



STUDENT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC GUIDELINES

MASTER'S PROGRAM IN MATHEMATICS EDUCATION

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education

SULTAN AGUNG ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY (UNISSULA)

Semarang, 2025



GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION CRITERIA



**MASTER'S PROGRAM IN MATHEMATICS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
SULTAN AGUNG ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC YEAR 2025/2026**

FOREWORD

In the Name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

Praise and thanks be to Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful, for His abundant mercy, guidance, and blessings, which have enabled the successful compilation of this Assessment Rubric Guide for students in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Sciences, Sultan Agung Islamic University.

This guide has been developed as part of the program's efforts to establish an assessment system that is objective, transparent, fair, accountable, and focused on learning outcomes. Assessment rubrics are a crucial tool in supporting the implementation of an Outcome-Based Education (OBE)-based curriculum, as they provide clear guidelines for faculty members to assess the achievement of Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs), Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), and Sub-CLOs in a consistent and measurable manner.

The development of this guide is based on the provisions of the National Standards for Higher Education, Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology Regulation No. 53 of 2023 on Quality Assurance in Higher Education, the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI) policies of Sultan Agung Islamic University, and the curriculum of the Master's Program in Mathematics Education. These guidelines are intended to serve as a reference for all faculty members in designing, implementing, and evaluating learning assessments, while also providing students with clear information regarding the criteria and assessment mechanisms applied in each course.

In addition to serving as a guide for conducting assessments, this document also functions as an instrument to support a culture of academic quality through the implementation of continuous learning evaluation (*Continuous Quality Improvement/CQI*). With the establishment of uniform assessment rubric standards, it is hoped that the assessment process will be more consistent and reliable, and capable of producing accurate information regarding the achievement of graduate competencies.

We express our appreciation and gratitude to all faculty members, the curriculum development team, the Quality Assurance Group, and all parties who have provided input and contributed to the development of this guide. We hope this document will contribute to improving the quality of the learning process, support academic quality development,

and serve as a supporting document in the implementation of both national and international accreditation.

We recognize that these guidelines can continue to be refined in line with advancements in knowledge, higher education policies, and the needs of the Study Program. Therefore, constructive criticism and suggestions are highly encouraged to inform future improvements.

May Allah the Almighty always grant us guidance and ease in all our efforts to improve the quality of higher education.

Wassalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.

Semarang, 2025

**Head of the Study Program
Master of Mathematics Education**

Dr. Nila Ubaidah, M.Ed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GUIDELINES FOR STUDENT EVALUATION CRITERIA.....	ii
FOREWORD.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Objectives	2
1.3 Legal Basis.....	2
1.4 Scope	2
1.5 Objectives	3
CHAPTER II LEARNING ASSESSMENT SYSTEM.....	4
2.1 General Provisions on Assessment.....	4
2.2 Assessment Principles	4
2.3 Assessment Mechanism	5
2.4 Forms of Assessment.....	5
2.5 Assessment Techniques and Instruments.....	6
2.6 Assessment Components.....	6
2.7 Grade Conversion.....	7
2.8 Assessment Documentation.....	9
CHAPTER III DEVELOPMENT OF AN ASSESSMENT RUBRIC.....	10
3.1 The Concept of Assessment Rubrics.....	10
3.2 Development of Assessment Rubrics	10
3.3 Components of an Assessment Rubric.....	10
3.4 Use of Assessment Rubrics	11
3.5 Mapping CPL, CPMK, and Assessment Rubrics	11
CHAPTER IV STUDENT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC	12
4.1 Attendance and Participation Rubric (Weight: 10%).....	12
4.2 Individual Assignment Rubric (Weight: 15%).....	14
4.3 Group Presentation/Assignment Rubric (Weight: 15%).....	16
4.4 Midterm/Final Exam Rubric (Weight: 20%).....	18

CHAPTER V IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION OF ASSESSMENT...	20
5.1 Implementation of Assessment	20
5.2 Monitoring of Assessment.....	20
5.3 Evaluation of Assessment.....	21
5.4 Follow-up on Assessment Results	21
5.5 Quality Assurance of Assessment	21
CHAPTER VI CONCLUSION.....	23
6.1 Conclusion.....	23
6.2 Conclusion.....	23

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Assessment is a key component of the learning process at universities, as it serves as a tool to measure the achievement of Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs). Through systematic, objective, transparent, and accountable assessment, faculty members can obtain information regarding students' mastery of knowledge, skills, and attitudes as a basis for continuously improving the learning process.

The Master's Program in Mathematics Education at Sultan Agung Islamic University implements an Outcome-Based Education (OBE) approach that places learning outcomes at the center of the entire educational process. Therefore, every form of assessment must be designed in alignment with the GLO, CO, and Sub-CO so that assessment results truly reflect the competencies students have achieved.

The nature of learning at the master's level requires students not only to master the concepts and theories of mathematics education but also to possess the ability to think critically, analytically, creatively, and innovatively; to conduct research; to solve problems in mathematics education; and to communicate research findings scientifically. Therefore, assessment cannot be limited to written exams alone; it must incorporate various authentic assessment techniques such as projects, case studies (*case method*), *project-based learning*, scientific presentations, portfolios, scientific articles, and research.

To ensure consistency in the assessment process across all faculty members, the Master's Program in Mathematics Education has developed the Student Assessment Rubric Guide. These guidelines provide direction on the principles, mechanisms, techniques, instruments, and assessment rubrics used in each course so that the assessment process is consistent, fair, transparent, and oriented toward *continuous quality improvement (CQI)*.

In addition to serving as a reference for teaching and learning, this guide also supports the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI), compliance with the National Standards for Higher Education, and the provision of evidence of learning outcome-based assessment in both national and international accreditation processes.

1.2 Objectives

This Student Assessment Rubric Guide was developed with the following objectives:

1. Serve as a guide for faculty members in designing and conducting assessments that are objective, fair, transparent, and accountable.
2. Ensure alignment between CPLs, CPMKs, Sub-CPMKs, learning methods, and assessment techniques.
3. Standardize assessment criteria across all courses in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education.
4. Provide clear information to students regarding the assessment indicators and criteria used in each form of assessment.
5. Support the implementation of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) through assessments focused on the achievement of learning outcomes.
6. Serving as one of the supporting documents for the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI), curriculum evaluation, and program accreditation.

1.3 Legal Basis

These guidelines are formulated based on the following regulations and policies:

1. Law No. 12 of 2012 on Higher Education.
2. Government Regulation No. 4 of 2014 on the Implementation of Higher Education and the Management of Higher Education Institutions.
3. Regulation of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology No. 53 of 2023 on Quality Assurance in Higher Education.
4. Applicable National Standards for Higher Education.
5. The Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI) of Sultan Agung Islamic University.
6. The Outcome-Based Education (OBE) Curriculum of the Master's Program in Mathematics Education at Sultan Agung Islamic University.

1.4 Scope

This guideline governs the entire learning assessment process in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education, which includes:

1. Assessment principles and mechanisms.
2. Assessment techniques and instruments.
3. Forms of learning assessment.
4. Assessment criteria and weightings.

5. Assessment rubrics for each form of assessment.
6. Conversion of final course grades.
7. Documentation and reporting of assessment results.

1.5 Target Audience

This guide is intended for:

1. Course instructors as a guide in designing and conducting assessments.
2. Department Chairs in monitoring and evaluating the learning process.
3. Students as a reference for understanding the assessment indicators and criteria for each course.

CHAPTER II

LEARNING ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

2.1 General Provisions for Assessment

Learning assessment is a systematic process of collecting, processing, analyzing, and interpreting information regarding students' learning outcomes. Assessment is conducted as an integral part of the learning process to measure the achievement of Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs), Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), and Sub-CLOs in accordance with the curriculum of the Master's Program in Mathematics Education.

The implementation of assessment is based on the principles of Outcome-Based Education (OBE), meaning that all assessment activities are designed to measure the learning outcomes specified in the curriculum. Assessment results are not only used to determine students' final grades but also serve as the basis for providing feedback to students and evaluating the learning process in support of *Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)*.

2.2 Assessment Principles

Learning assessment in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education is conducted based on the following principles.

a. Educational

Assessment is aimed at encouraging students to improve their academic, professional, and character skills through constructive feedback.

b. Objective

Assessment is conducted based on predetermined indicators, criteria, and rubrics to minimize assessor subjectivity.

c. Transparent

The criteria, techniques, instruments, and weightings for assessment are communicated to students at the beginning of the course through the Semester Learning Plan (SLP).

d. Accountable

The entire assessment process and results are accountable in accordance with applicable academic regulations and supported by documented assessment evidence.

e. Fair

Assessments are administered to all students without discrimination and are based on demonstrated learning outcomes.

f. Continuous

Assessment is conducted continuously throughout the learning process through formative and summative assessments.

2.3 Assessment Mechanism

Assessment is carried out through the following stages.

1. Identify the CPLs, CPMKs, and Sub-CPMKs to be measured.
2. Determine the assessment indicators and criteria.
3. Determine appropriate assessment techniques and instruments.
4. Develop an assessment rubric to serve as a guideline for assessment.
5. Conduct the assessment during the learning process.
6. Provide feedback to students.
7. Processing and determining the final grade for the course.
8. Documenting assessment results as part of the learning evaluation.

2.4 Forms of Assessment

Assessment is conducted through formative and summative assessments.

2.4.1 Formative Assessment

Formative assessment aims to monitor students' learning progress throughout the learning process. Assessment results are used as the basis for providing feedback and improving the learning process.

Forms of formative assessment may include:

- attendance and active participation;
- individual assignments;
- group assignments;
- presentations;
- discussions;
- case studies (*case method*);
- projects (*project-based learning*);
- portfolio;
- other assignments in accordance with the characteristics of the course.

2.4.2 Summative Assessment

Summative assessment aims to measure the level of achievement of learning outcomes at the end of the learning period.

Summative assessment may take the form of:

- Midterm Exam (UTS);
- Final Semester Exam (FSE);
- research reports;
- scientific article;
- final projects; or
- other forms of assessment appropriate to the characteristics of the course.

2.5 Assessment Techniques and Instruments

Assessment techniques are tailored to the characteristics of the learning outcomes to be measured.

Assessment Techniques	Assessment Instruments
Observation	Observation sheets and rubrics
Written Tests	Essay questions, case studies
Oral Test	List of questions and rubric
Assignments	Assignment rubric
Presentation	Presentation Rubric
Project	Project Rubric
Portfolio	Portfolio Section

2.6 Assessment Components

The assessment components for each course are tailored to the characteristics of the learning outcomes specified in the Course Syllabus. As a general guideline, the assessment components can be structured as follows.

Assessment Components	Weight (%)
Attendance and Participation	10
Individual Assignments	15
Presentation/Group Assignment	15
Midterm Exam (UTS)	20
Final Exam (UAS)	20

Assessment Components	Weight (%)
Project/Mini Research/Scientific Article	20
Total	100

Note: The weight of each component may be adjusted according to the characteristics of the course and the CPLs assigned, provided that the total assessment weight is 100%.

2.7 Grade Conversion

A student's final grade is derived from the accumulation of all assessment components established for each course according to their respective weights. Assessment results are expressed in numerical grades, letter grades, weighted grades, and achievement categories as listed in the Table.

Numerical Ranges	Grade	Letter Grades	Weighted Grades	Achievement Categories
85 – 100		A	4.00	With Honors (<i>Cum Laude</i>)
75–84		AB	3.50	Very Satisfactory
65–74		B	3.00	Satisfactory
60–64		BC	2.50	Fairly Good
50–59		C	2.00	Fair
40–49		CD	1.50	Less
30–39		D	1.00	Very Low
0–29		E	0.00	Fail

Grade interpretations are used as a reference in determining students' achievement levels relative to the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs). Each grade category reflects the level of students' mastery of competencies based on established indicators.

Letter Grades	Level of Achievement	Description
A	Very High	The student demonstrates comprehensive mastery of competencies, is able to analyze, evaluate, and develop concepts independently, and produces innovative solutions.

Letter Grades	Level of Achievement	Description
AB	High	Students have a strong command of nearly all competencies, are able to conduct critical analysis, and provide appropriate solutions based on theory and scientific evidence.
B	Good	Students have mastered the core competencies and are able to apply concepts to solve problems, although their analysis is not yet fully in-depth.
BC	Fairly Good	The student understands most of the competencies but still requires guidance in analyzing and applying concepts.
C	Fair	Students have mastered only the basic competencies and are not yet able to integrate concepts optimally.
CD	Insufficient	Students have not demonstrated mastery of the competencies in accordance with the established indicators and therefore require improvement.
D	Very Insufficient	Mastery of competencies is very limited and does not yet meet the minimum learning achievement standards.
E	Fail	The student does not demonstrate mastery of the competencies required for the course.

Grading Criteria

1. The student's final grade is the cumulative result of all assessment components according to the weights specified in the Semester Learning Plan (SLP).
2. Each assessment component must be evaluated using a rubric that aligns with the learning outcome indicators.
3. The course instructor is responsible for the accuracy, objectivity, and transparency of the assessment process.
4. The final grade is converted into a letter grade and a weighted grade in accordance with the provisions of the Study Program.

5. Assessment results serve as the basis for determining the achievement of Course Learning Outcomes (CPMK) and for evaluating learning as part of Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI).

2.8 Assessment Documentation

Each instructor is required to document the entire assessment process and results as part of the academic administration of the Study Program. Assessment documents include:

1. Semester Learning Plan (RPS).
2. Assessment rubrics.
3. Test questions and answer keys (if tests are used).
4. Student work samples.
5. Grading sheets and grade summaries.
6. Feedback on student learning outcomes.

These documents serve as evidence of teaching and learning activities, academic quality evaluation, and support for the implementation of the Internal Quality Assurance System (SPMI) and program accreditation.

CHAPTER III

DEVELOPMENT OF AN ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

3.1 The Concept of Assessment Rubrics

An assessment rubric is an assessment instrument used to measure the extent to which students have achieved learning outcomes based on predetermined indicators. Rubrics are designed to ensure that the assessment process is objective, consistent, transparent, and accountable.

In the Master's Program in Mathematics Education, assessment rubrics are developed based on the relationship between Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs), Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), and Sub-CLOs. Each rubric contains observable and measurable indicators so that faculty members have a common guideline for conducting assessments.

3.2 Development of Assessment Rubrics

The development of rubrics is carried out through the following stages.

1. Identifying the CPLs assigned to the course.
2. Determining the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) to be assessed.
3. Break down the CPMK into Sub-CPMKs.
4. Determining the achievement indicators for each Sub-CPMK.
5. Determining appropriate assessment techniques and instruments.
6. Developing assessment criteria based on students' achievement levels.
7. Determine the weight of each indicator according to its level of importance.

These steps are intended to ensure that every form of assessment truly measures the competencies expected in the course.

3.3 Components of the Assessment Rubric

Each assessment rubric in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education must include at least the following components.

Component	Description
CPL	Graduate Learning Outcomes Being Assessed
CPMK	Course Learning Outcomes
Sub-CPMK	Specific competencies measured
Indicators	Evidence of Competency Achievement
Assessment Techniques	How to Conduct the Assessment
Assessment Instruments	Tools used for assessment
Assessment Criteria	Measures of achievement

Component	Description
Weight	Percentage contribution to the final grade

3.4 Use of the Assessment Rubric

Assessment rubrics are used as guidelines for instructors in evaluating all learning activities. The use of rubrics aims to:

- improve the objectivity of assessment;
- ensure consistency in assessment standards among instructors;
- provide clear feedback to students;
- document the achievement of CPMK and CPL as part of curriculum evaluation.

Instructors may adapt the rubric to the characteristics of the course as long as they do not alter the learning outcome indicators established by the academic program.

3.5 Mapping of CPLs, CPMKs, and Assessment Rubrics

Each course must establish a connection between CPLs, CPMKs, Sub-CPMKs, assessment formats, and assessment rubrics. This mapping serves as the foundation for developing the Semester Learning Plan (RPS) and conducting assessments.

CPL	CPMK	Sub-CPMK	Assessment Format	Rubric
CPL-1	CPMK-1	Sub-CPMK-1	Individual Assignment	Assignment Rubric
CPL-2	CPMK-2	Sub-CPMK-2	Presentation	Presentation Rubric
CPL-3	CPMK-3	Sub-CPMK-3	Project	Project Section
CPL-4	CPMK-4	Sub-CPMK-4	Midterm	Midterm Exam Rubric
CPL-5	CPMK-5	Sub-CPMK-5	Final Exam	Final Exam Rubric

CHAPTER IV

STUDENT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

The assessment rubric serves as a guideline for instructors to evaluate the achievement of Course Learning Outcomes (CPMK) objectively, transparently, and consistently. Each rubric is developed based on observable and measurable performance indicators and aligns with the learning characteristics of the Master's Program in Mathematics Education.

Student assessment consists of six main components, namely: (1) Attendance and Participation, (2) Individual Assignments, (3) Presentations/Group Assignments, (4) Midterm Exam (UTS), (5) Final Exam (UAS), and (6) Project/Mini Research/Scientific Article.

4.1 Attendance and Participation Rubric (Weight: 10%)

Aspect	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
Attendance	30	Students attend all sessions, are never late, and always participate in all learning activities.	Students attended almost all sessions and were late only occasionally.	Students met the minimum attendance requirements and participated in most activities.	Students were present but were late or left class on several occasions.	Attendance meets the minimum requirement but participation is low.	Attendance is below the minimum requirement.	Frequent absences.	Does not meet attendance requirements.
Participation	40	Students are always active in asking questions, offering opinions, engaging in scholarly discussions, and are able to develop new ideas.	Students are active in nearly all discussions.	Students are fairly active in providing responses.	Students participate occasionally.	Students only answer when called on.	Students rarely participate.	Students are passive.	Never participate.
Academic Attitude	30	Students demonstrate	Very good.	Good.	Fairly good.	Fair.	Insufficient.	Far from it.	Committed an academic

		integrity, responsibility, academic ethics , respect for others' opinions, and professional collaboration.							ethics violation.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------

4.2 Individual Assignment Rubric (Weight: 15%)

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
Mastery of the Material	25	Students are able to explain all concepts comprehensively and accurately, and critically connect various theories and research findings.	Students are able to explain almost all concepts correctly and connect relevant theories.	Students are able to explain most concepts correctly, but their analysis is still limited.	Students understand the main concepts but are not yet able to fully connect them.	Students only understand basic concepts and still make some errors.	Students understand a small portion of the concepts, and many errors occur.	Students are not yet able to explain the concepts correctly.	Students do not demonstrate mastery of the material.
Analytical Skills	30%	Students are able to analyze problems critically, systematically, and theoretically, and produce innovative solutions.	Logical and systematic analysis that produces appropriate solutions.	Analysis is fairly good but not yet in-depth.	Analysis is still simple and lacks theoretical grounding.	Analysis is descriptive.	The analysis is inaccurate and not supported by theory.	Unable to perform an analysis.	No analysis provided.

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
Use of References	20%	Uses up-to-date primary references (≥80% from journals published within the last 5 years) and all citations follow scientific standards.	Uses relevant references, most of which are up-to-date.	References are sufficiently relevant but do not predominantly come from scientific journals.	References are still limited and not up-to-date.	References are few and do not sufficiently support the discussion.	References are not relevant to the topic.	Very few references.	No scientific references are used.
Writing Structure	15%	The writing is very systematic, follows academic guidelines, uses excellent scientific language, and contains no technical errors.	The writing is systematic with a few technical errors.	The writing is fairly systematic, but there are still some errors.	The structure is inconsistent.	Many formatting and language errors.	The structure is unclear.	The writing does not follow the guidelines.	It does not meet the standards of scientific writing.
Originality	10%	The entire work is the result of the	Highly original with a	Original, but the ideas have	Still heavily adapted from other sources.	The similarity	Indications of minor	Severe plagiarism.	Proven to have committed

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
		author's own thinking, demonstrates novel ideas, and is free of plagiarism.	very low similarity score.	not been fully developed.		rate is quite high.	plagiarism.		plagiarism or failed to submit the assignment.

4.3 Presentation/Group Assignment Rubric (Weight: 15%)

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
Problem Identification	15%	Students are able to identify problems comprehensively, relevantly, and based on data, while demonstrating urgency and novelty.	Students are able to identify problems clearly and relevantly.	Students are able to identify problems but have not yet optimally demonstrated their urgency.	The problem is fairly clear but still general.	The problem is not specific enough.	The problem is not very relevant.	The problem does not align with the objective.	Unable to identify the problem.
Project/Research Planning	20%	Students are able to develop a project/research proposal in a systematic, realistic manner, and in accordance with	The proposal is very good, with minor shortcomings.	The proposal is appropriate but lacks detail.	The proposal is reasonably appropriate.	The proposal is not systematic.	The proposal does not follow the methodology.	The design is incomplete.	No plan was prepared.

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
		scientific methodology.							
Project Implementation and Management	20%	The student carries out all project phases independently, on time, consistently, and is able to overcome obstacles effectively.	Excellent implementation with few obstacles.	Implementation is good but requires guidance.	Implementation is adequate.	Many stages were not optimal.	Execution did not go according to plan.	The project was not completed by the target date.	The project was not implemented.
Analysis and Discussion of Results	25%	The student is able to critically analyze data, integrate theory and previous research findings, and produce a logical and innovative discussion.	The analysis is excellent and supported by relevant theory.	The analysis is good but not yet in-depth.	The analysis is adequate but remains descriptive.	The analysis is limited.	The analysis is inaccurate.	The analysis is inappropriate.	No analysis was conducted.
Outputs and Innovation	10%	Project/research outputs are of high quality, innovative, applicable, and have the potential to be published or implemented.	The outputs are high-quality and practical.	Outputs align with the objectives.	The outputs sufficiently meet the objectives.	The outputs still require significant improvement.	The outputs are not very appropriate.	The output does not meet the objectives.	No output was produced.

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
Reports and Presentations	10%	Reports and presentations are highly systematic, use sound scientific language, are supported by up-to-date references, and present a convincing argument.	The report and presentation are excellent.	The report and presentation are good.	The report is fairly good.	The report is not very systematic.	There are many errors in writing and presentation.	The report does not follow the guidelines.	Did not submit a report or presentation.

4.4 Midterm/Final Exam Rubric (Weight: 20%)

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
Mastery of the Material	25	Students are able to comprehensively master all course material and accurately integrate various concepts.	Mastery of nearly all the material.	Mastery of most of the material.	Mastery of key concepts.	Mastery of basic concepts.	Limited mastery.	Many conceptual errors.	Does not understand the material.
Analysis and Synthesis	30%	The student is able to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize various concepts to	Excellent analysis and synthesis.	Analysis is good.	Analysis is adequate.	Analysis is still rudimentary.	Analysis is inaccurate.	Unable to analyze.	Did not provide an analysis.

Assessment Criteria	Weight	A (85–100)	AB (75–84)	B (65–74)	BC (60–64)	C (50–59)	CD (40–49)	D (30–39)	E (0–29)
		develop a comprehensive understanding.							
Problem Solving	20%	The student is able to formulate innovative, practical solutions supported by theory and research findings.	The solution is very appropriate.	The solution is appropriate.	The solution is fairly appropriate.	The solution is still a general one.	The solution is not quite right.	The solution is not suitable.	Does not provide a solution.
Scientific Argumentation	15%	The student is able to construct a scientific argument that is logical, systematic, critical, and supported by relevant references.	The argument is excellent.	Good argumentation.	Argument is adequate.	The argument is not very strong.	The argument is weak.	Unable to present an argument.	Did not provide an argument.
Systematic Approach and Accuracy of Answers	10%	Answers are organized systematically, clearly, using proper scientific language, and all questions are answered accurately.	Very systematic.	Systematic.	Fairly systematic.	Not very systematic.	Many errors.	Not systematic.	Did not answer.

CHAPTER V

IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION OF ASSESSMENT

5.1 Assessment Implementation

The implementation of assessment is an integral part of the learning process, carried out in a planned, systematic, and continuous manner in accordance with the Semester Learning Plan (RPS). Each instructor in charge of a course is responsible for conducting assessments in accordance with the established techniques, instruments, and rubrics.

In carrying out the assessment, instructors are required to:

1. Communicate the components, techniques, instruments, weightings, and assessment rubrics to students at the beginning of the course.
2. Conduct assessments according to the schedule and stages of learning.
3. Use the assessment rubric as the basis for assigning scores.
4. Provide feedback on assessment results to help students improve their learning process.
5. Document all assessment evidence as part of academic administration.

5.2 Assessment Monitoring

Assessment monitoring is conducted to ensure that the assessment process has been carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Study Program and the Semester Learning Plan (RPS).

Monitoring is carried out by:

- Course Instructors;
- Course Coordinators (if any);
- the Study Program Chair; and
- the Faculty Quality Assurance Team or the University Quality Assurance Unit, in accordance with their respective authorities.

The aspects monitored include:

1. The alignment of assessment techniques with the CPMK.
2. The alignment of assessment instruments and rubrics.
3. Accuracy of assessment weighting.
4. Timeliness of the assessment process.
5. Completeness of assessment result documentation.
6. Provision of feedback to students.

5.3 Assessment Evaluation

Assessment evaluation is conducted at the end of the semester to determine the effectiveness of the assessment process and the extent to which the course's learning outcomes have been achieved.

The evaluation includes:

1. Analysis of the achievement of course learning outcomes.
2. Analysis of student grade distribution.
3. Analysis of the alignment of assessment instruments with learning outcomes.
4. Identification of obstacles in the assessment process.
5. Recommendations for improving the learning process in the next semester.

The evaluation results are used as the basis for refining the Semester Learning Plan (RPS), teaching methods, and the development of assessment instruments.

5.4 Follow-Up on Assessment Results

Assessment results are not only used to determine students' final grades but also as a basis for continuous improvement in learning.

Follow-up on assessment results includes:

1. Providing feedback to students on the learning outcomes they have achieved.
2. Implementing remediation or additional assignments in accordance with course requirements, if necessary.
3. Refining teaching strategies based on the evaluation of CPMK achievement.
4. Refining assessment instruments and rubrics for the following semester.
5. Preparing a CPL achievement report as part of the curriculum evaluation.

5.5 Assessment Quality Assurance

To ensure the quality of the assessment process, the Master's Program in Mathematics Education implements a quality assurance mechanism that includes:

- the development of standardized assessment rubrics;
- dissemination of assessment guidelines to faculty members;
- monitoring and evaluation of the assessment process each semester;
- analysis of the achievement of CPLs and CPMKs;
- conducting learning evaluation meetings; and
- refining the assessment guidelines based on evaluation results and feedback from faculty, students, employers of graduates, and other stakeholders.

Through this mechanism, it is hoped that the assessment system in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education will operate consistently, objectively, transparently, and accountably, and will support continuous improvement in the quality of learning.

CHAPTER VI CONCLUSION

6.1 Conclusion

This Student Assessment Rubric Guide has been compiled as a reference for faculty members in designing and conducting assessments that are objective, transparent, fair, and accountable in accordance with the learning outcomes established in the curriculum of the Master's Program in Mathematics Education. The application of standardized rubrics is expected to improve consistency in assessment among faculty members, provide constructive feedback to students, and support the achievement of Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs).

6.2 Conclusion

This guide serves as a reference document for the implementation of learning assessments in the Master's Program in Mathematics Education and may be reviewed and refined periodically in accordance with curriculum developments, higher education policies, learning evaluation results, and the needs of stakeholders. With this guide in place, it is hoped that the assessment process will support the improvement of academic quality and the development of a sustainable culture of quality within the program.