	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		7420102211	Compulsory Study Program Subjects	**T=2**	**P=0**	**ECTS=3.18**	1	December 19, 2023
AUTHORIZATION		**SP Developer**		**Course Cluster Coordinator**			**Study Program Coordinator**	
		Vita Mahardhika, S.H.M.H		Vita Mahardhika, S.H.M.H			Vita Mahardhika, S.H., M.H.	

Learning model	Case Studies

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)	**PLO study program that is charged to the course**
	PLO-7 — Able to collaborate in mapping and making decisions accurately, scientifically, independently, with integrity and responsibility in the field of sports law in particular and legal cases in general;
	PLO-12 — Able to understand material legal aspects
	PLO-20 — Act as a citizen who is proud and loves the country by obeying the law and being disciplined in social and state life;
	Program Objectives (PO)
	PO - 1 — students master healthy ways of thinking in accordance with the rules of logic and drawing conclusions
	PLO-PO Matrix

P.O	PLO-7	PLO-12	PLO-20
PO-1			

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																

Short Course Description	This course examines healthy thinking according to the rules of logic and drawing conclusions directly, as well as various errors in thinking.

References	**Main :**
	1. 1. Warsono, 1997. Logika. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Logika Dasar, Tradisional. Simbolik, dan Induktif. Jakarta: Gramedia.
	Supporters:

Supporting lecturer	Prof. Dr. Warsono, M.S. Dr. Bachrul Amiq, S.H., M.H. Vita Mahardhika, 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	1. Able to explain the benefits of logic 2. Able to explain logical functions 3. Able to explain the relationship between logic and science 4. Able to differentiate facts and expectations	**Criteria:** 1. Good 2. Enough 3. Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	· Lectures, Discussions and Questions and Answers 2 X 50		**Material:** rules of logic and drawing conclusions **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
2	Able to explain the benefits and functions of logic, as well as the relationship between logic and science	1. Able to explain the benefits of logic 2. Able to explain logical functions 3. Able to explain the relationship between logic and science 4. Able to differentiate facts and expectations	**Criteria:** 1. Good 2. Enough 3. Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	· Lectures, Discussions and Questions and Answers 2 X 50		**Material:** Able to explain the benefits and functions of logic, as well as the relationship between logic and science. **Literature:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
3	Students are able to differentiate the types and functions of words, terms	1. Able to name types of words 2. Be able to name the type of term 3. Able to differentiate words from terms	**Criteria:** 1. Good 2. Enough 3. Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions and questions and answers 2 X 50		**Material:** Able to explain the benefits and functions of logic, as well as the relationship between logic and science. **Literature:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%

4	Students are able to make categorical and conditional propositions	1.Mention various propositions. 2.Create examples of each proposition	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers, exercises and assignments 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to make categorical and conditional propositions. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
5	Students are able to make categorical and conditional propositions	1.Mention various propositions. 2.Create examples of each proposition	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers, exercises and assignments 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to make categorical and conditional propositions. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
6	Students are able to reason soundly (logically)	1.Explain the rules of thinking 2.Can compose logical sentences and paragraphs 3.Differentiate deductive reasoning from induction 4.Can make reasoning by deduction and induction	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and exercises. 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to reason soundly (logically) **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%

7	Students are able to reason soundly (logically)	1.Explain the rules of thinking 2.Can compose logical sentences and paragraphs 3.Differentiate deductive reasoning from induction 4.Can make reasoning by deduction and induction	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and exercises. 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to reason soundly (logically) **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
8	UTS	1.Explain the rules of thinking 2.Can compose logical sentences and paragraphs 3.Differentiate deductive reasoning from induction 4.Can make reasoning by deduction and induction	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Test	UTS 2 X 50		**Material:** UTS **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	15%
9	Mastering the material from meetings 1 to 8	Students are able to answer questions/questions	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Test	written test 2 X 50		**Material:** TES **Literature:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	10%
10	Students are able to draw conclusions directly	1.Drawing conclusions from a proposition 2.Determining the error of a reasoning	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers, and assignments 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to draw conclusions directly. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%

11	Students are able to draw conclusions directly	1. Drawing conclusions from a proposition 2. Determining the error of a reasoning	**Criteria:** 1. Good 2. Enough 3. Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers, and assignments 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to draw conclusions directly. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
12	Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships	1. Distinguish between cause and effect 2. Explain the principles of cause and effect relationships	**Criteria:** 1. Good 2. Enough 3. Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and 2 X 50 exercises		**Material:** Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
13	Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships	1. Distinguish between cause and effect 2. Explain the principles of cause and effect relationships	**Criteria:** 1. Good 2. Enough 3. Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and 2 X 50 exercises		**Material:** Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%

14	Students are able to identify thinking errors	Identify thinking errors: a. generalization b. analogical. misguided language. analogy	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and exercises. 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
15	Students are able to identify thinking errors	Identify thinking errors: a. generalization b. analogical. misguided language. analogy	**Criteria:** 1.Good 2.Enough 3.Not enough **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Lectures, discussions, questions and answers and exercises. 2 X 50		**Material:** Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	5%
16	UAS	UAS	**Criteria:** Good, medium and poor **Form of Assessment** : Test	offline 2x50		**Material:** Students are able to identify cause and effect relationships, and draw conclusions about cause and effect relationships. **References:** *1. Warsono, 1997. Logic. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. 2. Soekadijo. 1985. Basic, Traditional Logic. Symbolic and Inductive. Jakarta: Gramedia.*	10%

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Case Study

No	Evaluation	Percentage

1.	Participatory Activities	65%
2.	Test	35%
		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.