

The Role of Social Participants in the Evaluation of Teachers at Universities in Serbia

NEBOJŠA PAVLOVIĆ

The evaluation of teachers' work is one of the weakest parts of the Bologna reforms.

Introduction

AMONG THE many problems created by Bologna reforms, the evaluation of teachers' work is at the top of the list. The need for the standardization of employees' work in higher education includes the obligation to evaluate or measure teachers' work. The lack of evaluation significantly impacts the good work of teachers (Maksić 2006). Therefore, a definition of evaluation has been developed. According to it, evaluation is explained as a process whereby teachers are analyzed, evaluated and measured according to previously determined criteria and standards (Robbins and Coutler 2008; Pavlović 2015). The Bologna process demands the precise measurement of teachers' work in order to develop clear norms, standards and procedures in teaching processes (<http://www.ehea.info>). Problems have appeared in the evaluation of teachers' work. How to perform this evaluation? Who is competent to evaluate

Nebojša Pavlović

Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism,
University of Kragujevac, Serbia.

teachers? How to form grades? How can evaluation grades be useful to teachers? It is very difficult to provide answers to all of these questions. An additional reason for this is the fact that higher education institutions are generally closed institutions which do not like controls, reviews, or especially the evaluation of work quality.

Resistance to and criticism of the current evaluation methods have led to the logical question: What can be done in order to improve the evaluation process considering the fact that the current methods of evaluation are not suitable? The usual defenders of educational policies are representatives of the education authorities. However, the case of evaluation showed that they are not convinced about the validity of this kind of measurement. The paradox in this situation is that teachers, students and the authorities' representatives are constantly dissatisfied, while nothing has been undertaken or changed during recent years. Since the existing evaluation did not fulfill expectations, the aim of this work is to find an answer to the question: What needs to be changed and done in order to improve this process? Focus on the existing condition is the first action. The first idea was to ask teachers about these issues since they are only ones likely to provide pertinent answers.

According to daily complaints by teachers, it was not hard to assume that the evaluation process is not good enough and that it has numerous deficiencies. This was assumed before this research. However, confirmation of that should be obtained from the teachers. Due to its numerous deficiencies, the classical survey was excluded from this research. The main reason is the bad response from faculty members. The teachers were interviewed via Google Forms. In this way, they had the opportunity to present their opinions on the evaluation of their work and to propose improvements to the evaluation process.

Beside the introduction and the literature review, the main scope of this work includes an analysis of the results with opinions and comments from teachers from different universities. Unlike elementary and secondary education, scientific publications in Serbia barely include literature on evaluation in higher education institutions. There have only been a few works which give serious warning about the fact that there is no serious approach to this issue (Mandić and Vilotijević 1980; Vilotijević 1992). It is very difficult to get any kind of information from the faculties. The teachers are not happy to discuss the evaluation issue and everything is based on their comments about its inaptitude (Janković and Jarić 2009, 5).

It can be claimed that failures and problems have followed the evaluation of teachers' work from the beginning, since the second half of the 20th century (Beck et al. 2002). There were disagreements in communication between those who should set the standards and criteria for the quality of teachers' work and

the teachers who needed to attain them. The teachers were not sure whether the evaluation was being conducted in order to judge their work or to improve their work using feedback (Lofty 2000). Since the standards and criteria were obviously not appropriately set, the model of a good teacher remained unknown (Pajak and Arrington 2005).

The Bologna reforms raised new doubts. Besides the complexity of the entire higher education system, the Bologna reforms led to the development of two opposite processes, introducing mandatory evaluation by students (Act on the student evaluation of teachers' pedagogical work during studies, 2006). One process tended to make the evaluation process senseless and criticized, while the other process was aimed at the development of optimal solutions for the evaluation of teachers' work (Betoret and Tomás 2003, 170). Neither of these processes has been concluded so far.

In research works on teachers' evaluation in our higher education system, the authors emphasize the fact that evaluation does not include a corrective aspect. It mostly consists of control and an enumerative function (Janković and Jarić 2009). Evaluation is not the goal in itself. It is a function of someone or something else (Clift and Imrie 1980). On the one hand, this means that the evaluation of teachers' work represents the need to provide data on their work. On the other hand, this information should be used as an argument for decision making. This is the only way to reach a full professionalization of the teacher's role (Meyer 2001). The information provided in the evaluation process should be used by the teacher for the purposes of his/her development and changes in his/her work (Danielson and McGreal 2000).

The term "evaluation process" usually causes confusion and concern among teachers. According to Lofty, confusion triggers questions to which it is difficult to get the right answers: What is the purpose of the evaluation? Which are the criteria for satisfying work? What does a model of a successful and good-quality teacher look like? Which teachers should do the evaluation? Should they provide action plans in order to improve their work or should this be done by someone else? (Lofty 2000).

The endless belief in the power of the quantitative measurement of everything in the area of education means that the evaluation of teachers' work is also set in this pattern. Tests, surveys and other quantitative approaches for data collection contribute to the idea that evaluation itself will have a corrective effect on teachers' work. Practice in faculties refutes the opinions of those who simplify the approach to the evaluation of teachers' work and reduce it to a quantification of educational work. Those who defend this method of evaluation have an idea of objectivity. However, objectivity itself is very problematic (Jankovic and Jarić 2009).

Before the introduction of the Bologna reforms, E. R. House noted that evaluation should be institutional for the democratization of public decisions while being open for reconsideration. As such, evaluation will be useful for society and for the teachers whose work should be evaluated (House 1978). Evaluation should be a function of change in teachers' work and should search for optimal solutions to the different aspects of educational processes. Hence, evaluation should include a wider range of interested people who would participate in this process. Apart from students who are mostly interested in the work of their teachers, all faculty teachers and education professionals should also be included. Evaluation should be seen as a process and something which continues to evolve after surveying the students. Activities related to creating an acceptable model of teachers' work should start after surveying the students (Buller 2013).

The evaluation model should be flexible, as teachers work in different circumstances which include numerous aspects, from specific technical conditions to different social groups which demand special attention. The teaching process is rarely predictive, so it requires the teacher to adapt quickly to new situations. If the teacher does not embrace these circumstances, limitations in the good relationship between teachers and students can appear. Also, it leads to students doubting their teacher's expertise.

Specific comments from students indicating problems in communication between them and their teachers are as follows:

"Generally, the professor is good but his contemporary knowledge is poor and he often yells at students without a particular reason" (<http://www.oceniprof>).

"The professor is maybe the best lecturer, but he is not correct in communicating with students. His attitude is too distant and arrogant toward the students" (<http://www.oceniprof>).

"He is undoubtedly the worst professor in the university. He is arrogant and pretentious. It is very difficult to attend his classes" (<http://www.oceniprof>).

"The lectures of this professor are actually read from a book. A graph from this book was copied onto the board, while he had to look at each square in order to read its content. The exams are reviewed by assistants as the professor is probably unsure about the answers to the exam questions" (<http://www.oceniprof>).

It is very difficult to determine the criteria and standards for measuring the quality of teachers' work (Shinkfield and Stufflebeam 2011). The relevant experience of other countries should be used in order to develop evaluation procedures in the best way (Frost and Teodorescu 2001). However, universal criteria for evaluation should not be pursued at all costs. It is important to respect the social, cultural, economic and historical specificities of each country and to use these differences for the development of original evaluation programs (Peterson and Comeaux 1990).

Also, it is particularly difficult to provide evaluation using only one criterion: evaluation by students. According to L. Hunt, it is important to use other criteria for evaluation in order to constantly improve the evaluation model (Hunt 2013). This is related in particular to the evaluation of work by colleagues and experts outside higher education institutions.

The researchers Moreno-Murcia et al. (2015) suggested a single questionnaire which could facilitate the comparison of criteria for the evaluation of teachers' work. Sawchuk (2016) claimed that the evaluation model is outdated and suggested the replacement of traditional models that evaluate teachers' work with a new way of measuring quality. Berk (2014) had doubts as to whether students are capable of making an appropriate evaluation of their teachers and whether teachers use these estimations on their own behalf. In their recommendations, Joughin and Winer (2014) stated the importance of evaluation for higher education institutions. Promoting teaching quality is only possible with a good-quality evaluation of the teachers. This should be included in the common strategy of every higher education institution. On the other hand, Alderman and Melanie (2012) claimed that feedback from students is the most important source of information for correcting teachers' work and improving its quality.

At the end of the literature review, those who were against each kind of evaluation and opposed measuring teachers' work using points, the number of published works, mobility, and similar criteria should also be mentioned (Baláž 2010). A lack of evaluation leads the teacher to limit his/her freedom in research and teaching. Therefore, the teacher is forced to work as an administrator with less time for creative work (Lisseman, 2009).

Since the research problem lies in the existing evaluation, which clearly does not fulfill expectations, the aim of this work is to provide an answer to the question as to what should be changed and done in order to make this process better. First, the focus should be directed toward the present direction. The idea was to ask professors, as only they are relevant for answering this kind of question.

Due to daily complaints from the teachers, it was not hard to assume that the evaluation process is not good enough, bearing in mind its numerous deficiencies. This was assumed before this research. However, it was important to obtain confirmation of the situation of the evaluation process from the teachers themselves. A classical survey was excluded from this research due to its many deficiencies. The main reason lies in the poor response of faculty members. The interviews were conducted via Google Forms. In this way, the teachers had the opportunity to state their opinions on the evaluation of their work, including suggestions for improving the evaluation process.

Materials and Method

IN THIS qualitative research the data were collected using numerous interviews conducted via Google Forms. A similar method of data collection was recommended by Barre (2015). A request was sent by email to teachers employed at five state universities. The teachers were randomly chosen so all of them had an equal opportunity to participate in the interviews. An equal number of docents, full-time professors and associate professors was taken into account. A total of 437 teachers from all five state universities in Serbia responded to this request (Belgrade, Novi Sad, Niš, Kragujevac and Novi Pazar) of which 43.6% were women and 56.4% were men. 24.8% were full-time professors, 17.5% associate professors and 32.2% docents. The teaching cooperatives and assistants made up 25.4% of the respondents. Also, the total number included 40.3% teachers from social science faculties, 13.3% from natural science faculties and 46.4% of teachers from technical science faculties.

As this was a qualitative research, no classically structured interviews were included. The teachers were asked to describe the method of evaluation at their faculties, including their opinions on the way the evaluation process should be set up. The teachers answered only one question: What is your opinion on the evaluation of the work of faculty members in Serbia? The teachers had the opportunity to give their comments and suggestions. This method of data collection was observed as being successful during research conducted by Janković and Jarić (2009).

Results

ANALYSES OF the material collected from the interviews with teachers from state universities in Serbia confirmed the assumption that evaluation does not fulfill teachers' demands. They did not expect that the evaluation process would be transformed into a judgement of their work. On the contrary, the plan was to use evaluation as an aid for professional development and improvement. However, the well-organized idea of following teachers' work and providing useful information did not obtain a better response.

This part of the work included several specific comments by the teachers. These comments can be used as a good starting point for further thinking on the evaluation of teachers' work. The scope of this work does not provide enough space for comments by all 437 teachers. A general note on all the comments is that they are very similar regarding the estimation of the evaluation of teachers'

work at faculties in Serbia. The comments are presented as received, without any adaptation or changes.

During the interviews, all the teachers mentioned that evaluation is necessary for them in order to better organize their work and tailor it to their students. On the other hand, their opinion is that the evaluation system is not well organized, nor is there enough effort to change this situation. A typical observation was outlined by one associate professor:

“This topic is very interesting. Also, there is an interesting fact that evaluation processes are more serious in secondary schools than in higher education institutions. Unlike the higher education system, the more serious evaluation system is present at lower levels of education” (University of Niš).

“I believe that your action is very important for all of us. Therefore, I am grateful! My comment would be the following: I would like it if there were more precise criteria for the measurement and evaluation of the quality of professors’ instructions. This applies to professors from undergraduate studies, Master studies and Ph.D. studies. Second suggestion: I would like it if measurements by students were treated as being more important so this action could be really relevant for the selection of professors for the next level of work” (Full-time professor, University of Belgrade).

This topic is confirmed as being important and interesting by certain full-time professors who do not usually participate in surveys. Also, there were the good will and desire of the teachers to contribute to improvements and changes in the evaluation process. However, the obstacles are obvious. There were suggestions for students to evaluate their professors after their studies and to make each measurement public. The comment by a certain full-time professor was as follows:

Although I do not like to participate in this kind of questionnaire survey, I’ve decided to give my opinion. I would suggest details of certain problems regarding teacher evaluation at our university which arose from an inadequately defined evaluation in a methodological sense. Your questionnaire does not provide this information. Some of them were mentioned at the beginning of the evaluation process, but there was a lack of response at the university. Maybe you will find time to observe them. My work was evaluated with the highest grades by the students but as I will go into retirement soon, this is not too important for me.

The attractiveness of the teaching subject content itself should be treated separately when using evaluation. It is especially recommended for “boring” and “complicated” subjects which are mandatory for students although their interest in them is negligible. The professors’ teaching methods can be essential to increase the students’ interest. The evaluation of professors by university students is conducted dur-

ing the last class of each semester. During that time, a significantly smaller number of students attend classes: they are studying for exams. Also, during the 1st semester of the 1st year of study, the students meet a small number of professors in their classes and evaluate only them as they do not have wider scope for a more realistic evaluation of their professors. Finally, they evaluated the objectivity of their professors during exams without passing the oral part of the exam first. Therefore, it is better if the students evaluate their professors at the end of their studies. It could be considered mandatory for them during document withdrawal after graduation. In that case, their evaluation would be more realistic while their fear of any consequences due to giving bad grades to their professor before an exam would be eliminated, as the evaluation is anonymous. The professor is the only one to be informed about the results of the evaluation of his work while the faculty authorities should only be familiar with the average results of all the professors. The evaluation results should be made public: each professor should see his position as compared to the others and use it to face certain consequences, as no other institutional consequences have been developed. (Full-time professor, University of Belgrade)

Teachers recognize different kinds of evaluation and want to focus on the negative aspects of the evaluation of teachers' work.

There are different types of evaluation by students. The first type, which was used by them last year, suggested that students who attend classes and who are familiar with the professor for that subject should be surveyed at the end of the semester. However, the online survey provides an opportunity for all students to participate even if there are students who did not have any contact with the professors. It can be observed for large groups of students that it is impossible to detect who attends classes and who does not. According to what has been previously mentioned, this imposed type is not good and no one takes it seriously. The first type of evaluation was much better. In that case, professors analyze their results seriously and their students' answers to many questions in the survey. I believe this method of evaluation is also important for serious research. (University of Kragujevac)

A similar opinion was given by an assistant professor from the University of Belgrade: "The biggest problem regarding evaluation is that students are required to fill in forms during their semester application. They do it automatically, no matter if they attended classes or not" (assistant professor, University of Belgrade).

One of the most common complaints by university professors was aimed at the bureaucratic way of conducting the evaluation. A common question is the following: Is it possible that the teacher does not need any kind of "validation"

of his/her pedagogical abilities? Most teachers did not have any pedagogical subjects on the curriculum during their education. Teaching is based on the teachers' memories of how their teachers behaved during their primary or secondary education.

No one ever came to see my teaching—I have been teaching classes to students ever since I became a freshman (since 1972—for 44 years). Not at all! Obviously, there is no need for that in some cases . . . It seems that no one actually cares about the quality of teaching! The state pays salaries which are enough to survive on, and the school community does not want to mention any issues and keeps them away from the public. Teaching plans and programs are NOT RELATED TO PRACTICAL NEEDS. The teachers teach what they want and in a way which has been appropriate for them during recent decades. Everyone determines his/her own assessment criteria, so there are certain students who “lose their minds” after the 18th time of failing to pass an exam. And no one has a problem with that. I made some attempts in my department but there was no understanding or results. God bless you if you make any progress in this area! (Full-time professor, University of Belgrade)

A full-time professor from the University of Niš had a similar opinion on bureaucracy and the evaluation of teachers. Beside bureaucracy, there is a constant issue regarding evaluation: In what way can students be competent enough to evaluate and assess the work of teachers? Is their opinion going to help the teacher to promote his/her development and teaching methods?

I support the initiative for the validation of the evaluation of the quality of teachers' work at universities. Also, I had some thoughts about this process before you came with this survey. I believe that evaluation is not well organized and that it does not reach its full potential. The evaluation is conducted only according to the university administration in order to complete reports on the selection of teachers using students' opinions (there is always a high grade, no matter what the final results are; no one adds comments or checks what was written in each report. No one was ever commended or punished due to bad results). The reason for my reaction is the following: I have witnessed situations where students answered questions irresponsibly and carelessly, not even knowing the name of the professor in question. Responsible professors supplied them with questionnaires and explained how to answer them even if they had not taught them at all. For example, I was asked for my name. After that, the quality of my work was evaluated by people who didn't know my name. Also, there is a practice in our institutions of making an evaluation of someone's work by 5, 50 or 80 students. Some professors are evaluated by a different number of students, unlike other professors. In this way, certain professors are rated

with the highest grades (5), as they meet familiar students in the hallway and supply them with questionnaires, while other professors are rated according to the large number of questionnaires given to a large group of students. Some of these students throw the questionnaires away, agree with their colleagues about the answers and make senseless and careless comments. It is a degrading situation. Also, there are certain professors who know the date of the questionnaire validation so they use the opportunity to communicate with their students, try to change their opinions, etc. Is it really possible for students to evaluate their professors' work in this manner? (Full-time professor, University of Niš)

An associate professor from the University of Novi Sad was stricter regarding the evaluation of professors' work by students: "My comment is the following: evaluation by students is nonsense. It is a matter of principle: the same person sues and judges you. The worse you behave (let them do what they want), the better you are for them. The evaluation of the work of scientists (Sci listed, lead author) and of others is also inappropriate since a scientist is not necessarily a good teacher. However, it is complicated and should be included in more Ph.D. theses until suitable indicators for evaluation are developed" (associate professor, University of Novi Sad).

A higher number of teachers (54.6%) claimed that a survey by students is good and necessary. However, certain rules are needed:

I believe this is good if the students evaluate their teachers' work regardless of the question whether they are competent enough. According to this, the correct questions in the questionnaire should be selected. We apply a single questionnaire as prescribed by the University of Belgrade. I doubt that any differences should be made between questions that are specific to certain faculties as parts of different gradations. Also, I am concerned about different surveys at other universities and the eventual comparison of the evaluation grades of teachers from different faculties. A common question at our institution is related to the number of students who should respond to a survey in order to make it valid. Undergraduate students are numerous enough and therefore there are no problems with that. However, Master studies and professional subjects (which usually comprise a minimum of 5 students) are related to the questionable validity of the student surveys. It is obvious that the students need the implication that these evaluations are important, including honest answers in the questionnaire. Our university includes a completely public survey that is available to all university members. Some universities have a rule that only Council or management members are allowed to see the survey. Which option is right and the most appropriate? (Full-time professor, University of Belgrade)

In the same way, a professor from the University of Belgrade explained the competency of students relating to their teachers' work:

I would like to mention that the opportunity for students to evaluate the work and professionalism of their teachers according to the survey conditions can be understood as follows:

- offering the chance for people without a university degree in law to play the role of judge or even supreme court judge;*
- revoking the opportunity for the “accused” to attend the courtroom;*
- revoking the opportunity for the “accused” to say anything in order to defend him/herself;*
- providing the opportunity for the “prosecutor” to obtain acceptance for anything said, without prior verification;*
- providing the opportunity for the “prosecutor” to make statements which are going to be automatically registered as being correct in the form of an official document.*

Students' surveys should be reduced to a narrow range of questions in which they are competent. Some examples are as follows:

- Dave all classes and consultations been conducted?*
- Did the professor ever refuse to provide an answer to the question asked by the student when the question was directly related to the studied material?*
- What was the exact form of the question asked?*

This should be the entire form of a survey. Even these simple questions can be misused by irresponsible and uninterested students. However, students' responses to these questions can be easily verified, so bad intentions on the part of some students can be easily discovered. I hope that this short comment will highlight the essence of the problem which university teachers face on a daily basis. (Full-time professor, University of Belgrade)

A full-time professor from the University of Belgrade offered concrete proposals as to when and how to perform an evaluation: “The evaluation of teachers should be conducted (as a rule) right before or after the class, during the school year, so it will not have an effect on the students' exam grades. Hence, the evaluation will not be the reason why some students are awarded the highest grade or fail their exams. In this way, the evaluation of teachers by students who never attended their classes can be avoided” (Full-time professor, University of Belgrade).

A colleague from the university mentioned an important criterion for the evaluation of teachers' work—innovation: “Also, innovations in lectures should

also be evaluated, including the option to decide which facts can be applied in practice (some facts related to economic science, for example)” (Full-time professor, University of Novi Pazar).

A certain number of teachers (10.8%) demanded to keep student surveys public. The teachers believe that the students who sign their names on the survey are more objective than students from anonymous surveys. Some teachers claim that certain teachers are concerned about the opinions of students during the evaluation. Therefore, they use many different ways to have a good relationship with them by giving them higher grades or certain benefits.

The evaluation of teachers’ work is a good cause. It should be developed and maintained.

Our faculty provides an evaluation of teachers’ work by students and these surveys are anonymous. I believe that this kind of survey should not be anonymous since there is no reason to hide behind anonymity if everything is done correctly. The reason for this opinion is the fact that many teachers are “afraid” to exclude students from their exams, or to punish them when they use inappropriate resources or obstruct classes, attend classes under the influence of alcohol, or behave inappropriately. They are afraid of how their students will evaluate them in the survey, so they can avoid a situation whereby they can be excluded from their workplace due to bad results. I do my best to work fairly and when I notice some disallowed resources (cheat sheets, phones and other kinds of inappropriate resources) I am strict about punishments. I have to admit that students appreciate my methods and they don’t want to be considered stupid if they study for exams, unlike others who use cheat sheets and phones and cheat in exams.

I believe that this kind of survey should be transparent rather than having some anonymous student claim that their professor is not a good teacher and gives low grades because he was punished by that professor during the previous years of study, or someone who attended less than 10% of classes. However, the teachers should not be familiar with the evaluation of each student, but in situations when someone wants to misuse this survey against their teachers and certain problems appear, the situation should be analyzed in a proper way.

It would be good if this research leads to some changes and standard methods of evaluation applicable to all universities. Also, this evaluation would not jeopardize students or teachers and there would be no opportunity for their misuse. (University of Belgrade)

Discussion

THIS RESEARCH confirms that one of greatest deficiencies in the evaluation of teachers' work is the fact that teachers do not participate in the process of determining the criteria for the evaluation of their work. Determining the criteria and models for the evaluation of teachers' work without their participation is usually rejected or unsuccessful. Teachers consider the model of a good-quality teacher as something new and imposed by the education authorities. According to their opinion, the criteria for the evaluation of teachers' work are not realistic and they do not provide the opportunity for the clear division of social circumstances in which the work is conducted. The exclusion of teachers from creating the evaluation process will lead to hostility from teachers toward the evaluation of their work. Therefore, it is important to keep teachers present during the creation of an evaluation model. Similar results were provided by Barre (2015) and Janković and Jarić (2009).

As mentioned earlier, there are numerous complaints regarding the methods of evaluating teachers' work. The comments from the texts above can be used as conclusions in order to develop a good model for the evaluation of teachers' work in the future. Above all, the evaluation of teachers should be developed using numerous criteria. One of the suggestions is evaluation by peers. This kind of evaluation is known and it could provide good results. Also, there is the option of evaluating innovations in teaching, creating good connections with other scientific institutions, evaluating the published work, and attending official conferences. This would mean that education criteria are used for the evaluation of teachers' work. Effectiveness, control, high efficiency and adaptability are recognized as non-educational criteria (Lisseman 2009). It is important to evaluate the teachers' attitude toward popular culture and their responsibility to society. If a teacher is not a leader in other areas it is hard for him/her to achieve this in the classroom.

On the other hand, teachers are correct when they claim that students should not be pressured to evaluate their teachers' work if they don't want to. The evaluation process should be voluntary and provide students with the opportunity to choose whether they evaluate someone's work or not. The results of these surveys would be more useful than surveys completed just because it was mandatory. On a website related to the voluntary evaluation of teachers' work, comments from students can be seen (www.oceniprofesora.com). It cannot be confirmed with certainty if some of these surveys are "ordered," no matter whether their character is positive or negative.

The specificity of the academic subject itself should be also considered. Teachers often highlight this fact. A mathematics professor cannot be evaluated in the

same way as a professor of physical education. Exams in mathematics are usually less than 50% successful, while physical education exams are 99% successful. This means that each subject needs to have its own model of evaluation. Also, the teacher should be included in the development of this model.

Students cannot use only their experience for the best assessment of their teacher. They should be allowed to participate in the creation of the evaluation model. Also, it should be explained to students that wrong information can be very harmful for the teacher.

At the end of this brief discussion, it should be noted that bad evaluations are not accepted by teachers, students or the education authorities. Everybody has an opinion about himself/herself, his/her work etc. The teacher believes that his grade is good enough, the student believes that he/she has solved a difficult task, while the education authorities can convince the public with evidence of the good standard of teaching in universities. This is not favorable for them. The ideal model of a teacher is a specific problem. What criteria should be used during the development of these models? There is no agreement on these criteria between teachers, students or the education authorities. However, some aspects can be mentioned: the organizational-technical role of teachers, communication about the teacher-student relationship and professional competence. Similar results were reached by Janković and Jarić (2009).

Conclusions

EVALUATION IS a very popular idea. The consideration that only the evaluation of teachers' work will solve the problem of teaching quality is not correct. It can be concluded that the evaluation of teachers' work is one of the weakest parts of the Bologna reforms. Almost no teachers gave positive comments about the evaluation of teachers' work at university. More than half the teachers claimed that the current model of evaluation has no significance or use for them. However, there are no precise suggestions as to what this model should look like. The fact that there is no significant difference between the comments of full-time and associate professors, docents, associates and assistants shows that attitudes are similar regarding the need to start changing the method of the evaluation of teachers as soon as possible.

The data collected from evaluations should help teachers to change their work methods and adapt them to students' needs and the university's demands. If this is not the case, the evaluation is useless. It is important to form the habit for the development of constant research in this area. It is a common conclusion that teachers should also actively participate in the creation of the evaluation model.

The suggestion to include other criteria for the evaluation of teachers apart from evaluation by students is very important. It would provide the development of a suitable and useful model for teachers. The model of a suitable teacher is important for the development of standards and good-quality criteria.



References

- Alderman, L. and L. Melanie. 2012. "REFRAME: A New Approach to Evaluation in Higher Education." *Studies in Learning, Evaluation, Innovation & Development* 9 (1): 33–41.
- Baláž, V. 2010. "Student Migration in Europe: Contest for Human Capital." *Sociológia—Slovak Sociological Review* 42, 4 (2010): 356–382.
- Barre, E. 2015. "Do Student Evaluations of Teaching Really Get an 'F'?" <http://www.cte.rice.edu/blogarchive/2015/07/09/studentevaluations>. Retrieved 12 March 2016.
- Beck, C., D. Hart, and C. Kosnik. 2002. "The Teaching Standards Movement and Current Teaching Practices." *Canadian Journal of Education*, 27 (2–3): 175–194.
- Berk, R. A. 2014. "Should Student Outcomes Be Used to Evaluate Teaching?" *Journal of Faculty Development* 28 (2): 87–96.
- Betoret, F. D. and A. D. Tomás. 2003. "Evaluation of the University Teaching/Learning Process for the Improvement of Quality in Higher Education." *Assessment & Evaluation, Higher Education* 28 (2): 165–178.
- Buller, J. 2013. *Best Practices in Faculty Evaluation: A Practical Guide for Academic Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clift, J. C. and W. B. Imrie. 1980. "The Design of Evaluation for Learning." *Higher Education* 9 (1): 69–80.
- Danielson, C. and S. McGreal. 2000. *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*. Princeton–NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Frost, S. H. and D. Teodorescu. 2001. "Teaching Excellence: How Faculty Guided Change at a Research University." *Review of Higher Education*, 24 (4): 397–415.
- House, E. R. 1978. "Assumptions Underlying Evaluation Models." *Educational Researcher* 7 (3): 4–12.
- Hunt, L. 2013. *University Teaching in Focus: A Learning-Centred Approach*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Janković, A. and I. Jarić. 2009. "Uslovi rada nastavnog osoblja na univerzitetu u Beogradu: evaluacija rada nastavnika." *Filozofija i društvo*.
- Joughin, G. and L. Winer. 2014. "Response to Teaching Evaluation Toolkit Preliminary Reporting." Panel discussion presented 5 March 2014 in Toronto, Ontario. http://www1.uwindsor.ca/ctl/system/files/Teaching_Evaluation_Toolkit.pdf Retrieved 12 March 2016.
- Lofty, J. S. 2000. "'We Are Doing This Already': Teacher Talk about Standards in Britain and America." *The English Journal* 89 (4): 97–104.

- Maksić, S. 2006. *Podsticanje kreativnosti u školi*, Belgrade: IPI.
- Mandić, P. and M. Vilotijević. 1980. *Vrednovanje rada u školi*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Meyer, H. 2001. *Didaktika razredne kvake*. Zagreb: Educa.
- Moreno-Murcia, J., Y. Torregrosa, and N. Pedreno. 2015. "Questionnaire Evaluating Teaching Competencies in the University Environment: Evaluation of Teaching Competencies in the University." *New Approaches in Educational Research* 4 (1): 54–61
- Pajak, E. and A. Arrington. 2005. "Empowering a Profession: Rethinking the Roles of Administrative Evaluation and Instructional Supervision, Improving Teacher Quality." *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* 4, 103 (1): 228–252.
- Pavlović, N. 2015. *Nove uloge menadžmenta ljudskih resursa*. Rača: Đura Jakšić.
- Peterson, P. L. and M. A. Comeaux. 1990. "Evaluating the Systems: Teachers' Perspectives on Teacher Evaluation." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 12 (1): 3–24.
- Robbins, S. and M. Coutler. 2008. *Management*. Belgrade: Datastatus.
- Sawchuk, S. 2016. "Teacher Evaluation: An Issues Overview." <http://www.edweek.org/.../teacher-performance-evaluation-issue-ov/> Retrieved 12 March 2016.
- Shinkfield, A. J. and D. L. Stufflebeam. 2011. *Teacher Evaluation: Guide to Effective Practice*, New York: Springer.
- Vilotijević, M. 1992. *Vrednovanje pedagoškog rada u školi*. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.

Abstract

The Role of Social Participants in the Evaluation of Teachers at Universities in Serbia

The subject of this work is the evaluation of faculty members' work. The obligation to evaluate the work of academic staff since the introduction of the Bologna reforms in higher education has caused different reactions from faculty members. The consideration that evaluation can be seen as a solution for issues on the quality of work in faculties was not justified. The aim of this qualitative research is to provide information on the evaluation of the academic staff in Serbia in order to discover if it can be useful for teachers and effective for the improvement of the quality of their work. The research is descriptive and mostly qualitative. Also, it was conducted at all five national universities in Serbia, where teachers (437) were interviewed via a semi-structured interview. They explained how their work is valued in the institutions where they are employed. One question was related to the method of evaluation in their universities. They were asked to offer their suggestions and leave comments. The analysis of their statements revealed numerous deficiencies in the evaluation of teachers' work. The teachers offered suggestions for the improvement of value processes which, in to their opinion, should lead to better quality of work in higher education institutions. The conclusion is that the evaluation of teachers' work is one of the weakest parts of the Bologna reforms. More than half of the teachers claimed that the present model of evaluation has no significance or importance for them. The improvement of teachers' work evaluation would lead to the creation of new models for this kind of evaluation.

Keywords

evaluation of teachers' work, faculty, social participants, teachers, students