			Universitas Negeri Surabaya **Faculty of Education,** **Educational Technology Undergraduate Study Program**				**Document Code**

SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN

Courses		CODE	Course Family		Credit Weight			SEMESTER	Compilation Date
Evaluation of Learning and Learning		8620302180	Compulsory Study Program Subjects		**T=2**	**P=0**	**ECTS=3.18**	2	March 21, 2022

AUTHORIZATION	SP Developer	Course Cluster Coordinator	Study Program Coordinator
	Hirnanda Dimas Pradana, M.Pd.	Prof. Dr. Rusijono, M.Pd.	Dr. Utari Dewi, S.Sn., M.Pd.

Learning model	**Project Based Learning**

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)	**PLO study program which is charged to the course**	
	PLO-5	Able to master the theoretical concepts of design, development, utilization, management and evaluation in the fields of curriculum and educational technology
	PLO-7	Able to apply scientific principles to produce designs, media, technology, as well as evaluation of learning and training programs based on information and communication technology
	PLO-9	Able to produce creative products in the field of educational technology that are educational and market them to the user community
	Program Objectives (PO)	
	PO - 1	Students are able to show a responsible attitude towards the tasks given in the field of educational technology in analyzing the basic concepts of learning evaluation
	PO - 2	Students are able to demonstrate independent performance as Education Analysts in developing learning evaluation tools
	PO - 3	Students are able to solve problems based on the case study method in the field of educational technology through analysis of learning evaluation results
	PO - 4	Students are able to master the concepts, structures and materials in educational technology science needed to carry out their duties as Education and Training Analysts by applying the results of learning evaluations in improving learning
	PLO-PO Matrix	

P.O	PLO-5	PLO-7	PLO-9
PO-1			
PO-2			
PO-3			
PO-4			

PO Matrix at the end of each learning stage (Sub-PO)

P.O	Week															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
PO-1																
PO-2																
PO-3																
PO-4																

Short Course Description	Study of the basic concepts and principles of assessing learning processes and outcomes, program assessment models, development of various evaluation tools and empirical testing of the quality of evaluation tools, and preparation of plans, implementation, processing and reporting of learning evaluations

References	**Main :**	
	1. Joko Widiyanto. 2018. Evaluasi Pembelajaran. UNIPMA Press 2. Ni Nyoman Parwati, dkk. 2018. Belajar dan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada 3. Anas Sudijono, 2016. Evaluasi Pendidikan, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada 4. Djemari Mardapi. 2007. Yogyakarta: Mitra Cendikia5. Zainal Arifin, 2019. Bandung: PT. remaja Rosdakarya 5. Suharsimi Arikunto dan Cepi Safruddin, 2014. Evaluasi Program Pendidikan. Jakarta: PT, Bumi Aksara.	

	Supporters:	
Supporting lecturer	Prof. Dr. Rusijono, M.Pd. Dr. Hari Sugiharto Setyaedhi, M.Si. Dr. Atan Pramana, M.Pd.	

Week-	Final abilities of each learning stage (Sub-PO)	Evaluation		Help Learning, Learning methods, Student Assignments, [Estimated time]		Learning materials [References]	Assessment Weight (%)
		Indicator	Criteria & Form	Offline (*offline*)	Online (*online*)		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	Students are able to analyze the definition of learning evaluation	1. The group's ability to formulate a definition of learning evaluation 2. Individual ability to convey a clear definition of learning evaluation	**Criteria:** 1. The quality of the learning evaluation definition formulated by the group 2. The quality of individual student presentations regarding the definition of learning evaluation **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	1. Students are divided into small groups. 2. Each group is given the task of discussing and formulating a definition of learning evaluation based on the material they have read previously. 3. Each group presents the definition they have formulated to the whole class. 4. After the group presentation, each student is asked to briefly convey their own version of the definition of learning evaluation. 5. This will be an opportunity for each student to demonstrate their understanding individually. 2 X 50		**Material:** understanding and use of digital literacy **Reader:** *Joko Widiyanto. 2018. Learning Evaluation. UNIPMA Press*	4%

| 2 | Students are able to identify the goals and benefits of learning evaluation | 1. Quality of presentation and group understanding of types of learning evaluation, objectives and benefits
2. Active participation and relevant questions in plenary discussion sessions. | **Criteria:**
1. Quality of presentation and group understanding of types of learning evaluation, objectives and benefits
2. Active participation in plenary discussions and relevant questions

Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities | 1. Students are divided into small groups.
2. Each group is given the task of identifying types of learning evaluation and elaborating on the goals and benefits of each type of evaluation.
3. Each group prepares a presentation to explain the type of evaluation they are studying along with its objectives and benefits.
4. After each group has finished with their presentation, there is a plenary discussion session where the whole class can ask questions and discuss further about the types of learning evaluation.
5. Lecturers assess the level of student involvement and contribution in plenary discussions.
2 X 50 | | **Material:** search for information that supports education and science.
Reference: *Ni Nyoman Parwati, et al. 2018. Learning and Learning. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada* | 4% |

| 3 | Students are able to differentiate between formative and summative evaluations. | 1. Quality of presentation and group understanding of the principles of learning evaluation as well as the differences between formative and summative evaluation
2. Active participation and relevant questions in plenary discussion sessions | **Criteria:**
1. quality of presentation and group understanding of the principles of learning evaluation as well as the differences between formative and summative evaluation
2. Active participation in plenary discussions and relevant questions

Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities | 1. Students are divided into small groups.
2. Each group is given the task of discussing the principles of learning evaluation and more specifically, they will focus on the differences between formative and summative evaluation.
3. Each group prepares a presentation to explain the principles of learning evaluation and the differences between formative and summative evaluation.
4. After each group has finished with their presentation, there is a plenary discussion session where the entire class can ask questions and discuss further about the principles of learning evaluation and the differences between formative and summative evaluation.
5. Lecturers assess the level of student involvement and contribution in plenary discussions.
2 X 50 | | **Material:** digital literacy for educational development, research, social media, infographics
Reader: *Anas Sudijono, 2016. Education Evaluation, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada* | 4% |
| 4 | Students are able to plan and develop valid evaluation questions. | 1. Students' ability to plan valid evaluation questions
2. The relevance of evaluation questions to learning material. | **Criteria:**
1. Quality of planned evaluation questions (validity, relevance and diversity)
2. Suitability of evaluation questions with learning material

Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment | 1. Each student is given the task of planning and developing a number of valid evaluation questions based on material previously taught in the course.
2. Students must choose topics that are relevant to learning and design appropriate formative and summative evaluation questions.
3. After planning the questions, students submit the assignment.
2 X 50 | | **Material:** media/infographics using digital literacy
Reader: *Djemari Mardapi. 2007. Yogyakarta: Mitra Cendikia5. Zainal Arifin, 2019. Bandung: PT. Rosdakarya teenager* | 4% |

| 5 | Students are able to develop evaluation tools that suit learning objectives | 1. Students' ability to develop evaluation questions that are in accordance with learning objectives
2. The relevance of evaluation questions to learning material | **Criteria:**
1. Concepts assessed:
2. Stages in carrying out the test

Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment | 1. Each student is given the task of developing a number of evaluation questions that are in accordance with the learning objectives that have been taught previously in the course.
2. Students must choose learning objectives that are relevant to the learning material and design appropriate formative and summative evaluation questions.
3. After developing the questions, students submit the assignment.
2 X 50 | | **Material:** example of news filtering (hoax)
References: *Suharsimi Arikunto and Cepi Safruddin, 2014. Educational Program Evaluation. Jakarta: PT, Bumi Aksara.* | 4% |
| 6 | Students are able to use different evaluation techniques, such as written exams and projects. | 1. Student understanding of formative and summative evaluation.
2. Students' ability to design written exam questions and projects that suit learning objectives. | **Criteria:**
1. Student understanding of formative and summative evaluation
2. The quality of written exam questions and the projects they design (validity, relevance and diversity)

Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment | 1. Each student is given material about formative and summative evaluation, as well as different evaluation techniques such as written exams and projects.
2. Students participate in online group discussions about the differences between formative and summative evaluation and the application of different evaluation techniques.
3. Next, students are given evaluation exercises which include writing written exam questions and learning projects.
4. Students must complete the evaluation exercise and submit the results.
2 X 50 | | **Material:** computer basics, types of processors, memory and storage media
Reader: *Joko Widiyanto. 2018. Learning Evaluation. UNIPMA Press* | 4% |

7	Understand and be able to develop tests	1.Students' ability to plan and collect evaluation data. 2.Students' ability to analyze evaluation data effectively. 3.Quality of data analysis reports.	**Criteria:** 1.Quality of evaluation data collection plan (validity and relevance) 2.Quality of evaluation data analysis 3.Quality of data analysis report (structure, clarity, and findings) **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Each student is given the task of planning and collecting evaluation data effectively. 2. Students choose a topic or case study that is relevant to this course and plan and carry out the collection of related evaluation data. 3. After data collection is complete, students analyze the data and prepare an analysis report. 2 X 50		**Material:** Types of computer operating systems **References:** *Suharsimi Arikunto and Cepi Safruddin, 2014. Educational Program Evaluation. Jakarta: PT, Bumi Aksara.*	4%
8	UTS	Students' ability to understand and apply concepts that have been taught in previous meetings.	**Criteria:** Level of understanding and application of concepts **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Students take the mid-term exam (UTS) which covers material that has been taught in previous meetings. 2. This exam will contain various types of case study questions according to the competencies that have been taught. 2 X 50		**Material:** privacy, security of digital media and social media, intellectual property rights **Reference:** *Ni Nyoman Parwati, et al. 2018. Learning and Learning. Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada*	15%
9	Students are able to analyze and interpret evaluation data	1.Students' ability to analyze and interpret evaluation data. 2.Quality of case study analysis reports.	**Criteria:** 1.Quality of evaluation data analysis (accuracy, depth of analysis) 2.Quality of the case study analysis report (structure, clarity, and findings) **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Students are given a case study that focuses on the use of learning evaluation in secondary schools. 2. Students are asked to analyze and interpret the evaluation data provided in the case study. 3. Students must identify key findings, relate them to the learning evaluation concepts that have been taught, and prepare an analysis report. 2 X 50		**Material:** Word application for writing books and scientific articles: organizing table of contents, tables, pictures, chapters and sub-chapters, bibliography, using delay Reader **:** *Anas Sudijono, 2016. Educational Evaluation, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada*	4%

10	Students are able to analyze and interpret evaluation data	1. Students' ability to analyze and interpret evaluation data. 2. Quality of case study analysis reports.	**Criteria:** 1. Quality of evaluation data analysis (accuracy, depth of analysis) 2. Quality of the case study analysis report (structure, clarity, and findings) **Form of Assessment :** Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Students are given a case study that focuses on the use of learning evaluation in secondary schools. 2. Students are asked to analyze and interpret the evaluation data provided in the case study. 3. Students must identify key findings, relate them to the learning evaluation concepts that have been taught, and prepare an analysis report. 2 X 50		**Material:** Word application for writing books and scientific articles: organizing table of contents, tables, pictures, chapters and sub-chapters, bibliography, using delay Reader **:** *Anas Sudijono, 2016. Educational Evaluation, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada*	4%
11	Students are able to identify areas of improvement based on the evaluation results.	1. Students' ability to identify and discuss areas of improvement based on evaluation results in online education. 2. The quality of the improvement plans they design	**Criteria:** 1. Student's ability to identify and discuss areas of improvement 2. Quality of improvement plan (relevance, clarity, and implementability) **Form of Assessment :** Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Students participate in online group discussions about learning evaluation in online education. 2. Students are asked to identify and discuss areas of improvement that emerge based on evaluation results in the context of online education. Next, students are given the task of designing an improvement plan based on the evaluation findings. 2 X 50		**Material:** types of application programs used to develop study programs. **Reference:** *Suharsimi Arikunto and Cepi Safruddin, 2014. Educational Program Evaluation. Jakarta: PT, Bumi Aksara.*	4%
12	Students are able to plan corrective actions based on evaluation findings.	1. Students' ability to analyze and identify areas of improvement based on evaluation findings in the work environment. 2. Quality of improvement plan reports.	**Criteria:** 1. Students' ability to analyze and identify areas of improvement 2. Quality of improvement plan reports (relevance, clarity and implementability) **Form of Assessment :** Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Students are given a case study that focuses on evaluating learning in the work environment. 2. Students are asked to analyze the case study and identify evaluation findings that indicate areas of improvement in learning in the work environment. 3. Next, students plan corrective actions based on the evaluation findings and prepare an improvement plan report. 2 X 50		**Material:** simple application for developing learning and science study program **Library:** *Djemari Mardapi. 2007. Yogyakarta: Mitra Cendikia5. Zainal Arifin, 2019. Bandung: PT. Rosdakarya teenager*	5%

13	Students are able to plan corrective actions based on evaluation findings.	1. Students' ability to plan corrective actions based on evaluation findings. 2. The quality of the corrective action plans they design.	**Criteria:** 1. Students' ability to plan corrective action 2. Quality of corrective action plans (clarity, scientificity, and implementability) **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	1. Students are asked to plan corrective actions based on learning evaluation findings. 2. Students must select one of the improvement areas identified in previous learning (Case Study 1, 2, or 3) and design a relevant improvement plan. 3. The improvement plan must include concrete steps, required resources, and implementation stages. 2 X 50		**Material:** application/media program project incorporating a combination of sound, images, text, animation, infographics and video **Reader:** *Anas Sudijono, 2016. Educational Evaluation, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada*	5%
14	Students are able to implement changes in the learning process.	1. Students' ability to apply technology to support changes in the learning evaluation process. 2. Students' ability to explain the technical steps taken and the benefits of the technology in the context of learning evaluation.	**Criteria:** 1. Students' ability to apply technology 2. Students' ability to explain technical steps and benefits of technology **Form of Assessment** : Practice / Performance	1. Students are asked to apply technology in developing or improving the learning evaluation process in an educational environment that is relevant to the improvement areas identified in the previous meeting. 2. Students must explain the technical steps they took, the tools or platforms they used, and how the technology supports changes in the learning evaluation process. 2 X 50		**Material:** internet, social networking, web pages and cloud storage **Reference:** *Anas Sudijono, 2016. Educational Evaluation, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada*	5%
15	Students are able to implement changes in the learning process.	1. Students' ability to analyze learning evaluation cases. 2. Students' ability to identify relevant solutions or corrective actions. 3. Active contribution to case discussions.	**Criteria:** 1. Students' ability to analyze cases 2. Students' ability to identify solutions or corrective actions 3. Active contribution to case discussions **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment	1. Students participate in case discussions that focus on learning evaluation. 2. Students analyze the learning evaluation cases that have been given previously. 3. Discussion includes understanding learning evaluation problems, identifying possible solutions or corrective actions, and sharing views with fellow students. 2 X 50		**Material:** internet, social networking, web pages and cloud storage **Reference:** *Anas Sudijono, 2016. Educational Evaluation, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Pesada*	5%

| 16 | UAS | 1. Students' ability to understand and apply learning evaluation concepts that have been taught during the semester. 2. Students' ability to answer UAS questions accurately and in detail. | **Criteria:** 1. Students' ability to understand and apply learning evaluation concepts 2. Students' ability to answer UAS questions accurately and in detail **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities, Portfolio Assessment | 1. Students take a final exam based on the material taught during this semester. 2. The exam will cover material from all previous meetings, including the concept of learning evaluation, types of evaluation, principles, planning, development of evaluation questions, formative and summative evaluation, collection and analysis of evaluation data, use of technology in evaluation, case studies, and learning improvement techniques. 2 X 50 | | **Material:** Explaining data storage with cloud storage **Reader:** *Joko Widiyanto. 2018. Learning Evaluation. UNIPMA Press* | 25% |

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Project Based Learning

No	Evaluation	Percentage
1.	Participatory Activities	56%
2.	Portfolio Assessment	39%
3.	Practice / Performance	5%
		100%

Notes

1. **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.
2. **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** abilities in the process and student learning outcomes are specific and measurable statements that identify the abilities or performance of student learning outcomes accompanied by evidence.
6. **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.
9. **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.