An Evaluation of the Bachelor of Education Program in Educational Measurement (Revised A.D. 2012) Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand

T. Tungprapa, S. Ruaengsri, K. Chue-Asa and S. Hitagowit

Abstract - The objective of this research is to evaluate the bachelor of education program in educational measurement (revised a.d. 2012), Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand. Population and samples were comprised of experts, lecturers, students, graduates and employers, a total of 62 people. The research tools were 5 sets of the questionnaires. The frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, standard deviation and content analysis were used in the analysis. The results of the evaluation in overall and each aspects passed the criteria set: 1) The curriculum documents, it is founded that it's objectives are considered as highly to very highly appropriate. The number of courses and credits are appropriate. The courses description are considered as highly to very highly appropriate. 2) The curriculum management resources, it is founded that the satisfaction of students and lecturers in overall is high. 3) The student's satisfaction toward the process of learning management, in overall, at the high level. 4) The quality of the graduates, according to the Thai Qualification Framework (TQF) standard, in overall are at the high level form the graduates' and employers' perspectives. The graduates are employed at the rate of 100%.

Index Terms- Evaluation, Bachelor of Education Program, Educational Measurement

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Educational Evaluation and Research, Faculty of Education, Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand, has offered the bachelor of education program in educational measurement since 1993 aiming to create educational evaluators in order to meet requirements by both government and private sectors.

Creating good quality graduates needs good quality curriculum. Saylor, Alexander and Lewis (1981) have proposed an idea for curriculum development that needs to set curriculum's goals and objectives, curriculum design, curriculum implementation, and, in final step, the curriculum evaluation [1]. Besides, Taba (1962) and Phupan (2003) concordantly pointed out that curriculum should serve the employers' needs and it should be evaluated in a manner that represents the curriculum's outcome. Therefore, curriculum evaluation is very important and essential factor which enables us to recognize quality and efficiency of the curriculum [2], [3]. As such, graduates creators essentially need curriculum evaluation in order to know level of graduates' quality and use such finding to improve for up-to-date curriculum that meets requirements of the society and those who employ graduates.

Furthermore, the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) and Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA), Thailand has placed emphasis on quality of curriculum by specifying that curriculum's quality are some of indicators for internal and external education quality assurance, both the curriculum administration indicator that requires curriculum evaluation and the curriculum's output indicator which is comprised of graduates' quality in accordance with Thai Qualification Framework (TQF) standard and graduates' employment rate [4], [5] and [6]. Consequently, Thai universities emphasise a quality of curriculum and need curriculum evaluation information to support the curriculum improvement.

The Department of Educational Evaluation and Research has continuously improved its curriculum [7], [8]. In this regards, the current curriculum, which was improved in 2012, has been consecutively used for four years. As such, it is considered for evaluation so that evaluation result can be used for curriculum improvement and creation of quality graduates that meet society's requirement.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The main objective of this research is to evaluate the bachelor of education program in educational measurement (revised a.d. 2012), Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand, with the following specific objectives.

1. To evaluate curriculum documents.
2. To evaluate curriculum management resources.
3. To evaluate process of learning management.
4. To evaluate quality of the graduates.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is an evaluation research. The research method were comprised of evaluation items, indicators, criteria, evaluation content, informant, instrument, data collection and data analysis as shown in conceptual evaluation framework presented in Table I.

TABLE I: THE CONCEPTUAL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Evaluation Items	Indicators	Criteria	Evaluation Content	Informant	Instrument	Data Collection	Data Analysis
1. Curriculum documents	Quality of curriculum documents	Evaluation result, above or equal to the high level (average score not less than 3.50 from full score of 5)	1. Curriculum's objectives. 2. Curriculum's structure. 3. Content of subjects in the curriculum	Experts**	Questionnaire for experts	Questionnaire sent by postal service	Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and content analysis
2. Curriculum management resources	Satisfaction on curriculum management resources	Evaluation result, above or equal to the high level (average score not less than 3.50 from full score of 5)	1. Lecturers 2. Learning media and venue	1. Students** 2. Lecturers*	1. Questionnaire for students 2. Questionnaire for lecturers	Questionnaire delivered by hand to students and lecturers	Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and content analysis
3. Process of learning management	Satisfaction on learning management	Evaluation result, above or equal to the high level (average score not less than 3.50 from full score of 5)	Learning process management	Students**	Questionnaire for students	Questionnaire delivered by hand to students	Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and content analysis
4. Quality of the graduates	4.1 Quality of the graduates	Evaluation result above or equal to the high level (average score not less than 3.50 from full score of 5)	Graduates' quality in accordance with TQF standard (5 learning domains)	1. Employers* 2. Graduates*	1. Questionnaire for graduate employers 2.Questionnaire for graduates	Questionnaire sent by postal service & Email	Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and content analysis
	4.2 Employment of the graduates	Not less than 80 percent	Employment rate based on IQA Indicator	Graduates*	Questionnaire for graduates	Questionnaire sent by postal service & Email	Frequency and percentage

* POPULATION

**SAMPLE

IV. RESEARCH RESULTS

The results of data analysis are divided into four parts as follows.

PART 1: RESULT OF CURRICULUM DOCUMENTS EVALUATION

1.1 From evaluation of curriculum documents, it is found that the curriculum's objectives conforms to societal requirements and regarded as professionally unique at high level while actually implemented at very high level, as shown in Table II.

TABLE II: RESULT OF CURRICULUM'S OBJECTIVES EVALUATION

Item	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Level
1. Conformance to societal requirements	4.27	0.64	High
2. professional uniqueness	4.47	0.84	High
3. Actual Implementation	4.60	0.43	Very High

1.2 Result of curriculum structure evaluation found that, in the group of general subjects, most experts considered the curriculum structure is sufficient. For the groups of specific

and free elective subjects, all experts considered that the curriculum structure is sufficient, as shown in Table III.

TABLE III: RESULT OF CURRICULUM'S STRUCTURE EVALUATION

Subject group	Number of credits	Evaluation Result		
		Too much	Sufficient	Too less
1. General subjects	33	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	-
2. Specific subjects	84	-	5 (100%)	-
3. Free Elective subjects	6	-	5 (100%)	-

1.3 Result of evaluation of content of subjects in the curriculum;

The overall evaluation result of the group of general subjects found that the content of each subject conforms to the curriculum's objectives, societal requirements and modernity are at high level, as shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV: RESULT OF COUSES' DESCRIPTION EVALUATION OF SUBJECTS IN THE GENERRAL SUBJECTS GROUP

Item	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Level
1. Conformance to Curriculum's objectives	3.94	0.97	High
2. Conformance to societal requirements	4.38	0.93	High
3. Modernity	3.88	1.20	High

In the group of specific subjects, the overall evaluation results found that the courses' description conforms to the societal requirement at very high level while highly conforming to the curriculum's objectives and having high level of modernity, as shown in Table V.

TABLE V: RESULT OF COUSES' DESCRIPTION EVALUATION OF SUBJECTS IN THE SPECIFIC SUBJECTS GROUP

Item	$\overline{X}$		S.D.		Level	
	Graduates			Employers		
Quality of Graduate	μ	σ	Level	μ	σ	Level
1. Ethics and moral	4.33	0.49	High	4.38	0.38	High
2. Knowledge	4.00	0.39	High	3.96	0.29	High
3. Cognitive skills	3.79	0.43	High	3.79	0.62	High
4. Interpersonal skill and responsibility	4.00	0.42	High	4.13	0.65	High
5. Numerical analysis, communication, and information technology skills	3.83	0.56	High	4.10	0.50	High
Average	3.99	0.31	High	4.07	0.20	High
1. Conformance to curriculum's objectives	4.43		0.67		High	
2. Conformance to societal requirements	4.51		0.67		Very High	
3. Modernity	4.04		1.03		High	

For the groups of free elective subjects, all experts considered that allowing students to choose their own choices of interested subjects is appropriate, as shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI: RESULT OF EVALUATION ON SUBJECTS IN THE GROUP OF FREE ELECTIVE SUBJECTS

Category	Frequencies	Percentage
Appropriate	5	100.00
Not Appropriate	-	-
Total	5	100.00

PART 2: RESULT OF CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT RESOURCES EVALUATION

Evaluation result found that students and lecturers are highly satisfied with curriculum management resources. Satisfaction with lecturers is at very high level while satisfaction with learning media and venue are at high level, as shown in Table VII.

TABLE VII: RESULT OF CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT RESOURCES EVALUATION

Evaluation Item	Students			Lecturers		
	$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Level	μ	σ	Level
1. Lecturer	4.50	0.37	Very high	4.55	0.37	Very high
2. Media and Venue	4.14	0.49	High	4.32	0.51	High
Average	4.32	0.38	High	4.44	0.40	High

PART 3: RESULT OF PROCESS OF LEARNING MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

From the overall evaluation result, it was found that students are highly satisfied with process of learning management, as shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII: SATISFACTION WITH PROCESS OF LEARNING MANAGEMENT

$\overline{X}$	S.D.	Level
4.35	0.38	High

PART 4: RESULT OF QUALITY OF THE GRADUATES EVALUATION

4.1 Evaluation result found that the quality of graduates, according to the Thai Qualification Framework (TQF) standard, as evaluated by the graduates, conforms to results evaluated by the graduates' employers are at the high level, as shown in Table IX.

TABLE IX: QUALITY OF GRADUATES BASED ON TQF STANDARD

4.2 Survey of graduate employment found that all 100 percent of graduates are employed, as shown in Table X.

TABLE X: GRADUATE EMPLOYMENT

Category	Frequencies	Percentage
Employed	6	100.00
Unemployed	-	-
Total	6	100.00

V. CONCLUSION

The results of the evaluation in overall and each aspects passed the criteria set:

1. The curriculum documents, it is founded that it's objectives are in accordance with social and the uniqueness of the program is in the high levels. Moreover the practicality is in the very high levels. The number of courses and credits are appropriate. The courses description of the group of general subjects and specific subjects conforms to the curriculum's objectives, responsive to societal requirement, and possess modernity, at high to very high level. For the group of free elective subjects, the course selection approach is appropriate.

2. The curriculum management resources, it is founded that the satisfaction of students and teachers in overall is at high level.

3. The student's satisfaction toward the process of learning management is, in overall, at high level.

4. The quality of the graduates, according to the Thai Qualification Framework (TQF) standard, in overall are at the high level form the graduates' and employers' perspectives. The graduates are employed at the rate of 100%.

REFERENCES

[1] J. G. Saylor, W. M. Alexander, & A.J. Lewis. *"Curriculum planning for better teaching and learning.* (4th ed.)*"*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. 1981. pp. 28 – 29.

[2] H. Taba. *"Curriculum development:Theory and practice"*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World. 1962. p. 21.

[3] S. Phupan. *"Fundamental Concept for Curriculum Creation and Development"*. Chiang Mai: The knowledge Center. 2003. p. 257.

[4] Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC), Thailand. *"Internal Quality Assurance Manual for Higher Education 2014"*. Bangkok: Phappim printing. 2014. pp. 58 – 60, 83 – 89.

[5] Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA), Thailand. *"A Assessment Manual of the Third Round of External Quality Assurance for Higher Education (2nd Edition)"*. Bangkok: Ofset printing. 2011. pp. 11 – 21.

[6] Higher Education Commission, Ministry of Education, Thailand. *Notification on the "Thai Qualification framework. 2009"*. 2009 .pp. 6- 7.

[7] S. Ruaengsri P. Setthawong and T. Ketsa. *"A comparison on curriculum and curriculum administration of the bachelor of education program in educational measurement, Ramkhamhaeng University, and the Teacher Training Institutes under the Ministry of Education"*. Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University. 1993.

[8] T. Ketsa, S. Ruaengsri and P. Setthawong. *"Evaluation of the bachelor of education program in educational measurement"*. Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University. 2000.

S. Hitagowit received Master's degree in Educational Measurement and Evaluation from Ramkhamhaeng University in Thailand. She is a lecturer at Ramkhamhaeng University in the Department of EducationalEvaluation and Research, Faculty of Education, and teacher at Ramkhamhaeng University Demonstration School,Thailand.

T. Tungprapa received Ph.D. in Educational Measurement and Evaluation from Chulalongkorn University in Thailand.
She is a lecturer at Ramkhamhaeng University in the Department of Educational Evaluation and Research, Faculty of Education, Thailand.

S. Ruaengsri received Master's degree in Educational Measurement and Evaluation from Chulalongkorn University in Thailand. She is associate professor at Ramkhamhaeng University in the Department of Educational Evaluation and Research, Faculty of Education, Thailand.

K. Chue-Asa received Master's degree in Educational Measurement from Srinakharinwirot University in Thailand.
He is a lecturer at Ramkhamhaeng University in the Department of Educational Evaluation and Research, Faculty of Education, and teacher at Ramkhamhaeng University Demonstration School, Thailand.