



Curriculum Evaluation of Jazz Studies Program, Faculty of Music, Silpakorn University, Thailand

Kittitach Sumpowthong

Silpakorn University, Thailand

Abstract

This research entitled evaluation of Jazz Studies Program in Faculty of Music, Silpakorn University, Thailand, is a mixed-method design study. This study aims to review, evaluate, and revise the Jazz Program in the academic year 2020. According to the national education strategy, the regular five-year review is assigned. The AUN-QA and OBE have been applied as a framework for an evaluation. CIPP model is used for tool development, including context, input, process, and product evaluation. Participants of this study are all stakeholders divided into three groups: 1) administrative staff and lecturers, 2) year 3 and 4 of jazz students 3) external stakeholders: employers. A total of 109 participants were selected using purposive sampling, and a self-administered questionnaire was used as a tool for data collection. The data collected was analyzed by frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. In-depth interviews with key stakeholders were also carried out. Content analysis was used to explore qualitative data. Quantitative findings, on a scale of 1-5, produced satisfying quality in 4 categories (context, input, process, and product) with category means of more than 4.0 (total of 5). Furthermore, qualitative data produced on development in the future that backward design should be concerned. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) should be identified through course reviews. Recommendations for the curriculum development should reflect on the change in the context of national and international jazz music. Relevancy of local and universal music dimensions is suggested in particular culture and economy. Entrepreneurship, music design, and media are more preferred in the future of the jazz music industry.

Keywords: Curriculum Evaluation, CIPP Model, Jazz Study, Undergraduate Program.

1. Background

Silpakorn University has been offering the Bachelor of Music (BM) program in Jazz Studies since 2000. In order to improve the quality of the program, the revision of the curriculum in 2021 is undergoing a revision in accordance with the conceptual framework of the ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA), which focus on both the program learning outcomes (PLOs) and the course learning outcomes (CLOs) for its assessment [1]. Both PLOs and CLOs expect students' cumulative learning (goal) across courses (process) at the end of the program. They reflect the need and expectation of graduates' skills and knowledge from employers and other stakeholders. Therefore, outcome-based education (OBE) was used as a core concept to design the new curriculum. In addition, an effective assessment and evaluation system is equally crucial in developing the quality program. Thus, a research study of a comprehensive evaluation system for the educational program is fundamental for developing and improving the education system in the 21st century.

2. Objectives

A research study of an evaluation system for the educational program is a mixed methods research to review and evaluate the Jazz Studies program (BM) 2016 by the application of the CIPP evaluation model [2]. The CIPP evaluation model concentrates on four stages of evaluations: 1) Context Evaluation, 2) Input Evaluation, 3) Process Evaluation, 4) Product Evaluation.

3. Method and participants

The total sample of 109 participants in this research consisted of 1) 8 participants who are the administrative team of the Faculty of Music at Silpakorn University, 2) 22 participants who are faculty in the jazz department, 3) 52 participants who are students in the program, 4) 3 participants who are educational services officers, 5) 13 participants who graduated from the program, and 6) 11 participants who are stakeholders of the program. All participants completed an individual satisfaction survey and interview. This qualitative research used the quantitative content analysis method through coding scheme and the application of quantitative techniques of descriptive statistics.



4. Results and discussions

The result of data analysis from the evaluation 2016 is presented in the four stages of evaluations as the following:

4.1 Context evaluation stage

The stage assessed two areas of 1) program objective; and 2) course content, structure, and curriculum. The results showed the mean satisfaction rate of “high”. The “highest” rate was from the administrative team participants (P1) with $M = 4.85$ and 4.70 , respectively. The faculty (P2), students (P3), and the graduated (P4) participants rated both areas as “high” ($M_{P2} = 4.32$ and 4.27 , $M_{P3} = 3.86$ and 3.64 , $M_{P4} = 4.12$ and 3.63). The educational services officers (P5) indicated “highest” in the area of program objective ($M = 4.56$) and “high” in the second area ($M = 4.48$). The participant group of stakeholders (P6) rated their level as “high” in the program objective area ($M = 4.25$).

4.2 Input Evaluation stage

This stage evaluations consists of 1) teachers, 2) students in the program, and 3) the educational environment. Overall, participants showed a “high” rate across three areas. The administrative participants have “highest” ($M = 4.67$) in the teachers’ evaluation and “high” ($M = 4.02$) in the educational environment. P2 indicated a “high” rate for teachers and students of the program ($M = 4.3$ and 3.79) but rated “medium” in the educational environment ($M = 3.70$). For P3, the satisfaction in all three areas of evaluation is “high” ($M = 4.06$, 3.79 , and 3.76). Similarly, P4 and P5 showed a “high” rate across three areas ($M_{P4} = 3.98$, 4.10 , and 3.71 , $M_{P5} = 4.42$, 4.47 , and 3.9). In addition, the participant group of stakeholders rated “high” in the second area ($M = 3.91$).

4.3 Process Evaluation stage

Two areas were evaluated: 1) the teaching and learning process, and 2) the academic or learning outcome. The results showed a “high” level in both areas for all participants ($M = 4.27$ and 4.23). The P1 rated “highest” ($M = 4.63$), while P2 rated “high” ($M = 3.95$) in the area of academic or learning outcomes. The student participants rated both areas with “high” level of satisfaction ($M = 3.93$ and 4.04). The graduates from the program also rated “high” in both areas ($M = 4.11$ and 4.04). Lastly, the educational services officers rated “high” in the academic or learning outcome area ($M = 4.50$).

4.4 Product Evaluation stage

This stage evaluated the application of both output and outcome of the program, with the variable being the quality of the graduates. Most of the participants were satisfied with the quality of the program’s graduates, with a level of satisfaction of “high.” The results showed that the administrative and the educational services officers group have the “highest” rate ($M_{P1} = 4.78$, $M_{P5} = 4.78$). In contrast, the faculty, the program’s students, the graduates, and stakeholder groups have a “high” level of satisfaction ($M_{P2} = 4.32$, $M_{P3} = 4.22$, $M_{P4} = 4.29$, $M_{P6} = 4.48$).

Table 1 Mean of satisfaction level across participants according to CIPP evaluation model [3]

Stages and areas of evaluation	P1 (mean/ level)	P2 (mean/ level)	P3 (mean/ level)	P4 (mean/ level)	P5 (mean/ level)	P6 (mean/ level)	Total (mean/ level)
Context							
1. Program objective	4.85 Highest	4.32 High	3.86 High	4.12 High	4.56 Highest	4.25 High	4.33 High
2. Course content and structure, and program curriculum	4.70 Highest	4.27 High	3.64 High	3.63 High	4.48 High	-	4.14 High



Stages and areas of evaluation	P1 (mean/ level)	P2 (mean/ level)	P3 (mean/ level)	P4 (mean/ level)	P5 (mean/ level)	P6 (mean/ level)	Total (mean/ level)
Input							
1. Teachers	4.64 Highest	4.3 High	4.06 High	3.98 High	4.42 High	-	4.28 High
2. Students in the program	-	3.79 High	4.07 High	4.1 High	4.47 High	3.91 High	4.07 High
3. Educational environment	4.02 High	3.7 Medium	3.76 High	3.71 High	3.90 High	-	3.82 High
Process							
1. Teaching and learning process	-	-	3.93 High	4.11 High	-	-	4.27 High
2. Academic or learning outcome	4.63 Highest	3.95 High	4.04 High	4.04 High	4.50 High	-	4.23 High
Product							
1. Quality of the graduates	4.78 Highest	4.32 High	4.22 High	4.29 High	4.78 Highest	4.48 High	4.33 High

The recommendation aspect of this program evaluation is derived from the qualitative data analysis of the interview with participants and presented in four areas of context, input factors, process, and product. The details are as the following.

Context area: It is recommended that the course objectives were designed to reflect the uniqueness of the professional field of jazz music while taking the organizational vision and strategy into consideration. In terms of course content, structure, and curriculum, the readiness to adjusting or adding new courses should be assessed, for example, academic writing and academic research in music. The program should design course content and learning process that integrate the growing knowledge of media and information technology. Lastly, the course content of the 2021 revised should include courses that promote the value creation and the addition of music works and practicum courses in the creation of jazz music.

Input area: It is recommended that instructors/teachers consider the appropriate number of students per instructor of the instrumental class. The program should also manage the quality and number of instruments to be of standard quality and available for students. There system and process of academic advisors should range from consulting to monitoring students' academic progress. In addition, the recruitment plan and strategy should focus on the organizations, partners, or high schools that are considered the target of the program.

Process area: The teaching and learning in music practicum should have clear grading criteria and system. Moreover, the students should have the opportunity to be a part of designing the learning process in these instrument practicum and ensemble classes. Most importantly, there should be a measuring or evaluating system with clear grading criteria. Lastly, it is recommended that the program should include activities that allow students to practice project-based learning (PBL).

Product area: The program should enhance graduates' potential to pursue various professions in music fields, not limited only to jazz. Next, the program's curriculum should focus on students' skills and knowledge in creating contemporary music works. The graduates should be able to pass on or educate others in music. The program should nurture professionalism in graduates and knowledge



and skill in technology relevant to the profession. Lastly, the program should also provide a foundation for graduates to further their education at the graduate level, entrepreneurship, and music and media production.

5. Conclusion

The CIPP evaluation model of the Bachelor of Music (BM) in Jazz Studies program 2016 showed the quality and efficiency of the program across four areas of evaluation, which evident in the quantitative results of program evaluation in four areas is at a “high” satisfaction level.

The qualitative results from the interview data of stakeholders, could further improve the 2021 revised program by implementing the result in the process of determining the expected program learning outcomes (PLOs) in relation to Bloom’s Taxonomy theoretical framework of learning, as well as the course learning outcomes (CLOs). The result of this study also provide information regarding the desirable characteristics of the graduates, which are the graduates who 1) have excellent musical performance skills, 2) are creative and innovative, 3) have the ability to apply and integrate different musical works to produce new creative works, 4) are able to assess and analyze the context in both current music profession and industry, 5) can further the direct music issues that are important to the music industry at both community and national levels, 6) have basic skills in academic music research and writing, 7) have professional moral and ethics, 8) are skilled and competent in both Thai and English communication, 9) capable of continually developing and improving their professional skills through a lifelong learning process, and 10) are prepared for a higher level of education in music. These are just part of valuable results and information that will be used to develop and design the 2021 revision of the Bachelor of Music (BM) in Jazz Studies program at the Faculty of Music, Silpakorn University.

References

- [1] Asian University Network Quality Assurance (2015). Guide to AUN-QA assessment at program level version 3.0. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- [2] Stufflebeam, D. L., & Zhang, G. (2017). The CIPP evaluation model: how to evaluate for improvement and accountability. The Guilford Press.
- [3] Sumpowthong, K. (2020). Research Report of Jazz Studies Curriculum Evaluation. Bangkok: Faculty of Music, Silpakorn University.