

DESCRIPTION OF COURSE UNIT
according to the ECTS User's Guide 2015

Course unit title	Lesson Plan Development
Course unit code	22010111D26
Type of course unit (compulsory, optional)	Compulsory
Level of course unit (according to EQF: first cycle Bachelor, second cycle Master)	Bachelor
Year of study when the course unit is delivered (if applicable) 2021/2022 Semester/trimester	3 rd year
Semester/trimester when the course unit is delivered	Sixth Semester
Number of ECTS credits allocated	4.32 ECTS. 3 credits equal to 4.32 ECTS. (1 ECTS = 27.5 hours per semester) In total 4.32 x 27.5 hours per semester = 118.8 hours per semester
Name of lecturer(s)	Dr. Laily Nur Arifa, M.Pd.
Learning outcomes of the course unit	CLO-1: Students are able to analyze comprehensive and responsive lesson plans, tailored for direct practical application in school environments, considering the context, resources, and unique characteristics of local learners. CLO-2: Students can reflect on the use of teaching tools in real school settings based on difficulty levels, flexibility, efficiency, and appreciating students' needs through TPACK-based and 21st-century learning. CLO-3: Students are capable of providing constructive criticism of prepared lesson plans by integrating perspectives from various stakeholders, and committed to continual improvement and adjustments. CLO-4: Students can integrate theoretical principles, practical applications, and emotional awareness in deep reflections on theory-practice integration based on their experiences with confidence, independence, and character development while upholding the values of religious moderation.
Mode of delivery (face-to-face, distance learning) Prerequisites and co-requisites (if applicable)	Face to face

Prerequisites and co-requisites (if applicable)	
Course Content	1. Analysis of learning device requirements (M-1) 2. Simulation of the preparation of learning devices (M-1) 3. Exhibition of learning devices (M-1) 4. Evaluation of the readiness of learning devices (M-1) 5. Reflection on the analysis of effective days, annual program, and semester program based on the implementation of the Education calendar in schools (M-2) 6. Review of Learning Objectives and Learning Objective Flow (M-2) 7. Analysis of the suitability of Learning Objective Achievement Criteria (M-2) 8. Development of TPACK-based teaching modules and 21st-century learning (M-2) 9. Analysis of the use of teaching modules: Factors affecting the mismatch between implementation and lesson plans in teaching modules (M-2) 10. Development of Student Worksheets based on partner school conditions (M-2) 11. Analysis of the implementation of Student Worksheets: difficulty level, flexibility, and efficiency of use of Student Worksheets (M-2) 12. Analysis of the suitability of P5 and PPRA modules in school projects (M-2) 13. Improvement of learning devices: towards ideal learning planning (M-3) 14. Integration of theory and practice: reflection on the use of learning planning at partner schools.
Recommended or required reading and other learning resources/tools	1. Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). Understanding by Design. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). 2. Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., Kalman, H. K., & Kemp, J. E. (2012). Designing Effective Instruction (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons. 3. Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2014). The Systematic Design of Instruction (8th ed.). Pearson. 4. Carr-Chellman, A. A. (2016). Instructional Design for Teachers: Improving Classroom Practice. Routledge. 5. Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). Instructional Design (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons. 6. Reigeluth, C. M. (Ed.). (2012). Instructional-Design Theories and Models, Volume IV: The Learner-Centered Paradigm of Education. Routledge. 7. Jonassen, D. H., & Land, S. M. (Eds.). (2012). Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments (2nd ed.). Routledge. 8. Gustafson, K. L., & Branch, R. M. (2002). Survey of Instructional Development Models (4th ed.). ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology. 9. Laily Nur Arifa, The use of playdough, uno stacko, kinetic sand, and flashcards in improving the al qur'an reading skill for students with dyslexia during pandemic of COVID-19, The use of playdough, uno stacko, kinetic sand, and flashcards in improving the al qur'an reading skill for students with dyslexia during pandemic of COVID-19, 2021. http://ejournal.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/preschool/article/view/14978

	10. Ernaka Heri P, Laily Nur Arifa, Muhammad Barid Nizar Wajdi. (2021). The Development Of Pai Learning Methods (Aspects Of Types And Its Supports), Jurnal Pendidikan Islam 11 (1). http://ejournal.iaidalwa.ac.id/index.php/jpi/article/view/614 11. Sahro, K., & Sutiah, S. (2023). Model Pengembangan Kurikulum Atkinson di Madrasah Aliyah Negeri 3 Malang. <i>MA'ALIM: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam</i>, 4(1), 130-144. 12. SUTIAH, D., & Pd, M. (2020). <i>Pengembangan model pembelajaran pendidikan agama Islam</i>. NLC. 13. Sutiah. (2020). Implementation of distance learning during the covid-19 pandemic in faculty of education and teacher training. <i>Cypriot Journal of Educational Science</i> 15 (1), 1204-1214. 14. Aditomo, A., Zulfikri, anggraena, Y., Ginanto, D., Felicia, N., Andiarti, A., Herutami, I., alhapip, L., Iswoyo, S., Hartini, Y., & Mahardika, R. L. (2022). Panduan Pembelajaran dan Asesmen Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Pendidikan Dasar, dan Menengah. BADAN STANDAR, KURIKULUM, DAN ASESMEN PENDIDIKAN KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN, KEBUDAYAAN, RISET, DAN TEKNOLOGI REPUBLIK INDONESIA. https://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Panduan-Pembelajaran-dan-Asesmen.pdf 15. Andi, P. (2015). Menyusun Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran (RPP) Tematik Terpadu (Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 untuk SD/MI). Prenada Media. 16. Anggriani, Fi., & Royanto, L. (2023). Panduan Pemetaan Kemampuan Fondasi dengan Konstruksi Pembelajaran dan Aspek Perkembangan. BADAN STANDAR, KURIKULUM, DAN ASESMEN PENDIDIKAN KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN, KEBUDAYAAN, RISET, DAN TEKNOLOGI REPUBLIK INDONESIA. https://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id/file/1689392629_manage_file.pdf 17. Badan Standar, Kurikulum dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. (2022). Tahapan Implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka di Satuan Pendidikan. Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. https://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Tahapan-Implementasi-Kurikulum-Merdeka.pdf 18. Baruta, Y. (2023). ASESMEN PEMBELAJARAN PADA KURIKULUM MERDEKA: Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini, Pendidikan Dasar, dan Pendidikan Menengah. Penerbit P4I. 19. Departemen Agama RI. (2004). Desain Pengembangan Madrasah. Departemen Agama Republik Indonesia. Direktorat Jenderal Kelembagaan Agama Islam. 20. Hastasasi, W., Harjatanaya, T. Y., Kristiani, A. D., Herutami, I., & Andiarti, A. (2022). Panduan Pengembangan Kurikulum Operasional Satuan Pendidikan. BADAN STANDAR, KURIKULUM, DAN ASESMEN PENDIDIKAN KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN,
--	---

	KEBUDAYAAN, RISET, DAN TEKNOLOGI REPUBLIK INDONESIA. https://kurikulum.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Panduan-Pengembangan-Kurikulum-Operasional-di-Satuan-Pendidikan.pdf 21. Kunandar. (2013). Penilaian Autentik (Penilaian Hasil Belajar Peserta Didik Berdasarkan Kurikulum 2013) Suatu Pendekatan Praktis. Rajawali Press. 22. Mudrikah, S., Pahleviannur, M. R., Surur, M., Rahmah, N., Siahaan, M. N., Wahyuni, F. S., Widyaningrum, R., Saputra, D., Prihastari, E. B., & Ramadani, S. D. (2021). Perencanaan Pembelajaran di Sekolah: Teori dan Implementasi. Pradina Pustaka. 23. Putro, S. C., & Nidhom, A. M. (2021). Perencanaan Pembelajaran. Ahlimedia Book. 24. Ramdhani, M. A., Isom, M., Asrohah, H., Hasanah, M., Yuliantina, I., Hasan, M. A., Ambarwati, A., Inovasi, T., Zamroni, A., Salim, N., Mariana, L., Jakfar, A., Nafisah, Z., Hakim, Z., Saepudin, J., Arief, B. F., & Mujib, M. N. (2022). Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila & Profil Pelajar Rahmatan Lil Alamin. Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Islam Kementerian Agama RI'. 25. Sufyadi, S., Harjatanaya, T. Y., Adiprima, P., Satria, R., Ardianty, & Herutami, I. (2021). Panduan Pengembangan Projek Penguatan Profil Pelajar Pancasila (Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah (SD/MI, SMP/MTs, SMA/MA). Pusat Asesmen dan Pembelajaran Badan Penelitian dan Pengembangan dan Perbukuan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. 26. Horton, W. (2011). E-Learning by Design (2nd ed.). Pfeiffer. Tim MKDK IKIP Surabaya, (1995), Pengantar Pendidikan: Bagian II, Surabaya: University Press IKIP Surabaya.
Planned learning activities and teaching methods	Lecture, cooperative, Case study, Cooperative Problem-Based Learning (Cooperative PBL), Project-Based Learning (Project-based PBL), Problem-Based Learning (Problem-based PBL).
Language of instruction	Indonesian
Assessment methods and criteria	Observation, Written test, Portfolio

DISCUSSION ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES

Course Name : _____

Name of Lecturer : _____

Departement : Islamic Religious Education

A. Assessment Rubric

No.	Assessment Criteria and Substances	Scoring and Indicators				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Active Participation (25%)	Not participating in the discussion	Participation is minimal and irrelevant	Very minimal participation but quite relevant	Moderately active participation, but less relevant	Very active and relevant participation
2	Material Understanding (25%)	Not understanding the material	Very little understanding and unable to analyze the material	Good understanding but unable to analyze	Minimal understanding, but can analyze well	Excellent and thorough understanding and can analyze well.
3	Argumentative Ability (20%)	Unable to argue	Arguments are feeble and irrelevant	Good enough argument, but not relevant	Arguments are strong and relevant, but not yet able to defend their opinions.	Arguments are strong and relevant and can defend their opinions.
4	Listening Skills (15%)	Having no desire to listen	Occasional listening and often ignorance of surroundings	Good listening, but less responsive	Listened well and was responsive, but interrupted several times.	Excellent listening and responsiveness

5	Teamwork (15%)	Not cooperating with the group	Cooperates with certain group members but is passive	Actively cooperates with certain group members but refuses to cooperate with other group members	Actively cooperates with all group members but is less efficient	Actively collaborate with all group members and work together efficiently
---	--------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--	--	---

B. Compilation of Final Grade

The final score is obtained using the following formula:

Final score =

- s_i score is the score obtained by the student on the i-th task
- $Substancs_i$ is the weight (in fractional form) of the i-th task
- The sum is done for all indicators, from indicators 1 to 5.

C. SCORING GUIDELINES

The scoring guidelines are as follows:

No.	Category	Value Range
1	Excellent	86-100
2	Good	70-85
3	Average	50-69
4	Deficient	25-49
5	Unsatisfactory	<25

D. Assessment Sheet

DISCUSSION ASSESSMENT SHEET

Student Name : _____

NIM : _____

Group Name : _____

Class : _____

Course Content : _____

Lecturer : _____

Assessment Date : _____

Ninth Meeting : _____

No.	Assessment Criteria and Substances	Checklist Column					Total Score
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Active Participation (25%)						
2	Material Understanding (25%)						
3	Argumentative Ability (20%)						
4	Listening Skills (15%)						
5	Teamwork (15%)						
Total Final Score							
Grade to Letter Conversion							
Value Category							

Malang, _____

Lecturer

**MATRIX CALCULATION
FINAL COURSE SCORE
DEPARTMENT OF ISLAMIC EDUCATION**

A. Assessment Aspects

Assessment Aspect					
Cognitive (Substance 60%)				Affective (Substance 20%)	Psychomotor (Substance 20%)
Papers/Essay/ Articles/Book Review/Article Review/Portfolio/ Mind Map (Substance 20%)	Discussion/Presentation/ Observation/Cas Study/Project (Substance 20%)	Midterm Exams (Substance 30%)	Final Exams (Substance 30%)	Assessment of Attitude (Observation/Self- Assessment/Peer Assessment)	Practice

B. Final Course Score Calculation

Na = Cognitive Aspect Score (CA) + Affective Aspect Score (AA) + Psychomotor Aspect Score (PA)

$$Na = CA \left(\left(\text{Midterm Exam Score} \times \frac{30}{100} \right) + \left(\text{Final Exam Score} \times \frac{40}{100} \right) + \left(\text{Task Accumulation I} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Score}_i \times \frac{15}{100} \right) + \text{Task Accumulation I} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \text{Score}_i \times \frac{15}{100} \right) \right) \right) \times \frac{60}{100} + AA \times \frac{20}{100} + PA \times \frac{20}{100}$$

Note: n = total task

I = 1st score

C. Guidelines for Score Conversion

The scoring guidelines are outlined as follows:

No	Category	Grade
1	Excellent	86-100
2	Good	70-85
3	Average	50-69
4	Deficient	25-49
5	Unsatisfactory	<25