

Aims of graduate Curriculum Evaluation Program Planning Major

Shahram Ranjdoust, Mohammad Beyrami

Department of Educational Sciences, Marand Branch, Islamic Azad University, Marand, Iran

Abstract: This study aims to evaluate the curriculum of the undergraduate program planning course using an evaluation method based on curriculum and syllabi approved by the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology (Iran). The study is a descriptive survey; the population included 17 women professors and 177 students of program planning and the sampling method of professors was census. For sampling students categorization sampling method was used with the size of 121 people. To evaluate the basic components of the study, researcher's questionnaire is used based on Likert scale of five degrees. Reliability of aspects of curriculum objectives was achieved through the implementation of pilot study and calculating Cronbach alpha of 0/85, respectively. T-test results showed that the goals of program planning curriculum at graduate degree moderately meet the needs and expectations of the students..

[Ranjdoust SH, Beyrami M. **Aims of graduate Curriculum Evaluation Program Planning Major.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(3s):177-181] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 25

Keywords: evaluation, higher education, curriculum planning goals

1. Introduction

With regard to the role of universities in training thoughtful, skillful human resources and production and development of science, technology in each society and pivotal role in the development process of any country, experts view at the supply and demand for higher education is not merely an economic perspective. Due to the preservation and improvement along with various aspects of quantitative growth are one of experts' main concerns and the governments of leading and pioneer countries have been in higher education. With regard to the importance of quality of higher education system in social, economic, political and cultural development of each society, transparency and accountability of higher education institutions is necessary. Hence, revision and amend in structure, missions and objectives of higher education to play a role in the production of knowledge and responding to economic and social needs of the society as a new approach in management and planning of higher education should seriously be considered by the officials. Meanwhile, curriculums as the heart of higher education has an undeniable role in higher education in order to fulfill the purpose and mission of higher education in terms of quality and quantity. In a more clear way, curriculum completely reflects development and a reflection of universities meeting the changing needs of society (Fathivajargah; Shafiei, 2007). Curriculum as a transmitter of information and providing expenses for the growth, acquiring skills and knowledge are of great importance. Thus, according to their quality, it is the dominant issue in higher education today (Sarmad; Vaziri, 1998).

2. Theoretical Foundations and Research

Curriculum has social and intellectual history, and is adapted, compatible and innovated based on economical political and social of each country. Changes in demand market and growing need for skilled labor and advanced knowledge of research methods in view of educational leadership at the national and institutional construction, will affect curriculum of graduate and undergraduate levels greatly. In other words, each country has its own system of higher education programs and courses in accordance with their circumstances and types of institutions (Ratklif, 1992, quoted by Hosseini, 2009). Therefore, identification of the orientation of curriculum is very important. Curriculum planning and revision based on technical aspects in order to achieve specific levels of knowledge and skill and in planning and revision of curriculum based on general competencies of the partial orientation is essential. According to "olrich Tichler" identification of orientations and curriculum design in the specialization area can be easier than general scope (Quoted by Arifi, 2005, p. 149). The aim of the graduate courses is on more knowledge and skills on specific areas and setting the ground for research, production and development of specialized knowledge. Thus simultaneously consider all orientations of higher education at all educationalevels but with varying degrees of qualitative and low priority in every phase (Short, quoted by Arefi, 2005, p. 224).

The main mission of Higher Education is as follows:

Knowledge Transfer (Education)

The first main function of higher education is knowledge transfer to younger generation, in order

to 1) To train educated graduates, and 2) training skilled human resources for the society (Ijtihadi, 1998, p 39).

(B). Knowledge production, (Research)

Among the functions of higher education research is the most important function. Generally research includes knowledge production, creating new approaches, in order to critically evaluate the past and previous knowledge and application of knowledge and experience in order to explain the social and professional needs (Ijtihad, 1998, p 39).

C. Dissemination and diffusion of knowledge (providing professional services)

Economic system in modern industrial societies is based on the principle of competition and in this system those who brought innovation in their activities and are themselves can continue to their economical life and remain in the competitive edge (Ijtihad, 1998, p 40).

D. Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship training today has become one of the most essential and wide missions and activities of the university and developed countries use appropriate supportive policies in strengthening in individuals and entrepreneurial activities generally society in general entrepreneurial spirit retention in the society (Hashemi, 2001; Vakilipour 2011). Each of these functions and missions has special importance and disregard for any of them follows irreparable damage (Marofi et al, 2007, p.83). In response to the need to reform the higher education system in line with needs and expectations of society and industry; approaches and new practices in the management and industry is arises for higher education policy makers. Increase in using higher education environment quality control system teaching has fundamental effects in the fields of teaching and trainin management. Combining system of accreditation and quality assurance concepts such as globalization, competitive environment, and changes made in the field of information technology and the emergence of the knowledge-based society, higher education gives institutions new dimensions (Mizkasky, 2006). And it always faces them with new challenges. Major concerns of many countries in this respect are responsiveness, quality and efficiency of higher education institutions (Nag, 2008, p 112). WHO defines quality as standards of all features and characteristics of a product or service indicating its ability to meet the demands expressed (Okland, 1993). The World Bank's definition of quality training offered includes two components: the learning environment and learner's performance (World Bank, 1995, quoted by Sheikhs, 1999), and the learning environment which itself is the

combination of inputs and processes and that affect learner's performance

The definition of an international network of quality assurance in higher education is the quality of higher education in accordance with the predefined standards, goals and expectations (Ziegler, 1994). According to UNESCO, the quality of higher education is a multidimensional concept that depends largely on the local education system, educational requirements and standards (UNESCO, 1995). Harvey and Green (quoted in Yarmohammadian, 2004) defined quality control system in two types 1. Quality is consistency with the target. The main goal of universities is training and research which in this regard the achievement levels of students' learning to effective and coordinated learning with the goals expressed in program planning, quality control is a measure to ensure quality. 2. Quality is the factor of change. Quality of teaching, learners' understanding of the world around, ways of using knowledge to solve real-world problems, teachers' understanding of their role which are explained now on education, and generally transforms the overall organizational culture. These successive changes were accepted when it leads to further improvements. Curriculum as a field of expertise is one of the most controversial areas of human knowledge, because passing almost a century since the birth of the field of expertise as a scientific discipline, yet there is little agreement regarding the dimensions elements among experts in this field. Each of the experts of curriculum designers about aspects and lesson planning stages expressed different views. Tyler (1949) elements of the curriculum include: aims and objectives, learning experiences, organizing and evaluating. Zeiss (1976) considers objectives, content, activities - learning and curriculum as components of evaluation method. Eisner (1985) elements of the curriculum include: purpose, content, variety of learning opportunities, organizing the content, presentation, response and evaluation method (Ghoorchian, 1995). Hildataba (1962) developed four elements of Tyler into seven-elements: Need, purpose, content, content organization, learning experiences, organizing and evaluating learning experiences. Fresein having influenced by practical approach and elaboration on Taba's model introduced curriculum elements as a process with 11 steps: identifying the problem, recognizing the seeking various ways, choosing the best solution, adopting the solution, and guiding staffs and evaluating effectiveness of curriculum (Wales and Bundy, 1995). Klein introduced 9 elements in the curriculum of the school training school model as (SOS): purpose, materials, content, learning activities, learning strategies, evaluation, categorization, or location, time and space

(Fathivajargah, 2007, pp. 6-5). If Fresein - Klein model, studied 10 elements of curriculum, except for the element of "Logic or why" of the curriculum, other elements of the pattern are common with Klein's model. Identifying those elements, he also posed some questions that clarify the status of the quality of the curriculum in the process of these elements. Table below shows this:

Table 1: Elements of lesson plans and defining the quality of the educational process

Directing Questions	Curriculum Elements
Why should learners learn?	Logic
Which aspects of learning do learners engage in?	Purpose and Content
What do learners learn?	Content
How do learners learn?	Learning Activities
How does the teacher facilitate teaching process?	Teacher's role
What helps them learn?	Material and Resources
Who do the learners learn with?	Categorization
Where do they learn?	Place
When do they learn?	Time
How much do they improve?	Evaluation and Assessment

The purpose of the curriculum is not usually significant, but their preparation is time consuming and somewhat complicated. Aimes indicate needs, deficiencies and gaps and are determined to meet them. It is said that if you don't consider the necessary scientific accuracy in choosing the goals, educational needs are not met (Maleki, 2006, p 84). The purpose of each curriculum has different levels. Each of these levels analyzes goals of higher levels. Determining the accuracy of these goals is important, because on the one hand ensures achieving the ultimate goal and on the other hand is used in content selection, teaching methods and evaluation methods (Maleki, 2006, p 49). Before planners select and organize the content of the curriculum regarding ultimate goal, they should acquire general goals and learning objectives from the relevant sources to formulate goals. It aims to distinguish and classify them according to different classifications. It is not meant to separate and break them apart, but it's to plan and determine the kinds of learning activities (Mohsenpour, 2011). In other words, carefully and acuity in defining and explaining curriculum goals decides desirability of other components of the program. So defining and explaining of the goals and

stating them as a mission statement, is one of the most important responsibilities of the top managers of any organization (Bandviewi; Lychmn, 2007) and is considered essential for curriculum planners. Basically in any plan or amendment, revision of curriculum, innovation or any change in the relation of the objectives is essential. Clear goals, are of the fundamental aspects of program planning, because enables us in reasonably choosing the content of teaching - learning and in designing an authentic evaluation (Nasr et al, 2007, p 47).

3. Methodology

The study is a descriptive survey; the population included 17 professors who are all men. And the population is also graduate students in the program planning courses over two semesters in district 13 of Azad universities over 177 people, of whom 86 were women and 91 are men. For sampling professors, census and for sampling students classification manner is used in accordance with the sample size of 121. To evaluate the basic components researcher's questionnaire based on a Likert of five-point scale is used. The students and teachers were asked to comment on any question based on Likert five-point scale. Categories of curriculum objectives are measured with 10 questions, to evaluate the validity of the questionnaire; face and content validity are used. Reliability of the aspects of curriculum objectives is achieved through the implementation of pilot study and calculation with Cronbach's alpha of 0/85, respectively.

Findings

Curriculum goals of program planning courses at graduate level moderately meet students' needs and expectations.

Given the normal distribution of data for average comparison of meeting the needs and expectations of students and professors through goals of dergraduate curriculum of program planning courses at middle level (3) one-sample T test is used.

Data in Table (2) indicates that the majority of students responded revolves around three options: high, low and somewhat, responses of the teachers around four options: high, to some extent, low and very low. So that the mean of professors in every question except questions 1 and 2 are smaller than average level (3) and the group of students except questions 4 and 5 are greater than average level (3). The greatest average at professors group is related to questions number 1 and 2 and the lowest average is related to questions number 6, 8, 9 and 10. The average of students' groups is related to questions number 1 and 2 and the lowest average is related to questions number 4 and 5.

Table (2): Frequency and percentage of respondents sample of professors and students about their needs and expectations through curriculum goals

Average	Frequency						Group	Factors
	very Low	Low	partly	High	v. high			
3.12	1	1	10	5	0	Professor	.1 Suitability of curriculum goals with top experts in the field	
3.38	3	10	52	50	6	Students		
3.24	0	2	11	2	2	Professor	2 Transparency and openness of the goals in training areas or presenting knowledge	
3.34	2	5	70	38	6	Student		
2.88	1	3	10	3	0	Professors	3. Transparency and openness of the goals in researching areas or knowledge creation	
3.09	3	20	65	29	4	Students		
2.82	1	3	11	2	0	Professors	4 Transparency and openness of the goals in services	
2.91	4	29	64	22	2	Students		
2.59	4	1	10	2	0	Professors	5. Transparency and openness of the goals in Entrepreneurship	
2.62	14	32	58	15	2	Students		
2.41	4	5	5	3	0	Professors	6 Transparency and openness of the goals in critical thinking	
3.19	6	20	49	37	9	Students		
2.94	2	3	8	2	2	Professors	6 Transparency and openness of the goals in communicative skills and group work	
3.15	8	14	56	38	5	Students		
2.47	3	6	6	1	1	Professors	.8 Transparency and openness of the goals in attitudes (having a positive attitude to the world, society, people, jobs)	
3.17	6	19	55	30	11	Students		
2.53	3	6	5	2	1	Professors	9 Emphasis on fostering independence, work, power and decision-making and risk -taking, life-long learning and self-confidence in students	
3.07	9	21	51	32	8	Students		
2.53	3	6	5	2	1	Professors	10 Emphasis on information literacy skills in students (research, analyzing, organizing, evaluating and using information)	

Table 3: Students and faculty members' descriptive statistics

N	Std. Deviation	Mean	Group
17	0.78	2.75	Professors
121	0.63	3.11	Students

Table 4: T test results, Students attitude toward curriculum goals

Test Value = 3					
T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
1.850	120	.067	.10661	-.0075	.2207

Table 5: T test results, faculty members attitude toward curriculum goals

Test Value = 3					
t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				Lower	Upper
-1.312	16	.208	-.24706	-.6462	.1521

Data analysis was based on the table (4-7) showed that the average of curriculum goals with regard to professors is 75/2 with an SD of 78. A comparison with the imaginary average (3), showed that significance level is higher than $t = 5/0$. Therefore, the difference between professors' group with imaginary average is not significant and objectives of the curriculum moderately meet their needs and expectations. Students' scores is 11/3 with $SD = 63/0$. In this regard comparing scores of responses given (3) with imaginary average showed significant level of t is higher than $05/0$.

4. Discussions

When developing curriculum, the most important and difficult decisions must be made in determining goals. Because wide range of views about the purpose of educational institutions. Educational goals can also change over time, they are affected by many factors including the rapidly changing nature of society and predicting future needs. In addition, they are related to learner needs and the changing nature of the subject. However in planning terms goals are critical elements which identifying and determining them are essential in shaping and orienting other elements including content, teaching methods and materials. The purpose of the curriculum is so important that without it in none of the stages of curriculum development right decision can be made. Therefore, the first, most important and most critical element criterion of curriculum development is objectives and all activities and program planning processes are in light of goals. For the purposes of developing goals a wide range of resources are considered including: self and colleagues analyzing the knowledge, skills and attitudes, ways of thinking and problem solving that should be fulfilled, interests, needs and characteristics of students'; lesson subject to in a way the published in technical texts (Specially appropriate to courses); needs of society, the requirements of professional bodies using educational services of graduate students, or faculty.

The results of this study are aligning with Hosseini (2009) regarding the objectives of the curriculum moderately meet their needs and expectations of professors and findings of Fathi vajargah and Shafiee (2007) are aligning with findings of this study regarding the average quality of curriculum and low levels of skills and information literacy of students. The findings of this study are aligning with Fathi vajargah (2007), Wang (2002) and comparative studies and innovative of research organizations and higher education planning (1999)

regarding that in the present study professors and students partly satisfied with the knowledge presented and creating skills required to perform research and services. In other words, professors and students consider existing curriculum to help authentication necessary job capabilities and presenting practical knowledge and compatibility with market needs and providing critical thinking and creativity by allowing partially successful and unsuccessful. Findings of the present study are in aligning with findings of Dalvsteel (1999) and WHO (2005) in issues such as: lack of scientific assessment of the program planning carried, lack of curriculum planning specialists and lack of consideration in scientific standards in curriculum development. Findings of the present study are in aligning with findings of Dirsal and Mihio (1974) in cases including lack of openness and transparency in curriculum goals and the lack of balance between the goals. Findings of the present study are not in aligning with findings Rabie et al (2010); Pezeshkirad and Mohtasham (1993) in cases including desirability of the quality of the curriculum in terms of objectives element and desirability of goals and course missions.

References:

1. Ng, P. T. 2008. The phases and paradoxes of educational quality assurance: The case of the Singapore system, *Quality Assurance in Education*. 16, 112-125.
2. Okland, J. S. 1993. *Total Quality Management: The Route to Improving Performance*. 2nd ed. London: Butterworth Heinemann.
1. Ziegler, H. 1994. International Development 3. in *Assuring Quality in Higher Education*. *Quality in Higher Education*. Vol. 4, n. 2.
2. UNESCO. 1995. *Policy Paper for Chang and Development in Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO . Vol. 4 & 18, n. 3.
3. Tyler, R. 1949. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
4. Taba, H. 1962 *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
5. Wiles, J; Bondi, J . 2002. *Curriculum Development*; 6. *A Guide to practice*. New Jersey, Merrill and prentice hall, 6th ed.
6. Akker, J.J.H Vanden 2003. *Curriculum Perspectives: An Introduction*. In j. Vanden Akker, W. Kuiper and U. Hameyer (Eds.) *Curriculum Landscapes and trends*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
7. Bandyopadhyay, K & Lichtman, R. 2007 *Six Sigma Approach to Quality and Productivity Improvement in an Institution*. *International Journal of Management*, 24, 4, 802-807.
8. Delevan Steele, E. 1999. *Program Evaluation in higher education: A Case Study*. 126. UMI Company.
9. Dressel, P. L & M ayhew, L. B. 1974. *Higher education as a field of study: The emergence of a profession*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

1/8/2013