TITLE (Times New Roman Font 12, Capital and bold, max 20 words, arranged in an inverted pyramid) (one article consists of a maximum of 10 pages)

ISSN: 2252-9454

Findiyani Ernawati Asih and Kusumawati Dwiningsih* (Full name affiliation without title)

Department of Chemistry, FMIPA, Universitas Negeri Surabaya

e-mail: kusumawatidwiningsih@unesa.ac.id (*corresponding author)

Abs	tract		
The aims of this research are			
(abstract maximum 250 words) Key words: assesment, e-learning, mastery learning (key words contain 3-5 word	ds)	
INTRODUCTION Chemistry Department, FMIPA Unesa Chemistry is an	Next, the responses follows Ta Table 1. Student Res		f student
assessment[1]. The lecturer	Percentage (%)	Criteria	
in charge of this assessment course	0-20 21-40 41-60 61-80 81-100	Very weak Weak Fair Strong Very strong	
(Article content in English, Times New Roman Font 11, spacing 1.15) METHOD	(Table Font 11, space ordered based on app by reference sources/ij	earance in the text, ac	ccompanied
This research follows a "one shot case study" design with the target of	Based on the are said to be positive [2].	nese criteria, student ive if the percentage	-
This research was conducted	RESULTS AND DI Before the f	ISCUSSION irst meeting, the stu	dents were
	given	a	briefing
	It was recor expressed their opin were even some s	tudents who expre	ion. There essed their

students summarized the results of the discussion and ended with a reflection.

After the second meeting, students were given a learning outcome test for the sub-materials

of Question Review, Scoring, Interpretation of Test Results and Remedial Teaching. The test was in the form of a description, consisting of 6 questions. The results of the students' work were corrected and the results are shown in Table 2.

ISSN: 2252-9454

Table 2. Percentage of Student Scores for the Sub-Material of Question Review, Scoring,

	Interpretation of Test	Results an	id Remedial Teaching	
No.	Score Range	Grade	Amount	Percentage (%)
1.	85 - 100	Α	19	38
2.	80 - <85	A-	4	8
3.	75 - <80	B+	7	14
4.	70 - <75	В	2	4
5.	65 - < 70	B-	2	4
6.	60 - <65	C+	0	0
7.	55 - <60	C	6	12
8.	40 - <55	D	2	4
9.	0 - <40	Е	8	16
			Amount	100

(If the table is not sufficient in two column format, it can be presented lengthwise in one column)

	Based	on	Table	2	shows	Based	on	Figure	1	it	shows	that
												· • • • •
						Ahmed						stated
						that						
			_						.[3]			
	2011	1	27					• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
AND DESCRIPTION	-		- Bill			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			• • • •			

Figure 1. Group Presentation

(provided with image descriptions and reference sources/ if there are reference sources)

The success of implementing e-learning is not only shown by the increasing value of students, but also by the positive responses of students. More clearly, the recapitulation of student responses is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Recapitulation of Student Responses to the Implementation of e-Learning Sub-Materials on Question Review, Scoring, Interpretation of Test Results and Remedial Teaching

No.	Details	Percentage (%)	Category
1.	Lecturer's encouragement to students to ask questions	80	Strong
2.	The success of lecturers in motivating students to ask questions	76	Strong
3. 4. 5.	Clarity in explaining lecture material	74	Strong

	Based	on	T	able	2	shows	that
CONC	CLUSIO	N					
conclu		on	the	disc	ussio	n it cai	n be that
				 		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • •

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCE

1. Tim. 2011. *Buku Pedoman. Universitas Negeri Surabaya*. Surabaya: Fakultas Matematika dan

Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Fakultas Teknik.

ISSN: 2252-9454

- 2. Riduwan. 2008. *Skala Pengukuran Variabel variabel Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- 3. Sadiman, A., Rahardjo, R., Haryono, A., and Rahardjito. 2003. *Media Pendidikan:Pengertian, Pengembangan dan Pemanfaatan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo.
- 4. Ahmed. 2008. *Manfaat e-learning Bagi Pembelajaran*. Mycoolworld_ahmed blog.blogspot.com/2008/07/manfaat e-learning-bagi-pembelajaran.html. Accessed February 7, 2012.
- 5. Tural, G. 2015. Cross-Grade Comparison of Students' Conceptual Understanding with Lenses in Geometric Optics. *Sci. Edu. Intr.*, Vol 26, No 3, pp. 325–343.

(Reference Times New Roman, font 11, arranged in the order in which the reference numbers appear in the article text, 1 space after 8 pt)