

Curriculum Evaluation of Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019), Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Thailand

Worawut Phengphan

Department of Vocational Education and Social Development, Faculty of Education, Burapha University,
Chonburi province , Thailand , Email – worawut@buu.ac.th

Abstract: *This research aims to: 1. Analyze the self-assessment report and internal quality assessment report of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the academic year 2020-2022. And 2. Study the stakeholder group recommendations of the curriculum for the improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Social Development program. This research collected data through document analysis and group discussions. Used Content analysis and presentation of data as averages, Standard deviation (S.D) and write descriptive narratives. The results of the research were as follows: 1. Assessment of the quality of education within the curriculum level according to ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA 4.0) criteria for the academic year 2020-2022. And the 2nd component has the assessment results for all 3 years, is at an inadequate quality level but minor improvement will make it adequate. And the results of the assessment of the curriculum that meet the needs of the course stakeholders are at a high level. And 2. Stakeholder Group Recommendations for Program Improvement of Doctor of Philosophy in Visual Education and Social Development 2.1 The context is clear, the objectives are interdisciplinary, appropriate to the current situation, data and feedback from stakeholders should be collected for use in curriculum design. 2.2 In terms of inputs, faculty members have high potential in both qualifications and research, and data should be reviewed and analyzed in order to design expected learning outcomes to be up-to-date with changes communicated to all stakeholder groups. 2.3 In terms of the process, learners are involved in the design of teaching activities and evaluation criteria together with the instructor, should arrange the teaching of each subject to link the expected learning outcomes of the course. 2.4) In terms of productivity, learners are knowledgeable and able to conduct research successfully as expected, should increase their experience in creating social innovations that meet the challenges of development, whereby faculty, current students, alumni should continuously participate in research and dissemination of collaborative research results at national and international levels.*

Key Words: *Curriculum Evaluation, Education and Social Development, Stakeholder Group, Burapha University.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

The situation of economic development from the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023-2027) shows that the development of the country's population potential or manpower preparation is important for economic and social development by enhancing the quality of life and well-being of the people, as well as economic and social development of educational manpower is urgently important to have knowledge and ability to manage education along with the development of the potential of Thai people in all dimensions, including physical, emotional, social and intellectual, emphasizing on having the necessary life skills and competencies that are ready for the changes of society in the future world with timely changes in all aspects and morality, understanding the impact of technology on society in order to produce quality costly people to be able to learn throughout their lives, know how to seek knowledge and apply knowledge under a Knowledge-Based Society that is in line with the country's context and culture,

can be an important force for the country in economic and social development to build the foundation for sustainable happiness of Thai people. (Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council,2023)

Curriculum development in line with socioeconomic changes assesses curriculum assessment as the final stage of the curriculum development process that indicates to us how successful the curriculum has been developed and implemented. This is to consider the value of the curriculum by using various methods of assessment in order to obtain factual information, analyze and summarize various deficiencies to be used as information for curriculum development. The results of the assessment of the curriculum will have benefits for both administration and educational management, when it is improved and developed, it will ensure that the curriculum is of good quality. (Khantisampanno and Kositpimanvach,2023) Assessment actors should understand the key aspects of curriculum assessment in the 21 century in order to be able to plan curriculum assessments in line with the curriculum assessment goals set out in order to effectively apply the curriculum assessment results to educational development (Suparp,2022). Therefore, there is a need to evaluate the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) in order to develop a curriculum that meets the needs of society and is modern, able to solve challenging problems and adapt to the changing dynamics of the world.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:

- To analyze the self-assessment report and the internal quality assessment report of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the academic year 2020-2022.
- To study the recommendations of the stakeholder groups of the curriculum for the improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development.

3. RESEARCH SCOPE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:

The scope of content is the self-assessment report and the internal quality assessment report of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the performance of the academic year 2020-2022. The conceptual framework of analysis of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) at the curriculum level and the results of the assessment of the quality of education within the curriculum level of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development for the academic year 2020-2022 according to the quality assurance criteria of the ASEAN University Network. (AUN-QA 4.0) using the concept of ASEAN University Network (2020) and a study of curriculum stakeholder group recommendations for curriculum improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Social Development on the evaluation of the CIPP Model curriculum by Stufflebeam et al. (1971) includes contextual, input, process and productivity

4. RESEARCH METHOD:

This research is a Qualitative Research with the following research process:

Step 1: Analysis of the Self-Assessment Report and the Educational Quality Assessment Report within the curriculum level of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development for the academic year 2020-2022 by analyzing documentary research from the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) at the curriculum level and the results of the assessment of the quality of education within the curriculum level according to the ASEAN University Network (AUN-QA 4.0) (ASEAN University Network,2020) for the academic year 2020-2022 by presenting the mean and standard deviation.

Step 2: A Study of Stakeholder Group Recommendations for Curriculum Improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Visual Education and Social Development Focus group discussion on the evaluation of the CIPP Model curriculum of Stufflebeam et al. (1971) includes context, input, process and productivity (Patphol,2018) of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development. We conducted group discussions and purposive sampling. It consists of 1) current students, 2) alumni, 3) instructors, 4) program management committee, 5) graduate users, and 6) prospective students. The selection criteria were 10 experienced and cognitive stakeholders related to the 3-year or more curriculum by interactive method to provide feedback on various issues for the improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development in the future and use Content Analysis. Present descriptive narrative information.

5. FINDINGS:

1. Analysis of Self-Assessment Report and Internal Quality Assessment Report according to ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance Criteria (AUN-QA 4.0) of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised Program 2019) for the academic year 2020-2022 by Component 1 Assessment Results Compliance is based on criteria. Component 2 has a 3-year assessment result at level 3 and the curriculum assessment results that meet the needs of the course stakeholders are at a high level.

Table 1: Assessment Results of Component 1 Compliance

Benchmarks	Assessment Results of the Committee		
	2020	2021	2022
Component 1 Compliance : Postgraduate Programs			
1. Number of teachers responsible for the course	✓	✓	✓
2. Qualifications of the teacher responsible for the course	✓	✓	✓
3. Course Teacher Qualifications	✓	✓	✓
4. Instructor qualifications	✓	✓	✓
5. Qualifications of Master Thesis Advisor and Independent Research Advisor	✓	✓	✓
6. Qualifications of joint thesis advisors (if any)	✓	✓	✓
7. Qualifications of thesis examination professors	✓	✓	✓
8. Publication of graduate works	✓	✓	✓
9. Dissertation advisory workload and independent research at the graduate level	✓	✓	✓
10. Course adjustments according to defined periods.	✓	✓	✓
The conclusion is based on criteria.	✓	✓	✓

According to Table 1, Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the performance of the academic year 2020-2022, it was found that the self-assessment results of Component 1 Compliance with all indicators of the 2015 Higher Education Curriculum Standards

Table 2: Results of internal education quality assessment according to ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance Criteria (AUN-QA 4.0)

Indicators	Assessment level by the Committee		
	2020	2021	2022
AUN-QA 1 Expected Learning Outcomes	2	3	3
AUN-QA 2 Programme Structure and Content	3	3	3
AUN-QA 3 Teaching and Learning Approach	3	3	3
AUN-QA 4 Student Assessment	3	3	3
AUN-QA 5 Academic Staff	3	3	3
AUN-QA 6 Academic Staff Quality	3	3	3
AUN-QA 7 Facilities and Infrastructure	4	2	3
AUN-QA 8 Output and Outcomes	2	3	3
Overall Rating	3	3	3

According to Table 2, Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the academic year 2020-2022, it was found that the results of the internal assessment of the quality of education according to the quality assurance criteria of ASEAN University Network (AUN-QA 4.0) were at level 3, which means that the quality is insufficient, but minor improvements or improvements can result in sufficient quality.

Table 3: Satisfaction with current students' needs on course quality

Assessment issues	Year 2020 (N=3)		Year 2021 (N=4)		Year 2022 (N=6)		Average 3 years	
	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.
1. Instructors	4.60	0.12	4.55	0.27	4.51	0.21	4.55	0.20
2. Learning Support	3.75	0.21	4.17	0.31	4.32	0.35	4.08	0.29
3. Curriculum Management	4.53	0.15	4.53	0.11	4.54	0.19	4.53	0.15
4. Teaching & Learning	4.33	0.37	4.36	0.55	4.63	0.35	4.44	0.42
5. Measurement and evaluation	4.36	0.13	4.55	0.17	4.52	0.14	4.48	0.15
6. Student Learning Outcomes	4.35	0.55	4.35	0.45	4.58	0.47	4.43	0.49
7. Course Structure	4.42	0.10	4.42	0.16	4.75	0.18	4.53	0.15
8. Course content	4.55	0.14	4.55	0.12	4.54	0.16	4.55	0.14
Average	4.36	0.25	4.44	0.27	4.55	0.26	4.45	0.26

According to Table 3, Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) For the academic year 2020-2022, satisfaction with the needs of current students for the quality of the program was very high, with an average of 4.45. Students are most satisfied with the instructors, course content, curriculum management, and course structure. This is followed by measurement and evaluation, teaching and learning management, student learning outcomes, and learning support at a large level, respectively.

Table 4: Alumni satisfaction effect on course quality

Assessment issues	Year 2020 (N=7)		Year 2021 (N=3)		Year 2022 (N=4)		Average 3 years	
	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.
1. Do you think that the current university has a good reputation affecting the quality of its courses?	4.35	0.21	4.45	0.31	0.35	5.00	4.60	0.29
2. Do you think that the quality of the curriculum gives the graduates good potential?	4.27	0.15	4.37	0.11	0.19	5.00	4.55	0.15
3. Are you involved in the development of knowledge for current students?	3.75	0.37	3.85	0.55	0.35	4.50	4.03	0.42
4. The university has faculty programs, conferences, seminars or workshops that continuously create new knowledge for alumni.	3.25	0.13	3.33	0.17	0.14	4.20	3.59	0.15
5. You receive information that is up-to-date and useful to alumni.	4.32	0.55	4.42	0.45	0.47	4.10	4.28	0.49
6. You recommended the younger ones he knew to apply to the faculty/university course.	4.29	0.10	4.39	0.16	0.18	4.50	4.39	0.15
7. You are willing to cooperate with the University Faculty Program when there are activities that require your cooperation.	4.65	0.14	4.75	0.12	0.16	5.00	4.80	0.14
Total Average Score	4.13	0.24	4.22	0.27	4.61	0.26	4.32	0.26

According to Table 4, Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the academic year 2020-2022, alumni satisfaction with the quality of the program was 4.32 average. Alumni think that the university's current reputation affects the quality of its courses and that the quality of the courses makes graduates have the greatest potential. Secondly, introduce the younger ones you know to apply for courses of the faculty/university to receive up-to-date information. The university has courses, faculty, seminars or trainings that continuously create new knowledge for alumni at a large level, respectively.

Table 5: Satisfaction results that meet the needs of graduate users

Assessment issues	Year 2020 (N=3)		Year 2021 (N=3)		Year 2022 (N=3)		Average 3 years	
	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.
1. Moral and ethical aspects	4.32	0.12	4.32	0.27	4.79	0.21	4.48	0.20
2. Knowledge	4.25	0.21	4.25	0.31	4.75	0.35	4.42	0.29
3. Cognitive Skills	4.23	0.15	4.23	0.11	4.75	0.19	4.40	0.15
4. Interpersonal skills and responsibilities	4.22	0.37	4.22	0.55	4.85	0.35	4.43	0.42
5. Numerical analysis skills Communication and Use of Information Technology	4.16	0.13	4.16	0.17	4.72	0.14	4.35	0.15
6. Special characteristics of students	4.23	0.55	4.88	0.45	4.88	0.47	4.66	0.49
Overall graduate quality	4.24	0.26	4.34	0.31	4.79	0.29	4.46	0.29

According to Table 5, Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development (Revised 2019) for the academic year 2020-2022, it was found that the satisfaction results that meet the needs of graduate users were at a high level, with an average of 4.46. This is followed by morality, ethics, interpersonal skills and responsibility, knowledge, intellectual skills, and numerical analysis skills. Communication and the use of information technology are respectively high.

2. The curriculum stakeholder group recommendations for curriculum improvement for the improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Social Development program were found:

Contextual : It was found that the clarity of interdisciplinary objectives is appropriate to the current situation and the policy of national development, which covers a wide range of sciences, can educate students in many areas and cater to many groups of learners. Therefore, data and feedback from stakeholders should be collected for use in curriculum design and teaching activities.

Input : It was found that faculty members have high potential in both qualifications and research, the teaching staff are knowledgeable and hold academic positions that are consistent with the expertise of the curriculum and have an understanding of the learners, have adequate and up-to-date learning support to support teaching and research, but should review and analyze the data to design expected learning outcomes to be up-to-date with changes and communicated to all stakeholders.

Process: It was found that learners' involvement in designing teaching activities and determining assessment criteria together with instructors was clear and precise, but the organization of instruction in each subject lacked a link between the learning outcomes of the curriculum in accordance with the learning theory and learning outcomes of each subject that must clearly be achieved in accordance with the expected learning outcomes of the course. The curriculum has a system of regular and close monitoring of students' progress and academic workload, diverse communication channels with learners, and continuity, but lack of systematic follow-up evaluation, resulting in time management between study, research, and routine work.

Productivity: It was found that learners are knowledgeable and able to conduct research successfully as expected, but lack expertise in interdisciplinary classification of sciences in education and social development, lack of practical skills in spatial development, and should enhance their experience in creating social innovations that meet challenging development needs. The Faculty, current students, alumni should participate in research and dissemination of collaborative research results at national and international levels continuously, and should create communication channels for all stakeholders to exchange knowledge in all dimensions in order to network and promote lifelong learning.

6. DISCUSSION:

1. Based on the results of the assessment of the quality of education within the curriculum level according to the quality assurance criteria of the ASEAN University Network (AUN-QA 4.0) for the performance of the academic year 2020-2022. The results of the assessment of Component 1 of the standard compliance are in accordance with the criteria. Component 2 has a 3-year assessment result at level 3 that reflects the quality may not be sufficient but can be improved or small improvements can result in sufficient quality and the assessment results of the curriculum that meet the needs of the course stakeholders to a large extent. This is in line with Anuwong et al. (2022) A study of the

understanding of internal quality assessors towards ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) at a program level found that all assessors assessed themselves as having a level of understanding of the criteria (AUN-QA) is moderate. The evaluators also viewed correlations that the curriculum often did not identify significant stakeholders and lacked a stakeholder needs analysis before implementing ELOs, or lacked a clear process for analyzing and assessing the needs. In terms of evaluating, preparing the curriculum and disseminating information about the curriculum, the assessor is not well-versed and lacks experience in conformity assessment that responds to the structure and subject matter of the curriculum, as well as in the assessment of course output, where most courses do not understand the principles or methods of benchmarking, and the evaluators have too little experience to help clarify the curriculum. In line with Dolly and Mukhaiyar (2020), studying the concept of curriculum evaluation in education program of electrical engineering using AUN-QA as benchmarking, it was found that qualified graduates are supported by an effective educational process, continuous talent development and the right curriculum, the curriculum thus becomes an integral part of education. It is necessary to use quality curriculum assessments for effective productivity as well as suggestions to universities to improve and maintain the quality of universities.

2. The curriculum's stakeholder group recommendations for curriculum improvement, Doctor of Philosophy in Education and Social Development in contextual and input assessments can be designed and done quite clearly, at the heart of which process and productivity assessments are the most obvious reflections of the curriculum. This is because the information can be used for consideration in the improvement of the Doctor of Philosophy Program in Education and Social Development Curriculum Revision 2024 in line with the research of Thammasit et al. (2023) Study on the assessment of master of Education in educational administration (Curriculum revised in 2019) and Promsuwicha (2022) Curriculum evaluation of master of education in education and social development (Revised B.E. 2561) faculty of education, Burapha University, It was found that contextual assessment would be used as information for defining philosophy. Objectives and structure of the course, as well as feasibility. Suitability Alignment with policy and social change. Inputs assessment is an assessment of what contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of the curriculum, whether by course instructors and instructors. Budget, supplies Location and facilities, etc. Process assessment will be used in curriculum management, teaching and learning, etc., in order to continuously improve and develop the effective implementation of the curriculum and the assessment of student productivity emphasizes the quality of the learning outcomes set out in the course textbook. Therefore, this assessment of the curriculum is a tool that will lead to the learning of all those involved in the curriculum that the curriculum has strengths and areas that need to be improved in order to align the curriculum with the current educational context and keep up with future changes in line with Cuong et al. (2022). Study of general education teacher training quality assurance in Vietnamese Universities according to Aun-Qa approach. It was found that upgrading the quality of human resources in education to international standards is urgent, especially amidst the rapidly increasing globalization and international strength, integrating social and economic life, this need is realized in the system of pedagogical institutions, gradually improving the quality of training and integrating with international higher education to affirm its position to establish an appropriate level of integration. Universities should implement quality assurance under regionally recognized international standards first.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Curriculum makers should continuously and deeply study the criteria for quality assessment of education within the curriculum level in accordance with the ASEAN University Network (AUN-QA) quality assurance criteria in order to plan, monitor and collect data systematically and verifiably.
- Communication channels should be studied for all stakeholders to exchange knowledge in all dimensions in order to build networks and monitor the changing situation for modern development.

Suggestions for doing the next research

- Personal factors, supporting factors, and other contributing factors that affect volunteer activities and students' interests should be analyzed and encourage social participation.
- The impact of social networks on sustainable volunteer activity networking should be studied.

REFERENCES:

1. Anuwong K., Supasuteekul A., Yoonaisil W., Suppakarn N., Damnui P., and Sawatwipachai B,(2022): The understanding of internal quality assessors towards ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) at a program level. Srinakharinwirot University (Journal of Science and Technology), 14(28), 28-35.
2. ASEAN University Network. (2020). The guide to AUN-QA assessment at programme level version 4.0. Bangkok, BKK: Chulalongkorn University.
3. Cuong L.P., Tuan V.V., Lam P.Q., and Hoa H.Q,(2022): General education teacher training quality assurance in Vietnamese Universities according to Aun-Qa approach. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(5), 5973-5980.
4. Dolly V.P., and Mukhaiyar R, (2020): Concept of curriculum evaluation in education program of electrical engineering using AUN-QA as benchmarking. Jurnal Pendidikan Teknologi Kejuruan, 3(1), 1-5.
5. Khantisampanno N.M., and Kositpimanvach E, (2023): An evaluation. Journal of Modern Learning Development, 8(3), 395-408.
6. Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council. (2023) . The thirteenth national economic and social development plan (2023-2027). Bangkok, BKK: Office of the Prime Minister.
7. Patphol, M. (2018). Curriculum Evaluation for learning and development. 4th ed. Bangkok, BKK: Charansanitwong Printing.
8. Promsuwicha S, (2022): Curriculum evaluation of master of education in education and social development (Revised B.E. 2561) faculty of education, Burapha University Journal.
9. Stufflebeam, D. L., Madaus, G. F., and Scriven, M. S. (1971). *Educational evaluation and Decision-Making*. Illinois,IL: Peacock Publisher.
10. Suparp S, (2022): Curriculum evaluation models in the 21st-century stemmed from the CIPP Model.Journal of Education Burapha University, 33(1), 1-14.of Education and Social Development, 17(2), 58-69.
11. Thammasit P., Kamolvoradet Y., Panyasai V., and Sichomphoo C, (2023): Assessment of master of Education in educational administration (Curriculum revised in 2019). Journal of Administration and Social Science Review, 6(2), 63-72.