



















income from their students. Instructors have bias in terms of providing a grading scale. Instructors also do not give students enough knowledge. The new graduate teachers do not match the fields of study, and have little experience. Instructors lack technical skills of how teachers should teach. Students do not understand teachers teaching in English.. More importantly, the findings from the participants who are currently working after graduating from this program, *participant X1* stated that instructors who taught the major subject did not change their teaching style. The teaching tasks were assigned to students, but instructors did not let the students know the results. The students did not comprehend what the instructor taught especially instructors who had completed a doctoral degree. They taught mathematics in English which was difficult to understand. And *participant X2* provided more information, the instructors often changed because some instructors were employed, and got a scholarship to study abroad. The instructors in the university are not really lecturers in the Faculty of Visual Arts. The instructors have to be able to teach all three aspects: music, art, dancing and drawing and painting etc. The instructor ignores students' tasks and do not return the results. Further, *Participants X3 and X4* provided more specific details; the teaching methods do not change. Most teachers taught the same method and the same techniques. The instructor cannot teach and transfer the knowledge to the students. For example, the teacher graduated in Physics, but he teaches computing (some) teachers teach only the theory. She or he cannot demonstrate the practical field, so the students cannot practice in an authentic situation.

### The Curriculum

With regard to the curriculum, most of the students thought that the content of the courses was too broad, but some students thought that the problems with the content of the courses were due to the structuring of courses in sets of subjects. As a consequence of this structuring, the students found themselves unable to keep up with the presentation pace of the lessons and were unable to study them in depth.

Most of pre-service teachers provided similar answers in terms of curriculum in the sense that the contents were too broad, with little depth. They gave similar responses on this issue as following:

*S2: "It seems like the curriculum was constructed by combining different courses together, which looked like a variety, but there was no deep detail."*

*M4: "The implemented curriculum was very broad, it looked like a collection of different courses together. In fact, it would be better if there would be an in-depth study in each course."*

*S3: "The curriculum put too much emphasis on theories, it was too academic and did not focus on processes to apply in the profession."*

*S5: "The 5 year curriculum was too long."*

According to the findings from the focus groups, the curriculum for foundation education is out of date. The curriculum of 5 years is too long. The teacher curriculum 5-year course gives much more information, and it is very difficult. In addition, the findings from the participants who are currently working after graduating from this program, for example: Participant X1 commented that disadvantages of a 5 years curriculum in the case of students who study in a Master degree. The four year course adds a two-year study period of 6 years in order to graduate, but the course of 5 years has to add more 2 years, a total of 7 years. The assessment does not match in the course (Course Syllabus). This course is defined as a method of evaluation criteria but is back to group-based assessment. And *participant X2* expressed about teacher education courses for students who learn together are not of much value.. The course does not focus on learning to authentic practice such as writing lesson plans, research and insights focused on the individual. More importantly, the courses for students who learn the teaching profession do not prepare for obtaining a teacher license (*Participants 3 and 4*).

### Management

As for the management itself, most of the students identified no problems with the management. However, they did mention a lack of variation in the activities provided by the program. Some students pointed out that IT learning resources in the classrooms were not sufficient, and that the atmosphere in the classrooms did not support learning.









- Eknarin B. (2009). *Guideline of enhance ethics for e-Learning among university students*. Khon Kaen.
- Hongpharn, T. (2001). *The professional teachers*. Bangkok: Rajabhat Institution.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case applications in education: Revised and expanded from case study research in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Montri V. (2000). *Moral teaching behaviors of teachers who taught moral in the primary school, Amphur Muang, Udonthani Province*. Thailand.
- Na Chiang Mai, N. (2006). *Ethics teaching techniques for Chiang Mai University Students*. Chiangmai: Chiang Mai University.
- Nakorntarp, A. (1997). The Reality of Land. J. Film Procel Limited. "Competent Teachers are Overall Lightening and Sparking Around the World Land, and the Spiritual Teachers".
- Office of National Education Commission. (1999). *Competency in the Competitiveness (A.D. 1999)*. B.E. 2542. Bangkok: Printing Group Limited.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2000a). *A Model Teacher*. The Fund of Professional Honor Awards (FPHA). Printing Group Limited.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2000b). *Competency of Thai Youth in the World Class: From the Result of Competitiveness in Academic Olympics, the Year 1997-1999*. Printing Group Limited.
- Office of Rajabhat Institutional Council. (2000). *Framework of teachers educational curriculum, Rajabhat Institution B.E. 2539(1996)*. Bangkok: ORIC.
- Pithiyanuwatana, S. (2000). *Proposal for the Policies in Teachers' Produce and Development*. Bangkok: Pharbpim Press.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tancharemrnat, B.(2005) *Reforms of Teachers' Selection*. Bangkok: Kurusapha Press.