill in Aspect: 1-4, 6



PROPOSAL ASSESSMENT RECAPITULATION

MASTER STUDY PROGRAM OF CHEMICAL SCIENCE FMIPA UI

Name :
Student ID Number :
Research Topic :

| ADVISOR NAME | AVERAGE VALUE* | ADVISOR AVERAGE SCORE | FINAL NUMBERS** | FINAL SCORE |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| NAME OF EXAMINER | AVERAGE VALUE* | EXAMINER AVERAGE SCORE | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

*AVERAGE VALUE between raters should not be different ≥ 20

**FINAL NUMBERS : (60% x Advisor Average Score) + (40% x Examiner Average Score)

FINAL SCORE :

| NUMBER SCORE | LETTER SCORE | VALUE |
|--------------|--------------|-------|
| 85 - 100 | A | 4.0 |
| 80 - 84 | A - | 3.7 |
| 75 - 79 | B+ | 3.3 |
| 70 - 74 | B | 3.0 |
| 65 - 69 | B - | 2.7 |
| 60 - 64 | C+ | 2.3 |
| 55 - 59 | C | 2.0 |
| 40 - 54 | D | 1.0 |
| 0 - 39 | E | 0 |

Depok, 2021

Chairperson of the Session

(Prof. Dr. Ridla Bakri)
NIP



RESEARCH RESULT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC
 FMIPA UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA

Name :
 Student ID Number :

| NO | ASPECT | EVALUATION | | | | | SCORE |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | INADEQUATE | NOT ENOUGH | ENOUGH | GOOD | VERY GOOD | |
| | | < 70 | (70 - 74,9) | (75 - 79,9) | (80 - 84,9) | (85 - 100) | |
| 1. | Systematics and writing techniques according to the guidelines | <input type="checkbox"/> Does not contain most aspects. | <input type="checkbox"/> Writing (abstract - reference) is less systematic; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction does not contain background, <input type="checkbox"/> literature review, theories and concepts are less relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> less relevant and less credible references (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites) <input type="checkbox"/> Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) but inconsistent and unrelated . | <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic (abstract - reference) writing according to writing guidelines; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction contains background, <input type="checkbox"/> review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> references are less relevant and less credible (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites). <input type="checkbox"/> The use of formal language and terms is understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic (abstract - reference) writing according to writing guidelines; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction contains background, <input type="checkbox"/> review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> research methods support research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> less relevant but credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). <input type="checkbox"/> Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic (abstract - reference) writing according to writing guidelines; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction contains background, <input type="checkbox"/> review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> research methods support research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> relevant and credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). <input type="checkbox"/> The use of formal language and terms is understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 2. | Introduction (title, problem formulation, objectives) and research hypotheses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ There is no relation to each other. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Unclear background raises problems, ▪ the objective has not answered the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with a hypothesis that is less related to the problem. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Unclear background raises problems, ▪ The aim is to answer some of the problems (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses that are less related to the problem. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The background clearly raises the problem, ▪ the purpose of answering the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses that are less related to the problem. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The background clearly raises the problem, ▪ the purpose of answering the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses related to the problem. | |
| 3. | Methods and data analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Discussion is unclear; ▪ the data is difficult to understand and does not support the research topic and is not original. ▪ Data analysis is not supported by related theory; ▪ There is no comparison of data with the results of previous studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Discussion contains unclear relationships among all data analyses; comparative data is not supported by related theories; ▪ data information is quite understandable (pictures, tables, graphs are quite understandable) and sufficiently supports the research topic and is original. ▪ Data analysis is not supported by related theory; ▪ There is no comparison of the data with the results of previous studies; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ the discussion contains fairly clear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ data comparison is sufficiently supported by related theory; ▪ data information is quite understandable (pictures, tables, graphs are quite understandable) and sufficiently supports the research topic and is original. ▪ Data analysis is sufficiently supported by related theory; ▪ Comparison of sufficient data available with the results of previous studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The discussion contains very clear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ data comparison is sufficiently supported by related theory; ▪ data information is quite understandable (pictures, tables, graphs are quite understandable) and sufficiently supports the research topic and is original. ▪ Complete data analysis supported by related theories; ▪ Comparison of available data complete with previous research results | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The discussion contains very clear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ data comparison supported by related theory; ▪ detailed data information (pictures, tables, graphs that are easy to understand) and strongly support the research topic and are original. ▪ Complete data analysis supported by related theories; ▪ Comparison of available data complete with previous research results | |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 5. | Presentation of research results | <input type="checkbox"/> unstructured presentation, <input type="checkbox"/> not focus on the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> weak presentation material preparation. | <input type="checkbox"/> unstructured presentation, <input type="checkbox"/> use poor sentence structure and language, <input type="checkbox"/> have a bad attitude <input type="checkbox"/> lack of focus on research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is not good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation is quite structured , <input type="checkbox"/> use sentence structure and language quite well , <input type="checkbox"/> have a good attitude , <input type="checkbox"/> enough to focus on the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The presentation is quite structured, <input type="checkbox"/> use good sentence structure and language, <input type="checkbox"/> have a good attitude, <input type="checkbox"/> enough to focus on the research conducted, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> Highly structured presentation <input type="checkbox"/> use good sentence structure and language, <input type="checkbox"/> have a good attitude, <input type="checkbox"/> very focused on the research carried out, <input type="checkbox"/> preparation of presentation materials is very good. | |
| 6. | Discussion of research results | <input type="checkbox"/> Did not answer most or all of the questions does not argue. | <input type="checkbox"/> Less able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> little argument based on data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficiently able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> argue based on some data evidence. | <input type="checkbox"/> Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, very well/politely, <input type="checkbox"/> argue based on data evidence. | |
| 7. | Process of making research proposals and scientific attitude *(additional for supervisor) | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing the proposal to the thesis does not improve the quality of the final project. | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing the proposal to the thesis does not improve the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate less effectively <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is not good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing a proposal to a thesis is sufficient to improve the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively , <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the revisions made is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing a proposal to a thesis improves the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow the instructor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the revisions made is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing a proposal to a thesis greatly improves the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow the instructor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is very good . | |



| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 8. | Potential for dissemination | <input type="checkbox"/> cannot be disseminated | <input type="checkbox"/> most likely to be disseminated in unreviewed forums | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce one dissemination reviewed | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce two reviewed disseminations | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce one reviewed publication and one reviewed dissemination | | |
| | | | | | | | Total score | |
| | | | | | | | Average score | |
| Comments/Suggestions for Improvement | | | | | | | | |

***Information:**

- Rating: 0 - 100
- Research Result Exam score range:
 - A : 85 - 100
 - A- : 80 - 84,9
 - B+ : 75 - 79,9
 - B : 70 - 74,9
 - B- : 65 - 69,9
 - C+ : 60 - 64,9
 - C : 55 - 59,9
 - D : 40 - 44,9

The average value < 70, then the student repeats the trial
- Research Results Seminar value range :
 - Recommended to continue research : 70 - 100
 - Not Recommended to continue research: < 70
- Supervisors fill in Aspects 1-7, and Examiners fill in Aspects 1-5, 7



S2.19. RECAPITULATION OF RESEARCH EXAM RESULTS

STUDY PROGRAM

**DEPARTMENT FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND NATURAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITAS
 INDONESIA**

Student Name :

Student Identification Number :

| SUPERVISOR | EXAM SCORES | SUPERVISOR'S AVERAGE | FINAL NUMBER | FINAL SCORE |
|------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| EXAMINER | EXAM SCORES | EXAMINER'S AVERAGE | FINAL NUMBER | FINAL SCORE |
| 1. | | | | |
| 2. | | | | |
| 3. | | | | |

FINAL NUMBER: (60% x Supervisor's Average) + (40% x Examiner's Average)

NILAI AKHIR :

| NUMBERS SCORE | LETTERS SCORE | VALUE |
|---------------|---------------|-------|
| 85 -100 | A | 4.0 |
| 80 - 84 | A - | 3.7 |
| 75 - 79 | B+ | 3.3 |
| 70 - 74 | B | 3.0 |
| 65 - 69 | B - | 2.7 |
| 60 - 64 | C+ | 2.3 |
| 55 - 59 | C | 2.0 |
| 40 - 54 | D | 1.0 |
| 0 - 39 | E | 0 |

Depok,

Chairman of the Research Results Examination Committee

(_____)
 NIP/NUP.



MASTER'S THESIS ASSESSMENT RUBRIC IN CHEMICAL SCIENCE
 FMIPA UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA

Name :
 Student ID Number :

| NO | ASPECT | EVALUATION | | | | | SCORE |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | INADEQUATE | NOT ENOUGH | ENOUGH | GOOD | VERY GOOD | |
| | | < 70 | (70 - 74,9) | (75 - 79,9) | (80 - 84,9) | (85 - 100) | |
| 1. | Systematics and writing techniques according to the guidelines | <input type="checkbox"/> Does not contain most aspects. | <input type="checkbox"/> Writing (abstract – reference) is less systematic; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction does not contain background, <input type="checkbox"/> literature review, theories and concepts are less relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> less relevant and less credible references (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites) <input type="checkbox"/> Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) but inconsistent and unrelated . | <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic (abstract – reference) writing according to writing guidelines; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction contains background, <input type="checkbox"/> review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> the research method is not in accordance with the research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> references are less relevant and less credible (some are not peer-reviewed or official organization websites). <input type="checkbox"/> The use of formal language and terms is understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic (abstract – reference) writing according to writing guidelines; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction contains background, <input type="checkbox"/> review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> research methods support research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> less relevant but credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). <input type="checkbox"/> Use of formal language and terms, understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | <input type="checkbox"/> Systematic (abstract – reference) writing according to writing guidelines; <input type="checkbox"/> introduction contains background, <input type="checkbox"/> review of literature, theories and concepts relevant to the research problem, <input type="checkbox"/> research methods support research objectives, <input type="checkbox"/> relevant and credible references (peer-reviewed or official organization website). <input type="checkbox"/> The use of formal language and terms is understandable, according to Indonesian grammar (SPOK) and consistent. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 2. | Introduction (title, problem formulation, objectives) and research hypotheses | <input type="checkbox"/> There is no relation to each other. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear background raises problems, ▪ the objective has not answered the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with a hypothesis that is less related to the problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear background raises problems, ▪ The aim is to answer some of the problems (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses that are less related to the problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The background clearly raises the problem, ▪ the purpose of answering the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses that are less related to the problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The background clearly raises the problem, ▪ the purpose of answering the problem (synthesis/analysis/characterization/evaluation/reconstruction) with hypotheses related to the problem. | |
| 3. | Adequacy of data information | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data information is difficult to understand ▪ The data do not support the research topic and are not original. ▪ Data availability/target ratio < 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data information is quite understandable (pictures, tables, graphs are quite understandable) ▪ The data is sufficient to support the research topic and is original. ▪ Data availability/target ratio < 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The comparison of data is sufficiently supported by related theories; ▪ The data information is quite understandable (figures, tables, graphs are quite understandable) and sufficiently supports the research topic and is original. ▪ Data availability/target ratio 50%-75% | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The comparison of data is sufficiently supported by related theories; ▪ The data information is quite understandable (pictures, tables, graphs are quite understandable) and are more supportive of the research topic and are original. ▪ Data availability/target ratio 75%-100% | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ data comparisons are strongly supported by related theories; ▪ detailed data information (pictures, tables, graphs that are easy to understand) and strongly support the research topic and are original. ▪ Data availability/target ratio 75%-100% | |
| 4. | Discussion and data analysis | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The discussion contains unclear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ There is no explanation of the relationship between the data ▪ Data analysis is not supported by related theory; | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The discussion contains unclear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ The relationship between data is poorly explained; ▪ Data analysis is not supported by related theory; ▪ There is no comparison of | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The discussion contains quite clear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ The relationship between the data is quite completely explained; ▪ Data analysis is sufficiently supported by related theories; | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The discussion contains very clear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ The relationship between data is explained in full; ▪ Complete data analysis supported by related theories; ▪ Comparison of available data complete with previous research results. | <input type="checkbox"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The discussion contains very clear relationships among all data analyses; ▪ The relationship between data is explained in full; ▪ Complete data analysis supported by related theories; ▪ Comparison of the | |



| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no comparison of data with the results of previous studies. | <p>data with the results of previous studies;</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparison of data is quite available with the results of previous studies. | | <p>available data is very complete with the results of previous studies.</p> | |
| 5. | Conclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ • Conclusions are not made based on the results of existing research and discussion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ • Accuracy in concluding research results related to the discussion is insufficient and does not answered the problem and research objectives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ • Accuracy in concluding research results related to the discussion is sufficient but does not answered the problem and research objectives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ • Accuracy in concluding research results related to the discussion is good but does not answered the problem and research objectives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ • Accuracy in concluding research results related to the discussion was very good and answered the problems and research objectives. | |
| 6. | Research proposal presentation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ unstructured presentation, ▪ not focus on the research conducted, ▪ weak presentation material preparation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ unstructured presentation, ▪ use poor sentence structure and language, ▪ have a bad attitude ▪ lack of focus on research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is not good. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ The presentation is quite structured, ▪ use sentence structure and language quite well, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ enough to focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ The presentation is quite structured, ▪ use good sentence structure and language, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ enough to focus on the research conducted, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is quite good. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ Highly structured presentation ▪ use good sentence structure and language, ▪ have a good attitude, ▪ very focused on the research carried out, ▪ preparation of presentation materials is very good. | |
| 7. | Attitude in research proposal discussions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ Does not answer most or all of the questions not argue. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ Not able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, little argument based on data evidence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ Sufficiently able to answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, argue based on some data evidence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, well/politely, argue based on some data evidence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ ▪ Can answer questions clearly, straightforwardly, precisely, very well/politely, argue based on data evidence. | |



| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| 8. | Process of making research proposals and scientific attitude *(additional for supervisor) | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing the proposal to the thesis does not improve the quality of the final project. | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing the proposal to the thesis does not improve the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate less effectively <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is not good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing a proposal to a thesis is sufficient to improve the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow some of the instructions of the supervisor, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively , <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the revisions made is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing a proposal to a thesis improves the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow the instructor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> The quality of the revisions made is quite good . | <input type="checkbox"/> The process of preparing a proposal to a thesis greatly improves the quality of the final project, <input type="checkbox"/> follow the instructor's instructions, <input type="checkbox"/> communicate effectively, <input type="checkbox"/> the quality of the revisions made is very good . | |
| 9. | Dissemination potential | <input type="checkbox"/> cannot be disseminated | <input type="checkbox"/> most likely to be disseminated in unreviewed forums | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce one dissemination reviewed | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce two disseminations reviewed | <input type="checkbox"/> Can produce one reviewed publication and one reviewed dissemination | |
| Total score | | | | | | | |
| Average score | | | | | | | |
| Comments/Suggestions for Improvement | | | | | | | |

Depok, _____ -20

(_____)

Supervisor/Examiner



*Information:

1. Assessment score range :

| | |
|----|-------------|
| A | : 85 - 100 |
| A- | : 80 - 84,9 |
| B+ | : 75 - 79,9 |
| B | : 70 - 74,9 |
| B- | : 65 - 69,9 |
| C+ | : 60 - 64,9 |
| C | : 55 - 59,9 |
| D | : 40 - 44,9 |

Average score < 70, then the student repeats the Thesis Assessment

2. Supervisor fills Aspect: 1-9, and Examiners fill in Aspect 1-7, 9



THESIS ASSESSMENT RECAPITULATION

MASTER STUDY PROGRAM OF CHEMICAL SCIENCE FMIPA UI

Name :
Student ID Number :
Research Topic :

| ADVISOR NAME | AVERAGE VALUE* | ADVISOR AVERAGE SCORE | FINAL NUMBERS** | FINAL SCORE |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| NAME OF EXAMINER | AVERAGE VALUE* | EXAMINER AVERAGE SCORE | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

*AVERAGE VALUE between raters should not be different ≥ 20

**FINAL NUMBERS : (60% x Advisor Average Score) + (40% x Examiner Average Score)

FINAL SCORE :

| NUMBER SCORE | LETTER SCORE | VALUE |
|--------------|--------------|-------|
| 85 - 100 | A | 4.0 |
| 80 - 84 | A - | 3.7 |
| 75 - 79 | B+ | 3.3 |
| 70 - 74 | B | 3.0 |
| 65 - 69 | B - | 2.7 |
| 60 - 64 | C+ | 2.3 |
| 55 - 59 | C | 2.0 |
| 40 - 54 | D | 1.0 |
| 0 - 39 | E | 0 |

Depok, 2021

Chairperson of the Session

(Prof. Dr. Ridla Bakri)
NIP