

The Evaluation of the Ph.D Curriculum in Educational Administration (revised 2556 B.E.)

การประเมินหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาการบริหารการศึกษา¹ (หลักสูตรปรับปรุง พ.ศ. 2556)

Mattana Wangthanomsak (มัธนา วงศ์วนอมศักดิ์)*

Abstract

The purposes of this study were to 1) evaluate the Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration (revised 2556 B.E.) at Silpakorn University and 2) examine the development and management guidelines for Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration. The research was conducted using Stufflebeam's CIPP Model to evaluate the curriculum, following a mixed methods; in which the data was collected through documentary study, structured interview and questionnaire, which had a response rate of 92.23%. Teachers, Doctoral advisory committee, Ph.D graduates and their superiors, with the total of 12 persons, were interviewed; and the questionnaires were used to collect the data from 133 Ph.D students during the academic year of 2556-2559 B.E. The data was analyzed by frequency, percentage, mean, standard deviation, and content analysis.

The findings were as follow:

1. The evaluation of Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration, from the qualitative and quantitative data collected from the interviews and the questionnaire, was found appropriate and satisfying in all aspects: context, input, process, and output.
2. The development and management guidelines for Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration were that the Department of Educational Administration 1) should monitor and focus on the changes in the education context in the country; 2) should strengthen its role in being an educational leader; 3) should adjust the curriculum contents to be more up to date and help build awareness in the role of Ph.D graudates; 4) should improve learning resources and other facilities such as computers, printers, internet system, online database, etc.; 5) encourage teachers, staff and students to engage more in curriculum management; 6) develop practicum activities and others activities to help students carry on with their research; 7)

* ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. ภาควิชาการบริหารการศึกษา คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร

Asst.Prof.Dr. The Department of Eduatioal Administration, Faculty of Education, Silpakorn University

increase communication channels to provide formal and informal academic advising for Ph.D students; 8) develop students' characteristics, academic leadership and self-discipline; 9) support teachers' and staff's development; and 10) encourage instructors/ teachers to conduct research, write academic articles, and publicize the work in the international arena.

Keywords : evaluation, Ph.D curriculum

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยประเมินหลักสูตรครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์ 1) เพื่อประเมินหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขา วิชาการบริหารการศึกษา (หลักสูตรฉบับปรับปรุง พ.ศ. 2556) มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร และ 2) เพื่อศึกษา แนวทาง การพัฒนาและบริหารหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาการบริหารการศึกษา การวิจัยประเมิน หลักสูตร ครั้งนี้อาศัยรูปแบบการประเมิน CIPP ในการประเมินหลักสูตรทั้งระบบและเป็นการศึกษาด้วยระเบียบ วิธีวิจัย แบบผสม (mixed methods) ผ่านกระบวนการศึกษาเอกสาร การสัมภาษณ์แบบมีโครงสร้างและแบบ สอบถาม ความคิดเห็น ซึ่งได้รับแบบสอบถามกลับคืนมา 92.23% เก็บข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับหลักสูตรจากอาจารย์ ประจำหลักสูตร อาจารย์ภาควิชาอื่น อาจารย์พิเศษ กรรมการผู้ทรงคุณวุฒิภายนอก ดุษฎีบัณฑิตและผู้ใช้ดุษฎีบัณฑิต จำนวน 12 คน และเก็บข้อมูลด้วยแบบสอบถามจากนักศึกษาในปีการศึกษา 2556 - 2559 จำนวน 133 คน และทำการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลด้วยความถี่ ร้อยละ ค่าเฉลี่ย ค่าส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐานและการวิเคราะห์เนื้อหา ผลการประเมินครั้งนี้พบว่า

1. การประเมินหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาการบริหารการศึกษา (หลักสูตรฉบับปรับปรุง พ.ศ. 2556) ซึ่งรวมรวมข้อมูล ความคิดเห็นเกี่ยวกับหลักสูตรที่รวมรวมได้ทั้งเชิงคุณภาพและเชิงปริมาณ พบว่า หลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาการบริหารการศึกษา (หลักสูตรฉบับปรับปรุง พ.ศ. 2556) มี ความ เหมาะสมและน่าพอใจทั้ง 4 ด้านคือ ด้านบริบท ด้านปัจจัยนำเข้า ด้านกระบวนการและด้านผลลัพธ์

2. แนวทางการพัฒนาและบริหารหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาการบริหารการศึกษา พบว่า 1) ภาควิชาฯควรติดตามสถานการณ์ความเปลี่ยนแปลงทางการศึกษาของประเทศ 2) ภาควิชาฯ ควรเพิ่ม บทบาทการเป็นผู้นำทางการศึกษา 3) ปรับเนื้อหารายวิชาให้ทันสมัย เพิ่มเนื้อหาที่สร้างความตระหนัก ให้แก่ นักศึกษาในบทบาทการเป็นดุษฎีบัณฑิต 4) ปรับปรุงแหล่งค้นคว้า ระบบการสืบค้นข้อมูลและสิ่งอำนวยความสะดวก ความสะดวก เช่น คอมพิวเตอร์ ปรินเตอร์ จุดเชื่อมต่ออินเตอร์เน็ตและฐานข้อมูลออนไลน์ เป็นต้น 5) ส่งเสริม การมีส่วนร่วมในการบริหารจัดการหลักสูตรของอาจารย์ บุคลากรและนักศึกษา 6) ปรับกิจกรรมฝึกปฏิบัติ งานและจัดกิจกรรมที่ช่วยพัฒนานักศึกษาในการทำวิจัย 7) เพิ่มช่องทางการและปรับระบบการให้คำปรึกษา ทางวิชาการแก่นักศึกษา 8) พัฒนาให้นักศึกษามีบุคลิกภาพ ความเป็นผู้นำทางวิชาการและมีระเบียบวินัย 9) จัดระบบการพัฒนาอาจารย์และบุคลากรและ 10) ส่งเสริมให้อาจารย์ทำวิจัยและผลิตผลงานวิชาการและเผยแพร่ผลงานในระดับนานาชาติ

คำสำคัญ : การประเมิน, หลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต

Introduction

The department of educational administration, Silpakorn University was founded in 1970 and has offered graduate programs in Master's degree since 1981 and doctoral degree since 2003. The department is committed to developing human capital, making an impact through research and advanced study, community engagement related to effective and ethical leadership; as to follow the philosophy of the department "Academic Excellent, Proficient Activist, Smart and Creative Leader."

The doctoral degree offered by the department of educational administration at Silpakorn University is called "Doctor of Philosophy Program in Educational Administration." In compliance with the Office of the Higher Education Commission for the efficiency and quality of the education, the Faculty of Education at Silpakorn University asked that all graduate programs should be evaluated every 5 years so that the program and its curriculum can stay up to date (OHEC, 2005: 17). Therefore, the Ph.D. curriculum was developed and revised regularly. The first version was developed in 2003 (2546 B.E.) and then the new version was revised in 2007 (2550 B.E.) and the current one was developed in 2013 (2556 B.E.). The purpose of the Ph.D. curriculum in educational administration is to produce Ph.D. graduates with skills and competency that may lead to leadership positions or careers in social, governmental, business, as well as in the university and college and schools; Ph.D. graduates who are equipped to be scholars, educators, researchers, educational leaders, and school directors and superintendents. The program consists of a scholarly dissertation (36-72 credits) and intensive coursework that develops knowledge and expertise reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of education including human development, administrative theories, research methods and statistics. Students learn the practical application of education, administrative and leadership theories, analytical thought and conceptual analysis. Enrollment in a Ph.D. program in educational administration requires a master's degree or the equivalent, preferable in a related field of study. Some graduate credits are transferable.

There are different models to evaluate the curriculum, based on the objectives of the study, for example, Tyler's goal-based model, which operated within a behavioristic framework, emphasizing the importance of student behaviors and what students are expected to do, thinking about curriculum in terms of purposes, learning experiences, organization and evaluation (Tyler, 1943); Stake's criterion-based model, which looked at the development of the curriculum, comparing the desired outcome with the actual outcome (Stake, 1967); Provus's decision-based model, which provided information for program assessment and

program improvement, determine whether to improve, maintain or terminate the program (Provus, 1969), etc.

As to comply with the requirement of the OHEC, Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model was selected to serve as a study framework to evaluate the Ph.D curriculum systematically in four dimensions: context, input, process and product (Stufflebeam, 1968); since the CIPP evaluation model was originally developed as a mean to systematically provide timely evaluative information for use in decision-making to facilitate educational improvement. The CIPP model has been developed to answer four kinds of questions: what should we do? How should we do? Are we doing it correctly? and Did it work? The Context evaluation dimension serves as planning decisions by identifying unmet needs, unused opportunities and underlying problems. This dimension helps identify if the curriculum meet with the needs of the community and the students, and looked at overall environmental readiness of the curriculum, the philosophical foundation and aims of the curriculum, stakeholders' needs, etc. It is to examine whether existing goals and plans are attuned. The input evaluation dimension serves structuring decisions by projecting and analyzing alternative procedural design and determine a responsive activities or projects or other necessary resources that can address the identified needs. This dimension looked at the subject contents, teaching personnel and support staff, learning materials and facilities, students, etc. Next, the process evaluation dimension serves the implementing decisions by monitoring curriculum operation and other process during the curriculum implementation. This dimension looked at curriculum management, teaching approaches, teacher, support staff and students selection process, classroom management and other extracurriculum activities, practicum, learning assessment and evaluation system, doctoral advising and counseling system, etc. Finally, the product evaluation dimension measured, interpret and judged the outcomes and its values. This dimension looked at teaching personnel satisfaction, student satisfaction, Ph.D graduates' superiors satisfaction, etc. The CIPP evaluation model has been thoroughly recognized in a variety of educational and non-educational evaluation settings (Zhang et al, 2011: 15:57-84). It addressed all phases of an education program and provides formative information to stakeholders for the purpose of improvement and informed decision-making. It also allowed the researcher to apply several data collection and analysis methods to triangulation of data and in turn increases the validity of the evaluation results (Yarbrough, 2010). This article elaborated the use of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model as a comprehensive framework to help evaluate the Ph.D program in educational administration at Silpakorn University.

The purposes of the research

The purposes of the study were 1) to evaluate the four dimensions : context, input, process, and product of the Ph.D curriculum in educational administration (revised 2556 B.E.) at Silpakorn University and 2) to examine the development and management guidelines for Ph.D curriculum in educational administration at Silpakorn University. There are potential benefits that can be drawn from this evaluation, namely: 1) terminate the program 2) revise the program or 3) continue the program.

Methodology

The study was implemented using a mixed methods research design (Creswell, 2007), which involves the collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data through interviews and questionnaire consisting of 85 items in 3 parts. The study framework was based on Stufflebeam's CIPP model to evaluate the curriculum systematically in four dimensions: context, input, process and product. This section briefly describes the study procedure, scope of the study, data collection instrumentation, key informants / study participants, and data analysis.

Study procedure

The study was conducted following three phases.

Phase I: The preliminary preparation: identifying the research problems, developing the research objectives and questions, studying background information, developing study framework and scope of the study.

Phase II: The study implementation: reviewing the existing researches and related literatures, developing the data collection instrumentations: structured interview and questionnaire, which were checked by five experts for the content validity and implemented in a pilot study to test for internal consistency of the scale (reliability). The data was collected in four aspects of the evaluation: context, input, process, and product. At this stage, the researcher also defined the key informants and participants for the study.

Phase III: The analysis the collected data and interpretation of the results. The findings of the study then are reviewed, and analyzed according to the type and content of the collected data. The analyzed data are then summarized and presented in a manner related to the research questions.

Scope of the study

1. Context evaluation

The context evaluation dimension looked at overall environmental readiness of the curriculum, the philosophical foundation of the department, the faculty of education, and the university and aims of the curriculum, stakeholders' needs, including the needs of students, student's workplace, and social needs, background context or environment, and also the compliance with Thailand qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF HEd).

2. Input evaluation

The input evaluation dimension helped determine a responsive activities or projects or other necessary resources that can address the identified needs. This dimension looked at subject contents, teaching personnel, supporting staff and students, medias, learning materials, and other physical facilities such as library, student lounge, cafeteria, classroom, and other learning resources, etc.

3. Process evaluation

The process evaluation dimension monitored the process during the curriculum implementation, possible procedural barriers and needs for adjustments. This dimension looked at curriculum management, teaching approaches, learning-teaching process, teacher and students selection process, classroom management and extracurriculum activities, praticum, students performance assessment and evaluation system, academic and thesis advising, etc.

4. Product evaluation

The product evaluation dimension measured, interpret and judged the outcomes and its values. This dimension looked at teaching personnel satisfaction, student satisfaction, Ph.D graduate's superiors satisfaction, and also the graduate's ability and personality.

Data collection instrumentation

There are two kinds of research instrumentations: 1) structured interview and 2) questionnaire. The structured interview form was developed by the researcher and tested for content validity. The questionnaire was also developed by the researcher, checked by the experts for content validity (IOC between 0.8-1.00) and implemented in a pilot study to test for internal consistency of the scale (reliability). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated and found at 0.947. Both the interview and the questionnaire consisted of 3 sections: 1) the checklist questions concerning general demographic information of the respondent; 2) the five-point Likert's rating scale questions with categories "completely match / very satisfied / excellent," "relatively match / satisfied / good," "moderately match / neither /

fair,” “slightly match / somewhat dissatisfied /poor,” and “does not match / very dissatisfied / very poor” concerning the Ph.D curriculum in four aspects: context, input, process, and product; 3) the open-ended questions concerning the development and management guidelines for Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration.

Key informants / study participants

There were two groups of participants in this study. One was the key informants for the interview, consisting of teachers/instructors (3 Assistant Professor, Ph.D), Doctoral advisory committee (3 Associate Professor, Ph.D), Ph.D graduates (one school director, one university faculty staff, and one chief of the subdivision of local education administration) and their superiors, with the total number of 12 persons (by purposive sampling technique).

Another group was questionnaire respondents, consisting of 133 Ph.D students from academic year 2556-2559 B.E. The number of the sample group, based on the studies by Krejcie and Morgan (1970: 607-610) regarding the sample size for research activities was 103. The stratified random sampling technique was used to obtain a random sample, by dividing the population into 4 groups, categorized by the academic year (2556-2559 B.E.) and simple random sampling was then conducted within each stratum. Out of 103 students, only 95 questionnaires were returned, which had a response rate of 92.23%, where 29 respondents were males, 66 were females; 65 works in the basic education school and 7 works the university and 23 different institutes.

Data analysis

After the 12 persons (key informants) were interviewed, all data were recorded, organized and analyzed using content analysis. The purpose of the interview was to examine whether the Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration, collectively and individually, is satisfying and able to address the needs of the stakeholders.

After the questionnaires were returned, the data was then examined, recorded, and analyzed by analysis software program. The researcher used descriptive statistics: frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation to describe the identified features of the data in the study. The content analysis was used to analyze the qualitative data from the open-ended questionnaire.

The findings of the study

The evaluation of the Ph.D curriculum in educational administration involved the collection and analysis of qualitative data and quantitative data through 1) semi-structured interviews from 12 key informants and 2) questionnaires from study participants, who were the

Ph.D students during the academic year of 2556-2559 B.E. The study framework was based on Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model in four dimensions : context, input, process, and product. The findings revealed as follow:

1. The evaluation of Ph.D curriculum in educational administration (revised 2556 B.E.) in four aspects: the context, input, process and product; were described below.

The results of the context evaluation revealed that the key informants (teachers/instructors, Doctoral advisory committee, Ph.D graduates and their superiors) are satisfied with the curriculum. All agreed that the curriculum can address the needs of the stakeholders, and are in compliance with Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF HeD) and the philosophical foundations of Silpakorn University, Faculty of Education and also the Department of Educational Administration. The findings from the questionnaires revealed that the Ph.D students (29 males, 66 female) are very satisfied with the overall context of the curriculum ($\bar{x} = 4.56$, $SD = .410$) including the objectives of the Ph.D curriculum ($\bar{x} = 4.60$, $SD = .438$), the curriculum structure ($\bar{x} = 4.55$, $SD = .464$), addressing the needs of the stakeholders ($\bar{x} = 4.53$, $SD = .500$).

The input evaluation revealed that the key informants (teachers/instructors, Doctoral advisory committee, Ph.D graduates and their superiors) are satisfied with the input aspect of the curriculum; including subject content, competency of the teaching personnel, supporting staff and students, medias, learning materials, and other physical facilities such as library, student lounge, cafeteria, classroom, and other learning resources. From the questionnaires, the inputs were found to be quite satisfactory ($\bar{x} = 4.41$, $SD = .433$), where the Ph.D students were very satisfied with the competency of the teaching personnel ($\bar{x} = 4.73$, $SD = .356$) and subject contents ($\bar{x} = 4.68$, $SD = .763$). The Ph.D students were quite satisfied with the supporting staff ($\bar{x} = 4.40$, $SD = .611$), facilities ($\bar{x} = 4.21$, $SD = .605$), and learning materials ($\bar{x} = 4.01$, $SD = .619$).

The result of the process evaluation revealed that the key informants (teachers/instructors, Doctoral advisory committee, Ph.D graduates and their superiors) are satisfied with the process aspect of the evaluation, including the curriculum implementation, curriculum management, teaching approaches, learning and teaching process, teaching personnel, supporting staff, and Ph.D student selection process, classroom management, extracurriculum activities, practicum, student performance assessment and evaluation, academic and thesis advising. From the questionnaire, the process aspect of the curriculum were found to be completely satisfactory ($\bar{x} = 4.53$, $SD = .471$), the Ph.D students are also very

satisfied with academic and thesis advising ($\bar{x} = 4.61$, $SD = .558$), learning-teaching process ($\bar{x} = 4.56$, $SD = .455$), student performance assessment and evaluation ($\bar{x} = 4.55$, $SD = .530$), extracurriculum activities ($\bar{x} = 4.51$, $SD = .545$), intership and practicum ($\bar{x} = 4.43$, $SD = .594$), respectively.

The evaluation of the product revealed that the key informants (teachers/instructors, Doctoral advisory committee, Ph.D graduates and their superiors) were very satisfied with the product aspect of the Ph.D curriculum, including the graduate's personality, abilities and characteristics. From questionnaire, the Ph.D students are also very satisfied with the product aspect of the curriculum ($\bar{x} = 4.56$, $SD = .439$).

2. The development and management guidelines for the Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration (revised 2556 B.E.) were that the Department of Educational Administration should; in regarding to the context aspect: 1) take into consideration the differences in student's background to adjust the curriculum structure to better address the needs of the students, 2) monitor and focus on the changes in the education context in the country, and 3) strengthen its role in being an educational leader; in regarding to the input aspect: 1) update the curriculum contents, 2) build awareness in being a Ph.D graduate or an academic leader, and 3) improve learning resources and other facilities such as computers, printers, internet system, online database, etc.; in regarding to the process aspect: 1) encourage teachers, staff and students to engage more in curriculum management, 2) develop practicum activities and others activities to help students carry on with their study and their research, 3) increase communication channels to provide both formal and informal academic advising for Ph.D students, 4) develop students' characteristics, academic leadership and self-discipline, 5) support and encourage teachers' and staff's development, 6) plan and implement the new student selection process systematically, and 7) encourage instructors/teachers to conduct research, write academic articles, and publicize the work in the international arena; and in regarding to the product aspect: 1) emphasize on the quality and personalities of the Ph.D graduate focusing on social etiquette, social manner, academic personality, self confident, self-concept, self identity, leadership and integrity, 2) develop plan/system to help speed up the student's research and 3) develop the student's communication skills and presentation skills.

Discussions and conclusions

The aims of this study were to evaluate the Ph.D curriculum in Educational Administration and to find the development and management guidelines for Ph.D curriculum in Educational administration. The researcher applied Stufflebeam's CIPP model to evaluate the curriculum systematically in four dimensions: context, input, process and product. The results of this study showed that the four dimensions of Stufflebeam's CIPP model could address all steps of the program development and decision-making for the stakeholders, since Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model has been utilized to evaluate and develop various education programs (Zhang et al, 2011;15: 57-84) and it also allows the researcher to apply several data collection and analysis methods to triangulation of data (Yarbrough, 2010).

The context evaluation showed that the Ph.D curriculum in educational administration are in compliance with Thai Qualifications Framework for higher education (TQF HeD) and also in accordance with the philosophical foundations of Silpakorn University, the Faculty of Education and also the department of educational administration. It is essential for the curriculum to conform to the TQF HeD so that the curriculum is recognized and accredited by the government that is why the department of educational administration need to take every aspects such as government requirements, stakeholders' needs, etc. into consideration before developing the curriculum as Fahnbulleh (2004) mentioned in his study that the curriculum must address the needs of the stakeholders. The findings also indicated that the department of educational administration needs to monitor and focus more on the changes in educational context so that the revision or the redesign of the curriculum stay up to date.

The input evaluation revealed that the input aspect of the curriculum are satisfactory; including subject contents, competency of teachers, supporting staff, student's ability, learning materials and other facilities such as library, student lounge, cafeteria, classroom and other learning resources (Mattan Wangthanomsak, 2554 and Maream Nillapun, 2554). The key informants and also the students all are satisfied with the input aspect of the curriculum. The subject contents are useful and can be applied to the student's work. The teachers and other personnel are competent, knowledgeable and friendly. The learning facilities are found to be quite satisfactory under the limited resources and budget, but the university and the faculty of education offer various learning facilities for the students such as self-learning center, library and online database, Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE). The findings also indicated that the input aspect of the curriculum can still be improved to better respond to the needs of the students such as increasing the contents that emphasizes on being academic leaders, updating the learning materials and equipments, increasing learning facilities like

computers, printers, and internet access points. These findings agreed with the study of Robert, Gentry and Townsend (2011) and study of Ringler and Rouse (2007) that the curriculum needs to have good inputs for the students to acquire necessary skills and knowledge applicable to their jobs.

The process evaluation showed that the curriculum implementation, curriculum management, teaching approaches, learning and teaching process, selection process, extracurriculum and practicum activities, student performance assessment and evaluation, and academic and thesis advising are satisfactory. The key informants and the Ph.D students are satisfied with the process of the curriculum. They found the curriculum implementation to be appropriately carried out. The findings from interviews and open-ended questionnaire indicated that the process of the curriculum could be improved by systematically planning the curriculum administration, including selection process, new personnel selection process, increasing the use of foreign language, especially English in the class, systematically monitoring the student's progress, engaging students more in the class, emphasizing on student's discipline and desired characteristics, and increasing communication channels for academic and thesis advising. The findings of the process evaluation aligned with the study of Fahnbulleh (2004) or the study of Cox-Peterson (2004), where the findings revealed that the curriculum needs to support students with mentors; adjust learning and teaching approaches like website, and so on; establish a better relationship between academic advisors and students or the study of Ringler and Rouse (2008) or the study of Stracke (2010) that the academic advising needs to be able to better address the student's needs, utilizing the peer learning or support group approach.

The results of the product evaluation showed that the graduates' personality, abilities and characteristics are satisfactory. The key informants and the Ph.D students are satisfied with the product dimension of the curriculum. The graduates are capable and competent in an academic and professional world, which can be seen from their advances in their careers and that their researches have been published in International journals or Thai-Journal Citation Index Centre (TCI), and they have been invited to be guest speaker or keynote speaker. The findings of this product evaluation agreed with the study of Clark (2006) where the findings revealed that the Ph.D students and Ph.D graduates were satisfied with the curriculum and were willing to recommend others to further their study at that university; also aligned with the study of Abidin (2015) or the study of Thirasak Unaromlert et al (2559) where the findings reveal that both teachers and students were satisfied with the curriculum. The findings from the interviews and open-ended questionnaire also indicated that the curriculum

could be improved by emphasizing on the quality and personalities of the Ph.D graduate focusing on social etiquette, social manner, academic personality, self confident, self-concept, self identity, leadership and integrity; developing plans or system to help speed up the student's research; and developing the student's communication skills and presentation skills.

Implication and recommendations

There are still some aspects of the curriculum that need improvement even though the results showed that the curriculum evaluation is mostly satisfactory. The findings suggested that the department of educational administration, Faculty of Education, Silpakorn University should focus more on the changes in various contexts; such as the social context, political and national context, including the changes in policy and the needs of the stakeholders. Therefore, these are some of the recommendations gathered from the research findings:

1. The department of educational administration, Silpakorn University should strengthen its role in being an educational leader of Thailand.
2. The department of educational administration should publicize the curriculum more to the public, and also promote the teacher's achievements, student's achievements, and department's activities or interesting events.
3. The department of educational administration should update the curriculum content and also the learning materials and facilities to better address the needs of the students.
4. The department of educational administration should offer the course regarding how to write research proposal, academic article, research paper and research presentation, and also how to be a trustworthy academic scholar or leader of today society.
5. The department of educational administration should encourage and support teachers and lecturers to work on their academic or research papers and publicize their works in the international arena.

References

Abidin, Munirul. (2015). "Higher Education Quality: Perception Differences among Internal and External Stakeholders." *International Education Studies*, Vol. 8 No. 12: 185-192.

Clark, Molly M. (2006). "An assessment of the Community College Leadership Doctoral Program at Mississippi State University as Perceived by Former and Current Students" Dissertation, Mississippi State University (abstract).

Cox-Peterson, Doris Lorraine. (2004). "A Qualitative analysis of a Cohort Doctoral Program in Educational Administration" University of Purdue.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). **Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches**, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fahnbulleh, H. M. (2004). "Student Experiences in the Doctoral Program in Educational Administration and Supervision at Ball State University, 1987-2002" Ed.D. Dissertation Ball State University, **Dissertation Abstracts International** 64 (10): 3548.

Krejcie, R.V. and D.W. Morgan. (1970). "Determining sample size for research activities." **Educational and Psychological Measurement** 30: 607-610.

Maream Nillapun. (2554). "การประเมินหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาหลักสูตรและการสอน คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร." **Veridian E-Journal, SU** Vol 4, No 2: 248-262.

Mattana Wangthanomsak. (2554). "การประเมินหลักสูตรปรัชญาดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาการบริหารการศึกษา คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร." **วารสารศิลปากรศึกษาศาสตร์วิจัย** ปีที่ 3 ฉบับที่ 1,2 (กรกฎาคม – ธันวาคม) : 38-49.

Provus, Malcdm. (1969). **Evaluation of Ongoing Programs in the Public School Systems : The Sixty – eighth Year Book of the National Society for the Study of Education**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ringler, Marjorie C. and William Rouse. (2007). **Evaluation of a Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership**. (National Council of Professors of Educational Administration).

Roberts, Jalynn; Debra Gentry; Amy Townsend. (2011). "Student perspectives: evaluating a higher education administration program." **Journal of Case Studies in Education**, Vol.1 (January).

Stake, R.E. (1967). "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation". **Teachers College Record**. 68: 523-540.

Stracke, Elke. (2010). "Undertaking the Journey Together: Peer Learning for a Successful and Enjoyable PhD Experience." **Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice**, V7 No1.

Stufflebeam, D.L. (1968). "Toward a Science of Education Evaluation." **Educational Technology**. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Thirasak Unaromlert et al. (2559). "Curriculum evaluation of Doctor of Philosophy in Development Education, Faculty of Education, Silpakorn University." **Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University** Vol. 9 No 3 (September - December) : 29-47.

Tyler, R.W. (1943). "General statement on evaluation." *Journal of Educational Research*, 35, 492–501.

Zhang G, Zeller N, Griffith R, et al. (2011). "Using the context, input, process, and product evaluation model (CIPP) as a comprehensive framework to guide the planning, implementation, and assessment of service-learning programs". *J High Educ Outreach Engagem.* Vol. 15: 57–84.

Yarbrough DB, Shulha LM, Hopson RK, Caruthers FA. (2010). **The program evaluation standards: a guide for evaluators and evaluation users.** 3rd ed. California: Sage Publications