Document Code



Universitas Negeri Surabaya Faculty of Educational Sciences Bachelor of Education Management Study Program

| | | | | |
|---------------|-------|------|------|-----|
| SEMES' | TED I | | IC D | ΙΔΝ |
| * 31 IVIL * 3 | | | | |

| | | CODE | Course Family | | Credit \ | Veig | ınt | SEMESTER | Compilatio Date |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| Educational I | Planning II | 8620402098 | | | T=2 P | =0 I | ECTS=3.18 | 2 | July 18, 202 |
| AUTHORIZAT | TION | SP Developer | <u> </u> | Course | Cluster | Cod | ordinator | Study Progr | |
| | | | | | | | Syunu Trihantoyo, S.Pd., M.Pd. | | |
| _earning nodel | Project Based Learni | ing | | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Program | PLO study program | that is charged to the | course | | | | | | |
| _earning Outcomes | Program Objectives | s (PO) | | | | | | | |
| (PLO) | PLO-PO Matrix | | | | | | | | |
| | P.O PO Matrix at the end of each learning stage (Sub-PO) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | P.O | | W | Week | | | | |
| | | 1 2 3 4 | 5 6 7 | 8 9 | 10 | 1 | 1 12 | 13 14 | 15 16 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Short Course Description | methodology, identifica | es basic concepts, mechar ation of problems and setti g in Indonesia, student flov nal planning. | ng goals for educat | ional plar | ning, pre | epara | ation of activ | ities and prog | ırams, analys |
| References | Main : | | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Anderson, Arnold. 1984. Educational Planning. Syracuse University 2. Banghart. Frank W and Trull, Alber. 1983. Educational Planning. London: Collier The Macmillan 3. Bryson, John M. 1991. Strategic Planning For Public and Non Profit Organizations: A Guide Line to Strengthening Sustaining Organizational Achievement. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass limited 4. Correa, Hector. 1969. Quantitative Methods of Educational Planning. Scranton: International Book Company. 5. Davis.1980. Planning Education For Development Volume I (Issues and Problems in The Planning Of Education Developing Countries). Cambridge: Harvard University. 6. Davis. 1980. Planning Education For Development Volume II (Model And Methods For Systemic Planning For Education Cambridge: Harvard University. 7. Gaffar, M.Fakry. 1995. Perencanaan Pendidikan: Teori dan Metodology. Jakarta: Depdikbud. 8. Hoy, K.W dan Miskel, G.C. 2001. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Mc. Graw. Book Company. 9. Journal of the International Society fo Educational Planning (ISEP). 2007. Educational Planning. Vol.16 No.1, d. [http://www.caee.org] 10. LP2KS. 2017. Penyusunan Rencana Kerja Sekolah/Madrasah. Kemdikbud 11. Master Plan for Education 2003-2023, tersedia di www.bkvgroup.com/portfolio.cfm/Education/Master_Plan 12. Peraturan Pemerintah No 32 Tahun 2013. Tentang Standar Nasioanal Pendidikan (SNP). 13. Peraturan Pemerintah No 66 Tahun 2010. Tentang Perubahan PP No 17 Tahun 2010 tentang Pengelolaan penyelenggaraan Pendidikan. 14. Peraturan Pemerintah No 48 Tahun 2013. Tentang Pendanaan Pendidikan. 15. Sa'ud. Udin Syaefudin. 2005. Perencanaan Pendidikan. Bandung: Remaja Rosda Karya 16. Soenarya, Endang. 2000. Pengantar Teori Perencanaan Pendidikan Berdasarkan Pendekatan Sistem. Jakarta: Adicita 17 | | | | | | | | |
| | 3. Bryson, John Sustaining Ore 4. Correa, Hecto 5. Davis.1980. F Developing Co 6. Davis. 1980. F Cambridge: H 7. Gaffar, M.Fak 8. Hoy, K.W dan Book Compan 9. Journal of the [http://www.ca 10. LP2KS. 2017. 11. Master Plan fo 12. Peraturan Per 13. Peraturan Per penyelenggar 14. Peraturan Per 15. Sa'ud. Udin S 16. Soenarya, Ene | M. 1991. Strategic Planniganizational Achievement. r. 1969. Quantitative Metholanning Education For Dountries). Cambridge: Harvellanning Education For Dearvard University. ry. 1995. Perencanaan Pela Miskel, G.C. 2001. Educaty. e. International Society for the education 2003-2023, temerintah No 32 Tahun 2013 merintah No 48 Tahun 2013 merintah Merintah No 48 Tahun 2013 merintah Mer | ng For Public and San Fransisco: Jos ods of Educational Fevelopment Volume and University. Educational Administrational Administrational Administrational Administrational Sekolah/Madrass rsedia di www.bkvg 3. Tentang Standar 2010. Tentang Pendana an Pendidikan. Bar ori Perencanaan Pe | ning. Lond Non Prof ssey-Bass Planning. e I (Issu II (Model Metodolo on: Theolo ing (ISEF ah. Kemd roup.com Nasioana rubahan aan Pend ddung: Re ndidikan | it Organs Imited Scrantor es and Imited And Met Gy. Jakary, Research P. 2007. Illikbud Infortfolical Pendid PP No idikan. Emaja Roberdasai | ization: Interpretation in Int | ernational B lems in The s For Syster Depdikbud. and Practic ucational Plant/Education/ (SNP). Tahun 2010 Karya Pendekatar | e Line to Stre cook Company e Planning O mic Planning F ce. New York: lanning. Vol.1: Master_Plan o) tentang Per on Sistem. Jaka | f Education For Education Mc. Graw Hi 6 No.1, dalai |
| | 3. Bryson, John Sustaining Ore 4. Correa, Hecto 5. Davis.1980. F Developing Co 6. Davis. 1980. F Cambridge: H 7. Gaffar, M.Fak 8. Hoy, K.W dan Book Compan 9. Journal of the [http://www.ca 10. LP2KS. 2017. 11. Master Plan fo 12. Peraturan Per 13. Peraturan Per penyelenggar 14. Peraturan Per 15. Sa'ud. Udin S 16. Soenarya, Ene | M. 1991. Strategic Planniganizational Achievement. r. 1969. Quantitative Metholanning Education For Dountries). Cambridge: Harvellanning Education For Dearvard University. ry. 1995. Perencanaan Pela Miskel, G.C. 2001. Educaty. e. International Society for the education 2003-2023, temerintah No 32 Tahun 2013 merintah No 48 Tahun 2013 merintah Merintah No 48 Tahun 2013 merintah Mer | ng For Public and San Fransisco: Jos ods of Educational Fevelopment Volume and University. Educational Administrational Administrational Administrational Administrational Sekolah/Madrass rsedia di www.bkvg 3. Tentang Standar 2010. Tentang Pendana an Pendidikan. Bar ori Perencanaan Pe | ning. Lond Non Prof ssey-Bass Planning. e I (Issu II (Model Metodolo on: Theolo ing (ISEF ah. Kemd roup.com Nasioana rubahan aan Pend ddung: Re ndidikan | it Organs Imited Scrantor es and Imited And Met Gy. Jakary, Research P. 2007. Illikbud Infortfolical Pendid PP No idikan. Emaja Roberdasai | ization: Interpretation in Int | ernational B lems in The s For Syster Depdikbud. and Practic ucational Plant/Education/ (SNP). Tahun 2010 Karya Pendekatar | e Line to Stre cook Company e Planning O mic Planning F ce. New York: lanning. Vol.1: Master_Plan o) tentang Per on Sistem. Jaka | f Education For Education Mc. Graw Hi 6 No.1, dalai |

| Support | | , M.Pd. | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|---|---|---|--------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Week- | Final abilities of each learning stage | E | valuation | Learı Studer | Ip Learning, ning methods, nt Assignments, timated time] | Learning materials | Assessment Weight (%) | |
| | (Sub-PO) | Indicator | Criteria & Form | Offline (offline) | Online (online) | References] | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | |
| 1 | Students can explain the general description of the objectives, processes, mechanisms and assessments in lectures. Students are able to explain the concepts and theories of comprehensive educational planning. | Students are able to describe the meaning, goals and subject matter of educational planning | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | | 0% | |
| 2 | Students are able to provide examples of applications of educational planning concepts | Students are able to describe the characteristics of planning, cycles of principles, types of techniques and planning models | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Group discussions, class discussions, questions and answers, reinforcement 2 X 50 | | | 0% | |

| 3 | Students are able to define educational problems | Students are able to identify the scope of problems in educational planning | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|----|
| 4 | Students are able to analyze the field of study of educational problems | Students are able to describe and systems in educational planning | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |

| 5 | Students are able to understand and apply the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) in educational planning | students are able to describe the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) in educational planning | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|----|
| 6 | Students are able to understand and apply the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) in educational planning | students are able to describe the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) in educational planning | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |

| | | T | 1 | T | 1 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 7 | Students understand and describe cohort analysis | Students are able to describe the meaning, objectives and benefits of cohort analysis | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |
| 8 | Students understand and describe cohort analysis | Students are able to describe the meaning, objectives and benefits of cohort analysis | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |
| 9 | | | Criteria: Full marks are obtained if you do all the questions correctly. Full marks if students are able to answer questions with descriptive, clear and systematic explanations and in accordance with the theory and policies used | 2 X 50 | | 0% |

| 10 | Students are able to describe the mechanism and flow of preparing a School/Madrasah Work Plan (RKS/M) | Students are able to explain the mechanism and flow of preparing the RKS/M | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |
|----|---|--|--|---|--|----|
| 11 | Students are able to describe the mechanism and flow of preparing a School/Madrasah Work Plan (RKS/M) | Students are able to explain the mechanism and flow of preparing the RKS/M | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combination of Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | 0% |

| 12 | Students are able to conceptualize and design plans at the Early Childhood Education (PAUD) level | students are able to outline planning at the Early Childhood Education (PAUD) level | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Group discussion, Q&A and reinforcement 2 X 50 | | 0% |
|----|---|---|---|--|--|----|
| 13 | Students are able to conceptualize and design plans at the elementary school (SD) level | Students are able to describe plane the lementary school (SD) level | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Group discussion, Q&A and reinforcement 2 X 50 | | 0% |

| 14 | Students are able to conceptualize and design plans at the Junior High School (SMP) level | Students are able to describe planning at the Junior High School (SMP) level | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Group discussion, Q&A and reinforcement 2 X 50 | | 0% |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|----|
| 15 | Students are able to conceptualize and design plans at the Senior High School (SMA) and Vocational High School (SMK) levels | Students are able to describe planning at the Senior High School (SMA) and Vocational High School (SMK) levels | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M.b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MPerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Group discussion, Q&A and reinforcement 2 X 50 | | 0% |

| 16 | Students are able to describe and reflect on comprehensive educational planning applications | Students are able to summarize concepts and empirical data related to educational planning clearly and in detail | Criteria: Paper: a) Conformity of the paper to the rules for writing scientific papers. b) The content of the paper includes the clarity of ideas and relevance to the topic and problem. c) References referred to (number and year of reference). Draft RKS/M: a) Conformity of the draft RKS/M with the flow and mechanism for preparing the RKS/M. b) Conformity of RKS/M with EDS. c) Complexity and completeness of components in the RKS/MMerformance design and Participation in Presentations: a) Mastery of presentation material. b) Language Quality. c) Ability to answer. d) Active in asking, answering and providing input to the group | Expository Learning Strategy; Combined Lecture & Discussion Learning Methods 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
|----|--|--|---|---|--|--|----|
|----|--|--|---|---|--|--|----|

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Project Based Learning

| Lva | idation i cit | ap. i roject be | |
|-----|---------------|-----------------|--|
| No | Evaluation | Percentage | |
| | | 0% | |

Notes

- Learning Outcomes of Study Program Graduates (PLO Study Program) are the abilities possessed by each Study
 Program graduate which are the internalization of attitudes, mastery of knowledge and skills according to the level of their
 study program obtained through the learning process.
- The PLO imposed on courses are several learning outcomes of study program graduates (CPL-Study Program) which
 are used for the formation/development of a course consisting of aspects of attitude, general skills, special skills and
 knowledge
- 3. **Program Objectives (PO)** are abilities that are specifically described from the PLO assigned to a course, and are specific to the study material or learning materials for that course.
- 4. Subject Sub-PO (Sub-PO) is a capability that is specifically described from the PO that can be measured or observed and is the final ability that is planned at each learning stage, and is specific to the learning material of the course.
- 5. **Indicators for assessing** ability in the process and student learning outcomes are specific and measurable statements that identify the ability or performance of student learning outcomes accompanied by evidence.
- Assessment Criteria are benchmarks used as a measure or measure of learning achievement in assessments based
 on predetermined indicators. Assessment criteria are guidelines for assessors so that assessments are consistent and
 unbiased. Criteria can be quantitative or qualitative.
- 7. Forms of assessment: test and non-test.
- 8. Forms of learning: Lecture, Response, Tutorial, Seminar or equivalent, Practicum, Studio Practice, Workshop Practice, Field Practice, Research, Community Service and/or other equivalent forms of learning.
- Learning Methods: Small Group Discussion, Role-Play & Simulation, Discovery Learning, Self-Directed Learning, Cooperative Learning, Collaborative Learning, Contextual Learning, Project Based Learning, and other equivalent methods.
- 10. Learning materials are details or descriptions of study materials which can be presented in the form of several main points and sub-topics.
- 11. The assessment weight is the percentage of assessment of each sub-PO achievement whose size is proportional to the level of difficulty of achieving that sub-PO, and the total is 100%.
- 12. TM=Face to face, PT=Structured assignments, BM=Independent study.