



**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
Legal Reasoning and Argumentation	7420102246	Compulsory Study Program Subjects	T=2	P=0	ECTS=3.18	4	July 17, 2024
AUTHORIZATION	SP Developer		Course Cluster Coordinator			Study Program Coordinator	
	Vita Mahardika, S.H., M.H.		Vita Mahardika, S.H., M.H.			Vita Mahardika, S.H., M.H.	

Learning model	Case Studies																																																		
Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)	PLO study program that is charged to the course																																																		
	PLO-21 Internalize academic values, norms and ethics with a spirit of independence, struggle and entrepreneurship																																																		
	Program Objectives (PO)																																																		
	PO - 1 Understand the basic concepts of logic, including propositions, inferences, implications, contradictions, and so on.																																																		
	PLO-PO Matrix																																																		
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td>P.O</td> <td>PLO-21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PO-1</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	P.O	PLO-21	PO-1																																															
P.O	PLO-21																																																		
PO-1																																																			
	PO Matrix at the end of each learning stage (Sub-PO)																																																		
	<table border="1" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <th rowspan="2">P.O</th> <th colspan="16">Week</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th><th>2</th><th>3</th><th>4</th><th>5</th><th>6</th><th>7</th><th>8</th><th>9</th><th>10</th><th>11</th><th>12</th><th>13</th><th>14</th><th>15</th><th>16</th> </tr> <tr> <td>PO-1</td> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td> </tr> </table>	P.O	Week																1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	PO-1																
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 how to think soundly in a juridical aspect according to the rules of logic and drawing conclusions directly, as well as various errors in thinking.
---------------------------------	--

References	Main :
	1. Warsono. 1997. Logika Cara Berpikir Sehat. Surabaya: IKIP University Press . Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Argumentasi Hukum. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada
	Supporters:

Supporting lecturer	Dr. Bachrul Amiq, S.H., M.H. Dr. Hananto Widodo, S.H., M.H. Vita Mahardhika, S.H., M.H. Irfa Ronaboyd, S.H., M.H. Kharizha Krishnandya, S.H., M.H. Ahmad Nailul Author, S.H., S.I.P., 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	<p>Criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.It's good if you can answer all the questions correctly 2.It is enough if you are able to answer most of the questions correctly 3.less if you are able to answer a small part of the questions correctly <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	2 X 50 discussion lectures		<p>Material: explaining the function of logic</p> <p>Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4: The answer is delivered coherently, showing good understanding of the concept, appropriate and able to formulate suggestions for improvement.</p> <p>Score 3 The answer is delivered coherently but lacking in some understanding of the concept. The answer to the questioner is generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement.</p> <p>Score 2. The answer submitted, is not coherent and/or shows a lack of understanding of several concepts. The answer to the question asker is generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement.</p> <p>Score 1. Answer submitted but lacking. incoherent and/or shows a lack of understanding of many concepts, the answer to a question is incorrect and unable to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Discussion Lectures 2 X 50		<p>Material: logical functions</p> <p>Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%

3	Able to differentiate the types and functions of words, terms	Mentioning types of words Mentioning types of terms differentiates words from terms	<p>Criteria: Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Discussion Lectures 2 X 50		<p>Material: distinguishing types and functions of words Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
---	---	--	---	-------------------------------	--	--	----

4	Able to differentiate the types and functions of words, terms	Mentioning types of words Mentioning types of terms differentiates words from terms	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Discussion Lectures 2 X 50		<p>Material: term type Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
---	---	--	--	-------------------------------	--	---	----

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.	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Discussion Lectures 2 X 50		<p>Material: logical reasoning</p> <p>Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
---	------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------	--	--	----

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.	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Discussion Lectures 2 X 50		<p>Material: healthy reasoning</p> <p>Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
---	------------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------	--	--	----

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	<p>Criteria: Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Discussion Presentation 2 X 50		<p>Material: cause and effect relationships Reader: Warsono. 1997. <i>The Logic of Healthy Thinking</i>. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. <i>Legal Argumentation</i>. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</p>	5%
8	UTS	UTS	<p>Criteria: UTS</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Test</p>	UTS 2 X 50		<p>Material: UTS Reader: Warsono. 1997. <i>The Logic of Healthy Thinking</i>. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. <i>Legal Argumentation</i>. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</p>	15%

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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: flow of natural law Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
---	---	--	---	--	--	---	----

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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: insight into the meaning of law</p> <p>Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
----	---	--	---	--	--	--	----

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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: legal positivism reasoning patterns</p> <p>Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
----	--	---	--	--	--	--	----

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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement</p> <p>Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: legal positivism Reader: Warsono. 1997. <i>The Logic of Healthy Thinking</i>. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. <i>Legal Argumentation</i>. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</p>	5%
----	--	---	--	--	--	---	----

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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: Understanding and having insight into sociological jurisprudence reasoning models. Library: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
----	---	--	---	--	--	---	----

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	<p>Criteria:</p> <p>Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: Understand and have insight into sociological jurisprudence</p> <p>Library: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
----	---	--	---	--	--	---	----

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	<p>Criteria: Score 4 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, shows good understanding of the concept, according to media criteria, answers to the questioner are correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 3 Answers delivered coherently with appropriate intonation and emphasis, but lacking in some areas understanding of concepts, answers to the questioner are generally correct, able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 2 Answers submitted are less coherent and/or show a lack of understanding of several concepts, answers to the question asker are generally incorrect but still able to formulate suggestions for improvement Score 1 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</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Tests</p>	Cooperative, discussion, question and answer 2 X 50		<p>Material: legal realism Reader: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	5%
16	UAS	UAS	<p>Criteria: UAS</p> <p>Form of Assessment : Test</p>	UAS 2 X 50		<p>Material: UAS Library: <i>Warsono. 1997. The Logic of Healthy Thinking. Surabaya: IKIP University Press. Hadjon, Philipus M.. 2006. Legal Argumentation. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada</i></p>	15%

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Case Study

No	Evaluation	Percentage
1.	Participatory Activities	67.5%
2.	Test	32.5%
		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.