	Universitas Negeri Surabaya Faculty of Education, Doctoral Study Program in Educational Technology	Document Code

SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN

Courses	CODE	Course Family	Credit Weight			SEMESTER	Compilation Date
Learning technologies	8600302018	Compulsory Study Program Subjects	T=2	P=0	ECTS=5.04	1	August 25, 2023

AUTHORIZATION	SP Developer	Course Cluster Coordinator	Study Program Coordinator
	Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd. I Dr. Syaiputra Wahyuda Meisa Diningrat, M.Pd	Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd.	Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd.

Learning model	**Case Studies**

Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

PLO study program which is charged to the course

Program Objectives (PO)

PO - 1	Have the ability to work together and care for the community by applying basic concepts of educational technology in order to optimize student learning processes and improve performance as Educational Technology Developers and Educational/Training Analysts.

PLO-PO Matrix

P.O
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 the meaning of educational technology and learning technology, areas of educational and learning technology, perspectives on educational technology, sciences that support educational technology, sources that influence learning technology and their application to education in Indonesia through collaborative learning.

References

Main :

1. Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary . AECT
2. Seels, Barbara B Dan Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field . AECT
3. Gloria Natividad, J. Michael Spector, Nicholas Evangelopoulos. 2018. An Analysis of Two Decades of Educational Technology Publications. Springer Singapore
4. Mustaji, Kristanto, Diningrat. 2023. CASE BASED LEARNING: Melatih Keterampilan Kolaborasi, Berfikir Kritis, dan Pemecahan Masalah. Yogyakarta: CV. Absolute Media

Supporters:

1. Hastings, N.B., Bauman, J.A. Trends, Issues, Best Practices and Current Research in Organizational Training and Performance: an AECT Division of Organizational Training and Performance Special Issue of Tech Trends. TechTrends 64, 188–189 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-019-00468-1
2. J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, Jan Elen, M. J. Bishop. 2020. Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology.Springer New York, NY
3. Allman, B., Kimmons, R., Rosenberg, J. et al. Trends and Topics in Educational Technology, 2023 Edition. TechTrends 67, 583–591 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-023-00840-2

Supporting lecturer	Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd. Dr. Utari Dewi, S.Sn., M.Pd. Dr. Syaiputra Wahyuda Meisa Diningrat, M.Pd.

Week-	Final abilities of each learning	Evaluation	Help Learning, Learning methods, Student Assignments, [Estimated time]	Learning materials [References]	Assessment Weight (%)

	stage (Sub-PO)	Indicator	Criteria & Form	Offline (*offline*)	Online (*online*)		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1	Students can explain lecture maps and describe learning/educational problems	Describe the road map for performance technology courses	**Criteria:** Accuracy of describing the road map for performance technology courses **Form of Assessment** : Test	direct learning questions and answers 2 X 50		**Material:** educational technology concepts **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** learning technology concepts **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	5%

2	Students can explain the history of learning problem solving and the emergence of educational technology as a problem solution	Describe the I Educational Technology paradigm	**Criteria:** accuracy of concluding the I Educational Technology paradigm **Form of Assessment** : Test	direct learning questions and answers 2 X 50		**Material:** Educational Technology **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** Learning Technology **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** educational technology **Bibliography:** *J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, Jan Elen, MJ Bishop. 2020. Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology. Springer New York, NY*	5%

3	Students are able to understand the Learning Technology paradigm II	Concluding the Learning Technology paradigm II	**Criteria:** Accuracy of concluding the Learning Technology paradigm II	direct learning questions and answers 2 X 50		**Material:** Field of Education Technology **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** Historical educational technology **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Development of educational technology **References:** *J. Michael Spector, M. David Merrill, Jan Elen, MJ Bishop. 2020. Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology. Springer New York, NY*	5%

4	Students are able to understand paradigm III of Educational Technology	Concluding paradigm III of Educational Technology	**Criteria:** Accuracy concludes paradigm III of Educational Technology **Form of Assessment** : Test	direct learning questions and answers 2 X 50		**Material:** Field of Education Technology **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** Historical educational technology **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Development of educational technology theory **References:** *Gloria Natividad, J. Michael Spector, Nicholas Evangelopoulos. 2018. An Analysis of Two Decades of Educational Technology Publications. Springer Singapore*	5%

5	Students are able to study the study of FACILITATING LEARNING in the Educational Technology paradigm III	Examining the concept of FACILITATING LEARNING in the Educational Technology paradigm III	**Criteria:** 1.accuracy of describing problem solving models according to educational technology 2.Analysis of the characteristics of problem solving that emerge as a learning resource 3.Active in discussions **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP problem solving model **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** Characteristics of TP Problem Solving **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Educational technology problem solving model **References:** *Gloria Natividad, J. Michael Spector, Nicholas Evangelopoulos. 2018. An Analysis of Two Decades of Educational Technology Publications. Springer Singapore*	5%

6	Students are able to study IMPROVING PERFORMANCE studies in Paradigm III of Educational Technology	Examining IMPROVING PERFORMANCE studies in Paradigm III of Educational Technology	**Criteria:** the accuracy of reviewing IMPROVING PERFORMANCE studies in Paradigm III of Educational Technology **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP problem solving model **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** Characteristics of TP Problem Solving **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	5%
7	Students are able to study IMPROVING PERFORMANCE studies in Paradigm III of Educational Technology	Examining IMPROVING PERFORMANCE studies in Paradigm III of Educational Technology	**Criteria:** the accuracy of reviewing CREATING studies in the III educational technology paradigm **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP problem solving model **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya* **Material:** Characteristics of TP Problem Solving **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	10%

8	UTS	Explain the intellectual techniques of educational technology. Explain the influence of educational technology on organizational systems	**Form of Assessment** : Portfolio Assessment	2 X 50 case study assignment		**Material:** Educational Technology **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya*	5%
9	Students are able to study USING studies in the Educational Technology paradigm III	Examining USING studies in paradigm III of educational technology	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing USING studies in the III paradigm of educational technology **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	5%
10	Students are able to study USING studies in the Educational Technology paradigm III	Examining USING studies in paradigm III of educational technology	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing MANAGING studies in the III educational technology paradigm **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	5%

11	Students are able to study PROCESSES studies in the Educational Technology paradigm III	Examining PROCESSES studies in paradigm III of educational technology	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing PROCESSES studies in the III educational technology paradigm **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	5%
12	Students are able to study RESOURCES studies in the Educational Technology paradigm III	Examining RESOURCES studies in paradigm III of educational technology	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing RESOURCES studies in the III educational technology paradigm **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Group Discussion 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	5%
13	Students are able to study the conceptual study of the Functional Position of Educational Technology Developer	Examining the conceptual study of the Functional Position of Educational Technology Developer	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing the conceptual study of the Functional Position of Educational Technology Developer **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Case Study 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	10%

14	Students are able to examine the implementation of educational technology theory and practice	Examining studies on the implementation of educational technology theory and practice	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing studies on the implementation of educational technology theory and practice **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Case Study 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	10%
15	Students are able to examine the implementation of educational technology theory and practice	Examining studies on the implementation of educational technology theory and practice	**Criteria:** The accuracy of reviewing studies on the implementation of educational technology theory and practice **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	Case Study 2 X 50		**Material:** TP Area **References:** *Seels, Barbara B and Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT* **Material:** Sources and problem solving TP **Reference:** *Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT*	10%
16	UAS	Analyzing the forms of application of educational technology in Indonesia	**Criteria:** Accuracy of Analyzing forms of application of educational technology in Indonesia **Form of Assessment** : Test	2 X 50 Case Study Assignment		**Material:** TP area 2007 **References:** *Januszewski, Alan and Molenda, Michael . 2008. Educational Technology: A Definition With Commentary. AECT 2. Seels, Barbara B And Richey, Rita . 1994. Instructional Technology, The Definition and Domains of the Field. AECT 3. Abdullah, Ishak and Deni Darmawan . 2015. Educational Technology. Bandung: Rosda Karya*	10%

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Case Study

No	Evaluation	Percentage
1.	Participatory Activities	70%
2.	Portfolio Assessment	5%
3.	Test	25%
		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.