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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **UNIVERSITAS INDONESIA****FAKULTAS PSIKOLOGI****PROGRAM STUDI SARJANA PSIKOLOGI** |
| **BUKU RANCANGAN PENGAJARAN** |
| **MATA KULIAH (MK)**  | **Psikologi Media** | **BOBOT (sks)**  | **MK yang menjadi prasyarat** | **Menjadi prasyarat untuk MK** | **Integrasi Antar MK** |
| **KODE** |  | 2 | Psikologi Sosial | - | - |
| **Rumpun MK**  | -  |  |
| **Semester** | 3 |  |
| **Dosen Pengampu** | Laras Sekarasih, Ph.D. |  |
| **Deskripsi Mata Kuliah** | Media adalah elemen yang tak terpisahkan dalam perkembangan dan tingkah laku manusia. Dalam perkembangan anak dan remaja, misalnya, media merupakan salah satu instrumen pendidikan, hiburan, maupun alat untuk menjaga koneksi dengan kerabat. Namun media juga menjadi elemen yang kerap diangkat dalam diskursus mengenai masalah dalam perkembangan anak. Dalam lingkup yang lebih luas, media sering pula disorot sebagai faktor yang dianggap signifikan dalam menjelaskan berbagai permasalahan sosial, seperti perilaku seksual berisiko, materialisme, kekerasan, pilihan politik, hingga prasangka dan konflik antarkelompok. Kompetensi yang hendak dicapai melalui Mata Kuliah (MK) Psikologi Media adalah kemampuan menganalisis gejala psikologis dan kebijakan media terkait pesan, fungsi, penggunaan, dan dampak media, baik media tradisional (e.g., televisi, suratkabar) maupun media digital (e.g., gawai), pada perilaku individu maupun kelompok.  |
| **Tautan Kelas Daring** |  |
|  |
| **CPL-PRODI** yang dibebankan pada MK  |
| CPL-A | Memiliki integritas, sikap positif, dan keterampilan dalam berhubungan interpersonal |
| CPL-C | Mampu memanfaatkan teknologi informasi agar dapat bersaing dalam dunia kerja (C3)Mampu menyelesaikan masalah psikologik di tingkat individu, kelompok, organisasi, dan masyarakat perkotaan (C4) |
| **Capaian Pembelajaran Mata Kuliah (CPMK)**  |
| CPMK-1  | Ketika mendapat pemicu pembelajaran, mahasiswa dapat menganalisis gejala psikologis dan kebijakan media terkait pesan, fungsi, penggunaan, dan dampak media, baik media tradisional (e.g., televisi, suratkabar) maupun media digital (e.g., gawai), pada perilaku individu maupun kelompok (C4). Mahasiswa mampu menunjukkan terjadinya gejala psikologis dan kebijakan media terkait fungsi, penggunaan, dan dampak media ini menggunakan basis teori psikologi media A4). |
| **Sub-CPMK**  |
| Sub-CPMK 1 | Mahasiswa mampu menjelaskan teori-teori dan penelitian-penelitian mutakhir psikologi media dengan memberikan minimum tiga contoh (C2). Mahasiswa mampu mengajukan pertanyaan maupun jawaban atas pertanyaan-pertanyaan dasar mengenai teori-teori psikologi media (A2). |
| Sub-CPMK 2 | Mahasiswa mampu menjelaskan proses kognitif dan emosional dasar yang terjadi dalam penggunaan media, serta perbedaman individual yang memengaruhi pemrosesan pesan media (C2). Mahasiswa mampu mengajukan pertanyaan maupun jawaban atas pertanyaan-pertanyaan dasar mengenai proses kognitif dan emosional pada penggunaan media (A2). |
| Sub-CPMK 3 | Mahasiswa mampu mengaitkan fenomena dan representasi sosial di media menggunakan teori-teori psikologi media (C3). Mahasiswa mampu memperjelas konsep representasi sosial di media melalui contoh-contoh (A3). |
|  |  |
| Sub-CPMK 4 | Mahasiswa mampu menganalisis fenomena-fenomena terkait penggunaan, konten, dan representasi media (C4). Mahasiswa mampu menunjukkan basis teoretis penggunaan, konten, dan representasi media (A4). |
|  |
| **Bahan Kajian:** Materi pembelajaran | Pengantar, Sejarah Psikologi Mediaa. Agenda-settingb. Framinga. Cultivationb. Social Cognitivea. Uses and gratificationb. Identifikasic. Interaksi dan hubungan prasosialThird-Person Perceptiona. Perbedaan individu dan efek mediab. Pemrosesan pesan mediaa. Kekerasan dalam Mediab. Media dan Tingkah Laku PrososialRepresentasi Berbagai Kelompok dalam Mediaa. Ras dan Etnisb. Agamac. Genderd. Kelas SosialKebijakan dan Regulasi terkait Media di IndonesiaMedia, Anak, dan KeluargaMedia Sosial dan Media DigitalLiterasi Media |
| Daftar Pustaka | Bandura, A. (2009). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 94 - 124. New York, NY: Routledge.Bushman, B. J., & Anderson, C. A. (2015). Understanding causality in the effects of media violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *59*(14), 1807-1821.Cohen, J. (2006). Audience identification with media characters. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer. *Psychology of Entertainment*, 183-198. New York, NY: Routledge.Collins, R. L. (2011). Content analysis of gender roles in media: Where are we now and where should we go?. *Sex Roles*, *64*(3-4), 290-298.Dibble, J. L., Hartmann, T., & Rosaen, S. F. (2016). Parasocial interaction and parasocial relationship: Conceptual clarification and a critical assessment of measures. *Human Communication Research*, *42*(1), 21-44.Giles, D. C. (2002). Parasocial interaction: A review of the literature and a model for future research. *Media psychology*, *4*(3), 279-305.Golan, G. J., & Day, A. G. (2008). The first-person effect and its behavioral consequences: A new trend in the twenty-five year history of third-person effect research. *Mass Communication and Society*, *11*(4), 539-556.Green, M. C., Brock, T. C., & Kaufman, G. F. (2004). Understanding media enjoyment: The role of transportation into narrative worlds. *Communication Theory*, *14*(4), 311-327.Greitemeyer, T. (2011). Effects of prosocial media on social behavior: When and why does media exposure affect helping and aggression?. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 251-255.Hoffner, C. A., & Levine, K. J. (2005). Enjoyment of mediated fright and violence: A meta-analysis. *Media Psychology*, *7*(2), 207-237.Knobloch-Westerwick, S. (2006). Mood management: theory, evidence, and advancement. In J. Bryant & P. Vorderer. *Psychology of Entertainment*, 239-254. New York, NY: Routledge.Koltay, T. (2011). The media and the literacies: Media literacy, information literacy, digital literacy. *Media, Culture & Society*, *33*(2), 211-221.Lauricella, A. R., Wartella, E., & Rideout, V. J. (2015). Young children's screen time: The complex role of parent and child factors. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 36, 11-17.Leshner, G., Vultee, F., Bolls, P. D., & Moore, J. (2010). When a fear appeal isn't just a fear appeal: The effects of graphic anti-tobacco messages. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *54*(3), 485-507.Mares, M. L., & Pan, Z. (2013). Effects of Sesame Street: A meta-analysis of children's learning in 15 countries. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *34*(3), 140-151.Martens, Hans (2010) "Evaluating Media Literacy Education: Concepts, Theories and Future Directions," *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, *2*(1). Available at: http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/jmle/vol2/iss1/1Mastro, D. (2009). Effects of racial and ethnic stereotyping. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 325-341. New York, NY: Routledge.McCombs, M., & Reynolds, A. (2009). How the news shapes our civic agenda. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 1-16. New York, NY: Routledge.Morales, A. C., Wu, E. C., & Fitzsimons, G. J. (2012). How disgust enhances the effectiveness of fear appeals. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *49*(3), 383-393.Morgan, M. (2009). Growing up with television: cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 34-49. New York, NY: Routledge.Nikken, P., & Jansz, J. (2014). Developing scales to measure parental mediation of young children's internet use. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *39*(2), 250-266.Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: a field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *96*(3), 574.Perloff. (2009). Mass media, social perception, and the third-person effect. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 252 - 268. New York, NY: Routledge.Perloff, R. M. (2014). Social media effects on young women’s body image concerns: Theoretical perspectives and an agenda for research. Sex Roles, 71(11-12), 363-377. Prot, S., Gentile, D. A., Anderson, C. A., Suzuki, K., Swing, E., Lim, K. M., ... & Liau, A. K. (2014). Long-term relations among prosocial-media use, empathy, and prosocial behavior. *Psychological science*, *25*(2), 358-368.Rozendaal, E., Lapierre, M. A., Van Reijmersdal, E. A., & Buijzen, M. (2011). Reconsidering advertising literacy as a defense against advertising effects. *Media Psychology*, *14*(4), 333-354.Rubin, A.M. (2009). Uses and gratification perspective on media effects. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 165 - 187. New York, NY: Routledge.Scheufele, D. & Tewksbury, D. (2009). News framing theory and research. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 17 - 33. New York, NY: Routledge.Sekarasih, L. (2016). Restricting, Distracting, and Reasoning: Parental Mediation of Young Children’s Use of Mobile Communication Technology in Indonesia. In Lim, S.S. (Ed.). *Mobile Communication and the Family,* 129-146. Netherlands: Springer.Sekarasih, L., Walsh McDermott, K., O’Malley, D., Olson, C., & Scharrer, E. (2016). To guide or to be the sage: children’s responses to varying facilitator prompts following a media literacy education curriculum in the United States. *Journal of Children and Media*, *10*(3), 369-384.Shrum, L. J. (2009). Media consumption and perceptions of social reality: effects and underlying process. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 50 -73. New York, NY: Routledge.Smith, S. L., & Granados, A. D. (2009). Content patterns and effects surrounding sex-role stereotyping on television and film. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 342 -361. New York, NY: Routledge.Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2013). The differential susceptibility to media effects model. *Journal of Communication*, *63*(2), 221-243.Walsh-Childers, K., & Brown, J. (2009). Effects of media on personal and public health. In J. Bryant & M.B. Oliver. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 469 - 489. New York, NY: Routledge. |

**RENCANA PEMBELAJARAN**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **\*Mg ke** | **Sub-CPMK (Kemampuan akhir yang diharapkan)** | **Bahan Kajian** **(Materi Pembelajaran)****[Rujukan]** | **Metode pembelajaran****[Estimasi Waktu]** | **Moda pembelajaran** | **Pengalaman Belajar** | **Indikator Pencapaian sub-CPMK** | **Bobot Penerapan sub-CPMK pada MK** |
| **Orientasi; Latihan ; Umpan Balik** | **Indikator Umum; Indikator Khusus** |
| **Daring (*online*)** | **Luring (*offline*)** |
| 1 | Sub-CPMK 1 | Pengantar, Sejarah Psikologi Media(Baran & Davis (2010)) | Kuliah interaktifDiskusi Kelompok(100menit) | Sinkronus | O: Perkenalan dari instruktur, penjelasan mengenai cakupan mata kuliah dan peraturan kuliah (15%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil dan kuis daring mengenai sejarah psikologi media (70%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (15%) |  | Mahasiswa memahami teori-teori dan penelitian-penelitian mutakhir psikologi media | 6.25% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Sub-CPMK 1 | 1. Agenda-setting
2. Framing

(McCombs & Reynolds (2009); Scheufele & Tewksbury (2009)) | Pembelajaran Kolaboratif(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O: *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil dan kuis daring mengenai agenda-setting dan framing (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | Mahasiswa memahami teori-teori dan penelitian-penelitian mutakhir psikologi media | 6.25% |
| 3 | Sub-CPMK 1 | 1. Cultivation
2. Social Cognitive

(Morgan (2009); Bandura (2009)) | Pembelajaran Kolaboratif(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil dan kuis daring mengenai teori cultivation dan social cognitive (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar menggunakan video singkat mengenai cultivation dan social cognitive(10%) |  | Mahasiswa memahami teori-teori dan penelitian-penelitian mutakhir psikologi media | 6.25% |
| 4 | Sub-CPMK 1 | 1. *Uses and gratification*
2. Identifikasi
* Interaksi dan hubungan prasosial
 | Diskusi kasus(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil menganalisis kasus dari berita atau media sosial; Kuis daring (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | * Mahasiswa memahami teori-teori dan penelitian-penelitian mutakhir psikologi media
 | 6.25% |
| 5 | Sub-CPMK 1 | * *Third-Person Perception*
 | Simulasi(100 menit) | Sinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Kerja dalam Kelompok Kecil mengolah data deskriptif mengenai Third-Person Perception (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | * Mahasiswa memahami teori-teori dan penelitian-penelitian mutakhir psikologi media
 | 6.25% |
| 6 | Sub-CPMK 2 | 1. Perbedaan individu dan efek media
* Pemrosesan pesan media
 | Pembelajaran Kolaboratif(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil dan latihan Cari Kata Psikologi Media (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | * Mahasiswa mampu menjelaskan proses kognitif dan emosional dasar yang terjadi dalam penggunaan media, serta perbedaan individual yang memengaruhi pemrosesan pesan media
 | 6.25% |
| 7 | Sub-CPMK 3 | 1. Kekerasan dalam Media
* Media dan Tingkah Laku Prososial
 | Diskusi Kasus(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | * Mahasiswa mampu mengaitkan fenomena dan representasi sosial di media menggunakan teori media
 | 6.25% |
| 8-9 | Sub-CPMK 3 | UTS (Analisis Kasus – Take Home) |  |  |  |  | Mahasiswa mampu mengaitkan fenomena dan representasi sosial di media menggunakan teori media | 12.5% |
| 10 | Sub-CPMK 3 | Representasi Berbagai Kelompok dalam Media1. Ras dan Etnis
2. Agama
3. Gender
4. Kelas Sosial

(Collins (2011); Mastro (2009); Paluck (2009); Smith & Granados (2009)) | Pembelajaran kolaboratif(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Mahasiswa mencari contoh-contoh representasi media kemudian dipresentasikan (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | Mahasiswa mampu mengaitkan fenomena dan representasi sosial di media menggunakan teori media | 6.25% |
| 11 | Sub-CPMK 3 | Media dan Pesan Kesehatan Masyarakat | (100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | Mahasiswa mampu mengaitkan fenomena dan representasi sosial di media menggunakan teori media | 6.25% |
| 12 | Sub-CPMK 4 | Media, Anak, dan Keluarga(Collier et al. (2016); Lauricella, Wartella, & Rideout (2015), Nikken & Jansz (2014); Mares & Pan (2013)) | Diskusi Kasus(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | Mahasiswa mampu menganalisis fenomena-fenomena terkait penggunaan, konten, dan representasi media | 6.25% |
| 13 | Sub-CPMK 4 | Media Sosial dan Media Digital(Chae (2017); Liu et al (2017)) | Menonton Film “Generation Like” atau “The Cleaners”(Tugas: Esai Reflektif)(100 menit) | Asinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Menonton film (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | Mahasiswa mampu menganalisis fenomena-fenomena terkait penggunaan, konten, dan representasi media | 6.25% |
| 14 | Sub-CPMK 4 | Literasi Media(Koltay (2011); Martens (2010); Rozendaal, Lapierre, & Reijmersdal (2011); Scharrer, Sekarasih, & Olson (2017)) | *Problem-based learning*(100 menit) | Sinkronus | O:  *Overview* agenda pembelajaran (10%)L: Diskusi Kelompok Kecil (80%)U: Klarifikasi dari pengajar, rangkuman materi (10%) |  | Mahasiswa mampu menganalisis fenomena-fenomena terkait penggunaan, konten, dan representasi media | 6.25% |
| 15-16 | Sub-CPMK 5 | UAS (Membuat Pesan Layanan Masyarakat Sederhana) |  |  |  |  | Mahasiswa mampu menganalisis fenomena-fenomena terkait penggunaan, konten, dan representasi media | 12.5% |

\*)Mg: Minggu

\*\*) Sinkronus: interaksi pembelajaran antara dosen dan mahasiswa dilakukan pada waktu yang bersamaan, menggunakan teknologi *video* *conference* atau *chatting*.

Asinkronus: interaksi pembelajaran dilakukan secara fleksibel dan tidak harus dalam waktu yang sama, misalkan menggunakan forum diskusi atau belajar mandiri/penugasan mahasiswa.

**RANCANGAN TUGAS DAN LATIHAN**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Minggu Ke** | **Nama Tugas** | **Sub-CPMK** | **Penugasan** | **Ruang Lingkup** | **Cara Pengerjaan** | **Batas Waktu** | **Luaran Tugas yang Dihasilkan** |
| 1 | Kuis | Sub-CPMK 1 | Kuis daring melalui aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis | Sejarah Psikologi Media | Mahasiswa mengerjakan 10 pertanyaan yang ditampilkan pada aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis melalui ponsel. | 5 menit | Respons mahasiswa dan persentase benar dan salah untuk setiap mahasiswa |
| 2 | Kuis | Sub-CPMK 1 | Kuis daring melalui aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis | Agenda SettingFraming | Mahasiswa mengerjakan 10 – 15 pertanyaan yang ditampilkan pada aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis melalui ponsel. | 10 menit | Respons mahasiswa dan persentase benar dan salah untuk setiap mahasiswa |
| 3 | Bermain peran | Sub-CPMK 1 | Bermain peran sesuai dengan konsep-konsep dalam teori *Cultivation* dan *Social Cognitive* | CultivationSocial Cognitive | Kelompok kecil diberi skenario (e.g., “Pada Hari Raya, seorang kerabat bertanya kepada Anda apa yang akan terjadi jika anaknya sering menonton acara *Smack* Down. Berikan jawaban sesuai teori Cultivation.”) dan memerankan sesuai dengan pertanyaan/skenario.  | 20 menit | Jawaban mahasiswa yang dipersiapkan sebelum bermain peran |
| 4 | Kuis | Sub-CPMK 1 | Kuis daring melalui aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis | Teori Audiens: Uses and Gratification, Identifikasi, Hubungan Parasosial | Mahasiswa mengerjakan 10 – 15 pertanyaan yang ditampilkan pada aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis melalui ponsel. | 10 menit | Respons mahasiswa dan persentase benar dan salah untuk setiap mahasiswa |
| 5 | Mengambil data survei kecil | Sub-CPMK 1 | Mahasiswa mewawancara mahasiswa fakultas lain, menanyakan efek media terhadap diri mereka sendiri dibandingkan terhadap orang lain.  | Third-Person Perception | Penugasan diberikan di akhir pertemuan pekan keempat | 1 minggu | Data survei yang dientri menggunakan Microsoft Excel |
| 6 | Cari Kata Psikologi Media | Sub-CPMK 2 | Menemukan dan memberi contoh penerapan konsep-konsep perbedaan individu dan pemrosesan media | Perbedaan individu dan efek mediaPemrosesan pesan media | Mahasiswa bekerja dalam kelompok dan menemukan kata-kata tersembunyi dalam *puzzle* dan memberi contoh dari masing-masing kata (konsep) yang ditemukan dalam *puzzle* | 20 menit | Lembar *word puzzle* yang telah dikerjakan dan jawaban mengenai contoh-contoh konsep |
| 7 | Kuis | Sub-CPMK 3 | Kuis daring melalui aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis | * 1. Kekerasan dalam Media
	2. Media dan Tingkah Laku Prososial
 | Mahasiswa mengerjakan 5 - 10 pertanyaan yang ditampilkan pada aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis melalui ponsel. | 10 menit | Respons mahasiswa dan persentase benar dan salah untuk setiap mahasiswa |
| 10 | Presentasi | Sub-CPMK 3 | Presentasi Kelompok mengenai contoh-contoh stereotipe ras dan etnis, agama, gender, dan kelas sosial dalam konten media di Indonesia | Representasi berbagai kelompok dalam media | Dalam kelompok, mahasiswa bekerja mencari contoh-contoh stereotipe (satu kelompok satu jenis stereotipe) dalam konten media Indonesia | 20 menit | PowerPoint Slides yang diunggah di SCELE |
| 12 | Kuis | Sub-CPMK 4 | Kuis daring melalui aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis | Media, Anak, dan Keluarga | Mahasiswa mengerjakan 5 - 10 pertanyaan yang ditampilkan pada aplikasi Kahoot atau Quizis melalui ponsel. | 10 menit | Respons mahasiswa dan persentase benar dan salah untuk setiap mahasiswa |
| 13 | Esai | Sub-CPMK 4 | Menulis esai berdasarkan film Generation Like | Media Sosial dan Media Digital | Mahasiswa mengerjakan esai setelah menonton film dan dikumpulkan melalui SCELE. | 2 minggu | Esai mahasiswa |

 **Kriteria Penilaian (Evaluasi Hasil Pemelajaran)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub-CPMK** | **Bentuk Evaluasi** | **Instrumen/****Jenis Asesmen** | **Frekuensi** | **Bobot Evaluasi (%)** |
| 4 | UTS (Individu) | Contoh kasus untuk dianalisis  | 1 | 20 |
| 6 | Tugas Akhir Semester (Kelompok) | Panduan Tugas Akhir | 1 | 35 |
| 6 | Draf 1 Tugas Akhir Semester | Panduan Tugas Akhir | 1 | 10 |
| 6 | Draf 2 Tugas Akhir Semester | Panduan Tugas Akhir | 1 | 10 |
| 5 | Refleksi Film | Film “*Generation Like”* | 1 | 15 |
| 1, 2 | Partisipasi dalam Kuis | Kuis Daring | 1 | 10 |
| **Total** |  | **100** |

**Pedoman Kriteria Penilaian**

Konversi nilai akhir mahasiswa berdasarkan ketentuan yang berlaku di Universitas Indonesia. Konversi nilai tersebut adalah:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Nilai Angka** | **Nilai Huruf** | **Bobot** |
| 85—100 | A | 4,00 |
| 80—<85 | A- | 3,70 |
| 75—<80 | B+ | 3,30 |
| 70—<75 | B | 3,00 |
| 65—<70 | B- | 2,70 |
| 60—<65 | C+ | 2,30 |
| 55—<60 | C | 2,00 |
| 40—<50 | D | 1,00 |
| <40 | E | 0,00 |

*Tabel 1 Rubrik penilaian laporan akhir*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **A (90)** | **B (75)** | **C (60)** | **D (50)** |
| **Organization**(Overall order, flow, and transitions) | Information is presented in effective order. Excellent structure of paragraphs and transitions enhances readability and comprehension.The executive summary or abstract is presented first,enabling the reader to easily follow the rest of the report | Information is logically ordered with paragraphs and transitions.Within sections, the order in which ideas are presented may be occasionally confusing | Information is scattered and needs further development. | There is no apparent ordering of paragraphs, and thus there is no progressive flow of ideas.Details and examples are not organized, are hard to follow and understand. |
| **Quality of Information** | Supporting details are specific to topic and provide the necessary information. | Some details don’t support the report topic. | Details are somewhat sketchy. | Unable to find specific details. |
| **Introduction** | Introductory paragraph is clearly stated, has a sharp, distinct focus andenhances the impact of the report | Introductory paragraph is clearly stated with a focus. | Introductory paragraph is vague. | Introductory paragraph is not apparent. |
| **Conclusion** | Concluding paragraph summarizes and draws a clear, effective conclusionand enhances the impact of the report. | Concluding paragraph follows and summarizes the report discussion and draws a conclusion. | Concluding paragraph is only remotely related to the report topic. | Concluding paragraph is not apparent. |
| **Use of Language: Word Choice, Grammar, and Sentence Structure** | Sentences are complete and grammatical, and they flow together easily. Words are chosen for their precise meaning. | For the most part, sentences are complete and grammatical, and they flow together easily. Any errors are minor and do not distract the reader. Repetition of the same words and phrases isavoided | Minor Errors in sentence structure and grammar are frequent enough that they reduce the reader and interfere with meaning.There is unnecessary repetition of thesame words and phrases | Major Errors in sentence structure and grammar are frequent enough that they distract the reader and interfere with meaning.There is unnecessary repetition of thesame words and phrases |
| **Use of Figures: Graphs, Charts, & Drawings** | All figures, graphs, charts, and drawings are accurate, consistent with the text, and of good quality. Theyenhance | For the most part, figures, graphs, charts, and drawings are accurate, consistent with the text, and of goodquality. They are | Just few of figures, graphs, charts, and drawings are accurate, consistent with the text, and of good quality. Theyare not labeled | Figures, graphs, charts, & drawings are of poor quality, have numerous inaccuracies & mislabeling, or maybe missing. There |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **A (90)** | **B (75)** | **C (60)** | **D (50)** |
|  | understanding of the text. All are labeled correctly in accordance with engineering standards and are referred to in thetext. | generally labeled correctly in accordance with engineering standards. All are referred to in the text. | correctly. | may be no corresponding explanatory text or there may be redundancy with the text. |
| **References** | All resources are cited and appear with correctformatting. | All resources are cited, but formatting isn’t correct. | Some resources are cited but not all.Not formatted correctly. | Resources not cited in paper or proper format not used. |
| **Critique** | The report discusses the strengths and weaknesses and suggests ways inwhich it can be improved. | The report discusses the strengths and weaknesses | The report discusses either the strengths or weaknesses of the invention but not both. | The report does not mention the strengths or the weaknesses |
| **Connections** | The report makes appropriate connections between all key components (problems to solutions, problem to problems, solutions tosolutions) | The report makes appropriate connections between several components | The report makes unclear or inappropriate connections between components | The report makes no connections, just showing the components |
| **Analysis** | The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are clear and highly accurate. | The paper successfully breaks the argument, issue, or problem into relevant parts. The connections between the parts are fairly accurate. | The paper breaks the argument, issue, or problem into parts, but some parts may be missing or unclear. The connections between the parts are somewhataccurate. | The parts identified are not the correct and/or relevant ones. The connections between the parts are completely inaccurate. |
| **Depth of Analysis** | Results are carefully and objectively analyzed.Interpretations are made using appropriate equations, models,or theories | Engineering analysis is detailed enough to aid understanding butis not enhanced with equations, models, or theories | Engineering analysis is so sketchy thatthe reader is barely able to evaluate the validity of the interpretation offindings | Engineering analysis is so inadequate that the reader is notable to evaluate the validity of the interpretation offindings |
| **Synthesis** | The paper successfully integrates all relevant parts from various places into a coherent whole. Theconnections between the parts | The paper integrates most relevant parts from various places into a mostly coherent whole. The connectionsbetween the parts are generally clear. | The paper integrates some parts from various places into a somewhat coherent whole. The connections between the parts | The parts to be integrated are not clear and/or relevant. The connections between the parts are unclear. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **A (90)** | **B (75)** | **C (60)** | **D (50)** |
|  | are clear and insightful. |  | are somewhat unclear. |  |
| **Professional Style** |
| **Visual Format** | The document is | Use of white space | The document is not | The document is |
|  | visually appealing. | and color help the | visually appealing | unappealing and no |
|  | White space and | reader navigate the | and there are few | or confusing visual |
|  | color are used | document, although | “cues” to help the | cues |
|  | appropriately | the layout could be | reader navigate the |  |
|  | to separate blocks of | more effective and | document. |  |
|  | text and add | appealing |  |  |
|  | emphasis. The |  |  |  |
|  | reader can easily |  |  |  |
|  | navigate the |  |  |  |
|  | document |  |  |  |
| **Ability to Define** | Engineering terms | For the most part, |  | There is an overuse |
| **Terms and Jargon** | and jargon are used | terms and jargon are | of jargon and |
|  | correctly. They are | used correctly with | technical terms |
|  | defined the first | some attempt to | without adequate |
|  | time they are used | define them. | explanation of their |
|  | in the report |  | meaning |
| **Self-Evaluation** |
| **Analysis of group** | Clearly articulates | Discusses only two | Does not articulate |  |
| **process and** | what worked well | of the three; | any of the three – |
| **individual role** | and why, what did | discusses group | what worked well |
| **within it** | not work well and | without discussing | and why, what |
|  | why, and ways to | self; discusses self | didn’t work well |
|  | increase | without discussing | and why, how to |
|  | effectiveness and | group | improve |
|  | efficiency of group |  |  |
|  | process in the |  |  |
|  | future, considering |  |  |
|  | self as well as others |  |  |

*Tabel 2 Rubrik penilaian presentasi*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **A (90)** | **B (75)** | **C (60)** | **D (50)** |
| **Gains attention of** | Gives details or an | Does a two- | Does not attempt to |  |
| **audience.** | amusing fact, a | sentence | gain attention of |
|  | series of questions, | introduction, then | audience, just starts |
|  | a short | starts speech. | speech. |
|  | demonstration, a |  |  |
|  | colorful visual or a |  |  |
|  | personal reason |  |  |
|  | why they picked |  |  |
|  | this topic. |  |  |
| **Style** | Level of | Level of | Aspects of | Presentation |
|  | presentation is | presentation is | presentation are too | consistently is too |
|  | appropriate for the | generally | elementary or too | elementary or too |
|  | audience. | appropriate. Pacing | sophisticated for | sophisticated for |
|  | Presentation is a | is sometimes too | audience. Presenter | the audience. |
|  | planned | fast or slow. The | seems uncomfortable | Information is read |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **A (90)** | **B (75)** | **C (60)** | **D (50)** |
|  | conversation, paced for audience understanding. It is NOT a reading of a paper. Speaker is clearly comfortable in front of the group and can beheard by all. | presenter seems slightly uncomfortable at times, and the audience occasionally has trouble hearing the presenter. | and can be heard only if listener is very attentive. Much of the information is read. | to audience. Presenter is obviously anxious and cannot be heard. |
| **Use of Communication Aids (transparencies, slides, posters, handouts, etc.)** | Communication aids enhance the presentation.They are prepared in a professional manner. Font on visuals is large enough to be seen by all.Information is organized to maximize audience understanding.Details are minimized so main points stand out. | Communication aids contribute to the quality of the presentation.Font size is appropriate for reading.Appropriate information is included.Some material is not supported by visual aids. | Communication aids are poorly prepared or used inappropriately. Font is too small to be easily seen.Too much information is included.Unimportant material is highlighted. Listeners may be confused. | No communication aids are used, or they are so poorly prepared that they detract from the presentation. |