

## Universitas Negeri Surabaya Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences Undergraduate Mathematics Study Program

Document Code

## SEMESTER LEARNING PLAN

				01.			.,				•			
Courses			COL	DE		Cours	e Family		Cı	redit W	eight		SEMESTER	Compilation Date
Mathema	tics	Seminar	4420	010211	.6				T=	=2 P=	0 EC	TS=3.18	5	July 17, 2024
AUTHOR	IZAT	ION	SP I	Develo	per			Course Cluster Coordinator				Study Program Coordinator		
												Prof. Dr. Raden Sulaiman, M.Si.		
Learning model		Case Studies												
Program	1	PLO study pro	gram that	t is cha	arged to t	he course								
Outcom	es	Program Object	ectives (PO)											
(PLO)		PLO-PO Matrix	(											
			F	P.O										
		PO Matrix at th	ne end of e	each le	earning st	tage (Sub-	PO)							
			P.O						Wee	k				
				1	2 3	4 5	6 7	8	9	10	11	12	13 14	15 16
Short Course Descript	tion	This course provides students with understanding and mastery of scientific writing, explaining the contents of scientific a literature studies to make mathematical research proposals, procedures for making proposals, how to explain the content proposal and argumentation of the contents of a scientific research idea in the field of mathematics, both theoretical and appropriate the content of the content of the content of a scientific research idea in the field of mathematics, both theoretical and appropriate the content of the							cientific articles, ie contents of a al and applied ok published by al in the field of					
Reference	ces	Main :												
		1. Penulisa	an Skripsi U	Inesa										
		Supporters:												
Supporting lecturer         Prof. Drs. I Ketut Budayasa, Ph.D.           Dr. Yusuf Fuad, M.App.Sc.         Prof. Dr. Manuharawati, M.Si.           Dr. Agung Lukito, M.S.         Dr. Abadi, M.Sc.           Prof. Dr. Dr. Nanuharawati, M.Si.         Dr. Abadi, M.Sc.           Prof. Dr. Dr. Juniati, M.Si.         Dr. Dr. Dwi Juniati, M.Si.           Dr. Budi Rahadjeng, S.Si., M.Si.         Dr. Dian Savitri, S.Si., M.Si.           Vuliani Puji Astuti, S.Si., M.Si.         Yuliani Puji Astuti, S.Si., M.Si.           Rudianto Artiono, S.Pd., M.Si.         Dwi Nur Yunianti, S.Si., M.Si.           Dwi Nur Yunianti, S.Si., M.Si.         Dwi Nur Yunianti, S.Si., M.Si.           Dwi Nur Yunianti, S.Si., M.Si.         Dwi Nur Yunianti, S.Si., M.Si.           Dimas Avian Maulana, S.Si., M.Si.         Dimas Avian Maulana, S.Si., M.Si.														
Week-	Fin eac stat	al abilities of h learning ge b-PO)		Ev	valuation			Help Learning, Learning methods, Student Assignments, [ Estimated time]			Learning materials [ References	Assessment Weight (%)		
			Indicat	tor	Criteri	ia & Form	Of of	fline( f <i>line</i> )		Onlin	e ( on	line )	1	
(1)		(2)	(3)			(4)		(5)			(6)		(7)	(8)

	scientific articles and scientific literature reviews in the field of mathematics	characteristics of scientific articles and scientific literature studies in the field of mathematics	<ol> <li>The assessment is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>Sub- summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>A 3x performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x 3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10</li> </ol>	discussion 2 X 50			
--	---	---	---	----------------------	--	--	--

	research	of a linguistic research proposal	<ol> <li>The assessment is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>Sub- summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>Asx performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x 3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10</li> </ol>	Discussion 2 X 50			
--	----------	---	--	----------------------	--	--	--

3	Explain the steps	Explain the steps in a	Criteria:	observation,		0%
	research proposal	mathematics research	is carried out on	2 X 50		
		proposal	the following			
			2 1 Participation			
			during lectures			
			and			
			presentations,			
			carried out			
			observation			
			(weight 2)			
			3.2. Sub-			
			summative test,			
			assessing all			
			relevant			
			indicators			
			through a written			
			and weighted (2))			
			4.3. Assessment of			
			proposal products			
			other than those			
			presentation is			
			considered an			
			assignment, the			
			scores are			
			averaged, then			
			5.4. 3x			
			performance			
			scores during the			
			presentation plus			
			proposal are			
			averaged as UAS			
			scores, given a			
			6 5 The final NA is			
			(participation			
			value x2)			
			(assignment			
			value x 3) (UTS			
			value x 2) OAS			
			by 10			

4	Developing a researcher proposal Example of a mathematics research proposal process according to a relevant topic	Being able to make decisions is characterized by skillfully developing mathematical proposals using various relevant learning sources	Criteria: 1. The assessment is carried out on the following aspects: 2.1. Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2) 3.2. Sub- summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2)) 4.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3) 5.4. 3x performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3) 6.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x3) (UTS value x2) UAS value (3) divided by 10	Observation, presentation 2 X 50		0%
5		vos viewer	Forms of Assessment : Participatory Activities, Project Results Assessment / Product Assessment	Bibliometric Analysis 100	Material: Bibliometric Analysis of Literature:	0%

6	Explain the theories that support mathematical research	Explain the learning theory that underlies mathematics research proposals	<ul> <li>Criteria: <ol> <li>The assessment</li> <li>is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>2.1. Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>3.2. Sub-summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through avvitten exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>4.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>5.4. 3x performance scores during the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>6.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x3) (UTS value x2) UAS value (3) divided</li> </ol></li></ul>	Presentation and discussion 2 X 50		0%
			value (3) divided by 10			

7 7	literature review		Criteria: 1. The assessment is carried out on the following aspects: 2.1. Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2) 3.2. Sub- summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2)) 4.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3) 5.4. 3x performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3) 6.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x 3) (UTS value x 3) UTS value x 3) divided by 10	Presentations, discussions. 2 X 50		0%
8	UIS	UTS	UTS	UTS 3 X 50		0%

observation (weight 2) 3.2. Sub- summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2))	
carried out	
observation	
(weight 2) 3.2. Sub- summative test	
carried out once, assessing all	
indicators through a written	
and weighted (2)) 4.3. Assessment of	
other than those shown in the	
considered an assignment, the	
averaged, then weighted (3)	
performance scores during the	
2x marks for the proposal are	
scores, given a weight of (3) 6.5. The final NA is	
(participation value x2) (assignment	
value x 3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10	

		decisions is characterized by skillfully developing titles using various relevant learning sources	<ol> <li>The assessment is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>2.1. Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>3.2. Sub- summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>4.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>5.4. 3x performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>5.5. The final NA is (participation value x 2) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10</li> </ol>	3 X 50			
--	--	--	--	--------	--	--	--

11	Explain the background of the problem	Explain the purpose of applying problem background. Give examples of problem background	<ul> <li>Criteria: <ol> <li>The assessment</li> <li>is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>2.1. Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>3.2. Sub-summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through avvitten exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>4.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>5.4. 3x performance scores during the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>6.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x3) (UTS value x 2) UAS</li> </ol></li></ul>	Presentation and discussion 3 X 50		0%
			(assignment value x 3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10			

12	Explain the theory that supports the problem	Explain the basis of problem- oriented theory	<ul> <li>Criteria: <ol> <li>The assessment is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>S.2. Sub-summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through a written exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>A.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>S.4. 3x performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>S.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10</li> </ol></li></ul>	Presentation and discussion 3 X 50			0%
----	--	---	--	---	--	--	----

13	Explain how to identify problems	Explain the identifying characteristics of the problem	<ul> <li>Criteria: <ol> <li>The assessment <ul> <li>is carried out on</li> <li>the following</li> <li>aspects:</li> </ul> </li> <li>2.1. Participation <ul> <li>during lectures</li> <li>and</li> <li>presentations,</li> <li>carried out</li> <li>through</li> <li>observation <ul> <li>(weight 2)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3.2. Sub- <ul> <li>summative test,</li> <li>carried out once,</li> <li>assessing all</li> <li>relevant</li> <li>indicators</li> <li>through a written</li> <li>exam, averaged</li> <li>and weighted (2))</li> </ul> </li> <li>4.3. Assessment of <ul> <li>proposal products</li> <li>other than those</li> <li>shown in the</li> <li>presentation, is</li> <li>considered an</li> <li>assignment, the</li> <li>scores are</li> <li>averaged, then</li> <li>weighted (3)</li> </ul> </li> <li>5.4. 3x <ul> <li>performance</li> <li>scores during the</li> <li>presentation plus</li> <li>2x marks for the</li> <li>proposal are</li> <li>averaged as UAS</li> <li>scores, given a</li> <li>weight of (3)</li> <li>6.5. The final NA is</li> <li>(participation</li> <li>value x2)</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ol></li></ul>	Presentation, discussion, reflection 3 X 50		0%
			scores, given a weight of (3) 6.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x 3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10			

14	Explain the steps for problem	Explain the steps for	Criteria:	Observation,		0%
	identification	identifying problems	is carried out on	3 X 50		
			the following			
			2.1. Participation			
			during lectures			
			and			
			presentations,			
			carried out			
			observation			
			(weight 2)			
			3.2. Sub-			
			summative test,			
			carried out once,			
			relevant			
			indicators			
			through a written			
			exam, averaged			
			and weighted (2))			
			proposal products			
			other than those			
			shown in the			
			presentation, is			
			considered an			
			scores are			
			averaged, then			
			weighted (3)			
			5.4. 3x			
			performance			
			presentation plus			
			2x marks for the			
			proposal are			
			averaged as UAS			
			scores, given a			
			6.5. The final NA is			
			(participation			
			value x2)			
			(assignment			
			value x 3) (UTS			
			value (3) divided			
			by 10			

13	UAS	UAS	<ul> <li>1. The assessment is carried out on the following aspects:</li> <li>2.1. Participation during lectures and presentations, carried out through observation (weight 2)</li> <li>3.2. Sub-summative test, carried out once, assessing all relevant indicators through avritten exam, averaged and weighted (2))</li> <li>4.3. Assessment of proposal products other than those shown in the presentation, is considered an assignment, the scores are averaged, then weighted (3)</li> <li>5.4. 3x performance scores during the presentation plus 2x marks for the proposal are averaged as UAS scores, given a weight of (3)</li> <li>6.5. The final NA is (participation value x2) (assignment value x 3) (UTS value x 2) UAS value (3) divided by 10</li> <li>Criteria:</li> </ul>	UAS		0%
10	0,3	043	UAS	2 X 50		0%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.
- 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
- 10. Learning indernals are details of descriptions of study indernals 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.