	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
Advanced Educational Psychology	8600302046		T=2	P=0	ECTS=5.04	1	July 17, 2024

AUTHORIZATION	SP Developer	Course Cluster Coordinator	Study Program Coordinator
	Dr. Fajar Arianto, M.Pd	.....	Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd.

Learning model	**Case Studies**
Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)	**PLO study program that is charged to the course**
	Program Objectives (PO)
	PLO-PO Matrix

	P.O

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

Short Course Description	Critically examine the relationship between learning theories and learning, the use of learning media, and educational technology. This ability includes (1) making decisions and solving problems wisely, (2) applying knowledge, experience and thinking skills more practically both inside and outside the organization/school, (3) producing creative and innovative ideas or creations, (4) overcome hasty, vague and narrow ways of thinking, (5) improve cognitive and affective aspects, and (6) be open in receiving and giving opinions, make judgments based on reasons and evidence, and dare to give views and criticism

References

Main :

1. Pablo Briñol and Kenneth G. DeMarree.2012. Social metacognition. Taylor & Francis Group, LLC; NY
2. Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY
3. Levin , Daniel T. 2004. Thinking and seeing : visual metacognition in adults and children. Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Massachusetts
4. Peña-Ayala, Alejandro. 2015. Metacognition: Fundaments, Applications, and Trends: A Profile of the Current State-Of-The-Art. Springer; NY
5. Larkin, Shirley. 2010. Metacognition in young children. Routledge; NY
6. Azevedo, Roger & Aleven, Vincent. 2013. International Handbook of Metacognition and Learning Technologies. Springer; NY
7. Slavin, R. E. 2017. Education Psychology: Teori and Practice. New York: Pearson
8. Blummer, B., & Kenton, J. M. (2015). Improving Student Information Search A Metacognitive Approach. India: Chandos Publishing.
9. Chinien, C. A., & Boutin, F. (1993). Cognitive Style FD/I: An Important Learner Characteristic for Educational Technologists. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 21 , 303-311.
10. . Cormier, W., & Cormier, L. (1985). Interviewing Strategies For Helpers: Fundamental Skill Cognitive Behavioral Interventions. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
11. . Faschingbauer, T. R., Moore, C. D., & Stone, A. (1978). Cognitive Style, Dogmatism, and Creativity: Some Implications regarding Cognitive Development. Psychological Reports , 775-804.
12. . Kozhevnikov, M. (2007). Cognitive Styles in the Context of Modern Psychology: Toward a Integrated Framework of Cognitive Style. Psychological Bulletin , 464–481.
13. . Lajoie, S. P. (2008). Metacognition, Self Regulation, and Self-regulated Learning: A Rose by any other Name? Educ Psychol Rev , 469–475.
14. . Riding, R., & Cheema, I. (1991). Cognitive Styles—an overview and integration. Educational Psychology , 193-214.
15. . Santrock, J. W. (2010). Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
16. . Scunk, D. H. (1985). Self Efficacy and Classroom Learning. Psychology in the Schools , 208-223.
17. . Slavin, R. E. (2006). Education Psychology: Teori and Practice. New York: Pearson.
18. . Thomas, P. R., & McKay, J. B. (2010). Cognitive styles and instructional design in university learning. Learning and Individual Differences , 197–202.

Supporters:

Supporting lecturer	Dr. Miftakhul Jannah, S.Psi., M.Si.,Psikolog Dr. Diana Rahmasari, S.Psi., M.Si.,Psikolog. Dr. Fajar Arianto, S.Pd., M.Pd. Irena Yolanita Maureen, S.Pd., M.Sc., Ph.D.

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	Describe the relationship between behavioristic and social theories in learning	1.· Describe behaviorism in learning 2.· Describe social cognitive learning	**Criteria:** depth in analysis **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** Behavioristics **Reader:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	50%
2	Describe the relationship between behavioristic and social theories in learning	1.Describe behaviorism in learning 2.Describing social cognitive learning	**Criteria:** depth in analysis **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** social cognitive **Reference:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	0%
3	Describe the relationship of cognitive theory in learning	1.Describe the relationship between cognitive development and learning 2.Describe the relationship between language development and learning · 3.Describe the relationship between intellectualism and learning	**Criteria:** depth in discussion **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** cognitive theory **References:** . *Slavin, R.E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. New York: Pearson.*	0%
4	Describe the relationship of cognitive theory in learning	1.Describe the relationship between cognitive development and learning 2.Describe the relationship between language development and learning · 3.Describe the relationship between intellectualism and learning	**Criteria:** depth in discussion **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** cognitive theory **References:** . *Slavin, R.E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. New York: Pearson.*	0%
5	Describing constructivism in learning	Describe constructivist theory. Describe the relationship between constructivists in learning	**Criteria:** depth in providing research	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** Constructivist **Literature:** . *Santrock, J. W. (2010). Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.* **Material:** Constructivist **Literature:** . *Slavin, R.E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. New York: Pearson.* **Material:** Constructivist **Reader:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	0%

6	Describing constructivism in learning	Describe constructivist theory. Describe the relationship between constructivists in learning	**Criteria:** depth in providing research **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** Constructivist **Literature:** . *Santrock, J. W. (2010). Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.* **Material:** Constructivist **Literature:** . *Slavin, R.E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. New York: Pearson.* **Material:** Constructivist **Reader:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	0%
7	Describing constructivism in learning	Describe constructivist theory. Describe the relationship between constructivists in learning	**Criteria:** depth in providing research **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** Constructivist **Literature:** . *Santrock, J. W. (2010). Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.* **Material:** Constructivist **Literature:** . *Slavin, R.E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. New York: Pearson.* **Material:** Constructivist **Reader:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	0%
8	Midterm exam			2 X 50			0%
9	1. Describing metacognition in learning 2. Distinguish between metacognition as a process, ability and skill 3. Describe metacognition in learning	1. Describe metacognitive theory 2. processes, abilities and skills Distinguish between metacognitive as 3. Describe metacognition in learning	**Criteria:** depth in making research **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** metacognitive **Bibliography:** *Peña-Ayala, Alejandro. 2015. Metacognition: Fundaments, Applications, and Trends: A Profile of the Current State-Of-The-Art. Springer; NY* **Material:** metacognitive **References:** *Levin, Daniel T. 2004. Thinking and seeing: visual metacognition in adults and children. Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Massachusetts* **Material:** metacognitive **Bibliography:** *Larkin, Shirley. 2010. Metacognition in young children. Routledge; NY* **Material:** metacognitive **References:** *Blummer, B., & Kenton, JM (2015). Improving Student Information Search A Metacognitive Approach. India: Chandos Publishing.*	50%

10	1.Describing metacognition in learning 2.Distinguish between metacognition as a process, ability and skill 3.Describe metacognition in learning	1.Describe metacognitive theory 2.processes, abilities and skills Distinguish between metacognitive as 3.Describe metacognition in learning	**Criteria:** depth in making research **Form of Assessment** : Participatory Activities	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** metacognitive **Bibliography:** *Peña-Ayala, Alejandro. 2015. Metacognition: Fundaments, Applications, and Trends: A Profile of the Current State-Of-The-Art. Springer; NY* **Material:** metacognitive **References:** *Levin, Daniel T. 2004. Thinking and seeing: visual metacognition in adults and children. Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Massachusetts* **Material:** metacognitive **Bibliography:** *Larkin, Shirley. 2010. Metacognition in young children. Routledge; NY* **Material:** metacognitive **References:** *Blummer, B., & Kenton, JM (2015). Improving Student Information Search A Metacognitive Approach. India: Chandos Publishing.*	0%
11	Describe the relationship between motivation and the learning process	1.Clarifying motivation theory 2.Describe the factors that influence motivation 3.Describe the impact of motivation on learning	**Criteria:** 5	case studies		**Material:** Motivation **Reader:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY* **Material:** motivation **Reference:** *. Santrock, J. W. (2010). Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.*	0%
12	Describe self regulated learning	· Describe the basis of self-regulated learning. Describe the relationship between self-regulated learning and learning	**Criteria:** depth in analysis	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** Self regulated learning **Reference:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	0%
13	Describe self regulated learning	· Describe the basis of self-regulated learning. Describe the relationship between self-regulated learning and learning	**Criteria:** depth in analysis	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** Self regulated learning **Reference:** *Schunk, Dale H. 2012. Learning theories : an educational perspective.Pearson:NY*	0%
14	Describe the relationship between cognitive style and learning	· Describe the differences between FI and FD cognitive styles. Clarify the relationship between cognitive styles and learning	**Criteria:** depth in providing analysis	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** cognitive style **References:** *. Thomas, P. R., & McKay, J. B. (2010). Cognitive styles and instructional design in university learning. Learning and Individual Differences, 197–202.*	0%
15	Describe the relationship between cognitive style and learning	· Describe the differences between FI and FD cognitive styles. Clarify the relationship between cognitive styles and learning	**Criteria:** depth in providing analysis	case study 2 X 50		**Material:** cognitive style **References:** *. Thomas, P. R., & McKay, J. B. (2010). Cognitive styles and instructional design in university learning. Learning and Individual Differences, 197–202.*	0%
16	UAS						0%

Evaluation Percentage Recap: Case Study

No	Evaluation	Percentage

1.	Participatory Activities	100%
		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.