

The Driving Force of Evaluation at Higher Education Institutions in Serbia

Professional paper

UDC 378:005.962.131

KEY WORDS: evaluation, teacher, student, higher education institutions

ABSTRACT- In this paper, the focus is on the evaluation of teachers' work at higher education institutions in Serbia. On the one hand, evaluation enables the faculties to reveal how teachers work, and on the other hand, due to the feedback the teacher can undertake corrective measures in order to improve their work. The aim of this study is to research the evaluation at the faculties in Serbia. The results were obtained by the quantitative and qualitative method of research. 432 professors from all universities in Serbia participated in the study. The results show that evaluation at faculties does exist, but it does not meet the expectations of teachers. In order to get complete results related to evaluative processes, the opinions of students and faculties' management should be investigated in future researches.

Strokovni članek

UDK 378:005.962.131

KLJUČNE BESEDE: evalvacija, učitelj, študent, visokošolske institucije

POVZETEK – V prispevku je poudarek na evalvaciji dela visokošolskih učiteljev na visokošolskih institucijah v Srbiji. Na eni strani, evalvacija omogoča fakultetam, da ugotovijo, kako posamezni učitelji delajo, na drugi strani pa lahko na podlagi povratne informacije učitelji tudi svoje delo izboljšujejo. Cilj raziskave je raziskati evalvacijo na fakultetah v Srbiji. Rezultate smo pridobili z kvantitativno in kvalitativno metodo, v raziskavi pa je sodelovalo 432 profesorjev iz vseh univerz v Srbiji. Podatki kažejo, da na fakultetah sicer izvajajo evalvacijo, ampak ne v skladu s pričakovanji učiteljev. Da bi lahko dobili popolne rezultate s področja procesov evalvacije, je potrebno v prihodnosti pridobiti še mnenja študentov in vodstva fakultet.

1 Introduction

In recent years, evaluation of teachers' work at faculties induces a lot of polemics for which there are more reasons. Serbia is a country in transition, over and above the economic problems, it has also a crisis of creating the value systems. There are increasing doubts in the work of faculties and their teachers. Various reports in the media about false diplomas and false doctorates contributed to it. The faculties, traditionally closed institutions to external happenings, did not timely react to eliminate the doubt on their correctness by giving enough information about their work.

Because of all this, the evaluation of teachers' work is conducted in difficult and uncertain circumstances. Bologna reform of higher education has brought the obligatory self-evaluation and student evaluation of the teachers. Of course, there is the possibility of additional techniques and evaluation models of teachers' work. The resistance of teachers towards and support of the evaluation by educational authorities appeared. While teachers say that evaluation diminishes the educational process, the educational authorities see the evaluation as an important developing element. Today

the evaluation got wider dimensions. It can be said that evaluation now involves consideration of the entire educational process.

Definition of the evaluation has been changing over time, as the process of evaluation has been changed as well. Evaluation (its models and methods) has been changed in recent years. From complete confidence in measurement expressed by quantitative indicators, it led to the creating larger number of evaluation models, where the other actors participate beside the teachers and students (Pavlović, 2016).

Janković and Jarić (2009) define the evaluation as “the process of attributing the value to someone or something in relation to previously set criteria and standards”. There are two basic elements of this definition. The first says about the evaluation of work, and other about the possibility of evaluation (measurement) only with the set criteria and standards. In such a way, the authors divided themselves in the area of evaluation of pedagogical work. On the one hand, we have the authors whom it is important to quantify teachers’ work through testing and abilities of students (Ebel, 1979; Potkonjak, 1972). On the other hand, however, we have authors who, with all the quantification, pay attention to achieving appointed standards and criteria of evaluation (House, 1990; Pešić, 2000). Clift, Imrie (1980) and Vilotijević (1982) go even further, highlighting the need that evaluation, besides quantification and reaching appointed standards, needs to answer the question: Which corrections should be undertaken based on the obtained results?

According to highlighted author’s opinions, we conclude that evaluation should be in function of change and educational development. The evaluation should not at all be considered as an utter measurement of teachers’ work because of measuring, but due to qualitative improvement of work based on the obtained information.

In his paper, Cashin (1989) mentions even nine evaluation models of teachers’ work. The first is self-evaluation, which should be the most significant because the teacher undertakes the steps by himself for improvement of his work and answers the question why he works good or poor. The second model is an evaluation by using the data about the teacher, which are obtained at the faculty. Usually, administration or teacher (portfolio) collects the data about performance: presence in the classroom, assessment, keeping record, preparation of programs, participation in the work of the faculty. These are valuable data on the basis of which certain conclusions could be made about professors’ performance (Centra, 1993). Evaluation of teachers by the students is the third model of evaluation of teachers’ work, and it classifies as the most significant. Students are in the focus of the teacher’s work and, logically, the conclusion is that they are the first who should evaluate the performance of the teacher. One of the reasons for that could be a desire to prevent lower interest in the future students and quitting of current students of a particular faculty. The forth evaluation model includes colleagues who have knowledge about the subject (colleagues from the specific expert group or department) which is taught by the teacher who is being evaluated.

Colleagues who do not have the knowledge of those fields in which the evaluating teacher is an expert (all teachers - colleagues on a faculty) belong to the sixth evaluation model. Evaluation by the dean is considered as the seventh model. The dean can be

a supervisor who is interested in teachers' work at the highest level. In this situation, they will undertake the responsibility for the evaluation of teachers. The eighth model of evaluation belongs to the administration. Administration's working on the evaluation of teachers' performance is similar to collecting data about a teacher (portfolio), however, it is about specialised service for collecting data about the teacher's performance. The ninth model suggests the engagement of consulting-expert service beyond the faculty, which can independently and neutrally evaluate the work of the teacher.

Hoyt and Pallet (1999) speak about the significance of good and effective teacher for the excellence of each faculty. They say that teachers should be responsible for their activities and performances. Furthermore, they mention that using evaluation in working process of faculty will have an influence on both works of faculty and work of the teacher. Thirdly, they claim that evaluation, as a process will have a positive result because teachers and faculty will affect the process of evaluating with improving its mode of functioning.

2 Evaluation practice

Every faculty has its own aspect of evaluating the teachers (Braskamp et al., 1984). For the purposes of this study, we have chosen the practice of evaluation of teachers in two world-renowned universities: Flinders University of Adelaide (Australia, 230th on the Shanghai list) and University of Michigan (The USA, 22nd on the Shanghai list). The Flinders University of Adelaide in Australia demonstrates about how they set up the evaluating system of teachers' work. They formulated a few questions: 1) What should be evaluated? 2) How to recognise a good teacher? 3) What are the models of evaluation? 4) How to collect information for the evaluation? (www.flinders.edu.au).

1. It is questionable what should be evaluated. There is no agreement around this issue, neither among teachers nor among researches of evaluation of teachers' performance. At the Flinders University the emphasis is put on the following:

- assessment of the teaching is in the first place,
- quality, quantity and teaching level in the classroom,
- development of curriculum which includes new programmes,
- assessing students, mentoring, graduate students' theses,
- consultation with students (from model "one on one" to group consultation),
- supervision of assistants' work who work on their subject,
- supervision of practical tasks,
- supervision of assistants' research work,
- counselling of students,
- work on research projects.

2. A good teacher is recognised by the following characteristics:

- possessing teaching and competent skills,
- stimulating and spreading enthusiasm,
- right-minded to students,

- well-organized and prepared for teaching and educational work,
 - assessing the appropriate level of the student workload.
3. At Flinders University, next evaluation models are pointed out: self-evaluation, evaluation by students, evaluation by colleagues, consultants, and experts in the fields of evaluation.
 4. Data are being collected via surveys, questionnaires, focus groups where students participate; by observation and feedback, personal data of teacher, video recordings, and learning outcomes of students.

The university of Michigan has its own guide for evaluating the process of the teacher (www.crit.umich.edu). At the introduction of this document, it is said that unique system for evaluation of teaching quality of faculty and teachers' performance do not exist. They set up the next evaluation principles:

- It is the most important to consider evaluation through more various models of evaluation, in order to collect as many data as possible, and therefore to provide the best evaluation of teachers' work.
- It is necessary that the faculty determines strong standards and criteria for assessment of evaluation.
- Evaluation should be individualised. It should be started from each member of the university who will have an individual evaluation. Group evaluation did not leave a good result.
- Evaluation should not cover only work of the teacher in the classroom. It is also necessary to assess all the other activities of the teacher. The most significant are: mentoring, assistance in preparing seminar and diploma papers, writing scientific papers and visiting educational seminars. As sources of data for evaluation, they state students, colleagues, and introspection or self-evaluation.

The reports by the external commission of quality control of the faculty's work are interesting. In the report about the external evaluation of higher education institutions in Montenegro, it is said that evaluation is focused on teaching, but not on the learning process (www.gov.me). A number of students that responded to the survey was very small. Students usually do not know what is expected of them, and in order to cheer up the teachers, they give the highest marks. In addition, other evaluation models of teachers' work are established. Due to the insufficient number of teachers and teachers who "travel" from faculty to faculty, it is very difficult to create a correct evaluation of teachers' performance.

It is very hard to find internal reports of higher education institutions in Serbia regarding the evaluation of teachers' work. Even when there are reports, they include just a few sentences where praises are highlighted that students participate in the evaluation and nothing else. Regarding the external reports, the situation is similar. There is no significant information about evaluation, except the mentioning that evaluation does exist. There are no results, their marks, how and in what way they are conducted (www.filfak.ni.ac.rs).

Branković and Partalo (2015) mention the significance of quality for the functioning of the faculty. Evaluation is important for the work quality. Evaluation is im-

plemented at two levels: by the specialised institutions which have established indicators of measuring, and by self-evaluation. Brankovic and Partalo set the problem of scientific merits of evaluation and, particularly, the indicators' validity (if they really measure the quality of work). From everything listed, the research problem has been imposed in relation to the evaluation process at our faculties. Problem question would be: What is the evaluation at the universities in Serbia like?

3 Methodology

3.1 The purpose and aim

The main aim of the study was to determine what the evaluations is like at universities in Serbia. We examined the evaluation because of its huge significance for improving work quality at faculties, by which the data are ensured for the faculty management to initiate changes that will bring better results. The teachers use feedback from evaluators, in order to perceive their work and make a decision if it is necessary to change something in the method of working with students.

3.2 Research methods and techniques

In order to respond to the research question, we have conducted the interview via questionnaires (quantitative part of the study), by requesting teachers to simultaneously give their comments related to subject about the evaluation of teachers' work at faculties where they work. Teachers could give recommendations in their comments for resolving the problem of evaluation and they could comment the evaluation's practice at other faculties as well (qualitative part of the study).

In the study, a questionnaire was used which consisted of 10 questions. We were collecting five types of data by the questionnaire: the facts (about the respondent), opinions, attitudes, knowledge (about what and how it works), and behaviour of the respondents (related to the evaluation). We had two discontinuous and eight continuous variables, which has significantly facilitated the analysis of data. Teachers openly commented on evaluation without suggesting an answer to the particular questions. Teachers obtained detailed instructions on how to complete the questionnaire and answer the questions. 434 requests were sent for completing the questionnaire and leaving the comments. Only two teachers' rejected to answer the questionnaire. 86 teachers gave the comments.

3.3 Sample description

The sample consists of 432 teachers, 44.2% were women (191), 55.8% were men (241). Regular professors were represented in 25.5% (110), 17.4% (75) were associate professors, 31.9% (138) were assistant professors, and 25.2% (109) were teaching assistants. There were 46.3% (200) respondents from technical sciences, 40.7% (176) from Social and Humanities, and 13% (56) were from natural sciences. The sample size provided a degree of confidence of 95%. In the study, we used the stratified ran-

dom sample in order to avoid deficiency of the simple random sample. We possessed a list of e-mail addresses of most professors at universities of Serbia. For the study, a proportional participation was important: a) male and female gender; b) regular, associate professors, assistant professors and teaching assistants and c) professors from faculties of technical, natural and social sciences. We sent the questionnaires to the e-mail addresses of teachers. In addition to answers to the questionnaires, teachers were sending their comments related to the subject of evaluation.

3.4 Data collection

Data collection was conducted in the period from 3 March to 10 March 2016. Data were collected in two ways. The first was by completing the questionnaires on Forms in Google and the other by direct e-mail.

5 Results analysis

Teachers were answering the ten questions in the questionnaires.

1. The first question was: Does the evaluation of teachers' work exist at your faculty? 90% of teachers confirmed that there is an evaluation by students at their faculty. Around 6% of teachers said that for them there is self-evaluation. Below 2% verified that there is an evaluation by colleagues. 2% of the teachers claimed that there is no evaluation at their faculty.
2. The second question was: Are the regulations on evaluation about teachers' work applied? Over 60% of teachers responded that there are some regulations, and 5.8% answered that there are no regulations. 34% respondents answered that they do not know about the existence of any regulations.
3. The third question was: Are the results of teachers' work discussed during the meetings of Academic Council or at the Departments? 56.5% answered that the evaluation results are discussed, and 38.3% that it is not discussed, but 5.5% responded that they do not know about the discussion of this subject.
4. The fourth question was: In your opinion, is the evaluation of teachers' work at your faculty good? Around 26.4% answered that evaluation is good, while 53.5% responded that evaluation teachers' work is not good. Around 20.1% of teachers said that they do not know the answer.
5. The fifth question: Are the corrective measures undertaken by teachers who have poor evaluation results? 46.5% of teachers claimed that no corrective measures are undertaken, 24.3% said that they are undertaken, and 29.2% contented that they do not know anything about undertaking any measures.
6. The sixth question: Do students complete the surveys on the evaluation of the teachers' work after each semester? 85.9% of them positively answered this question. 9% of teachers responded that the students do not complete the surveys, while 5% said that they do not know if the students complete the surveys.
7. The seventh question: Do students sign the survey (not anonymous) on the evaluation of the teachers' work? Around 87.3% said that students do not sign the survey,

- and 5.1% think that the survey is signed, while 7.6% of teachers claimed that they do not know if students sign the survey.
8. The eighth question: Are the students competent enough to assess the performance of teachers? 54.9% of teachers said that students are competent enough, and 32.9% said that they are not. 13.2% of them did not know the answer.
9. The ninth question: What evaluation would be the best in your opinion? The answers were as follows:
- evaluation by colleagues - 23.6%
 - evaluation by students (an anonymous survey) - 62.3%
 - evaluation by students (signed survey) - 10.6%
 - evaluation of teaching experts outside of faculty - 30.6%
 - other - 22.9%.
10. The tenth question: Are all teachers included in the evaluation of teachers' work? 79.2% of them answered that all teachers are included, and 5.3% responded that not all teachers are included in the evaluation. 15.5% said they do not know the answer to this question.

5 Discussion of results

Our study confirmed that one of the biggest lacks of evaluation of teachers' work is the fact that in the process of establishing criteria for evaluation of performance teachers do not participate. Establishing the criteria and models without the involvement of teachers is condemned to the failure, and often it is rejected. The teachers perceive the model of qualitative teacher as something alien, obtruded by the educational authorities. According to them, criteria for evaluation of the teachers' work are unrealistic and without possibilities to describe social circumstances where the work takes place. Excluding teachers from creating the evaluation process can lead to the resistance to the teachers towards evaluation of their work. Thus, it is necessary for teachers to be always present in creating evaluation model. Janković and Jarić (2009) also got similar results.

In this study, contentions by Peterson and Comeaux (1990) and Lofty (2000) are substantiated. Namely, teachers are confused about the purpose of evaluation. Teachers do not know what should the model of successful teacher be and what the "satisfactory" work is. We did not obtain the answers that would direct us to the conclusion that the results of the evaluation are used for the correction of teachers' work at some faculties.

Can students objectively assess the work of a teacher? Obtained results are in accordance with findings that are obtained by Milenkovic's study (2015). He claimed that students could not be objective in assessing the teachers for several reasons. The reasons are students' competence and the relation between students and professors that are being assessed.

Almost all faculties in Serbia have an evaluation of the performance of the teacher. However, teachers agree in their comments that evaluation is not earnestly conducted. The comment by a full professor from Nis is very interesting, he says: "The subject is very interesting. It is interesting that processes of evaluation are more serious in primary schools and secondary schools than in higher education institutions, faculties. There is to a large degree more serious system of evaluation at lower levels of education, as opposed to the higher education system". Teachers desire evaluation not to be formal but essential: "I would appreciate if the evaluation of teachers by students had more powerful significance and that this would be really relevant for elections into the forthcoming title, because it is not insignificant" (Full professor, University of Belgrade).

Around 40% of surveyed teachers said that they do not know if there are any regulations regarding evaluation at their faculty. Usually, several people are obliged to be engaged in the evaluation at the faculty. As the teachers have confirmed, those are the people who are close to the faculty management. It is never obvious how students assess teachers because the data is not transparent. "I welcome the initiative for a quality check-up of teachers' evaluation and their work at universities. I also had thought about that process, before you came with the survey. I think it is poorly organised and it does not have a real purpose. It is performed only because the evaluation must be done due to the request of the government. Also, for the election to a position based on the students' evaluation, the highest mark is always entered, regardless of the mark that the teacher has received; nobody comments that nor verifies what is written in the report. Nobody has ever been lauded. Nobody has ever been punished if he got the poorest marks. This is why I say that: First, I was a witness when the students completed the survey irresponsible and superficially. They did not even know who is the professor in question, teachers on duty gave them the surveys just to get the job done, and that professor was not even their lecturer. For instance, they also ask me first what my name is, and write the evaluation about my performance and quality of my work afterwards. Nevertheless, it is not the same when the one teacher is evaluated by five students or 50, even 80, as it is in practice here. In that way, some professors get the mark 5, because they meet familiar students in the hallway and give them the questionnaires; some other teachers give them out to huge groups at the class, during which the students grin and make faces, prompt each other, comment loud, agree on what to write - completely pointless and superficial, almost humiliating. In addition, there are professors who know when the questionnaires for evaluation are given out, and they start courting students, affect their opinions ... Could students indeed evaluate teachers' work in this manner?" (Full professor, University of Novi Sad).

An associate professor from Belgrade was sharper in terms of evaluation of teachers if only students are involved: "My comment: Evaluation done by students is nonsense. It is like being a judge and a jury. The worse you are (more indulgent), the better. Evaluation via SCI papers (SCI lists, author's note), for example, is also inadequate because the scientist is not necessarily a good teacher. However, it is com-

plicated and it is certainly part of multiple doctorates until the adequate indicators will be found." (Associate Professor, University of Belgrade).

In this way, professor of Belgrade University sees the competence of students in the evaluation of teachers' work: "I want to draw attention to the giving opportunity to students to evaluate performance and expertise of teacher, in terms how now surveys are being conducted; it is the same as:

- enabling for people who were not graduated from Law faculty to be judges or even judges of the Supreme Court,
- disabling for the accused to be present in the courtroom,
- disabling for the accused to express words of defense,
- believing that everything the prosecutor says must be accepted as an absolute truth without any verification,
- believing that everything the prosecutor presents must be automatically registered as upright in terms of official documents.

Questionnaires for students should be oriented only on a narrow domain of issues for which they are eventually competent. For example:

- if all lectures and consultations were performed,
- if the teacher has avoided answering a question that student asked, and it was directly related to the lecture,
- what the particular question was.

Nothing more. Irresponsible, disinterested students could misapply even these simple questions. However, students' answers to these questions are easily verifiable, thus it is very simple to reveal poor intentions by some students. I hope that this short comment will contribute to noticing the essence of the problems that teachers deal with in everyday work at universities." (Full professor of Belgrade University).

A certain number of teachers required students' questionnaires not to be anonymous (10.8%). Teachers believe that students, who sign the surveys, would be more objective compared to students who are completing the anonymous surveys. Some teachers emphasised that teachers feel uneasy when students are giving opinions by evaluation of their work, thus they are trying to flatter to students in various ways. The most common way is to give students certain privileges or higher marks.

"Evaluation of teachers' work is a good thing. It should and must exist. At our faculty, students evaluate the teacher and the questionnaire is anonymous. In my opinion, the questionnaire should not be anonymous, why would someone hide behind the anonymity if everything was being done honestly and properly? I speak because I know that many teachers hesitate to expel students from exams and severely sanction them in a situation when they use prohibited aids or when they obstruct the teaching, as well as when they come drunk and are rude in a discussion. Teachers and assistants fear how students will evaluate them, and want to avoid the situation in which they could not get their contract extended due to the poor evaluation. Personally, I invest an effort to do my job honestly and when I perceive some prohibited aids among students (... and other methods of cheating during tests) I try to severely sanction them, and not to pretend that I have not seen it. I must admit that diligent students appreciate that

and they do not want to seem like they are stupid because they study. I think that the questionnaire should be transparent, and should not allow to some anonymous student to write that you are not a good lecturer and put all the lowest rates. Especially, if it is somebody whom you sanctioned in the previous year for prohibited aids and thereby he was absent from 10% of teaching, and this person evaluates you as a poor teacher. Of course, teachers should not know how students evaluated them. But, in situations when someone wants to misuse the questionnaire against the teacher and when a problem appears, it should be possible to analyse who the student, who has such negative opinion, is, and if the claims are true. It would be nice if your study succeeded to change something or maybe to lead to some standard methods of evaluation valid for all universities, and thereby neither students nor teachers would be threatened by those evaluations, and nobody could misuse them". (Full professor, University of Belgrade.)

6 Conclusion

Apparently, the evaluation is not a favourite subject among the university teachers in Serbia. Primarily, the problem is awareness of teachers about the evaluation. There is still formal evaluation performed at faculties, which does not accomplish its main aim: correction of the teachers' work. Faculties do not use the evaluation in order to ensure teachers advancement and development. Faculties do not have a transparent method of presenting the data, which voids the whole evaluation process.

Data, collected by the evaluation, should help teachers to change their way of work and to adapt it to the needs of students and teaching requirements of the faculty. If this is not the case, then the evaluation has no purpose.

It is necessary to create the habit of conducting continuous researches in this area. The general conclusion is that teachers should also actively participate in creating the evaluation model. Of course, in addition to the evaluation by students, there should also be other criteria of evaluation, in order to form a model which would be appropriate and useful for teachers. Primarily, we must agree about the teachers we need, and according to that model, we must develop the quality standards and criteria.

Dr. Nebojša Pavlović

Gonilna sila evalvacije na visokošolskih institucijah v Srbiji

Evalvacija dela visokošolskih učiteljev na fakultetah je v zadnjih letih predmet problemike, za kar obstaja več razlogov. Srbija je država v tranziciji in ima poleg ekonomskih izzivov tudi krizo na področju ustvarjanja sistemov vrednot. Vedno več je dvoma v delo fakultet in visokošolskih učiteljev, k čemur so prispevala tudi različna poročanja medijev o lažnih diplomah in doktoratih. Fakultete, ki so tradicionalno zaprte instituti-

cije za zunanja dogajanja, se niso pravočasno odzvale z informacijami o delu, da bi dvom o korektnosti odpravile.

Posledično poteka evaluacija dela visokošolskih učiteljev v težkih in negotovih razmerah. Bolonjska reforma visokošolskega izobraževanja je vpeljala obvezno samoevalvacijo in evalvacijo študentov. Prav tako pa obstajajo še dodatne tehnike in evalvaciski modeli za vrednotenje dela učiteljev. Pojavil se je upor učiteljev na eni strani in podpora evalvaciji s strani vodstev izobraževalnih ustanov na drugi. Medtem ko učitelji pravijo da evalvacija zmanjšuje vrednost izobraževalnega procesa, vodstvo izobraževanja ocenjuje evalvacijo kot pomemben element v razvoju izobraževalnega dela. Danes dobiva evalvacija širše razsežnosti. Lahko rečemo, da evalvacija zdaj obravnava celoten izobraževalni proces.

Opredelitev evalvacije se je skozi čas spreminja, kakor se je spreminja tudi sama evalvacija, še posebej je v zadnjih letih prišlo do sprememb modelov in metod evalvacije.

Poraja se vprašanje, kaj bi naj pravzaprav evalvacija sploh zajemala. Niti med učitelji, niti med raziskavami evalvacije uspešnosti učiteljev ni jasnega dogovora o tem.

Na Flinders University poudarjajo pomen:

- ocene poučevanja, ki je na prvem mestu,
- kakovosti, količine in ravni poučevanja v predavalnici,
- razvoja učnega načrta, ki vključuje nove programe,
- ocenjevanja študentov, mentorstva, tem diplomskih nalog,
- konzultacij s študenti (prehod iz modela "ena na ena" na skupinske konzultacije),
- nadzora nad strokovnim delom asistentov pri posameznih predmetih,
- nadzora nad praktičnimi nalogami,
- nadzora nad asistenti raziskovalnega dela,
- svetovanju študentom,
- delu na raziskovalnih projektih.

Dobrega učitelja odlikujejo naslednje lastnosti:

- dobre spretnosti in kompetence poučevanja,
- spodbujanje in širjenje navdušenja,
- mišljenje v korist študentov,
- dobra organizacija in pripravljenost na poučevanje in izobraževalno delo,
- dobra ocena količine obremenitve študentov.

Na Flinders University prav tako poudarjajo naslednje modele evalvacije: Samo-evalvacija, evalvacije s strani študentov, s strani kolegov, svetovalcev in strokovnjakov s področja izobraževanja.

Podatki so bili zbrani s pomočjo raziskav, vprašalnikov, fokusnih skupin, v katerih so sodelovali študenti, s pomočjo opazovanj in povratnih informacij, osebnih podatkov učiteljev, video posnetkov ter učnih rezultatov študentov.

Univerza v Michiganu ima svoj vodnik za evalvacijo procesa učiteljev (www.crit.umich.edu). V uvodu prispevka smo omenili, da ni enotnega sistema za evalvacijo

kvalitete poučevanja in uspešnosti učiteljev. Postavljena so bila naslednja načela evalvacije:

- *Najbolj pomembno je pristopiti k evalvaciji preko različnih modelov le-te, da se lahko zbere čim več podatkov in da se zagotovi najboljša možna ocena učiteljevega dela.*
- *Potrebno je določiti trdne standarde in kriterije za ocenjevanje.*
- *Evalvacija mora biti individualizirana, zato je treba izhajati iz vsakega člena neke visokošolske institucije posebej, ter omogočiti individualno ocenjevanje. Evalvacija po skupinah se ni izkazala za najboljšo.*
- *Evalvacija prav tako ne sme zajemati zgolj učiteljevo delo v predavalnici, pač pa je treba oceniti vse ostale učiteljeve dejavnosti. Najbolj pomembno je, da ločimo tudi ostale dejavnosti, kot so mentorstvo, pomoč študentom pri pripravi seminar-skih in diplomskeh nalog, pisanje znanstvenih člankov in obiske seminarjev. Kot vir podatkov za evalvacijo so navedeni študenti, kolegi učitelji ter introspektiva oz. samoevalvacija.*

Poročila zunanjih komisij za ocenjevanje kakovosti dela fakultet so zelo zanimiva. V poročilu o zunanji oceni visokošolskih zavodov v Črni gori je navedeno, da je evalvacija usmerjena v poučevanje in ne v učni proces (www.gov.me). Število študentov, ki se je odzvalo na anketo, je zelo majhno. Študenti največkrat ne vedo, kaj se od njih pričakuje, zato dajejo najvišje ocene, da ugodijo in razveselijo učitelje. Poleg tega se uveljavljajo različni modeli vrednotenja učiteljevega dela. Zaradi nezadostnega števila učiteljev in učiteljev, ki se selijo iz fakultete na fakulteto, je izredno težko ustvariti pravilno in pravično evalvacijo uspešnosti dela učiteljev.

V anketi so učitelji odgovarjali na deset vprašanj.

Prvo vprašanje je bilo: Iz česa je sestavljena evalvacija učiteljevega dela na vaši fakulteti? 90 % učiteljev je potrdilo, da je na njihovi fakulteti evalvacija zgolj ocena študentov. Okrog 6 % učiteljev je dejalo, da pri njih obstaja samoevalvacija. Manj kot 2 % je dodalo, da jih ocenjujejo tudi kolegi. 2 % vprašanih učiteljev je dejalo, da na njihovi fakulteti ne izvajajo evalvacije.

Drugo vprašanje je bilo: Ali so predvideni predpisi oz. pravila za evalvacijo dela učiteljev? Več kot 60 % učiteljev je odgovorilo, da predpisi obstajajo in 5,8 % odgovorilo, da ne. 34 % anketiranih je odgovorilo, da niso seznanjeni s pravili.

Tretje vprašanje je bilo: Ali se obravnavajo rezultati evalvacije učiteljevega dela tudi na sestankih akademskih zborovali kateder? 56,5 % odgovorilo, da se o rezultatih razpravlja, 38,3 % pa, da se ne razpravlja. 5,5 % ni seznanjenih z morebitnimi razpravami na omenjeno temo.

Četrto vprašanje je bilo: Je po vašem mnenju evalvacija učiteljevega dela na vaši fakulteti dobra? Okoli 26,4 % odgovorilo, da evalvacija je dobra, medtem ko 53,5 % meni, da evalvacija učiteljevega dela ni dobra. Okoli 20,1 % učiteljev se pri tem vprašanju ni opredelilo.

Peto vprašanje: Ali se korektivni ukrepi, v primeru slabih rezultatov, izvajajo s strani učiteljev, ki so slabo ocenjeni? 46,5 % učiteljev je povedalo, da se niso izvajali

nikakršni korektivni ukrepi, 24,3 % je potrdilo izvajanje ukrepov in 29,2 % jih ne ve, da bi kakršniki ukrepi obstajali.

Šesto vprašanje: Ali študenti izpolnijo ankete o evalvaciji dela učiteljev po vsakem semestru? 85,9 % je odgovorilo na to vprašanje pritrdilno. 9 % učiteljev je odgovorilo, da študenti ne izpolnjujejo ankete, 5 % pa je dejalo, da ne vedo ali učenci izpolnjujejo ankete.

Sedmo vprašanje: Ali se študenti podpišejo na izpolnjene ankete o evalvaciji učiteljevega dela? Okoli 87,3 % učiteljev je informiranih o tem, da študenti ne podpisujejo izpolnjenih anket, 5,1 % jih pravi, da študenti ankete podpišejo, 7,6 % učiteljev pa ne ve, ali se študenti podpišejo ali ne.

Osmo vprašanje: Ali so študenti kompetentni za ocenjevanje uspešnosti učiteljev? 54,9 % učiteljev je dejalo, da študenti so kompetentni za ocenjevanje učiteljev in 32,9 % jih meni, da ne. 13,2 % učiteljev ne ve, ali so študenti kompetentni ali ne.

Deveto vprašanje: Katera evalvacija bi po vašem mnenju bila najboljša? Učitelji so odgovore podali v naslednjih odstotkih:

- evalvacija kolegov - 23,6 %
- evalvacija študentov (anonimna anketa)- 62,3 %
- evalvacija študentov (podpisana anketa)- 10,6 %
- evalvacija strokovnjakov izven fakultete- 30,6 %
- drugo - 22,9 %

Deseto vprašanje: Ali so vsi učitelji vključeni v evalvacijo dela učiteljev? 79,2 % jih je odgovorilo, da so vsi učitelji zajeti in 5,3 % da niso vsi učitelji zajeti v evalvacijo; 15,5 % je dejalo, da ne pozna odgovora na to vprašanje.

Očitno evalvacija ni prljubljena tema med učitelji na visokošolskih institucijah v Srbiji. Predvsem pa je problem ozaveščenost učiteljev o evalvaciji. Še vedno obstaja uradna evalvacija na nekaterih fakultetah, ki ne dosega svojega glavnega cilja: Popravljanje učiteljevega dela. Fakultete ne uporabljajo evalvacije za namen napredovanja in razvoja učiteljev in njihovega dela. Fakultete nimajo preglednega načina prikazovanja podatkov, pridobljenih z evalvacijo, kar še nadalje spodbuja vrzeli v procesu evalvacije.

LITERATURE

1. Branković, D. and Partalo, D. (2015). Evaluacija kvaliteta procesa i ishoda univerzitetske nastave. Zbornik "Nastava i učenje". Užice: Učiteljski fakultet u Užicu.
2. Braskamp, L., Brandenburg, D. and Ory, J. (1984). Evaluating teaching effectiveness: A practical guide. Beverly Hills: CA, Sage.
3. Cashin, W. (1987). Defining and Evaluation College Teaching. Kansas State University: IDEA Paper 21, september 1989.
4. Centra, J. (1993). Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
5. Clift, J. and Imrie, W. (1980). The Design of Evaluation for Learning. Higher Education, 9, No. 1, pp. 69–80.
6. Ebel, R. (1979). Essentials of Educational Measurement. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

7. Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching. Retrieved on 8/15/2016 from the Internet: <http://www.crit.umich.edu>.
8. House, K. (1985). Trends in Evaluation. *Educational Researcher*, 19, No. 3, pp. 24–28.
9. Hoyt, P. and Pallet, H. (1999). Appraising Teaching Effectiveness: Beyond Student Ratings. IDEA Paper 36, November.
10. Izveštaj i spoljnoj proveri, Filozofski fakultet u Nišu. Retrieved on 8/15/2016 from the Internet: <http://www.filfak.ni.ac.rs>.
11. Izveštaj o eksternoj evaluaciji ustanova visokog obrazovanja u Crnoj Gori. Retrieved on 8/15/2016 from the Internet: <http://www.gov.me>.
12. Janković, A. and Jarić, I. (2009). Uslovi rada nastavnog osoblja na univerzitetu u Beogradu:evaluacija rada nastavnika. *Filozofija i društvo*, 3.
13. Lofty, J. (2000). We Are Doing This Already: Teacher Talk about Standards in Britain and America. *The English Journal*, 89, No. 4, pp. 97–104.
14. Milenović, Ž. (2015). Objektivnost studenata u evaluaciji rada fakulteta, njegovih delova i učesnika u nastavnom procesu. *Zbornik "Nastava i učenje"*. Užice: Učiteljski fakultet.
15. Pavlović, N. (2016). Vrednovanje rada nastavnika u visokoškolskim institucijama Srbije. *Ekonomika*, Vol. 2, pp. 85–97.
16. Pešić, M. et al. (2000). Pedagogija u akciji. Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju.
17. Peterson, P. and Comeaux, M. (1990). Evaluating the Systems: Teachers Perspectives on Teacher Evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12, No. 1, pp. 3–24.
18. Potkonjak, N. (1972). Vrednovanje rada u osnovnoj školi. Beograd: Jugoslovenski zavod za proučavanje školskih i prosvetnih pitanja.
19. Vilotijević, M. (1992). Vrednovanje pedagoškog rada u školi. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
20. What is Effective Teaching? What Can Be Evaluated? Retrieved on 8/15/2016 from the Internet: <http://www.flinders.edu.au>.