

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

Document Code

SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN

ładi Susarno ed to the c	Con Pros	npulso gram	ory St Subje	udy ects	ourse	T=2 Clus	P=0 ter Co	ECTS=3	.18 or	Study	2 Drogra	Mar 2022	ch 15 2	
ladi Susarno ed to the c	o, M.F	Pd		C	ourse	Clus	ter Co	ordinato	or	Study	Drogra			
ładi Susarno ed to the c	o, M.F	۶d									Ployia	m Coo	Study Program Coordinat	
ed to the c			Dr. H. Lamijan Hadi Susarno, M.Pd			Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd				Dr. Utari Dewi, S.Sn., M.Pe				
ed to the c		earning												
	cours	e												
Program Objectives (PO)														
-1 Able to have the character of Faith, intelligent, independent, honest, caring and tough (Idaman Jelita) as a business person in the field of human resource development for educators both at school and outside school (Diklat)														
Able to master the basic orientation of developing learning plans and identifying the relationship between learning component systems in designing learning plans as a Learning Technology Analyst and Developer														
Able to master various basic concepts of learning planning models and master the concepts and principles of learning planning development as a Learning Technology Analysis and Developer														
O - 4 Able to master the process of analyzing learning planning design needs and identifying the basis for developing learning planning in the K-13 context as a Learning Technology Analysis and Developer														
PLO-PO Matrix														
ng stage (S	Sub-F	PO)												
<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>					1	Wee	k							
2 3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
arning syste ing models curricula at	em de for de t the le	sign, evelop evel o	mode ing le f certa	els of arnin ain ec	learni g syst lucatio	ing sy æm de onal u	stems esigns nits (s	, and ste both in t chools).	eps fo he fo and o	or deve rm of s outside	loping syllabi a school	learnin nd les trainin	ig sy: son p g).	
	curricula a	curricula at the le	curricula at the level o	curricula at the level of certa	curricula at the level of certain ec	curricula at the level of certain educatio	curricula at the level of certain educational u	curricula at the level of certain educational units (s	curricula at the level of certain educational units (schools).	curricula at the level of certain educational units (schools). and c	curricula at the level of certain educational units (schools). and outside	curricula at the level of certain educational units (schools). and outside school/	curricula at the level of certain educational units (schools). and outside school/training	

		 Abdul Roesda Atwi Su Carey, ' Lamijar Masnur Pengaw Morriso & Sons 	Majid. Iparmar W Dick Hadi S Muslic vas Sek n Gary , Inc.	2006 Perenc 1. 2012. Desain , and Carey, L & Susarno. 2016. I ch. 2008. KTSF colah, Kepala Sr R, Ross, Steve	anaan Pembelajaran: N Instruksional Modern: Pa & Carey, JO. 2009. The S Desain Sistem Pembelaj P: Dasar Pemahaman [ekolah, Komite Sekolah, n M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 20	Mengembangka anduan Para Pe iystematic Desiy aran. Surabaya Dan Pengemba Dewan Sekolah Dotan Sekolah Dota. Designing	n Standar Kompetens engajar & Inovator Pendid gn of Instruction. New Je : CV.Bintang Ingan Pedoman Bagi P I, dan Guru. Jakarta: Bur Efective Instruction. Thir	i Guru. Bandung likan. Jakarta: Erl rsey: Pearson. engelola Lembag ni Aksara. d Edition. New Yo	y: PT Remja angga. ja Pendidikan, ırk: John Wiley
		Supporters:							
		1. Khotima Strategi	ah, K., ies. Inte	& Rusijono, A. Prnational Journ	. M. (2024). Enhancing al of Interactive Mobile T	Metacognitive echnologies, 18	and Creativity Skills th 3(5).	rough Al-Driven	Meta-Learning
Support lecturer	ing	Dr. H. Lamijan H Prof. Dr. Mustaj Citra Fitri Kholid	Hadi Su i, M.Pd. Iya, S.P	sarno, M.Pd. 'd., M.Pd.				1	
Week-	Fin eac sta	al abilities of h learning ge		Eval	uation	He Lear Studer [Es	elp Learning, ning methods, nt Assignments, <mark>stimated time]</mark>	Learning materials [References	Assessment Weight (%)
	(Su	b-PO)	I	ndicator	Criteria & Form	Offline(offline)	Online (<i>online</i>)	1	
(1)		(2)		(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	St to rel be Co Ec Te	udents are able explain the lationship tween Learning esign and the ncept of Jucational echnology	1.E g 2.E 3.la ir o ir d	Explain the eneral design oncept Describe the eaning of dentifying the iterrelationship f components in the TP omain	Criteria: A = 86 - 100 (3.8 - 4.00) A = 80 - 85 (3.7 - 3.79) B = 75 - 79 (3.6 - 3.69) B = 70 - 74 (3.5 - 3.59) B = 7 65 - 69 (3.4 - 3.49) C = 50 - 64 (3.00 - 3.39) D = 25 - 50 (2.00 - 2.99) E = < 25 (0 - 1.99) Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Lectures and Discussions 2 x 50	-	Material: Learning Design with the concept of Educational Technology Reader: Abdul Majid. 2006 Learning Planning: Developing Teacher Competency Standards. Bandung: PT Remja Roesdakarya.	5%
2	St th CCC Le De	udents Master e Basic oncepts of iarning System evelopment	Stud class varia	ents can ify learning bles.	Criteria: Accuracy of classifying learning variables. Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Through a problem based learning model using lecture methods, questions and answers, and individual structured assignments 2 X 50		Material: Basic Concepts of Learning System Development Library: Lamijan Hadi Susarno. 2016. Learning System Design. Surabaya: CV.Bintang Material: Learning variables Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta:	5%

3	Students Master the Basic Concepts of Learning System Development	Students can classify learning variables.	Criteria: 1.Concepts assessed: 2.Basic Concepts of Curriculum & Learning Development. If answered correctly for each question, the maximum score obtained is 20. Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Through a problem based learning model using lecture methods, questions and answers, and individual structured assignments 2 X 50	-	Material: Learning variables Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: Learning variables References: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.	5%
4	Students can master the basic concepts of learning system planning	Mastering Learning System Planning	Criteria: 1.Concept assessed: Learning System Planning 2.If each question is answered correctly, the maximum score obtained is 25. Form of Assessment Participatory Activities	Collaborative Learning Model with Question and Answer, Assignment and Discussion methods. 3 X 50	-	Material: Learning planning Bibliography: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Material: Learning planning Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga.	3%
5	Students can master the basic concepts of learning system planning	Mastering Learning System Planning	Criteria: 1.Concept assessed: Learning System Planning 2.If each question is answered correctly, the maximum score obtained is 25. Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities	Collaborative Learning Model with Question and Answer, Assignment and Discussion methods. 2 X 50		Material: Learning planning Bibliography: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.	3%

6	Students can master the basic concepts of learning system planning	Mastering Learning System Planning	Criteria: 1.Concept assessed: Learning System Planning 2.If each question is answered correctly, the maximum score obtained is 25. Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Collaborative Learning Learning Model with Question and Answer, Assignment and Discussion methods. 2 X 50	Material: Learning System Planning Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: Learning System Planning References: Carey, W Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, JO. 2009. The Systematic Design of Instruction. New Jersey: Pearson.	5%
7	Sub-summative exam or mid-term exam	able to identify and analyze various Objective and Results-based Planning Models in developing Learning Design	Criteria: A = 86 - 100 (3.8 - 4.00) A - = 80 - 85 (3.7 - 3.79) B = 75 - 79 (3.6 - 3.69) B = 70 - 74 (3.5 - 3.59) B - = 65 - 69 (3.4 - 3.49) C = 50 - 64 (3.00 - 3.39) D = 25 - 50 (2.00 - 2.99) E = < 25 (0 - 1.99) Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Tests	Online 2 X 50	Material: Goal and Results based Planning Model in developing Learning Design Library: Lamijan Hadi Susarno. 2016. Learning System Design. Surabaya: CV.Bintang.	5%
8	Students can master the steps for developing learning planning	Identifying learning needs and initial characteristics of students	Criteria: 1.Concepts assessed: 2.Basic Concepts of Curriculum & Learner Development. If each question is answered correctly, the maximum score obtained is 20. Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Problem Based Learning model, 2 X 50 lecture assignments, discussions and questions and answers	Material: Learning Planning Development Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: Learning Planning Development Bibliography: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.	5%

9	Students can analyze learning and formulate learning objectives.	Analyze learning and formulate general and specific learning objectives	Criteria: 1.Assignment: Create a learning analysis that includes learning objectives. 2.Assessment Description: 3.4 = very good 4.3 = good 5.2 = not good 6.1 = very poor Form of Assessment Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Based learning model, lectures, discussions, questions and answers and 2 X 50 assignments	Material: Analyzing learning Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: formulate learning objectives. Reference: Lamijan Hadi Susarno. 2016. Learning System Design. Surabaya: CV.Bintang.	5%
10	Students can develop benchmark tests	Develop benchmark benchmark tests	Criteria: 1.Assessment Aspect Criteria: 2.1. Very appropriate to the learning formula 3.2. In accordance with the learning formula 4.3. Not suitable. buyer's formulation. 5.4. Irrelevant 6.Score Description: 7.4 = very good 8.3 = good 9.2 = not good 10.1 = very poor Form of Assessment Participatory Activities	Problem based learning model, lectures, discussions, questions and answers and 2 X 50 assignments	Material: benchmark test References: Carey, W Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, JO. 2009. The Systematic Design of Instruction. New Jersey: Pearson. Material: benchmark test Reference : Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: benchmark test Reference : Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: benchmark test Reference: Lamijan Hadi Susarno. 2016. Learning System Design. Surabaya: CV.Bintang	5%

11	Students can develop learning strategies	Develop learning methods and media in the learning process	Criteria: 1.Aspect: 2.1. Very suitable for learning materials 3.2. In accordance with learning materials 4.3. Not suitable. purchasing materials. 5.4. Not appropriate. learning materials 6.Score Description: 7.4 = very good 8.3 = good 9.2 = not good 10.1 = very poor Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Collaborative learning model with lectures, discussions, questions and answers and 2 X 50 assignments	Material: learning strategies References: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Material: learning strategies Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga.	5%
12	Students can develop learning materials	Steps for developing learning materials	Criteria: 1.Aspects: 1. Very appropriate to the formulation of learning objectives 2.2. In accordance with the formulation of learning objectives 3.3. Not suitable. formulation of the buyer's objectives. 4.4. Not appropriate. formulation of the buyer's objectives. 5.Score Description: 6.4 = very good 7.3 = good 8.2 = not good 9.1 = very poor Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Problem Based Learning Model with Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and 2 X 50 assignments	Material: Developing learning materials References: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Material: Developing learning materials References: Carey, W Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, U Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, U Dick, and Carey, J. & Carey, J. & Construction. New Jersey: Pearson. Developing learning materials Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga.	5%

13	Students can develop formative evaluation tools	Formative evaluation steps	Criteria: 1.Aspect: 2.1. Very appropriate to the formulation of learner goals. 3.2. In accordance with the buyer's stated objectives 4.3. Not suitable. formulation of the buyer's objectives. 5.4. Not in accordance with the formulation of learning objectives 6.Score Description: 7.4 = very good 8.3 = good 9.2 = not good 10.1 = very poor Form of Assessment Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Problem based learning model using lecture, discussion, question and answer and 2 X 50 training methods	Material: Formative Evaluation Tools Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: Formative Evaluation Tools References: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Material: Formative Evaluation Tools Literature: Lamijan Hadi Susarno. 2016. Learning System Design. Surabaya: CV.Bintang	5%
14	Develop learning programs	Steps for developing a learning implementation plan	Criteria: 1.Criteria: 2.5 = very good 3.4 = good 4.3 = not good 5.2 = not good 6.1 = very bad Form of Assessment : Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Problem based learning model using lecture, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50 methods	Material: learning program Reader: Lamijan Hadi Susarno. 2016. Learning System Design. Surabaya: CV.Bintang	10%
15	Developing learning programs	Steps for developing a learning implementation plan	Criteria: 1.Criteria: 2.5 = very good 3.4 = good 4.3 = not good 5.2 = not good 6.1 = very bad Form of Assessment Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Problem based learning model using lecture, discussion, question and answer 6 X 50 methods	Material: learning program Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: learning program References: Carey, W Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, JO. 2009. The Systematic Design of Instruction. New Jersey: Pearson.	20%

16	Develop learning programs	Steps for developing a learning implementation plan	Criteria: 1.Criteria: 2.5 = very good 3.4 = good 4.3 = not good 5.2 = not good 6.1 = very bad Form of Assessment Participatory Activities, Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Problem based learning model using lecture, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50 methods	Material: Developing a learning program Reader: Atwi Suparman. 2012. Modern Instructional Design: A Guide for Teachers & Educational Innovators. Jakarta: Erlangga. Material: Developing learning programs References: Morrison Gary R, Ross, Steven M, Kemp, Jerrold E. 2001. Designing Effective Instruction. Third Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Material: Developing learning programs References: Carey, W Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, JO. 2009. The Systematic	9%
					Dick, and Carey, L & Carey, JO. 2009. The Systematic Design of Instruction. New Jersey: Pearson.	

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Project Based Learning

	Evaluation i broomage nooapin reject Basea Ecanning							
No	Evaluation	Percentage						
1.	Participatory Activities	23%						
2.	Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	74.5%						
3.	Test	2.5%						
		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** 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.
- 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.