Formulation and standardization of quality assessment qualification and validating he undergraduate student's curriculum planning

Yousef Rezaei 1
Ali Maghool 2*
Ahmed Akbari 3
Moslem Cherabin 4

1 Department of Educational Management, Neyshabour Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran.
*2 Department of Educational Management, Neyshabour Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran.
*Correspondence to: Ali.maghool@yahoo.com
3 Department of Educational Management, Bardaskan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran.
4 Department of Educational Management, Neyshabour Branch, Islamic Azad University, Neyshabur, Iran.

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to develop and standardize the indicators of quality assessment and validating of the undergraduate curriculum of North Khorasan University of Education. Method: The present study was a descriptive-survey method with respect to its fundamental purpose and a qualitative and quantitative method. The statistical population consisted of faculty members, visiting professors, and staff who were in the second semester of the 1996-1997 academic year in an undergraduate degree in the field of education. The sample consisted of 77 individuals by census method. In the qualitative part of the research, recruitment has been done through the study of internal, external research and literature review, and the background to quality and validating evaluation, especially curriculum validating factors, criteria and indicators. Then, eight faculty members and visiting professors were purposefully selected and conducted 18 sessions of guided and semi-structured interviews. In the quantitative part of the research, a researcher-made questionnaire was completed by statistical sample after determining validity and reliability in order to standardize and weight the factors, criteria and indicators of curriculum quality evaluation and validation. Results: The findings were analyzed in qualitative section in three stages: 1- Drafting factors, criteria and markers according to semantic units derived from semi-structured interview, 2- Drafting critique and evaluation by university professors. Farhangian, 3. Ranking, standardization, and weight determination using Friedman tests, one-sample t-test, and mean weight. For this purpose, a researcher-made questionnaire was given to 40 faculty members of Educational Sciences Department of Farhangian University. After calculating the reliability of the questionnaire through Cronbach's alpha test (0.986), 77 professors were selected by census method. A poll was conducted. The findings of this study showed that there were 12 factors, 33 criteria, and 211 indicators for the undergraduate curriculum in the field of education. The analysis of the findings showed that the factors, criteria and markers were multivariate, including assigning the highest rank and weight to the content factor and the lowest rank and weight to the time factor. Consider all the components of the curriculum. Localization is the focus of management and utilities as new elements of the curriculum. **Keywords**: Quality Assessment, Validating, Curriculum, Indicators, Bachelor of Education.

Introduction

In general, for the higher education system there are four functions: 1- planning; 2- organization; 3- guidance and leadership; 4- monitoring and evaluation. Among these four functions, supervision and evaluation play a significant role in the success of higher education (Bazargan, 14 2015). The role of the higher education system in the 21st century in producing, promoting, and applying knowledge in the various fields of medicine, economics, commerce, politics, military industry, architecture, etc., which ultimately leads to the sustainable development of countries, is undeniable. Given the developments and challenges of the 21st Century higher education system, including the increase in the number of students in need of education and consequently the increase in the student population, the disproportionate increase in the number of students is compounded by the growth of elements and elements of the higher education syllabus. The diversity of higher education institutions,

the multitude of unemployed graduates (especially in developing countries), the academic competition between universities and countries, the spread of science, technology and information and communication technologies, the emergence of knowledge-based economies, as well as resource constraints in finance, the human intellectual developments (agriculture, industrial and post-industrial), lifestyle change, globalization, competitiveness, democracy, decentralization, replacement of demand for education rather than supply-side, international interactions and adaptation, the diverse and unlimited human needs, which can be said to be the key components of quality in the higher education system, are all expectations of the system. Higher education systems in different countries of the world have changed more and more, requiring attention to the effectiveness, efficiency, productivity and quality of these systems. Therefore, to achieve this, self-management, managerial independence, and design of structures and mechanisms for validating and quality assessment for higher education institutions are essential (Walker R, 2018).

Yasnoff, O'Carroll, Koo, Linkins believes that governments, on the other hand, that having skilled human resources plays a key role in sustainable (economic, social and environmental) development of societies. They allocate the state's annual budget to the country's higher education system to equip their youth with the qualitative and quantitative knowledge and qualifications necessary for the knowledge society by expanding the higher education system. Along with the increase in current credits and funding for university and higher education, there is growing concern among government officials about the quality of performance of these institutions. Each focuses on three main issues: 1- Do the managers of the education system have the necessary administrative, human, and technical skills to develop the specialized, committed, and needed community skills to perform the tasks of planning, planning, organizing, commanding, coordinate, supervise, and control efficiently? 2- Is the education system managers efficient and make the best use of the financial resources? 3- Is the education system managers effective and capable of educating students? To train them to have economic, political, social, religious, and so forth influences on society?

If the educational institutions and the higher education system of the country are not effective and efficient and do not have good quality, they will not achieve their goals and will waste their financial and human resources. Loss of financial resources can be compensated, but the low quality of graduates and the output of educational institutions cannot be compensated, and this will endanger all the beneficiaries (Venkatarao, Patil, Prasad, Anasuya 2018) because of the quality. Various words such as engineering, law, teacher and other jobs in the community will also be affected by the quality of educational institutions and higher education system. Therefore, in this context, as the quality assessment and validating of curriculum requirements of educational institutions and higher education system, so it will be the country. The history of human life demonstrates his spirit of perfectionism, excellence, and selectivity. Human beings, in the period of their intellectual developments, namely agriculture or pre-modernism, industrialism or modernism, and post-industrialism or post-modernism, are at the core of their activity, focusing on effectiveness, efficiency, productivity and, in other words, the quality of goods and services. That man chooses the goods he desires according to his taste and desires expresses quality. The historical and evolving evolution of the intellectual, technology and artifacts left behind by the ancestors, in other words, cultural heritage, indicates that the desirable quality of goods and the proper delivery of services as indicators of evaluation and ultimately selection have been the focus of human creation since the beginning (Chen H., Yu P., Wang N, 2012). Although the concept of quality has always been the subject of human life, historically, the general idea of quality was first introduced by industry and by deming, consequently in recent years' attention has been paid to the concept of quality. And its use in educational systems has also expanded (Bazargan, 2006, quoted by

Zarei Zawaraki and Maghami, 1396: 150). Quality is not a fixed and static point, but a continuous one (Zawaraki and Maqami, 1396: 150). Therefore, the quality can be changed according to the conditions and facilities in the community. In the present study, the quality of the syllabus is the least desirable. Standardization is one of the fundamental tasks of the higher education system to improve quality. Standards are real guides and vital tools in the fields of production and service, and by adhering to standards we can protect top quality manufacturers as well as protect the rights and health of consumers. The credibility, base and productivity of educational institutions and programs depend on adhering to standards in the various processes of their educational activity. Therefore, in setting standards, a dynamic approach should be taken to best assess the quality of the institution or program being evaluated. By setting the standard we want to answer the question of how much of the criterion is enough to make the situation desirable (Bazargan, 1380: 34). Standard in the sense of being itself is synonymous with order. Each standard is the result of a special effort to bring the components together in a certain field and to have them approved by the competent authority (Khannifar, 2004: 153). Standards are the criteria that enable managers to make the right decisions and make the right choices and to enable them to achieve the desired perfection in any field (2004, quoting Worlds, 2014: 82).

In the last few years, the directors and staff of the Cultural University have made numerous efforts and efforts in the field of curriculum, including faculty, student acceptance practices, curriculum goals, headings and content, practices. Teaching - Learning, introducing scientific resources, research, physical space, equipment, course time, organizational charts, curriculum management and evaluation. Since improving and enhancing the academic and professional capacity of students and graduates to provide efficient and effective educational services to students is one of the main policies and missions of the Farhang University, objectives require a system of quality assessment and validation to assess the status of society by means of pre-established standards, and to provide a legal and practical identity to the curriculum of the University of Culture. To this end, the Department of Performance Assessment was established at Talabani University. Since in the process of quality assessment and validating of the curriculum, in order to judge its quality and determine its desirability, it is necessary to consider the factors, criteria and indicators that can be used to provide data, the department collected the necessary information about the present situation and judged it by analyzing and interpreting it (MacDonald, 2009, quoting Farmer and Farahmani Farahani, 1395: 115). In this regard, I have undertaken a research entitled: "Development and standardization of quality evaluation and validating indices of the undergraduate curriculum of North Khorasan University of Educational Sciences".

Each of the key constituent elements of an organization, apparatus, or appraisal that is considered for appraisal is called an “agent”. In fact, it defines the main dimensions and components of the subject of evaluation (Bazargan & Farasatkhah, 1396: 51). The criterion is what is known for evaluating an important program (Mashayekh, 2014: 115). The quality of the agent is determined by the criteria. In this way, the criteria of each agent represent the main aspects and characteristics of that agent so that based on the criteria we can investigate and ascertain the status of each agent (merchant and extracurricular) (1396: 52). The Educational Research Encyclopedia (1992) defines the marker as follows: "The marker of education is statistics related to educational policies designed to provide information about the rating, quality and performance of the educational system”. To convert statistical data into markers, a standard must first be considered to judge against it (Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1992: 410).

In the twenty-first century, higher education systems across the world have faced multiple challenges. On the one hand the impact of epistemological underlying perspectives

on knowledge building and on the other hand the use of converging technologies in globalization and globalization as well as the need to pay attention to the sustainable development of countries have transformed the effectiveness and efficiency of higher education in different countries. It is for this reason that in most countries around the world the promotion of higher education quality has been a priority in aligning higher education systems and academic programs with global development needs and developments. As a result, considerable efforts have been made in recent years to evaluate the quality of universities and other higher education institutions in some countries worldwide. In addition, other countries are increasingly in need of quality assessment. They have felt the need for higher education and have acted (International Network of Representatives for Higher Education Quality Assurance, 2003).

Harman (1998) identifies five main methods for assessing academic quality: 1) self-assessment (internal evaluation); 2) external or homogenous assessment; 3) statistical analysis or use of performance indicators; 4) survey of Students, alumni, employers (alumni recruiters); and 5) testing students' knowledge, skills, and competencies. Among the afore mentioned methods, self-assessment (internal evaluation) and external evaluation, due to having a theoretical framework for institutional change and change theory-based change, can improve and enhance the quality of educational departments, colleges and universities. They have a significant role to play (quoted by Hashemi and Pouraminzadeh, 2011: 12). Halak (1995) has attempted to define school effectiveness in the form of school management by expressing three inseparable attributes: autonomy, participation, and self-evaluation. In this regard, he argues: “Autonomy - in terms of management - requires cooperation among actors, the key to participation, and the need to establish sound school management structures (financial, human resources, and curriculum). In addition, autonomy is one of the prerequisites for self-assessment and self-monitoring. Participation is another management issue. Individuals invited to participate need a clear understanding of the institutional tasks in which self-governance is exercised. Establishing appropriate communication channels and information systems among the actors of an educational institution requires self-assessment, and ultimately not self-monitoring or self-assessment of the end of the effective management process but can provide school management capacity by providing information to provide feedback. And enable the result of meaningful partnership among educational fellows” (Halak, 1995: 112-113). Tyler (1986) argues that "in order to improve the quality of education, educational planners, managers, and decision makers must believe that gathering information and making decisions about the quality of education requires decentralization at the organizational level" (quoting elders, 1393: 46). Therefore, it can be said that independent management and leadership, in other words self-regulation, requires quality assessment and validating of curricula in educational institutions.

Quality assurance practices can be divided into three categories: (a) quality audit, (b) quality assessment, and (c) validating (Bazargan, 2007, quoted by Zare Zwarki and Magham, 1396: 155). Quality assessment in education is the process of determining, collecting data and information to judge the system's inputs, processes, and outputs for judgment or decision making (Aliari et al., 2012: 51). Comparative education shows that validating has been used for years to evaluate the quality of educational institutions in different countries around the world. Kells (1995) considers validating as a process for judging the quality of higher education systems that can be achieved to achieve two goals: 1- Accountability of higher education institutions in how they use resources. 2- Evaluating the degree of compliance of the activities of higher education institutions with pre-established standards (Bazargan, 2009, quoted by Aliari et al., 2012: 51). Validation model is one of the approaches of evaluating the quality of education system based on the opinion of the experts. This model is the most

famous model of quality evaluation of educational systems in the world, in which indicators of different elements of educational system are formulated in two stages: "internal evaluation" and "external evaluation". Accordingly, the "factors" of education systems are first identified and then the "criteria" and "indicators" or "indicators" are determined (Mirzam Mohammadi, 2006, quoted by Farmerzadeh and Farhmani; Farahani, 1395: 109).

The quality issue can be addressed in the following two ways (Alikhani Kashkak, 2009: 3): 1- Non-customer-oriented quality: It is the degree of conformity of product characteristics with world or national standards approved by experts and technical experts. It is a product, so it does not refer to the customer's tastes and outlooks, and only the technical and specialized parameters of the product are considered. 2- Customer-oriented quality: in addition to non-customer-specific specifications and characteristics, customers, preferences, and preferences of the customers are shaped, design, beauty, luxury, class characteristics and so on. The production at multiple customers' needs and expectations match, at the same time considering the same consumption patterns is important. The World Bank's definition of quality includes two components: the learning environment and student performance. The learning environment itself, which reflects a combination of inputs and processes, affects student performance. Student performance is also measured by clear learning goals and setting national standards at all levels of education, but how to achieve the performance and achievement of the highest standards is necessary given local community conditions, and to identify the participation and collective agreement of the educational actors. The learning environment appropriate to the inputs it receives has an impact on students' performance, including those that play a central role in the form of the learning environment, and is also mentioned in a World Bank study. These include: 1) student learning capacity and motivation, 2) subject matter or syllabus, 3) subject-specific teacher with teaching skills, 4) time needed for learning, 5) tools and equipment needed Teaching and learning (Quoted by the elders, 2014: 44-45).

According to Krametti (2013), the quality of the educational system can be defined on the basis of each of the elements of the syllabus, namely input, process, product, output, and outcome: the quality of input is the amount Adaptation of system metadata (learner characteristics, teacher capabilities, curriculum, etc.) to predefined standards. Process quality is the degree of satisfaction with teaching-learning and other processes (organizational-organizational and support process). The quality of the product means, to what extent, the system's intermediate outputs (the results of semester exams, upgrading from one academic level to another, etc.) are satisfactory. Output quality is how satisfying the results of the education system (graduates, research results and other scientific work of specialized services provided) are compared to predetermined standards (or goals and expectations). The quality of the outcome is to what extent the employment status of the graduates (from their own perspective, their parents, employers, and the general community using them) is satisfactory (Karamati, 2013: 23-24). Therefore, in evaluating the quality and validation of the curriculum, a systematic thinking and attitude must be in place. And to include all the elements and components of the curriculum, because education is a complex and consequently curriculum, there are several factors that affect its effectiveness, efficiency and overall quality (Wilkinson, D.L., McCarthy M., 2007).

Schwab considers the elements involved in curriculum development including subject, learner, teacher, and context (educational, cultural, social, and physical environments). Schwab argues that all these headings should be coordinated so that none of them are neglected in the curriculum process (Naderi et al., 2016: 31). Tyler offers four elements of purpose, content, methodology and evaluation. Hilda Taba, another scholar in educational planning, expanded Tyler's four elements into seven elements of needs, goals, content, content

organization, learning experiences, organizing learning experiences and evaluation (Fathi Wajargah, 2007 1393: 126). The concept of the program has five basic elements: 1- Purpose 2- Method 3- Tools 4- Practice 5- Evaluation. And about the five elements of a curriculum, there are three principles that are true: 1. At the top of the five pillars of each program is a philosophical umbrella called the ultimate goal or philosophy of doing it. 2- The five elements of the program have a logical order. 3. Each of these elements - including the philosophical umbrella - has decisive and decisive effects on subsequent elements (Parvand, 1992: 3-4).

According to Klein (1991), the components and components of a curriculum are the purpose, time, content, environment, learners' learning activities, grouping learners, learning resources and tools, assessment methods and teaching strategies (According to Mehr Mohammadi, 2002: 57). Acker (2003), based on the Francis Klein model, considers curriculum elements in 10 elements (logic, goals, objectives, content, learning activities, teacher roles, materials and resources, grouping, location, time, and evaluation). It has asserted that other elements than the logic or why element of the syllabus have other elements in common with the Klein pattern (Fathi Wajaragah, 2014: 130). Standardization of the curriculum is one of the key tasks in higher education and at the University of Farhangan to improve quality. As we move to the third millennium, standardization of curriculum quality assessment and validating indicators is a major issue for administrators, planners and practitioners of the higher education system and the University of Culture. Because standards are the criteria and criteria that enable managers to make the right decisions and make the right choices and enable them to achieve the desired perfection in any field. The "Curriculum Standard" is a coherent and balanced expression of the expectations that students have for learning. In fact, these standards refer to the desirable level or quality of learning standards, and the commitment of the educators to improve the curriculum. "Curriculum standards" are a good benchmark for judging at the national, state, and local levels. And provide a structure on which to build a rich and deep local curriculum (Shahmohammadi and Chamanara, 2014: 15).

Setting standards of content and performance in different curricula can be a good starting point for curriculum reform, including decentralization in the curriculum. Although standardization is thought to be applicable only to a centralized education system, Standards in decentralized education are undeniable, and the use of curriculum standards in countries with decentralized education is a testament to this (Shahmohammadi & Chamanara, 2014: 14). Existential Philosophy of Curriculum and its Approach and Logic; 2-Textbook Objectives; 3-Textbook Content Framework; 4-Textbook Teaching Methods; 5-Textbook Evaluation; 6- Teacher Properties to teach the lesson; 7- Characteristics of the textbook and teacher's guidebook, workbook, as well as evaluation and educational software related to the lesson; 8- Predicting the essentials, equipment, and facilities required; Course (Office of Planning and Writing Textbooks, 2000, Moghanizadeh, 2002). Aliari et al. (2012), in the study "Compilation and standardization of quality evaluation indices and validating of undergraduate nursing curriculum in medical sciences universities" considered nine factors as quality and validating factors of curriculum. These include: 1- Curriculum management 2- Curriculum objectives 3- Curriculum content 4- Teaching process - Learning 5- Faculty 6- Students 7- Graduates 8- Space, equipment and time 9- Evaluation of what is learned Students. Keshavarzzadeh, Fermini Farahani (2016) in the study "Designing and Validating the Criteria and Indicators of the Quality Assessment of the High School Curriculum in the Country", five factors were considered as factors of curriculum quality evaluation and validation, which are: Material, human and financial 2- Curriculum tailored to individual and community needs 3- Curriculum content 4- Curriculum flexibility 5- Student satisfaction with curriculum. Abdollahi (2007). In the research "Design of Primary and Secondary School Quality Assessment Indicators System", using the SIP model, which includes four elements:

context, input, process and output, the validation and validation of school quality performance indicators have been investigated. Rajaiipour (2007) in a study "Evaluation of desirable indicators in school management evaluation process from the point of view of principals and high school teachers in Shahrekord", based on research findings from the viewpoints of principals and teachers of the most important indicators in evaluating school management It is about education. They cited indicators of finance, space, and educational equipment, educational staff, student affairs, and school and community relations, respectively, as the most important indicators in evaluating principal performance.

Abbasi and Vakourkashani (2015) in the study "Explaining the place of standardization in promoting the quality of education system" believes that: applying standards in the organization has many benefits. Using them can simplify things, make them interchangeable, increase activity safety and save material, economic and human resources. Implementation of standards in the education system requires compliance with the requirements that are met. They can promote and realize standards as well as sustainability. These include prerequisites, a precise definition of the goals of the education system and its needs, an accurate identification of the community's wishes and ways of achieving them. Increasing the adaptability of the educational system regarding peripheral changes, including changes in the world It is. There are disagreeable views on standardization in the education system. Standardization and the emphasis on the application of standards in evaluating the quality of the educational system has always been the focus of most managers, practitioners and educational planners, and fewer object to the application of standards.

He also stated that, however, one should not be ignorant of the views of opponents of standardization in the education system. Of course, their opposition was not to the creation and application of standards, but to the opposition who believe that full adherence to the standards and neglect of the consequences of its indisputable application to the educational system is problematic. Eliot Eisner (1994) argues that he undermines standardization, creativity and constructivist thinking, multiple intelligences, and the acquisition of all kinds of knowledge. He believes in the creation and application of standards in education, It makes it from the human state to the non-human (factory) state. Given the many views of advocates and dissenters, as well as the significant benefits of standardization and its application to the education system, one cannot object to it 100 percent, but it should be noted that the standards, their captivity and their immersion in the standardization literature are completely ignored. In the education system it is as harmful as neglecting it can be harmful. Therefore, standardization should be used in assessing the quality of the educational system, and on the other hand, the complexities, subtleties and dimensions of the system should not be excused under the pretext of standardization and use. He forgot about it. Department of Education and Virginia (2011) Standards in the Twelve Standards for Validating Standards for Virginia Schools Research Project: Goals and Goals, Management and Leadership, School Improvement Planning, Financial Resources, Equipment, Equipment and School Organizations School safety and health are educational planning and evaluation of student learning. Each contains many criteria and indicators that are used to validate schools in schools (Quoted by Farzadzadeh and Farmini Farahani, 1395: 113).

Bazargan (2015), in the research "Higher Education Standards: From Idea to Reality" stated that: European Community standards for quality assurance of universities and institutes of higher education consist of three categories: 1- Seven standards For Internal Evaluation, -2 Eight Standards for External Evaluation, -3 Eight Standards for Executing Evaluation and Validating Organizations (Bazargan, 1394: 17-18): 1- How to approve, monitor and periodically evaluate training programs; 2- Evaluation of students' academic achievement; -3 Guaranteeing the quality of faculty performance; -4 Learning materials and support facilities;

-5-System Informative for effective management; -6 detailed information science programs and educational courses; 8. Kht¬Mshy¬Ha and forecasting practices to determine quality. External Quality Assessment Standards are: 1- External evaluation based on the approved Internal Evaluation Framework, Standard One, 2- External evaluation procedures prior to implementation; Approved 4- Externalizing evaluation processes over the final goals and specific goals of the evaluated university; 5-Preparing and publishing an external evaluation report to inform and use stakeholders; 6- Action to improve and follow-up; 7- External evaluation periodically at specified times; 8- Analyzing the results of evaluations throughout the system. Excellent cross-sectional evaluation and validation by the Institute.

The standards of the validating and evaluation organizations are as follows: 1- Using recommended external evaluation processes; 2- Confirmed competence of the evaluation and validating institutes; 3- External evaluation of the quality of universities and higher education institutes. Periodically and regularly; 4- Having enough financial resources and manpower to perform external quality assurance; 5- Exactly expressing the goals, objectives, methods and how to perform external evaluation; 6- Organizational independence and Evaluation and Validating of the Institute so that the executive processes and the results of the external evaluation and its recommendations are affected The influence of others, including the heads of higher education institutions, ministers and other stakeholders, should not be affected; 7- The criteria, indicators and methods used for external evaluation should be pre-identified and made available to all; 8- Evaluation and validating bodies should identify ways of responding and be publicly available.

Hong Kong Ministry of Education (2011 & 2012) in Research Project "Advanced Standards for Validating for School Quality Systems in Hong Kong" identifies the factors, criteria, and indicators for quality assurance in their school systems. It can include goals and objectives, management and leadership, school improvement planning, financial resources, equipments, school organization and atmosphere, school safety and health, educational planning and student learning assessment (Quoted by Farzadeh and Farahmani Farahani, 1395: 113). Bazargan (2015), in his research "Higher Education Standards: From Idea to Reality", stated that: In addition to North American countries and European Community countries, some other countries, including Australia, have developed higher education standards. In Australia, higher education standards are defined in five categories: (1) standards for higher education providers (universities) and other institutions (2) standards for higher education; (3) standards for teaching learning; (4) standards. Related to the research; (5) Information standards on the specifications of the courses and programs offered (Bazargan, 2015: 18).

Bazargan (2015), in his research "Higher Education Standards: From Idea to Reality," states that: Each American Evaluation and Validating Association, according to the community of universities and institutes of higher education covered by the standards themselves, they formulate and apply to higher education colleges and institutes to judge the quality of higher education. One of the US Middel Stave validating and validating bodies employs 14 standards: 1- Mission, Overall Objectives and Specific Goals of Higher Education Unit; 2- Planning, Resource Allocation and How to Review Organizational Activities; 3- Timeline; 4- Leadership and Administration; 5- Support and Administrative Affairs; 6- Intervention and Integrity of Activities; 7- Assessment and Feedback of Activities; 8. How to Accept Students; 10- Faculty; 11- Courses and educational programs implemented; 12- Public education; 13- Other related educational activities; 14- Student evaluation and involvement (Bazargan, 2015: 16).

Research methods

The present study is of applied nature in terms of nature and purpose. Since the results of this study lead to management decisions and curriculum reform of the Department of Educational Sciences of North Khorasan University of Technology. The research method in this study is qualitative and quantitative, which is a descriptive-survey type. The statistical population of the study includes faculty members, visiting professors and staff who teach in the second semester of the academic year 1996-1997 in Bachelor of Education in North Khorasan Cultural University. The statistical sample of the study, due to the limited population of the statistical population, comprises a total of 77 statistical populations. In this study, due to the limited population, sampling is not necessary, and data are collected through a complete census of the population (census). Therefore, the sampling method is the census method. The data collection tool was survey, interview and questionnaire. In the qualitative part of the research, recruitment has been done through the study of internal, external research and literature review, and the background to quality and validating evaluation, especially curriculum validating factors, criteria and indicators. Then, in order to determine the factors, criteria and indicators of curriculum evaluation and validating, eight faculty members and visiting professors were purposefully selected (according to field of study and years of service and responsibility) and in 18 sessions guided interviews semi-structured, centered around curriculum factors, criteria, and indicators whose contents (semantic units) were recorded and coded, and after editing and arranging, a researcher-made questionnaire and response package containing an introduction. It had a rational and concise look, was designed and adjusted. To standardize and weight the factors, criteria and indicators of quality assessment of the undergraduate curriculum of North Khorasan University of Education, a questionnaire was given to 17 faculty members who were purposefully selected and instructed by professors. They were asked to study the questionnaire carefully and incorporate their ideas into curriculum factors, criteria, and indicators in the open space.

Finally, 7 faculty members, whose fields of study are Measurement, Persian Language and Literature, Management and Curriculum Development, Management (Future Research), Sociology of Social Research Tendency, Philosophy of Education and Training, corrected the defects of the questionnaire and confirmed its validity. Internal consistency or Cronbach's alpha was used to determine reliability. And the questionnaire, consisting of 12 factors, 33 criteria and 212 markers, was provided to 40 members of the statistical sample during various sessions (due to the high number of questionnaire questions) in a pilot study, to the degree of importance of the questions and statements. Its effects range from very low to very high. After collecting the questionnaires, the reliability of the curriculum factors was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient through spss software. The obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated 0.986 for the whole questionnaire. Since the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was greater than 0.700, the reliability of the questionnaire was considered acceptable. In the quantitative part of the research, a researcher-made questionnaire was completed by statistical sample after determining validity and reliability in order to standardize and weight the factors, criteria and indicators of curriculum quality evaluation and validation. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the research data. In descriptive statistics, data were analyzed using frequency distribution table, mean calculation and dispersion indices including standard deviation. Inferential statistics, in this study to standardize the factors, criteria and indices of the one-sample T-test, to rank the factors, criteria and indices of the Friedman test, to determine the weight and importance of the factors. One-way analysis of variance was used to evaluate the effect of statistical community characteristics on the quality of the syllabus.

Findings

The present study was conducted in three stages:

1- Based on internal and external studies and researches related to curriculum quality assessment and validating standards as well as semi-structured interviews with faculty members of North Khorasan University of Culture, 12 factors, 33 Criteria and 212 markers for quality evaluation and validating of the undergraduate curriculum of North Khorasan University of Education were prepared and proposed;

2- 1 proposed questionnaire was reviewed by experts from North Khorasan University of Culture. It includes: Teaching Process Agent - Learning with 4 Criteria 28 indicators, educational goals factor with 4 criteria and 25 indicators, physical space factor with 1 criterion and 7 indicators, welfare and spiritual services factor with 3 criteria and 18 indicators, educational materials and equipment with 2 criteria and 11 indicators, factor Faculty members with 4 criteria and 21 indicators, Evaluation factor with 4 criteria and 22 indicators, Stakeholders with 2 criteria and 19 indicators, Content factor with 6 criteria and 31 indicators, Time factor with 1 criterion and 7 indicators, Logic factor And why with 1 criterion and 11 indicators and management and leadership factor with 1 criterion and 12 indicators for curriculum quality assessment and validation. Finally, the reliability of the researcher-made questionnaire in a pilot study was confirmed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.986;

3- For rating, standardization and marker weight determination, the questionnaire was answered by the statistical sample. The results of descriptive statistics show that 27.3% of the sample are female and 72.7% are male, 35.1% have a master's degree, 44.1% are PhD students and 20.8% They have a doctorate degree. 11.7% have served less than 10 years, 22.1% have served 10 to 20 years, 45.4% have served between 20 and 30 years, and 20.8% have served more than 31 years. 23.4% teach at Imam Jafar Sadegh campus, 58.4% at Imam Mohammad Bagher campus and 18.2% teach at both campuses. 96.1% are married and 3.9% are single. 15.6% are faculty members, 70.1% are visiting professors and 14.3% are university staff.

Table 1- Curriculum Factor Ratings (Friedman Test)

Raw	Factor	Factor rank	P – value	Mean factor
1	Curriculum content	8.68	0.000	4.4365
2	Management and leadership	8.32	0.000	4.3820
3	The teaching process - learning	7.75	0.000	4.3734
4	Faculty Members	7.62	0.000	4.3704
5	Training materials	7.39	0.000	4.3093
6	Physical space	6.71	0.000	4.2245
7	Assessment	6.13	0.000	4.2302
8	Logic and why	5.99	0.000	4.1677
9	Educational Objectives	5.79	0.000	4.2255
10	Stakeholders	5.49	0.000	4.1975
11	Spiritual services	5.05	0.000	4.0996
12	Time	3.08	0.000	3.8126

Friedman test was used to rank the factors of curriculum. According to Table 1, the highest rank is related to curriculum content factor with 8.68 and the smallest time factor with

3.08. Since p-Value is zero in this test with three decimal places. Therefore, ranking of curriculum factors is significant and with 99% probability of all (12 factors) curriculum influencing the level of curriculum quality improvement. One-sample T-test was used to standardize the factors and criteria for evaluating curriculum quality and validating. In the T-test of a sample, the mean of factors, criteria and markers is compared with a hypothetical constant number. Given the numerical value assigned to the Likert sequential scale (Very Low: 1, Low: 2, Average: 3, High: 4, and Very High 5), the expected mean or Test-value of the present study is 3. The research hypothesis is = 3μ. Therefore, the statistical hypotheses are H0: μ <= 3 versus H1: μ> 3. In all tests performed, H0 is the claimant's claim and H1 is the claimant's. A one-sample t-test was performed on 12 factors and 33 criteria and 212 markers. In all factor tests and markers except marker 183, the P-value was with three decimal places. Therefore, in all tests H0 was rejected and H1 hypothesis was confirmed with 99% confidence. The p-value of marker 183 in the test is 0.691 which is greater than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is confirmed and the opposite assumption is rejected with 0.05 and 0.01% error levels and the significance of marker 183 - Weekly intensive curriculum (three days a week) - Improves the quality of the curriculum.

Table 2: Quantitative to Qualitative Conversion Scale on the Impact of Curriculum Factors and Criteria on the Quality of the Undergraduate Education Curriculum.

Quantitative decision making criterion	5	4.7-4.9	4.4-4.6	4.1-4.3	4	3.7-3.9	3.4-3.6	3.1-3.3	3
Qualitive decision making criterion	Extreme								

For the effect of curriculum factors and criteria on curriculum quality, the quantitative-qualitative word conversion scale in Table 2 and the results on standardization of curriculum quality evaluation factors and criteria are presented in Tables 3 and 4, respectively.

Table 3 - Evaluation of the Impacts and Elements of Quality Assessment and Curriculum Validation on the Quality of Curriculum through One-Sample T-Test.

Row	Factor	Sample mean	sd	(Test Value)	P – value
1	The teaching process – learning	4/3734	0/35909	3	0/001
2	Educational Objectives	4/2255	0/40189	3	0/001
3	Physical space	4/2245	0/60761	3	0/001
4	Spiritual services	4/0996	0/60365	3	0/001
5	Training materials	4/3093	0/61803	3	0/001
6	Faculty Members	4/3704	0/42153	3	0/001
7	assessment	4/2302	0/43781	3	0/001
8	Grouping of stakeholders	4/1975	0/43310	3	0/001
9	Curriculum content	4/4365	0/39593	3	0/001
10	Time	3/8126	0/50255	3	0/001
11	Logic and why	4/1677	0/55613	3	0/001
12	Management and leadership	4/3820	0/48842	3	0/001

Table 3, examining the impact of the quality assessment and validating factors of the undergraduate curriculum on the quality of the syllabus through a one-sample t-test, shows that the content factor of the syllabus, with a mean of 4.4365, is the most influential and time factor of the syllabus. With an average of 3.8126 had the least effect on the quality of the undergraduate curriculum in the field of education. In this test, the P-value with three decimal places is zero. Therefore, in this test H0 was rejected and H1 assumption was confirmed with 99% confidence. That is, the mean difference between the sample and the test value is significant.

Table 4 - Evaluation of the Impact of Quality Assessment and Validating Criteria on Educational Quality in Curriculum Quality through One-Sample T-Test.

Row	Criterion	Mean	Sd	(Test Value)	P – value
1	Teaching strategies and methods	4/5563	0/40158	3	0/001
2	Instructional Design	4/3173	0/49249	3	0/001
3	Keeping education with research	4/2353	0/47120	3	0/001
4	Teaching Culture - Learning	4/4304	0/47010	3	0/001
5	Characteristics of behavioral goals	4/2319	0/42355	3	0/001
6	Matching goals to the characteristics and needs of students	4/3420	0/53728	3	0/001
7	Adaptation of educational objectives to the needs of the community	4/1905	0/55059	3	0/001
8	Coherence and coordination of educational goals	4/1364	0/48721	3	0/001
9	Features of Educational, Workshop, Laboratory, Welfare and Green Space building	4/2245	0/60761	3	0/001
10	Services Consulting	4/0501	0/71532	3	0/001
11	Sport and nutrition services	4/1602	0/62093	3	0/001
12	Spiritual Services	4/0961	0/82309	3	0/001
13	Books and libraries	4/2835	0/69777	3	0/001
14	Electronic equipment and ICT	4/3403	0/61393	3	0/001
15	Academic Degree	4/4675	0/50431	3	0/001
16	Educational and research activities of faculty members	4/3939	0/54203	3	0/001
17	Faculty interaction with students	4/2675	0/47750	3	0/001
18	Continuing education of faculty members	4/3481	0/57069	3	0/001
19	Systematic Evaluation of Faculty Members' Performance	4/1429	0/56624	3	0/001
20	Student evaluation	4/3792	0/51153	3	0/001
21	Evaluation practices	4/2251	0/50925	3	0/001
22	self-assessment	4/2045	0/66852	3	0/001
23	Grouping of stakeholders	4/1748	0/47511	3	0/001
24	Graduates, Education Managers and Student Parents	4/2468	0/53230	3	0/001
25	Observe the principles of importance and usefulness	4/4304	0/46609	3	0/001
26	Content validity	4/3939	0/46822	3	0/001
27	Content fit with students' needs and	4/4364	0/48853	3	0/001

	characteristics				
28	Content Balance (Curriculum Legislation)	4/4740	0/46344	3	0/001
29	Organize content	4/3539	0/47008	3	0/001
30	Creativity and thinking	4/5325	0/45377	3	0/000
31	Schedule weekly exams and classes	3/8126	0/50255	3	0/000
32	The logic and why of the syllabus	4/1677	0/55613	3	0/000
33	Management and leadership of curriculum elements	4/3820	0/48842	3	0/000

Table 4, examining the impact of the quality assessment and validating standards of the undergraduate curriculum on the quality of the syllabus through a one-sample T-test, shows that the criterion of teaching strategies and teaching methods with a mean of 4.5563 has the most impact. And the weekly planning criterion for classes and exams with a mean of 3.8126 had the least effect on the quality of the undergraduate curriculum in the field of education. In this test, the P-value with three decimal places is zero. Therefore, in this test H0 was rejected and H1 assumption was confirmed with 99% confidence. That is, the mean difference between the sample and the test value is significant.

Table 5- Weighting the Quality Assessment Factors and Curriculum Validation

Row	Factor	Mean	Weight of the factors in the quality of the curriculum
1	The teaching process - learning	4/37	0/0860
2	Educational Objectives	4/23	0/0831
3	Physical space	4/22	0/0831
4	Spiritual services	4/10	0/0807
5	Training materials	4/31	0/0848
6	Faculty Members	4/37	0/0860
7	assessment	4/23	0/0832
8	Stakeholders	4/20	0/0826
9	Curriculum content	4/44	0/0873
10	Time	3/81	0/0750
11	Logic and why	4/17	0/0820
12	Management and leadership	4/38	0/0862

In this study, weights of quality evaluation and curriculum validation factors were calculated using weighted average. Table 5 shows that content factor weighing 8.73 had the highest weight and effect and time factor weighing 7.50 had the lowest weight and effect on curriculum quality. In this study, weights were used to determine the weight, importance and prioritization of factors, criteria and indicators of curriculum quality evaluation and validation. In the factor of teaching - learning process, the indicator "Observing the effective factors in teaching methods (readiness, motivation, past experiences, learning environment and..." with the highest weight of 0383 and the indicator "scientific - research journal or University - weighting 0.0307 had the lowest weight. In terms of educational goals, the indicators of "Goal Performance" and "Relevance of Educational Goals to Life Skills, Communication and Information Skills" with the weight of 0.4278 were the highest and "Educational Goals Fit to Feminist Identity" with the weight of 0.3516 had the least weight. In the physical space factor, the indicator was "150% of the weight of educational, workshop, laboratory and amenities with heating, cooling, ICT technology" and "observance of

architectural and engineering principles with regard to teaching." Islamic Religious and Architectural in Educational, Workshop, Laboratory and Welfare Buildings »with the lowest weight was 0. 1304. In terms of welfare and spiritual services, the indicators of "reinforcing intrinsic values rather than extrinsic values of students" had the highest weight of 0.89595 and "telephone counseling" of 0.4892 had the lowest. In terms of educational materials, the indicators of "teaching ICT to students" with the weight of 0.9534 were the highest and the index of "Able to book or book via the Internet" with 0.8657 were the lowest. In terms of faculty members, it indicates the "teaching experience of faculty members in education (acquaintance with elementary concepts)" with a weight of 0.4698 and indicates "age gap between faculty members and students and rapid changes in values" with the lowest weight was 0.4373. In the evaluation factor, the indicator of "evaluation expertise" with the weight of 0.4814 was the highest and the indicator "Evaluation of the amount of power and scientific influence of faculty members or number of highly cited lecturer articles" with weight of 4242.0 had the least weight. In the beneficiary's factor, the index of "Students' interest in the field of study, teaching job and university" with a weight of 0.84545 and the most "Indicators of NGOs" and "Student participation in weekly program planning, exams" "Unit selection and master selection per semester" weighed 0.4830 the lowest. In the content factor, the index of "Creation and creativity in students" had the highest weight of 0.3380 and the index of "content content according to the gender of the audience" had the lowest weight of 0.2898. In the time factor, the marker "Weekly syllabus during the week and at optimum hours" was 0.1635 and the marker "Weekly syllabus intensive (three days a week)" with the lowest weight was 0.1099. In the Logic, What and Why of the Curriculum, the indicators "Knowledge of the Reasons and Why of Educational Goals Selection" and "Knowledge of the Philosophy of Teaching - Learning Strategies" with the weight of 0.9433 are the most and markers of "Reason to Build Educational and Welfare Facilities with Special Architecture" Weight 0.8668 had the lowest weight. In the curriculum management and leadership factor, the indicator "Systematic attitude and attention to all the elements and elements of the curriculum" with 0.8841 weight was highest and the indicator "Creating management information systems for decision making" with weight 0.7977 was the lowest yhey had.

Table 6: One-way ANOVA or ANOVA Analysis of Curriculum Factors in Multiple Population Samples by Degree, Working Status, Degree, and Gender

Factor	F teachers academic degree statue test	P – value	F teachers work statue test	P – value	F teachers major statue test	P - value	Teachers' Gender F Test	P- value
The teaching process - learning	0/924	0/401	0/555	0/576	0/466	0/856	0/116	0/734
Educational Objectives	0/263	0/770	1/122	0/331	0/663	0/702	0/028	0/867
Physical space	0/415	0/662	0/462	0/632	0/347	0/929	2/495	0/118
Spiritual services	1/286	0/282	1/235	0/297	0/352	0/927	0/948	0/333
Training materials	0/520	0/596	1/641	0/201	1/494	0/184	3/908	0/052
Faculty Members	0/388	0/680	0/630	0/535	1/136	0/351	0/464	0/498
assessment	2/361	0/101	1/024	0/364	0/622	0/736	0/009	0/295
Stakeholders	0/672	0/514	0/993	0/375	0/927	0/491	1/910	0/171
Content	2/429	0/095	0/989	0/377	1/306	0/261	0/795	0/376

Time	3/238	0/045	1/969	0/147	1/136	0/351	5/971	0/017
Logic and why	1/932	0/152	0/410	0/665	0/429	0/881	1/961	0/165
Management and leadership	0/624	0/538	0/115	0/891	0/554	0/791	0/596	0/443

One-way ANOVA was used to calculate the effect of statistical community characteristics on the quality of the curriculum. One-way analysis of variance is in fact a generalized form of comparison of two averages, in which the averages of more than two populations are compared together. The assumption is that the average curriculum factors are the same between the three groups of professors (Ph.D., Ph.D. and Master's degree), the three groups of professors in terms of work status (faculty members, visiting professors, and university staff), eight professors in the field of study (1- Management, Planning, Philosophy, Technology and Measurement and Measurement, 2- Counseling and Psychology, 3- English Language and Persian Literature Language, 4- History, Social Sciences and Geography, 5- Statistics, Mathematics and Computing, 6- Jurisprudence, Islamic Studies and Quranic Sciences, 7- Physical Education and Art, and 8- Chemistry and Medicinal Plants) and two groups of professors (gender and Rejections were tested by one-way analysis of variance, the result of which according to Table 6 shows that the P-value of all curriculum factors in all groups of professors, except for factor 10, in the three groups. Professors were higher than 0.05 in terms of education and two groups of professors, and at the error levels of 0.05 and 0.01, the null hypothesis based on the uniformity of the syllabus averages was confirmed. The difference between the mean of all curriculum factors except factor 10 was not significant in the three groups of university professors in terms of degree and the two groups of teachers in terms of gender. P-value of curriculum time factor in three groups of professors (doctoral degree, doctoral student and master's degree) is 0.045 and two groups of professors (male and female) is 0.017 because it is less than 0.05 The null hypothesis is rejected with the error level of 0.05 and the opposite assumption is confirmed. That is, the mean difference in time factor between the doctorate, doctoral and postgraduate students and male and female professors is significant and with 95% confidence the contrary assumption is confirmed.

Discussion

The curriculum forms the core of all education activities. And as part of the educational planning process, it is one of the fundamental factors that make up the quality of the educational system that can make the University of Farhangi achieve its goals. Therefore, it should be tailored to the needs of learners and the community and be responsive to change and the needs and needs of these developments. To understand this, the curriculum must be constantly evaluated and reviewed. In order to evaluate the quality of the curriculum, according to the conditions and possibilities of the educational system, we need to formulate and standardize the factors, criteria and indicators to compare the current educational system with the standards. In the present study, the factors, criteria and indicators developed to evaluate the quality and validation of the curriculum have the following characteristics:

1- With the entry into the Third Millennium and the evolving world, the role of higher education and consequently, the role of the University of Culture has changed. In the meantime, the curriculum, which transmits information and provides the basis for knowledge building and acquisition of skills, should be given special attention in terms of quality. For this purpose, according to the results of the present study, a list of the most important and most important factors, criteria and indicators (12 factors, 33 criteria and 211 indicators), for curriculum quality assessment, validation, formulation and standardization According to Friedman tests, univariate T and weighting of curriculum factors (Tables 1, 3, 4 and 5) were

confirmed with 99% confidence. This collection is a very important document for evaluating the quality and validating of the curriculum of educational sciences in North Khorasan University of Technology.

2- According to Friedman tests, univariate T and weighting of curriculum factors (Tables 1, 3 and 5), curriculum content factor in the present study was highest in terms of mean, weight and effect on curriculum quality. Among the factors of the curriculum, therefore, the content is considered as one of the main components of the curriculum from the viewpoint of the faculty members of North Khorasan Farhangian University. In other words, agency is given to the content and the rules of education, which is the interactive relation of teacher and student, are faded into the education system and consequently into the curriculum. Therefore, as it is centralized to manage the higher education system and the Farhangian University, it is recommended that the content and subject lines of undergraduate courses in the field of education be formulated and formulated by specialized, efficient and effective committees. Assign content to other curriculum elements including the needs of students and stakeholders, faculty theories, educational goals, teaching-learning strategies, teaching materials, physical space, time, technology and information technology. And formulate and communicate communications. That each of the curriculum elements fit into the curriculum context. Unless each of the elements of the syllabus is put in its proper place (syllabus syllabus), any false slogan may be created at any time without a factor over this syllable and occupy us a few hours. And finally, it goes to silence.

3. In the present study, the quality and validating factors of the curriculum include: teaching-learning process, educational goals, physical space, welfare and spiritual services, teaching materials, faculty, evaluation, stakeholders, Content, timing, logic and why, are management and leadership, are confirmed by Friedman test and univariate T test. According to education experts' views on curriculum elements, the nine elements of Klein and Decker's elements are the most comprehensive and refer to more variables in the curriculum, 2007) (Wilkinson DL, McCarthy M Knows the constituent elements of curriculum including goals, content, teaching-learning strategies, materials and resources, learner learning activities, evaluation methods, grouping learners, time and space (Mehr Mohammadi, 2002, quoted Fathi Wajaragah, 2014: 127. According to Francis Klein's model, Aker has taken elements of the curriculum into 10 elements that focus on the "logic or why" element other than The other elements are in common with Klein's model (Fathi Vajjarah, 1393: 130) It can be concluded that the present study covers all the main elements and components of the curriculum which are all in line with Klein and Acker theory. Attention to all elements of the curriculum reflects a systematic attitude to education and curriculum, and each of these elements has a place and value in the quality of the curriculum, which no other component can replace. It is suggested that the administrators and stakeholders of the Higher Education System and the North Khorasan University of Technology are incorporating all the elements and elements of the undergraduate curriculum. Tet Education confirmed in this study, consideration has to be Dodecagon System is the curriculum, to improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of higher education and university teachers and preserved.

4. The present study not only covers the factors of the curriculum of Klein and Acer, but also other factors such as welfare and spiritual factors, management and leadership factors in the quality of the curriculum. Management and Leadership Factor After content factor ranking, average, weight and quality of curriculum influence, it is ranked second among curriculum factors (Tables 1, 3 and 5). Considering the centrality of the Farhangian University administration and the lack of attention to local and regional needs, the role of faculty members in coordinating the curriculum elements of the university, as well as the coordination and consideration of all curriculum elements in the quality of the program, A

lesson is very important, so for faculty members of North Khorasan University of Technology, management and leadership play an important role in this coordination and attention to all factors of the curriculum. Therefore, it is suggested that the provincial administration be given more authority to coordinate curriculum elements, in order to create more coherent coordination between curriculum elements. The Welfare and Spiritual Services Agent, which encompasses the standards of counseling and medical, sports, and nutritional, spiritual services, has been endorsed by faculty members who reflect on the mental and physical health needs of learners. Based on this finding, it is suggested that Farhangian University should pay more attention to the above-mentioned services in order to improve the quality of the curriculum's impact on curriculum elements.

5. Formulation and standardization of the factors, criteria and indicators for quality and validation evaluation have been carried out in the following steps: 1- Drafting the factors, criteria and indicators from semantic units coded from semi-structured interviews. Structured Professors. 2. Refining, drafting of factors, criteria and indicators by experts. 3. Obtaining a consensus among the experts on the refinement of the criteria and markers factors, as required by the relevant questionnaire at the end of each factor, if in addition to the mentioned factors, criteria and markers Consider other things to mention. 4. Final validation of the questionnaire by faculty members.

The above measures include the formulation and standardization of factors, criteria and indicators, indicating localization and attention to local needs, facilities and conditions. 6- Based on one-way ANOVA test (Table 6), the lower rank, mean and weight factor of the syllabus is due to the difference between the mean time factor, between male and female professors as well as professors with A doctoral degree, a doctoral student and a master's degree are significant. In the present study, in terms of male professors as well as PhD students, the time factor among curriculum factors had the least effect on the quality of educational curriculum in North Khorasan Farhangian University.

References

1. Bazargan, A. (2015). Higher Education Standards: From Ideal to Reality, Higher Education Letter, New Course, Eighth Year, (30), 11-23.

2. Walker R. (2008). Health information and public health. Health Inf. Manag. J.; 37, 4–5.

3. Yasnoff W., O'Carroll P., Koo D., Linkins R. & Kilbourne E. (2006), Public health informatics: Improving and transforming public health in the information age. J. Public Health Manag. Pact, 6, 67–75.

4. Venkatarao E., Patil R.R., Prasad D., Anasuya A. & Samuel R. (2012). Monitoring data quality in syndromic surveillance: Learnings from a resource limited setting. J. Glob. Infect. Dis. 2012; 4, 120–127. (doi: 10.4103/0974-777X.96778)

5. Chen H., Yu P. & Wang N. (2012). Do we have the reliable data? An exploration of data quality information system in China. Stud. Health Technol. Inform.; 192, 1042–1042.

6. Zarei Zavaraki, I. & Maghami, H.R. (1396). Evaluation of Small Educational Systems, Tehran, Position.

7. Bazargan, A. (2001). "Evaluation Approaches of the Institute of Higher Education", Secretariat of the Iranian Association for Educational Research, Tehran, 1-16.

8. Khanifar, H. (2004). Introduction to Standardization of Human Resources in Education, Journal of Psychology and Education Sciences, Thirty-Fourth Year, (2), 153-174.

9. The World, R. (2014). Providing a Framework for Standardizing Human Resource Development in Educational Systems, Journal of Human Resource Education and Development, 1 (2), 81-102.

10. Keshavarzzadeh, A. & Farmini Farahani, M. (2016). Designing and Validating Criteria and Indicators of High School Curriculum Quality Assessment: A Case Study, Quarterly Journal of Qualitative Research in Curriculum Planning, 1 (2), 107-141.

11. Bazargan, A. and Farasatkhah, M. (1396). Monitoring and Evaluation in Higher Education, Tehran, Khome Publications.

12. Mashayekh, F. (2014). New Perspectives on Educational Planning, Khome Publications, Tehran.

13. The World, R. (2014). Providing a Framework for Standardizing Human Resource Development in Educational Systems, Journal of Human Resource Education and Development, 1 (2), 81-102.

14. Encyclopedia of educational research (1992), 2 (Y), Macmillan publishing company.

15. International network for quality assurance agencies in higher (INQAAHE) (2003), quality assurance agencies. Dublin: HETAC.

16. Hashemi, S.H. & Puraminizadeh, S. (2011). "Analysis of Validating Model and Internal Evaluation for Evaluation and Quality Assurance in the University System", 5th Conference on "Quality Evaluation in the University System", University of Tehran, Campus of Technical Schools, May 2011.

17. Hallak, I. (1995), Managing Schools for Educational Quality and Equity: Finding the proper Mix to Make It work, in j. Hallak and F. Caillods (Eds), Educational planning: The International Dimension, parise: Enesco, IIEP.

18. Aliari, S. et al. (2012). Developing and Standardizing the Indicators of Quality Assessment and Validating of the Nursing Curriculum of Nursing in Medical Sciences of Iran, Journal of Army Medical Sciences University of Iran, 10 (1), 50-61.

19. Alikhani Kashkak, R. (2009). Comprehensive Quality Management with TQMEX Approach - Tehran - Jahan Jam Jam Publishing Institute - First Edition.

20. Keramati, MR (2013). Curriculum Evaluation, Tehran, Roshd Publications.

21. Wilkinson D.L., McCarthy M. (2007). Use of comparative data for integrated cancer services. BMC Health Serv. Res; 7-204 (doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-7-204).

22. Naderi, N., Norouzi, R.A. & Siadat, S.A., Education Policy Making (2016). Esfahan, Yarmana Publications.

23. Parvand, M.H. (1371). Basics of Educational and Curriculum Planning, Tehran, Sahifeh Publications.

24. Fathi Wajargah, C. (2014). Basic Principles and Concepts of Curriculum Planning, Tehran, Publisher of Professors Science.

25. Mehr Mohammadi, M. (2002). Curriculum: Views, Approaches and Perspectives, Mashhad, Astan Qods Razavi Publications.

26. Shahmohammadi, N. & Chamanara, A. (2014). Curriculum Standardization, What and Why and Its Essentials, Growth Journal, Educational Technology, 7, Bit and Ninth Course.

27. Moghanizadeh, M.H. (2002). Evaluation of Standards in the Curriculum System of Elementary School Social Studies Course in 2003-2004. Institute for Educational Research and Planning.

28. Abdollahi, B. (2007). "System Design of Primary and Secondary School Quality Assessment Indicators", Journal of Education, Twenty-third Year, (2)

29. Rajaiipour, S. et al. (2007). "Evaluation of Desirable Indicators in School Management Evaluation Process from the Perspective of Principals and Secondary School Teachers in Kurdish City", Journal of Educational Management of Garmsar Azad University, 1 (2).

30. Abbasi, E. & VakhorKashani, M.S. (2015). Explaining the Position of Standardization in Promoting Educational Quality System, Iranian Journal of Engineering Education, 17th Year, (65).