

*Review paper*Accepted: 7<sup>th</sup> December 2020**Nedim Ćirić, PhD**

Islamic Pedagogical Faculty of Bihac, The University of Bihac  
Bosnia and Herzegovina  
nedim.ciric@ipf.unbi.ba

## SELF-EVALUATION OF EXCELLENCE OF DIDACTICAL-METHODICAL ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING

**Abstract:** *The total excellence of university teaching largely depends on pedagogical and didactical-methodical competencies of university professors. The development and promotion of academic teaching is enabled by the modernization of the teaching process which does not encompass only modernization of curriculum but the entire didactical-methodical organization of teaching. Pleasure and requirements of students are to be accentuated accordingly, as well as competencies of teachers and expectations of labor market. The purpose of this paper is to establish which element of didactical-methodical organization of university teaching is the most important dimension of excellence of teaching as well as in what way university professors perform self-evaluation of the excellence of didactical-methodical organization of teaching at the University of Tuzla. The analytical-descriptive survey method was used as a variant of analytical-descriptive method as well as procedures of analysis of contents and polling. It is supposed that there is statistically significant difference in self-evaluation of the importance of elements of excellence in didactical-methodical organization of teaching at the University of Tuzla and that self-evaluations of the importance of individual elements of excellence of university teaching differ with regard to age, sex, teaching/academic title, years of experience in academic institutions and scientific field the faculty belongs to. The results of this research show that the excellence of planning and preparation and excellence in choice of teaching methods are the most important elements of excellence in the organization of university teaching, and that 90% of teaching personnel evaluates that the classes they organize are at very high level of excellence.*

**Keywords:** *excellence of university teaching, teaching methods, teaching forms, teaching aids and technology*

## INTRODUCTION

Modernization of the reform process of the academic education in Bosnia and Herzegovina formally began by signing the *Bologna Declaration* and at the same time there were tendencies to join all universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the unique area for academic education of the European Union. At the same time the question of excellence of academic education as well as academic teaching was raised and the process of reforms was channeled through internal structure and external structure of excellence. Taking into consideration the fact that the object of our research is excellence of university teaching, the focus is the teaching process and its structure. According to didactic legalities and principles, any teaching regardless of differentiation and classification is based on good internal organization and well-structured teaching plans and programs. The excellence of internal organization of university teaching is directly related to expert competencies of teachers in certain areas from one side and pedagogical and methodical competencies of holding, organizing, and managing classes on the other side.

Ensuring and developing the excellence of academic education as well as higher education teaching requires a continuous monitoring, analyses, and adjustments of teaching process to circumstances in which teaching is conducted with constant innovations of academic methodology of teaching as well as teaching practice. Lučin (2007) understands evaluation as a process of critical reconsideration and usual procedure when it comes to European higher education and institutions that possess the excellence culture. Based on the above mentioned, Legčević and Hećimović (2016) consider that higher education institutions should consistently apply international regulations and standards that are predefined and published from the aspect of excellence assessment. Evaluation of teaching process is an important part of professional practice of every teacher. The complete process of evaluation of excellence in teaching at university is conducted through three positions of excellence evaluation. The first position of evaluation is self-evaluation in which the teacher performs self-control of teaching excellence based on self-critical approach towards their own work and based on set and accomplished goals and tasks in organized type of classes. The second position of evaluation of teaching process emerges from users of services of academic education, i.e. students and based on experiences and by personal participation in such organization of teaching process. The third position of evaluation of excellence of teaching work, which is the least frequently used at academic teaching practice, is engaging expert educator associates who by different inventories, scales and other indicators can independently evaluate excellence of teaching from the aspect of didactical legalities, methodical competencies and the like.

In this research the procedure of self-evaluation of excellence of teaching is used from the perspective of university teachers. The research objective is to establish how the teachers evaluate the importance of different elements of excellence

of didactical-methodical organization of university teaching as well as how they evaluate the excellence of teachers' own didactical-methodical organization of teaching at the faculties of the University of Tuzla. Under the excellence of didactical-methodical organization of teaching the university teachers in their work evaluated the importance of the following components: methods of planning and preparation of classes, choosing appropriate teaching forms and teaching methods, choosing appropriate teaching technologies and self-evaluated the total excellence of didactical-methodical organization of teaching. To this purpose, Likert's 1-5 point scale was used.

## EVALUATION AND SELF-EVALUATION OF EXCELLENCE OF UNIVERSITY TEACHING

Within reform tendencies based and initiated with the aim of creating the "European higher education area" and increasing competitiveness and international competitiveness of European universities, the matter of excellence of university teaching and of the overall system of higher education has become the priority and the essence of the reform process. Therefore, the excellence of university teaching is set high at the scale of priorities in the area of promotion of systems of academic education. The question that emerges is: what is the excellence and how to define the term of *excellence*? There are many definitions of "excellence" in dictionaries and generally accepted definition according to Juran and Gryn (1999, p. 3) is: "The excellence is the pleasure of users." Nikolić et al. (2011, p. 183) emphasize that Ivošević et al. (2006) define excellence as a "continuous process that ensures fulfillment of designated standards". Standards should ensure that any academic institution has a potential to accomplish high excellence of outcomes and results during the process of studying and teaching. It refers to assets and processes by which an institution guarantees that standards and excellence in offered education is maintained and promoted continually. Vlahović (2001) emphasizes that for the excellence and reform above all program modernization is necessary, i.e. different curriculums based on which intellectual and other competencies of students can be developed, developing rational but also humanistic and creative approaches towards scientific, technical and artistic contents, and promoting initiative and adaptability.

Academic teaching is a very complex educational process which has its flow, course and duration and follows certain rules. According to Vilotijević (2001), a successful performance of teaching process can be done only by those who are specialists in all its structural elements and their mutual functional relations and connections. When it comes to excellence in teaching, it represents multidimensional, multilevel and dynamic concept that refers to contextual hypothesis of educational model, mission and goals of university institution and specific standards of the system, university, study program and scientific area. The excellence

of university teaching can take on different meanings and one of them according to Van Damme (2003) is interest of different participants of the higher education system in which the requirement for excellence is dictated by scientific area, labor market, society, government, students, etc. In relation to traditional paradigm of higher education in which the question of excellence of university teaching was not prominent, contemporary paradigm integrated through Bologna concept of higher education transfers the question of excellence into priority segments of evaluation of higher education success. Related to this, Mencer (2010, p. 138) emphasizes that if higher education is an important factor of economic and social development and by that also an assumption of social cohesion and justice, than for higher education interested sides are the following: employers, students, parents and public administration at all levels. Evaluation as a phenomenon and pedagogical term has always drawn attention of experts from the area of pedagogy, psychology and sociology. Since evaluation (evaluation, assessment, grading) represents very important activity in education, pedagogical and methodical aspects and activities point to the dimension of excellence and in that sense give instructions for necessary actions that lead towards promotion of excellence of teaching. When it comes to evaluation, Simmons (2004, according to Patoon, 1987, p. 21) emphasizes that excellence represents “systematical collection of data on activities, characteristics and outcomes of projects in order to bring evaluation on project, improve efficiency and make decisions on future projects”. Lutfullayev (2007) suggests that the most important factor that affects change in excellence in work of academic institution is the courage of their leaders to identify shortcomings and change them into potential solutions. Predojević (2014) says that institutions which have ensured internal excellence successfully perform evaluations, programs monitoring, verification of qualifications and skills of their employees, establish criteria of evaluation, define procedures for evaluation of students as well as collect the data using information technologies.

In this context, the necessity for analysis and evaluation of excellence of university teaching comes from responsibility of the institution of higher education but also teachers towards students, employees, students’ parents, authorized institutions, employers at the labor market as well as community. Omerović (2014, p. 112) emphasizes that teaching can be evaluated during the teaching process (*formative evaluation*) and at the end of the semester or the year (*summative evaluation*). There are several procedures of evaluation of teaching process such as surveys, interviews, games for evaluations, monitoring and observing of teaching process, evaluation and assessment, group discussions, etc. The most frequent technique in evaluation of teachers and teaching process (according to Lukas et al., 2014) is evaluation by students that has vast usage as an indicator of excellence of higher education. Student evaluation of excellence of academic teaching is performed by poll surveys which are designed in a manner that enables students a quantitative

evaluation of work excellence of academic teachers. Kuzmanović et al. (2013) consider evaluation by students as procedure organized with the purpose of improvement of teaching efficiency, formulation of human resources decisions in the sense of promotions, advancement to higher teaching positions, rewarding, etc., as well as information used by students for the purpose of choosing certain courses.

Evaluation of teaching represents a part of professional practice of any university teacher. According to Hounsell (2003) teachers evaluate teaching process in order to find out how much they are successful in the realization of their personal professional practice, to reveal their strong and weak sides and see how successful they are in comparison to their teacher colleagues. Feedback information on teaching work and excellence of teaching process is possible to collect from students, teacher colleagues or expert associates by evaluation or self-evaluation. According to Poljak (1984), the purpose of self-testing and self-evaluation of teachers is critical analysis and controlling of application of methodology of teaching for the purpose of improvement and promotion of excellence of teaching process. Teachers and expert associates can ensure feedback information by their observation of classes and cooperative commenting. Hounsell (2003) emphasizes that self-evaluation is feasible through reviewing of audio or video recordings from classes and observing and marking changes in teaching while teachers collect data on daily practice by monitoring and re-evaluation of teaching and their effects. Implementing of evaluation with the task of completion of formal requests is extrinsically motivated. Collection of data that are initiated by teachers themselves is of a wider range and with deep intrinsic motivation.

Self-evaluation of teaching process serves for its promotion as well as for evaluation of (in) appropriate procedures in the organizing, realization and evaluation of the teaching process. In that manner teachers self-evaluate their own methodical and pedagogical competencies and they can realize in which direction their own pedagogical, psychological, didactic and methodical improvement should be directed. Related to this, Brown et al. (2003) emphasize that a good teacher is the one who re-evaluates their own teaching practice, promotes their skills and evaluates teaching process according to its influence on students. It is important to mention that there is a large number of various classifications of dimensions of evaluation of teaching process (according to researches Feldman, 1988; Jackson et al., 1999; Johnston & Reid, 1999, etc.) and, therefore, the role of academic teachers as experts, scientists and pedagogues is very complex and extremely demanding.

Malčić et al. (2017, p. 263) emphasize that academic teachers should continually advance theoretical knowledge and didactic competencies in their own area (Malešević et al., 2011), ability of transferring knowledge and teaching competencies (Kostović, 2008); communication skills, availability and empathy necessary in students' dilemmas with the purpose of developing positive relations that were proven to be crucial in motivation and support of students (Rubie-Davies, 2007),

as well as competencies in evaluation through monitoring and timely feedback on their effects in order to achieve necessary level for the exam taking (OECD, 2005).

Dimensions of evaluation of the excellence of the teaching process at universities according to Lukas et al. (2014) are *planning* (as the process of designing the curriculum content), interaction and communication of academic teachers and students (application of appropriate methodological strategies and didactical aids on certain courses) with the purpose of developing competencies of students as well as motivation of students and enthusiasm of academic teachers in achieving the expected results, and *results (learning outcomes)*, i.e. accomplished formative goals, level of competencies and pleasure with classes organization. Malčić et al. (2017, p. 262) state five dimensions of the evaluation of the teaching process: organization of classes, difficulties that academic teachers encounter, expectations and just evaluation, and care of academic teachers for students and the knowledge they will acquire.

Concerning that the problem of this research is evaluation of excellence of university classes through self-evaluation of teaching work, it is necessary to define and separate characteristics of teaching process that represent indicators or predictors of excellence of teaching work. Out of the total ten criteria of validity of teaching emphasized by Meyer (2005), our focus was on planning and preparation, selection of appropriate teaching forms and methodology of teaching work as well as choice of adequate teaching aids and teaching technology.

The aim of this research was to determine which factor of didactical-methodical organization of university teaching is the most important dimension of teaching excellence according to the attitudes of university teachers as well as how university teachers evaluate their own excellence of didactic-methodical organization of teaching at the University of Tuzla. The research assumed that there is a statistically significant difference in the self-evaluation of the importance of factors of excellence of didactic-methodical organization of teaching at the University of Tuzla and that there are differences in self-evaluation of the importance of individual factors of excellence in university teaching with regard to age, sex, teaching/academic title, years of work experience in higher education institutions and the field of science to which the faculty belongs.

## METHODOLOGY

In the sense of methodology, the research is transversal and analytical-descriptive and survey methods were used as variants of analytical-descriptive method. Procedures of content analyses and interviewing were used. The instruments used are two survey questionnaires. *Questionnaire on socio-demographic characteristics of respondents* – for data that refer to all independent variables of this research to include age, sex, teaching/academic title, years of experience in higher education institutions and the field of science to which the faculty belongs. *SENUNTZ-VI/9-13* – is the survey questionnaire constructed for the purpose of this research

that consists of six parts divided into nine particles in which respondents present self-evaluation on the scales of five degrees (*Always, Frequently, Sometimes, Rarely and Never*) and (*Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, Non-Satisfactory*).

The research was conducted at the University of Tuzla in the academic year 2015/2016 at sessions of Scientific-Teaching Councils of the faculties of the University of Tuzla on which 80% of samples were collected, while 20% of respondents were contacted by email. For processing, the SPSS 21 software (*Statistical Package of Social Sciences – for Windows*) was used.

The population of this research is composed of all teaching staff and associates at the University of Tuzla. The sample was composed of twenty teachers and associates selected from five groups of sciences and arts (social, humanistic, natural, bio-medical and health, technical) consisting of thirteen faculties, organizational units of the University of Tuzla. The population differs in sex, age, years of experience in higher education teaching and academic/teaching title. The total number of respondents is 101.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Planning and preparation of teaching process on daily, weekly, monthly and annual level, usage of appropriate teaching methods and forms for the implementation of teaching content, usage of appropriate teaching assets and technical aids and teaching technology, as well as didactical-methodical elements of excellence of contemporary university teaching should be in accordance with requirements of students and oriented towards contemporary tendencies of democratic society which is in the process of learning.

Tendencies toward excellence of teaching work are based on new methodological concepts in higher education teaching in which the significant role is dedicated to pedagogical and didactical-methodical guidelines for action work in the teaching practice. One of the tendencies of contemporary paradigm of higher education that emerges from the principle of *Bologna Declaration* (according to Dukić, 2010) and Schultz et al. contemporary didactic theories (according to Gudjons et al., 1994) is partial replacement of the frontal form of individual and group teaching work with students. Piršl and Ambrosi-Randić (2010) stress that of the basis of studying before Bologna Process consisted of teaching and frontal work at the majority of higher education institutions in Republic of Croatia.

When it comes to Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is almost identical. From the aspect of educational politics, it could be said that even though there is a large number of researches on implementation and effects of Bologna Process, both students and teachers being direct participants in the changes in the process of reform, from the aspect of higher education pedagogy and higher education didactics, those researches are modest, especially when it comes to excellence in internal organization of teaching at higher education.

Analyzing the sample of respondents with regard to socio-demographic variables, Hi-square test established that there is no statistically significant difference  $\chi^2(df=4)=0.00$ ,  $p>0.05$ . Considering groups of sciences in which academic teachers were chosen there is no statistically significant difference, there is no statistically significant difference when sex of respondents is taken into consideration either  $\chi^2(df=1)=0.00$ ,  $p>0.05$ . Statistically significant difference was established regarding the work status,  $\chi^2(df=1)=38.44$ ,  $p<0.05$  in which significantly higher number of employees participated (80.2%) comparing associates (19.8%). It was established that there is statistically significant difference regarding scientific title,  $\chi^2(df=5)=69.80$ ,  $p<0.05$ , i.e. the largest number of respondents who participated come from the group of assistant professors (37.6%), associate professors (33.7%), the same percentage of assistants and senior assistants (11.9%), professors and (4%) and emeritus professors (1%). There is a statistically significant difference regarding age,  $\chi^2(df=4)=30.70$ ,  $p<0.05$ , i.e. the largest number of respondents were between 30 and 40 years old, (34.7%), between 40 and 50, (26.7%), between 50 and 60 (22.8%), between 20 to 30 (13.9%) and over 60 (2%). It was also established that there was statistically significant difference regarding the age of experience in higher education institutions,  $\chi^2(df=3)=15.04$ ,  $p<0.05$ , i.e. the highest percentage of respondents (40.6%) i.e., the highest percentage of respondents has work experience from 9 to 15 years, 23.8% of respondents with experience from 4 to 8 years, (20.8%) of respondents with experience over 15 years, and 14.9% of respondents with experience from 1 to 3 years.

Considering that the purpose of the research was to establish what factor of didactical-methodical organization of academic teaching is the most important dimension of teaching excellence and how higher education teachers evaluate excellence of didactical-methodical organization of teaching at the University of Tuzla, the following results were established:

**Table 1** Self-evaluation of the importance of methodical excellence elements of teaching work (%)

Self-evaluation aspects	Relevance of excellence elements				
	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Planning and preparation of teaching work	50	30	8	4	8
Choice of teaching work methods	29	41	23	3	4
Choice of teaching work forms	11	20	27	20	22
Choice of teaching assets and technical aids	7	13	37	30	13
Choice of teaching technology	6	9	31	23	31



From the results shown in *Table 1*, it could be concluded that the most dominant element of excellence is planning and preparation of teaching work is according to statements of teaching staff. As much as 80% of respondents state that the excellence of planning and preparation of teaching work is the most important element for achieving high excellence of teaching process. On the other hand, 70% of respondents state that it is the choice of methods of teaching work that is the most important factor in achieving high excellence in the teaching process, 31% of respondents state that the most important element of excellence of teaching work is excellence of choice of teaching methods, 20% state that it is the excellence of choice of teaching assets and technical aids, while 15% of respondents state that for the excellence of teaching the most important aspect is choice of teaching technology.

Furthermore, during research it was a priority to establish whether planning and preparation of teaching is statistically significantly more frequently evaluated as the most important element of excellence of teaching in comparison to others. We used Wilcoxon's test based on results of test of normality of distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test) which shows asymmetry of distribution of all stated scales. The results of stated analysis are shown in the *Table 2* below.

**Table 2** Wilcoxon's Test results on frequency of usage of frontal form of work

	Z	df	p
Planning and preparation – Choice of teaching work methods	-1.966	99	.049
Planning and preparation – Choice of teaching work forms	-6.200	99	.000
Planning and preparation – Choice of teaching assets and technical aids	-6.424	99	.000
Planning and preparation – Choice of teaching technology	-7.420	99	.000

The results shown in *Table 2* indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in the average evaluation of excellence elements of planning and preparation for classes when compared to the choice of teaching methods  $Z(df=99)=-1.966$ ,  $p<0.05$ , where the excellence of planning and preparation is of lower average result, i.e. of higher choice and strategies of teaching staff when compared to teaching methods. There is a statistically significant difference in the average evaluation of elements of planning and preparation of classes compared to the choice of teaching methods,  $Z(df=99)=-6.200$ ,  $p<0.05$ , where excellence of planning and preparation is of lower average result, i.e. of higher choice and strategies of teaching staff compared to the methods of teaching work. Besides that, it was established that there is a statistically significant difference in average evaluation of elements of planning and preparation of classes when compared to the choice of forms of teaching work,  $Z(df=99)=-6.424$ ,  $p<0.05$ , where excellence of planning and preparation is of lower average result, i.e. is higher choice and strategies of

teaching personnel compared to the form of teaching work. It was established that there is a statistical significant difference in the average evaluation of elements of excellence of planning and preparation of classes when compared with choice of teaching technology,  $Z(df=99) = -7.420$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , where excellence of planning and preparation is of lower average result, i.e. of higher choice and strategies of teaching personnel compared to excellence of choice of teaching aids and technology.

The discriminative analysis was used in order to establish whether there is statistically significant difference in self-evaluation of the importance of excellence of planning and preparation of teaching work considering socio-demographic variables: age of academic teachers and assistants, sex, academic/teaching titles, years of experience in higher education institutions and groups of sciences to which the appropriate faculty belongs to.

**Table 3** Discriminative analysis results

F	$\lambda$	% variables	Cumulative % of variables	$r_c$	Wilkinson's $\lambda$	$\chi^2$	df	p
1	0.113	67.7	67.7	0.319	0.852	15.099	20	.771
2	0.035	21.1	88.8	0.185	0.948	5.013	12	.958
3	0.014	8.2	97.0	0.117	0.982	1.749	6	.941
4	0.005	3.0	100.0	0.070	0.995	.464	2	.793

Results of discriminative analysis show that there is no statistically significant difference in self-evaluation of the importance of excellence of planning and preparation of teaching work in terms of socio-demographic variables. There are four discriminative functions, Wilkinson's  $\lambda$  at the first discriminative function is high (Wilkinson's  $\lambda_1 = 0.852$ ) showing that variables do not contribute to more significant amount of prediction in differing of groups, i.e. that the strength of discriminative functions is small. From this indicator we can see that 85.2% of variance is not defined.  $\chi^2$  test is not significant for the function 1,  $\chi^2 = 15.099$ ,  $p > 0.05$  which was shown for other functions as well, which proves that discriminative model is not significant and that variables are not certain predictors of association with the group based on evaluation of the importance of excellence of planning and preparation of teaching work.

**Table 4** Self-evaluation of total excellence of teaching work on scale 1 – 5 (f, %)

		Excellence self-evaluation				
		1. Excellent	2. Very good	3. Good	4. Satisfactory	5. Non-Satisfactory
f	75	15	9	1	1	
%	74.2	14.9	8.9	0.99	0.99	

From the results shown in *Table 4* it could be concluded that 74.2% of teaching personnel evaluates the total excellence of university teaching as excellent, 14.9% evaluates it as very good, 8.9% of teaching personnel evaluates it as good and 1% of teaching personnel evaluates it as satisfactory and non-satisfactory for both. There is no statistically significant difference in self-evaluation of total excellence of university teaching in relation to socio-demographic variables of respondents.

According to Franković et al. (1963) planning in teaching means premeditated projecting of the entire teaching work. The purpose and goal of planning of teaching is to approach teaching work in a creative and organized manner. According to Kiryacou (1994) the four most important elements of planning and preparation of classes encompass decision on pedagogical goals, choice and written preparation of teaching unit, preparation of teaching assets and aids, decisions on the method of monitoring and evaluation of progress. By testing self-evaluation of university teaching personnel, in relation to this aspect, the results of research point out that 80% of respondent state that the excellence of planning and preparation of teaching work is the most important element for achieving high excellence of teaching process.

When it comes to teaching methods, it is known that there is no universal teaching method but their application depends exclusively on reality of pedagogical situation in teaching processes. Jelavić (1998, p. 43) defines teaching methods as a didactically planned and optimally organized system of activities of teaching and studying with the primary goal of achieving certain skills, develop certain abilities and other relevant characteristics of personality. By testing the self-evaluation of university teaching personnel in relation to this aspect, the results of research point out that 70% of respondents state that the excellence of choice of methods of teaching work is an element for achieving high excellence of teaching process.

Education process and pedagogical situation at university teaching are characterized by different social relations between students and teachers as well, and they are manifested in different shapes and forms. According to Vilotijević (2001), forms of teaching work by social criteria are frontal, group work, pair work, individual and individualizing. The results of the research show that 31% of respondents state that the excellence of choice of type of teaching work is the most important element in the total excellence of teaching process by testing self-evaluation of university teaching personnel in relation to this aspect.

The material technical basis of teaching represents dimension of excellence and it encompasses a wide range of teaching assets and goals with emphasis to pedagogical didactic functions and roles determined by basic goals and teaching tasks. Branković and Ilić (2003) consider material-technical basis of classes the contemporary and functional teaching objects, technical devices and teaching aids, teaching assets and didactic material. Osmić and Tomić (2008, p. 77) define technical or teaching aids as “tools for work with teaching assets or work overall”.

Technical aids are devices, instruments and similar tools which help in using teaching assets. Teaching assets are sources of knowledge and teaching aids activate the sources of knowledge in order to be accessible to senses of the ones being taught. The results of research point out that 20% respondents state that excellence of choice of teaching assets and technical aids is the most element in total excellence of teaching process by testing the self-evaluation of university personnel in relation to this aspect.

When it comes to didactic media and teaching technology, the contemporary didactic theorist Wolfgang Shulz (according to Gudjons et al., 1994) defines them as concrete mediators in understanding the teaching actions. According to Shulz's theory of teaching, the media are appropriate in different ways for separate teaching methods. Media are auxiliary aids for teaching communication; they substitute for the teacher as a lecturer, coach, examiner, etc. (like educational TV shows, computer software and program for testing etc.), which means that such classes adopt new excellence. The contemporary didactic literature frequently introduces the term didactic quadrilateral in which educational technology takes the place of a factor of sustainability of teaching. By testing self-evaluation of teaching personnel in relation to this aspect, the results of research show that 15% of respondents state that the excellence of choices of teaching technology is the most important element for achieving high excellence of teaching process. The results of analysis of Wilcoxon's test based on results of test of normality of distribution (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) that shows asymmetry of distribution of all stated scales, indicate that there is statistically significant difference between the evaluations of the importance of elements of excellence of planning and all other elements of excellence of respondents in this research. The results of discriminative analysis show that there is no statistically significant difference in accentuating the elements of excellence of planning and preparing of teaching work in relation to socio-demographic variables of respondents.

When it comes to the total excellence of university teaching, the results of self-evaluation of teaching personnel show that 74.2% of respondents evaluate the total excellence of the teaching as excellent, 14.9% evaluate it as very good. These results point out the fact that self-evaluation of total excellence of teaching does not include self-criticism and the question that arises is: based on what the excellence of university teaching is tested if even 90% of teaching personnel think that courses they organize are at the high level of excellence.

## CONCLUSION

The values of results obtained are numerous from the aspect of measuring the excellence of university teaching by self-evaluation of teaching personnel. Through self-evaluation the elements of excellence that refer to planning, preparation, choice of teaching methods, forms of teaching work, teaching assets and

technical aids as well as teaching technology were evaluated. We started from the assumption that there is statistically significant difference in self-evaluation of the importance of excellence of didactic-methodical organization of teaching work of teachers of the University of Tuzla and that in self-evaluation of the importance of individual elements of excellence of university teaching there are differences regarding age, sex, academic/teaching title, years of experience in higher education institutions and the field of sciences to which the appropriate faculty belongs. The results of self-evaluation of excellence of teaching staff at the University of Tuzla show that the excellence of planning and preparation and the excellence of choice of teaching methods are the most important elements of excellence. When it comes to tested elements of excellence by self-evaluation of teaching personnel, no statistically significant difference was found related to socio-demographic variables of respondents. Based on results of self-evaluation, it could be concluded that teaching personnel at the University of Tuzla evaluate their own organization of teaching work excellent. It is assumed, in the light of evaluation of excellence of academic teaching, that future researches should include wider aspect of didactical-methodical elements of excellence of academic teaching such as teaching styles, communication and interaction in classes, teaching systems, methods, techniques and types of evaluation of achievements of students, etc. and that these should be researched through evaluation of excellence from the point of view and role of students in academic courses. Besides the above mentioned it would be significant to research how university teachers evaluate individual course efficiency of teaching through methodical-didactical determination of university courses, the level of engagement of students in those processes as well as out-of- institution relations and activities in practical academic courses (companies, institutions, NGOs, etc.) that are usually marginalized in researches such as this one.

## REFERENCES

1. Branković, D., & Ilić, M. (2003). *Osnovi pedagogije*. Filozofski fakultet in Banja Luka.
2. Brown, M., Fry, H., & Marshall, S. (2003). Reflective Practice. In H. Fry, S. Ketteridge & S. Marshall (Eds.), *A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 215–225). Kogan Page.
3. Đukić, M. (2010). Nova paradigma univerzitetske nastave kao izraz pedagoške reforme visokog obrazovanja. *Sociološka luča*, 4(1), 135–145.
4. Feldman, K. A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students and faculty views: matched or mismatched priorities? *Research in Higher Education*, 28(4), 291–329.
5. Franković, D., Pregrad, Z., & Šimleša, P. (1963). *Enciklopedijski rječnik pedagogije*. Matica Hrvatska.
6. Gudjons, H., Teske, R., & Winkel, R. (1994). *Didaktičke teorije*. Educa.

7. Hounsell, D. (2003). The evaluation of teaching. In H. Fry, S. Ketteridge & S. Marshall (Eds.), *A handbook for teaching & learning in higher education* (pp. 200–212). Kogan page.
8. Ivošević, V., Mondekar, D., Geven, K., & Bols, A. (2006). *Vodič kroz osiguranje kvalitete u visokom školstvu. Priručnik za profesore i studente*. Agram naklada.
9. Jackson, D. L., Teal, C. R., Raines, S. J., & Nansel, T. R. (1999). The dimensions of students' perceptions of teaching effectiveness. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 59(4), 580–596.
10. Johnston, M., & Reid, D. J. (1999). Improving teaching in higher education. *Educational Studies*, 25(3), 269–281.
11. Jelavić, F. (1998). *Didaktika*. Naklada Slap.
12. Juran, J. M., & Gryna, F. M. (1999). *Planiranje i analiza kvalitete*. Matte.
13. Kiryacou, C. (1994). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća*. Educa.
14. Kostović, S. (2008). *Pigmalion u razredu*. Filozofski fakultet.
15. Kuzmanović, M., Savić, G., Gušavac, B. A., Makajić-Nikolić, D., & Panić, B. (2013). A Conjoint-based approach to student evaluations of teaching performance. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40(10), 4083–4089.
16. Legčević, J., & Hećimović, V. (2016). Internal quality assurance at a higher education institution. *Poslovna izvrsnost Zagreb*, 10(2), 75–87.
17. Lučin, P. (2007). *Kvaliteta u visokom obrazovanju*. Nacionalna zaklada za znanost, visoko školstvo i tehnologijski razvoj Republike Hrvatske.
18. Lukas, J. F., Santiago, K., Etxeberria, J., & Lizasoain, L. (2014). Adapting to the European Higher Education Area a questionnaire on student opinion about the teaching of lecturers. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación y Evaluación Educativa*, 20(1), art. 3. DOI: 10.7203/relieve.20.1.3812.
19. Lutfullayev, P. (2007). Research on Benchmarking in higher education: An overview. In *Quality driven initiatives: sharing good practices in higher education. Proceedings of the Regional conference on quality in higher education, Faculty of Education* (pp. 1–16). Hilton Petaling Jaya.
20. Malčić, B., Tančić, N., & Kostović, S. (2017). Dimenzije uloge nastavnika u visokoškolskoj nastavi iz perspektive studenata. *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu*, 42(2), 259–273. <https://doi.org/10.19090/gff.2017.2.259-273>
21. Malešević, D., Adamović, Z., & Đurić, Z. (2011). The influence of competences of a teacher on the quality of professional education. *Technics Technologies Education Management – TTEM*, 6(4), 1100–1109.
22. Marsh, H. W. (2007). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases and usefulness. In R. P. Perry & J. C. Smart (Eds.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: An evidencebased perspective* (pp. 319–384). Springer.
23. Mencer, I. (2010). Upravljanje kvalitetom na hrvatskim sveučilištima u nastojanjima uključivanja u europski prostor visokog obrazovanja. In M. Drljača (Ed.), *Kvaliteta, konkurentnost i održivost* (pp. 133–149). INTER-ING.
24. Meyer, H. (2005). Što je dobra nastava. Erudita.
25. Nikolić, G., Zorić, D., & Saškin, B. (2011). Osiguranje kvalitete studija kao proces stvaranja prepoznatljive konkurentnosti. In M. Plenković (Ed.), *Book of Manuscripts:*

- Society and Technology 2011 / Društvo i tehnologija 2011* (pp. 183–192). Hrvatsko komunikološko društvo i Nonacom.
26. OECD (2005). *Teachers matter: Attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. OECD.
  27. Omerović, M. (2014). *Vrednovanje pedagoškog rada u školi – susret s metodičkom praksom*. Off Set.
  28. Osmić, I., & Tomić, R. (2008). *Didaktika*. Selimpex.
  29. Piršl, E., & Ambrosi, R. N. (2010) Prati li reforma učenja reformu visokog obrazovanja. *Informatologija*, 43(3), 212–218.
  30. Poljak, V. (1984). *Didaktika*. Školska knjiga.
  31. Predojević, Z. (2014). Osiguranje kvalitete u visokom obrazovanju u Republici Hrvatskoj. Pomorski Fakultet.
  32. Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2007). Classroom interactions: Exploring the Practices of High and Low-Expectation Teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(2), 289–306. DOI: 10.1348/000709906X101601.
  33. Simmons, B. (2004). *Designing Evaluation for Education Projects. Environmental Education*. Illinois University, Department of Teaching and Learning.
  34. Van Damme, D. (2002). “Outlooks for the International Higher Education Community in Constructing the Global Knowledge Society.” Paper presented at the First Global Forum on International Quality Assurance, Accreditation and the Recognition of Qualifications in Higher Education, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Paris, France, October 17–18 [http://www.aic.lv/bologna/Bologna/Bol\\_semin/Oth\\_conf/UNESCO\\_GF1/gf7\\_vandamme\\_document.pdf](http://www.aic.lv/bologna/Bologna/Bol_semin/Oth_conf/UNESCO_GF1/gf7_vandamme_document.pdf)
  35. Vilotijević, M. (2001). *Didaktika III*. BH MOST.
  36. Vlahović, B. (2001). *Putevi inovacija u obrazovanju*. Stručna knjiga i Educa.

