

		Universitas Negeri Surabaya Faculty of Languages and Arts English Literature Undergraduate Study Program					Document Code																																										
SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN																																																	
Courses		CODE	Course Family		Credit Weight		SEMESTER	Compilation Date																																									
Semantics		7920202190			T=2	P=0	ECTS=3.18	6 July 18, 2024																																									
AUTHORIZATION		SP Developer		Course Cluster Coordinator		Study Program Coordinator																																											
			Dr. Ali Mustofa, S.S., M.Pd.																																											
Learning model	Case Studies																																																
Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)	PLO study program that is charged to the course																																																
	Program Objectives (PO)																																																
	PLO-PO Matrix																																																
		<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px; text-align: center;">P.O</td> <td colspan="16"></td> </tr> </table>							P.O																																								
P.O																																																	
	PO Matrix at the end of each learning stage (Sub-PO)																																																
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td rowspan="2" style="width: 30px; text-align: center;">P.O</td> <td colspan="16" style="text-align: center;">Week</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">6</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">7</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">8</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">11</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">12</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">13</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">14</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="width: 20px; text-align: center;">16</td> </tr> </table>																P.O	Week																1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
P.O	Week																																																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16																																	
Short Course Description	<p>The lesson deals with linguistic meaning, types of basic elements to make reference in characterizing the meanings of words or other linguistic units, types of relevant data, and how to evaluate the various possible types of data and how word meanings change. Theoretical topics covered include categorization construal acquisition of concepts metaphor blending metonymy compositionality mental spaces lexical semantic change. Various semantic domains will be examined in connection with these topics, eg color terms, kinship, dimensional terms, verb meaning but two domains will be treated in depth from various perspectives: the semantics of everyday concepts, and the semantics of space and motion. For pragmatics theoretical frameworks are speech acts, implicature, presupposition, relevant theory, cooperative principles, politeness principles, references, deixis, contexts and co-texts. The final project is documenting the short functional texts that are found in the public areas to interpret the communication functions.</p>																																																
References	Main :																																																
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. References 2. Griffiths, Patrick. 2006. An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 3. Kertez, Andras. 2004. Cognitive Semantics and Scientific Knowledge: Case studies in cognitive science of science. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 4. Riemer, Nick. 2010. Introducing Semantics. New York: Cambridge University Press 5. Van Geenhoven, Veerle. 2006. Semantics in Acquisition. Netherland: Springer. 																																																
	Supporters:																																																
Supporting lecturer	SUWONO Prof. Slamet Setiawan, M.A., Ph.D. Dr. Widyastuti, S.S., 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	To identify the theory of Semantics To show understanding of the theory of English Semantics	To compare between language form and language meaning To explain and give examples of the scope of English Semantics	Criteria: 1.Level 1: 50-59% 2.Level 2: 60-69% 3.Level 3: 70-79% 4.Level 4: 80-100%	· Lecturing · Discussion · Question-Answer 2 X 50			0%
2	To examine the meaning and definition To identify some different ways of defining meanings	To examine the units of meanings To categorize different ways of defining meaning	Criteria: 1.Level 1: 50-59% 2.Level 2: 60-69% 3.Level 3: 70-79% 4.Level 4: 80-100%	· Lecturing · Discussion · Question-Answer 2 X 50			0%
3	To identify the scope of meaning I: external context	To define the difference between meaning and context To compare the concepts of sense and reference To find the concept of dictionary and encyclopedia	Criteria: 1.Level 1: 50-59% 2.Level 2: 60-69% 3.Level 3: 70-79% 4.Level 4: 80-100%	· Lecturing · Discussion · Question-Answer 2 X 50			0%
4	To understand the scope of meaning II: interpersonal context	To differ the concept of Illocutionary force and speech acts To outline the difference between speaker intention and hearers inference To outline the difference between speaker intention and hearers inference	Criteria: 1.Level 1: 50-59% 2.Level 2: 60-69% 3.Level 3: 70-79% 4.Level 4: 80-100%	· Lecturing · Discussion · Question-Answer 2 X 50			0%
5	To analyze and distinguish meanings	To organize the lexical relations To organize the lexical relations To focus on the componential analysis To categorize polysemy and meaning divisions	Criteria: 1.Level 1: 50-59% 2.Level 2: 60-69% 3.Level 3: 70-79% 4.Level 4: 80-100%	· Lecturing · Discussion · Question-Answer 2 X 50			0%
6	To understand logic as representation of meaning	To outline the difference between speaker intention and hearers inference To outline the difference between speaker intention and hearers inference To outline the difference between speaker intention and hearers inference	Criteria: 1.Level 1: 50-59% 2.Level 2: 60-69% 3.Level 3: 70-79% 4.Level 4: 80-100%	· Lecturing · Discussion · Question-Answer 2 X 50			0%

7							0%
8							0%
9							0%
10							0%
11							0%
12							0%
13							0%
14							0%
15							0%
16							0%

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Case Study

No	Evaluation	Percentage
		0%

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.**