



Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Faculty of Social and Legal Sciences,
Bachelor of Laws Study Program

Document Code

SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Courses | CODE | Course Family | Credit Weight | | | SEMESTER | Compilation Date |
| Logic and Legal Reasoning | 7420102142 | | T=2 | P=0 | ECTS=3.18 | 3 | July 18, 2024 |
| AUTHORIZATION | SP Developer | | Course Cluster Coordinator | | | Study Program Coordinator | |
| | | | | | | Vita Mahardhika, S.H., M.H. | |
| 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; height: 20px;">P.O</td></tr> </table> | | | | | |
| P.O | | | | | | | |
| Short Course Description | This course examines how to think soundly in the juridical aspect in accordance with the rules of logic and drawing correct conclusions, as well as various errors in thinking. | | | | | | |
| | References | | | | | | |
| | <p>Main :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Warsono. 1997. Logika Cara Berpikir Sehat . Surabaya: IKIP University Press 2. Hadjon, Philipus M dan Djatmiati, Tatiek Sri. 2006. Argumentasi Hukum . Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press. <p>Supporters:</p> | | | | | | |
| Supporting lecturer | Dr. Hananto Widodo, S.H., M.H. Muh. Ali Masnun, S.H., M.H. Irfa Ronaboyd, S.H., M.H. | | | | | | |
| 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 | Able to explain the benefits and functions of logic, as well as the relationship between logic and science | explain the benefits of logic explain the function of logic explain the relationship between logic and the science of distinguishing between facts and expectations | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently, showing good understanding of the concept, appropriate and able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently but lack some understanding of concepts. Answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Listen to interactive media and answer questions given via independent asynchronous; Online lectures and discussions via virtual synchronous 4 X 50 | | | 0% |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|
| 2 | Able to explain the benefits and functions of logic, as well as the relationship between logic and science | explain the benefits of logic explain the function of logic explain the relationship between logic and the science of distinguishing between facts and expectations | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2. Answers are delivered coherently, showing good understanding of the concept, appropriate and able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4. Answers are delivered coherently but lack some understanding of concepts. Answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6. The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8. Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Independent asynchronous through interactive learning media Virtual synchronous via zoom/google meet/room conference UNESA Collaborative asynchronous through 4 X 50 discussion forums | | | 0% |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|----|
| 3 | Final ability: Able to differentiate the types and functions of words, terms and definitions. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.mention types of words and terms 2.distinguish words from terms 3.explain the meaning and types of definitions 4.explain the rules/requirements of the definition | Criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Synchronous (virtual/live)Asynchronous (Independent and/or Collaborative) 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|----|
| 4 | Able to differentiate the types and functions of words, terms, and definition rules/requirements | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.mention types of words and terms 2.distinguish words from terms 3.explain the meaning and definition 4.explain the rules/requirements of the definition | Criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Synchronous (virtual/live)Asynchronous (Independent and/or Collaborative) 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|----|
| 5 | Able to reason soundly (logically) | Explains the rules of thinking. Can compose logical sentences and paragraphs. Differentiates deductive reasoning from induction. Can make deductive and inductive reasoning. | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6. The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8. Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Synchronous (virtual/live)Asynchronous (Independent and/or Collaborative) 4 X 50 | | | 0% |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|----|
| 6 | Able to reason soundly (logically) | Explains the rules of thinking. Can compose logical sentences and paragraphs. Differentiates deductive reasoning from induction. Can make deductive and inductive reasoning. | Criteria: 1. Value 4 2. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3. Value 3 4. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5. Value 2 6. The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7. Value 1 8. Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Synchronous (virtual/live) Asynchronous (Independent and/or Collaborative) 4 X 50 | | | 0% |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|----|
| 7 | Able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships | Distinguish between cause and effect Explain the principles of cause and effect relationships | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
| 8 | UTS | UTS | Criteria: UTS | UTS 2 X 50 | | | 0% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|----|
| 9 | Understand and have insight into variants related to the meaning of law according to the natural law school; Understand and have insight into the reasoning patterns of the natural law school model. | Explain the meaning of law according to the flow of natural law; Explains the reasoning patterns of the natural law school model | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 4 X 50 | | 0% |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|----|
| 10 | Understand and have insight into variants related to the meaning of law according to the natural law school; Understand and have insight into the reasoning patterns of the natural law school model. | Explain the meaning of law according to the flow of natural law; Explains the reasoning patterns of the natural law school model | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 4 X 50 | | 0% |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|
| 11 | Understand and have insight into legal positivism; Understand and have insight into the reasoning patterns of legal positivism | Describe legal positivism; Explains the reasoning pattern of legal positivism | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 4 X 50 | | | 0% |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|
| 12 | Understand and have insight into legal positivism; Understand and have insight into the reasoning patterns of legal positivism | Describe legal positivism; Explains the reasoning pattern of legal positivism | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6. The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8. Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 4 X 50 | | | 0% |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|----|
| 13 | Understand and have insight into sociological jurisprudence; Understand and have insight into sociological jurisprudence reasoning models | Explain sociological jurisprudence; Explains the model of sociological jurisprudence reasoning | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|----|
| 14 | Understand and have insight into sociological jurisprudence; Understand and have insight into sociological jurisprudence reasoning models | Explain sociological jurisprudence; Explains the model of sociological jurisprudence reasoning | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4.Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6.The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8.Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
|----|---|--|---|--|--|--|----|

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|--|----|
| 15 | Understand and have insight into legal realism; Understand and have insight into legal realism reasoning patterns | Explaining legal realism; 2 Explain the legal realism reasoning pattern | Criteria: 1.Value 4 2. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, show good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 3.Value 3 4. Answers are delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lack some understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement 5.Value 2 6. The answers submitted are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, the answers to the question asker are generally not correct but are still able to formulate suggestions for improvement 7.Value 1 8. Answers are submitted but are not coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement | Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50 | | | 0% |
| 16 | UAS | UAS | Criteria: UAS | UAS 2 X 50 | | | 0% |

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Case Study

| 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
 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.