Original research paper

HIGHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

UDC 371.214:378; 371.11:005

Marija Jovanović, Dragana Dimitrijević

Faculty of Philosophy, Department for Pedagogy, University of Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *Curriculum management is an important aspect and prerequisite for successful teacher leadership and teaching process quality. In order to ensure horizontal and vertical alignment and the development vision of instruction, it is necessary to identify the functional elements of this dimension in the context of higher education. For these reasons, the concept of curriculum management is viewed in this paper from the perspective of three main functions: monitoring and evaluating the teaching process, coordinating curriculum development, and tracking student progress by university teachers and associates. With the aim of determining whether and to what extent the above-mentioned dimensions of curriculum management are present at the higher education level, the research was conducted on a sample of 216 students from four faculties of the University of Niš. The results of this research show the studied functions a are present at a significant level with a statistically significant frequency of their use among the teaching associates. As for the individual components of the surveyed functions, a statistically significant difference was found between the teachers from different faculties in terms of: teacher evaluation of students' involvement in the instruction process, student motivation for more intense engagement and student involvement in the evaluation process. On the other hand, teaching associates are characterized by different approaches to monitoring and evaluating instruction in terms of checking the level of understanding of the content covered in class. The established differences point to the conclusion that the researched functions are more effectively realized at faculties where instruction happens in smaller groups and where the functional learning objectives are emphasized. From the standpoint of legislation and standards for the accreditation of study programs, it can be concluded that they provide a favorable foundation for curriculum management, and that by mapping shortcomings and strategic planning of future activities, this field can be significantly improved.*

Key words: *curriculum management, teacher leadership, monitoring, evaluation, curriculum development*

1. INTRODUCTION

The 20th century pedagogy characterized by its focus on providing the quality of the education process, improving the efficiency and effectiveness of learning, and instruction, has resulted in a more intense dealing with the issue of leadership in education. The current topicality of this issue is based on the previously conducted research that unequivocally confirm the role and benefit of educational leadership in the field of: (1) student achievements (Hallinger, 2006; Marzano et al., 2005; Witziers et al., 2003; Day et al., 2010; Grissom & Loeb, 2011); (2) Improving the learning process (Leithwood et al., 2004; Barber et al., 2010), and (3) providing a good quality of education in general (BUSH 2007; Ross & Berger, 2009; Møller, 2009; Đurišić-Bojanović & Maksić, 2006; Robinson et al., 2009; Stanković, Ševkušić, & Teodorović 2015; Jovanović, 2022).

Modern theoretical approaches recognize instructional, transformational and transactional, constructivist, servile, pedagogical, strategic and distributed educational leadership (Jovanović, 2022). The most common ones found in education are *transformational leadership*, which is aimed at developing people and organizations, and *instructional leadership* that relates to instruction management (Hallinger, 2003). Since the objective of this paper is to conduct an empirical research of curriculum management as an important dimension and prerequisite of successful teacher leadership, the text hereinafter will attempt to prepare a theoretical discussion of the instructional leadership that it belongs to.

The definition of instructional leadership is approached in two ways. The first, narrower concept defines leadership as activities that are directly related to instruction and learning, while the second, broader concept, includes all activities that indirectly affect student learning (Jovanović, 2022). Instructional leadership is based on three dimensions: (1) defining the school mission by defining the school goals and communicating them, (2) managing the curriculum, which is based on the coordination and control of instruction; (3) promoting a positive school climate that is more broadly defined and includes providing incentives to teachers, securing teaching time, establishing visibility (Hallinger, 2003, p. 332). Although it is most often associated with school principals as leaders who, in order to improve the instruction process, set demands on teachers and students (Hallinger, 2005), the role of teachers in the instructional leadership process must not be neglected. Teachers are actually the leaders of many activities for all the defined dimensions of instructional leadership. One of the key dimensions, which is this paper's research subject, is the instruction process management. The research focus on this dimension of leadership is based on the roles and importance that the teacher has successful instruction management for the purposes of ensuring the quality of the instruction process.

Curriculum management includes three functions: instruction monitoring and evaluation, curriculum coordination, and student progress monitoring (Hallinger, 2003). A successful implementation of these functions requires continuous engagement in the instruction process itself, which highlights the special importance of looking at this dimension of leadership at the teacher level. As the realization of this function depends on a series of skills that teachers acquire during formal education, the focus of our paper is precisely on the research of this dimension at the level of higher education. If we want quality education and teachers-leaders who will be the initiators and implementers of continuous innovation and improvement of the curriculum and effective teaching control, then it is necessary that the experience of the higher education context provides them with this as a fundamental basis for future work.

An analytical approach to discussing this problem unfortunately points to the unenviable level of attention given to it, not only in our region, but also on a global level. There are very few papers studying teacher leadership in higher education. Existing studies approach this topic mainly from the aspect of change management in higher education and the concept of authentic leadership (Gojkov, 2019), abilities and challenges of leaders (Black, 2015) or the effectiveness of higher education teaching (Bryman, 2008, p. 697). These studies addressed educational leadership in higher education from the perspective of school principals, deans, vice deans, heads of departments, that is, at the level of management of the entire institution, while the role of teachers is significantly neglected.

From the aspect of the subject of our research, it is worth mentioning the results of the research on instructional leadership at the university level, which has confirmed through the self-reflection of managers and teaching staff that all three dimensions are more frequently found in managers than among teaching staff, that is, that the function of monitoring student progress is perceived as the least represented by teaching staff (Hallinger et al., 2015, p. 53).

Since this paper is based on the insufficient number of relevant studies, the shortcomings and one-sided approach of published publications in this field, and on the importance of all participants in the instruction process (teachers and assistants) in ensuring the quality of instructional and distributive leadership (Gosling et al., 2012), our paper precisely focuses on researching curriculum management at the level of higher education. The three basic functions on which the realization of this leadership dimension is based, and through which it was investigated in the paper, are the instruction monitoring and evaluation, curriculum development coordination, and monitoring student progress by university teachers and teaching associates. The aforementioned functions require the teacher to "be very engaged in the implementation and improvement of instruction" (Stanković, Ševkušić, & Teodorović, 2015, p. 109), and to take a futuristic view of the process of realization, innovation and improvement of instruction.

Instruction monitoring and evaluation is a very responsible and complex process that includes a series of teacher activities that provide objective feedback on the characteristics and quality of the instruction process. This function involves monitoring and evaluation of student involvement in the classroom, their motivation and engagement in completing learning objectives, as well as mapping their aspirations in relation to defined education objectives. Instruction management in the field of monitoring and evaluation necessarily requires continuous verification of the appropriateness of learning materials to students' prior knowledge, their ability to understand and adopt it at the highest cognitive and functional level. In addition to the focus on monitoring and evaluating the quality of final results, an important element of the function of leader monitoring and evaluation of instruction is the focus on instruction methods, forms and tools, i.e., their alignment with the learning content, student opportunities and needs, but also to the immediate context of higher education instruction. Finally, checking the level of achieving the defined learning objectives is one of the key elements of the instruction monitoring process. By analyzing this aspect of instruction, it is possible to undertake both preventative and corrective measures of instruction management, which can significantly improve the quality of instruction and the leadership role of teachers. Regardless of whether it is structured or unstructured monitoring, important elements of this process in the context of higher education are the structure, articulation and dynamics of instruction, differentiation of instruction, character of didactic media, innovation of instruction procedures and types of social forms that are used in the instruction process.

Coordinating the development of the curriculum is a process of systematic monitoring, changing and adapting the curriculum and its essential elements to the realistic learning conditions and immediate opportunities for the students. This process implies the teacher's focus on the realization of learning material, their differentiation and individualization for the purpose of achieving the defined goals and objectives. Procedures for the realization of learning material are also elements important for coordinating curriculum development. Thus, the following stand out as important procedures for ensuring the development of the curriculum: additional explanations, describing or explaining the learning content, demonstration for the purposes of easier mastering of the content, encouraging additional interest and providing students with the opportunity to learn more and master content better, providing additional help and support in the event of obstacles in the learning process, supplementary and corrective teacher training, development of individualized curriculum, etc.

Monitoring student progress by higher education teachers is an important role of successful teacher leadership. Aimed at continuous monitoring of progress, help, support and guidance of students towards the optimization of instruction, this dimension of leadership enables the student to be the center of teaching activities and an active creator of the instruction process. In that process, the teacher is obliged to motivate the students to actively get involved and independently participate in the lesson. The achievement of students should be understood as a continuous process of their advancement, development and improvement, which should be monitored in all phases and through the application of various assessment methods and techniques. An important role in the process of monitoring students' progress is their inclusion in the process of evaluation of achievements and self-assessment of results, but also their training to critically evaluate individual, group and collective achievement and put it into the function of personal development and advancement.

Keeping in mind that the realization of the mentioned functions of instruction management during the formal education of future teachers represents the main foundation for the development of their leadership competencies, in this paper we have approached the empirical research of this issue in the context of higher education instruction process.

2. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this paper is to examine whether and to what extent curriculum management is realized as one of the main teacher leadership functions in higher education instruction process. The operationalization of the defined goal was realized through the research of the realization of the function of managing the curriculum from the point of view of teachers, and the teaching associates in higher education institutions, as well as identifying the differences in the realization of the said function between these two groups.

Curriculum management is viewed through three basic dimensions: instruction monitoring and evaluation, curriculum development coordination and student progress monitoring. The general hypothesis which the paper started from is that curriculum management as one of the basic teacher leadership functions is significantly present in higher education, as well as that it is more often performed by associates. The research hypothesis was defined in accordance with the main characteristics of higher education instruction, which includes the theoretical focus of the instruction process and the practical focus of the exercises. The focus of the exercise classes towards the practical application of knowledge, the development of skills and the critical analysis of theoretical hypothesis enables the implementers to

continuously monitor students' work and progress, and to adapt the learning content and methods to the individual needs and abilities of students, i.e., the group. According to the stated starting point, a slightly higher level of representation of the researched leadership function among teaching associates of higher education institutions is expected.

2.1. Research sample

The research was conducted on a sample of 216 students from four faculties of the University of Niš. According to its characteristics, the sample belongs to the group of random convenient samples. The structure of the sample in relation to the faculty they attend and the year of study is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Sample structure in relation to research variables

Faculty	N	%	Year of Study	N	%
Faculty of Philosophy - philology departments	45	20.8	1st year	70	32.4
Faculty of Philosophy - philosophy departments	58	26.9	2nd year	42	19.4
Faculty of Sport and Physical Education	60	27.8	3rd year	46	21.3
Faculty of Natural Sciences	38	17.6	4th year	41	19.0
Faculty of Pedagogy	15	6.9	Master's – 5th year	17	7.9

In relation to the faculty they attend, the research included students from four faculties. Due to the specifics of the study programs and the size of the groups with which the exercises are carried out, the sample was operationalized into five categories. This categorization is the result of classifying the students of the Faculty of Philosophy into subcategories, which allowed us to recognize the natural differences in the teaching of philology and philosophy subjects. In accordance with all the above, students of the Faculty of Philosophy are represented in two subcategories: students of philology departments (e.g., Serbian, English, German language and literature) and students of philosophy departments (e.g., pedagogy, psychology, sociology, history...).

2.2. Instrument

The research was carried out using an instrument that was created for the purposes of this research. The instrument consists of three subscales that correspond to the functions of curriculum management defined by Hallinger (Hallinger, 2003): instruction monitoring and evaluation, curriculum development coordination, and student progress monitoring. Within each subscale, five items related to teachers and five related to teaching associates were created. The items within each subscale are compatible with each other, which allows us to compare the differences in the obtained data on teachers and teaching associates. The final instrument is a Likert-type assessment scale that consists of 30 items, 15 of which examine students' perceptions of the teacher's curriculum management and 15 items that examine the same elements but for associates. Within all subscales, students' opinions were examined on a five-point scale with the following categories: 1-never, 2-rarely, 3-occasionally, 4-often, 5-constantly. The Cronbach's Alpha test value for the instrument as a whole is 0.969, which indicates high reliability and provides a basis for using the data for scientific purposes. Also, reliability was confirmed individually for all subscales. Cronbach's Alpha test values of individual subscales are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Reliability per subscale

Subscales	Cronbach's Alpha
Monitoring and evaluation of instruction by teachers	0.876
Coordination of curriculum development by teachers	0.841
Monitoring of students' progress by teachers	0.908
Monitoring and evaluation of instruction by teaching associates	0.903
Coordination of curriculum development by teaching associates	0.857
Monitoring of students' progress by teaching associates	0.881

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to have a systematic display and analysis of the obtained results, they were structured within three items that correspond to the defined research objectives: curriculum management by the teachers; curriculum management by the associates; differences in the level of representation of curriculum management functions between teachers and teaching associates.

3.1. Curriculum management by the teachers

In order to identify the level of representation of the analyzed functions of the curriculum management dimension in higher education instruction, the subscales corresponding to the isolated functions were analyzed. The subscales represent items grouped by mean values that were used to examine students' opinions on this issue.

Table 3 Representation of functions relating to curriculum management by teachers

Subscale	M	Sd
Instruction monitoring and evaluation	3.89	0.83
Curriculum development coordination	4.13	0.75
Student progress monitoring	3.82	0.93

Based on the presented data (Table 3), we can see that monitoring students' progress is the least common among teachers, while coordinating curriculum development is the most common. Observing the results from the perspective of the assessment scale used (1-never to 5-constantly), it is important to emphasize that from the perspective of the students of the University of Niš, teachers perform all the analyzed functions of curriculum management on a scale from occasional to constantly. As the obtained values are above the average, it can be concluded that the researched higher education instruction process is characterized by an enviable level of curriculum management by its implementers. This unequivocally speaks of the enviable quality of instruction, because through the realization of this leadership function by the instruction process implementer, optimum conditions are created for the realization of the main tasks and objectives of instruction.

In order to identify whether there are any differences in curriculum management style depending on the faculty type, an ANOVA test was carried out with grouped variables corresponding to the analyzed functions. Statistical analysis did not show significant differences between the faculties included in the research.

Table 4 Differences in the elements of teacher curriculum management depending on the faculty type

Statement	Faculty	N	M	Sd	F test	df	p
The teacher values the students' involvement in the instruction process and motivation to learn	FF- philology departments	45	4.07	0.915			
	FF- philosophy departments	58	4.24	0.757			
	Faculty of Sport and Physical Education	60	4.23	0.817	2.724	4	0.036
	Faculty of Natural Sciences	38	3.76	1.125			
	Faculty of Pedagogy	15	3.80	0.561			
The teacher motivates the students to work more intensively and have greater achievements	FF- philology departments	45	3.76	1.131			
	FF- philosophy departments	58	4.05	0.44			
	Faculty of Sport and Physical Education	60	4.07	1.087	3.363	4	0.011
	Faculty of Natural Sciences	38	3.34	1.122			
	Faculty of Pedagogy	15	3.80	1.146			
The teacher involves students in the process of evaluating achievements	FF- philology departments	45	3.58	1.196			
	FF- philosophy departments	58	3.71	1.060			
	Faculty of Sport and Physical Education	60	3.90	1.175	3.428	4	0.010
	Faculty of Natural Sciences	38	3.03	1.241			
	Faculty of Pedagogy	15	3.53	1.246			

An in-depth analysis of all individual items (Table 4) revealed that, depending on the faculty in question, there is a statistically significant difference in one element that belongs to the function of instruction monitoring and evaluation (*The teacher evaluates the involvement of students in the instruction process and motivation to learn*) and two elements that belong to the function of student progress monitoring (*The teacher motivates students to work more intensively and have greater achievements*; *The teacher includes students in the process of evaluating achievements*). These elements are more often implemented by teachers at the Faculty of Sports and Physical Education and at the Faculty of Philosophy in the philosophy departments, while they are used the least at the Faculty of Natural Sciences. The established differences indicate that the aforementioned functions are more effectively realized at faculties where instruction is organized in small groups and the focus is predominantly on the development of skills and abilities. When it comes to the lowest representation of these elements, it was confirmed for the Faculty of Natural Sciences, which corresponds to the fact that the contents of natural science subjects are characterized by a high logical structure of content and abstract concepts, which often requires the primary focus of the teacher to be on the learning content itself. Apart from the mentioned elements, it is important to emphasize that in relation to the

function *curriculum development coordination*, no statistical differences were confirmed depending on the faculty, which indicates that all teachers pay attention to the implementation of the curriculum, appropriateness of the learning content to students and adaptation of the content to the individual abilities of students.

In regards to the year of study as another research variable, the statistical analysis showed that there is no significant difference in the analyzed functions of curriculum management, viewed as a group, as well as from the aspect of individual elements. This data indicates that teachers in all years of studies, including undergraduate and master's studies, have a similar approach to instruction and are equally committed to instruction monitoring and evaluation, curriculum development coordination and student progress monitoring.

3.2. Curriculum management by teaching associates

The research on the representation of the functions pertaining to curriculum management by the associates was carried out per subscales representing grouped items, created for the purposes of obtaining the necessary data. For a more realistic and detailed understanding of the obtained results, it is important to clarify that the category of teaching associates includes the implementers of exercise classes: assistants, teaching assistants, researchers-trainees, researchers-associates and demonstrators.

Table 5 Representation of functions relating to curriculum management by teaching associates

Subscale	M	Sd
Instruction monitoring and evaluation	4.24	0.76
Curriculum development coordination	4.28	0.73
Student progress monitoring	4.10	0.80

The obtained results show that all the functions of curriculum management are highly represented among the associates, and at the level of *often* to *constantly*, which implies efficient implementation of the curriculum provided for exercise (practical) classes. Although there is a slight difference between the representation of the analyzed functions, we can highlight the fact that the most frequent function is the curriculum development coordination, while the slightly less dominant function is student progress monitoring.

In regards to the analysis of differences in the representation of the analyzed functions depending on the faculty type, no statistically significant differences were confirmed for the grouped variables, so an analysis of individual elements within each function was carried out (Table 6).

Table 6 Differences in the elements of teaching associate curriculum management depending on the faculty type

Statement	Faculty	N	M	Sd	F test	df	p
The assistant verifies whether the students understand the content being taught	FF- philology departments	45	4.42	0.892			
	FF- philosophy departments	58	4.57	0.704			
	Faculty of Sport and Physical Education	60	4.07	1.026	3.833	4	0.005
	Faculty of Natural Sciences	38	4.55	0.602			
	Faculty of Pedagogy	15	4.67	0.488			

Depending on the faculty they are working at, it was established that there is a difference in terms of monitoring student progress from the aspect of checking whether students understand the content being taught. This function is more pronounced among teaching associates at the Faculty of Pedagogy and the Faculty of Philosophy (philosophy department). Moreover, the results show that for teaching associates from the Faculty of Sports and Physical Education, this domain of the above-mentioned function is performed somewhat less often, compared to other faculties and study programs where there is a fair degree of uniformity. After analyzing the established results from the aspect of the specifics of learning content studied at the above-mentioned faculties, the obtained results can be explained by the predominant practical character of the exercises, and the focus on the functional learning objectives at the Faculty of Sports and Physical Education.

By analyzing the data in relation to the year of study, no statistically significant difference was confirmed in any of the analyzed functions of curriculum management, observing them grouped together or analyzing them through their individual elements. These data confirm the previously mentioned similarity of the activities of associates related to the functions of curriculum management across all years of study.

3.3. Differences in the representation of the analyzed functions of curriculum management by teachers and teaching associates

In order to identify whether there are any differences in the representation of curriculum management functions between teachers and teaching associates, we calculated the t-test for dependent samples.

Table 7 Significance of differences between subscales paired for teachers and teaching associates (t-test for dependent samples)

		M	Sd	t-test	df	p
Pair 1	Instruction monitoring and evaluation by teachers	3.89	0.83	- 8.270	215	0.000
	Instruction monitoring and evaluation by teaching associates	4.23	0.76			
Pair 2	Curriculum development coordination by teachers	4.13	0.75	-4.303	215	0.000
	Curriculum development coordination by teaching associates	4.27	0.73			
Pair 3	Monitoring of students' progress by teachers	3.82	0.93	-7.154	215	0.000
	Monitoring of students' progress by teaching associates	4.10	0.80			

The results indicate that for all three dimensions of curriculum management there is a statistically significant difference ($p<0.01$) in the frequency of their use by teachers and teaching associates. Teaching associates at the faculties in Niš monitor and evaluate instruction, coordinate curriculum development and monitor student progress significantly more often than teachers. Although all analyzed functions are often present in the work of both teachers and teaching associates, the function of student progress monitoring stood out as the least represented compared to the other two, which is in accordance with the results of the research (Hallinger et al., 2015) that studied all ten functions within

instructional leadership. We can interpret the mentioned differences from the aspect of the size of the groups which the teaching associates work with in exercise lessons, the characteristics and objectives of the exercise classes, and also from the aspect of the smaller age gap that allows the teaching associates to more easily follow and understand the needs, abilities and interests of the students.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Although the 21st century is seen as a turning point in the development and actualization of leadership in education, it is undeniable that insufficient attention is still paid to the essential issues of teacher leadership. The focus on school principals and the frequent use of the term leadership in education with this population threatens to marginalize the importance of teacher leadership in the education process and ensuring the quality of teaching. As direct leaders of instruction, but also its planners and implementers, teachers are central figures who, through successful leadership, can ensure the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of instruction in the most direct and optimum way. For this reason, this paper has tried to shed light on one of the most significant, didactic issues of teacher leadership - curriculum management as a leadership function of a modern teacher. The concept of curriculum management is viewed in the paper from the perspective of three basic functions: instruction monitoring and evaluation, curriculum development coordination, and student progress monitoring by university teachers and teaching associates.

The research conducted on a sample of 216 students from four faculties of the University of Niš showed an enviable level of representation of the researched functions by teachers and teaching associates. The results show that there is a statistically significant difference between the teachers from certain faculties in terms of: teacher evaluation of students' involvement in the instruction process, motivating students to engage more intensively and their inclusion in the process of achievements evaluation. The diversity of approaches to the function of instruction monitoring and evaluation in the domain of verifying the level of understanding the content taught in class is typical for teaching associates of the University of Niš. Based on the established differences, it can be concluded that the researched functions are performed more effectively at faculties where work in smaller groups is more frequently organized, i.e., at the faculties where the functional objectives of instruction are emphasized. The established results can also be viewed from the aspect of the age difference, which enables the teaching associates to see more realistically and adequately appreciate the needs, abilities and interests of students, and to adapt their work to the immediate situational context and differentiate and individualize instruction more effectively.

From the aspect of legal regulations and standards for the accreditation of study programs, it can be concluded that they provide a favorable basis for the curriculum management, precisely in the domain of established results. First of all, the standards for the accreditation of study programs for undergraduate and master's academic studies foresee the possibility of innovating the curricula of extracurricular subjects by up to 30% during one accreditation period. In this way, the preconditions are provided that, in accordance with the needs that arise from the process of instruction monitoring and evaluating and student progress, the continuous development of the curricula is carried out from the aspect of content, instruction methods, types of instruction as well as teaching strategies. On the other hand, the selection procedures that teachers of higher education institutions go through necessarily include

evaluation of their pedagogical work and involvement in the development of instruction, which encourages but also regulates important issues in the field of efficient teacher leadership.

In regards to improving the studied problem, it is important to emphasize that in the domain of higher education there are other mechanisms that are aimed at mapping and overcoming the shortcomings of the leadership competencies of teachers. In this sense, the importance and role of the Centers, i.e., the Committees for quality improvement, whose activities pay significant attention to the curriculum management issues, but also to other important issues in the field of teacher leadership, are emphasized. Student evaluation, instruction evaluation reports, annual and three-year action plans, quality assurance strategies are just some of the ways in which numerous issues and problems in the field of higher education teacher leadership can be systematically and continuously improved.

REFERENCES

Black, S. A. (2015). Qualities of Effective Leadership in Higher Education. *Open Journal of Leadership*, *4*(2), 54-66. https://doi.org/10.4236/OJL.2015.42006

Bryman, A. (2008). Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, *32*(6), 693-710. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114

Bush T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy, and practice. *South african Journal of Education*, *27*(3), 391-406.

Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Harris, A., Leithwood, K., Gu, Q., & Brown, E. (2010). *10 strong claims aboutsuccessful school leadership*. Nottingham: National College for Leadership of Schools and Chilfren's Services.

Gojkov, G. (2019). Management of Changes in Higher Education – the Complexity of Leadership. In J. Starc (Ed.), *Zbornik prispevkov Izzivi globalizacije in družbeno-ekonomsko okolje EU* (pp. 24-41). Univerza v Novom mestu. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343814989

Gosling, J., Bolden, R., & Petrov, G. (2009). Distributed leadership in higher education: What does it accomplish? *Leadership*, *5*(3), 229-310.
https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1742715009337762

Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating Principal Effectiveness: How Perspectives of Parents, Teachers, and Assistant Principals Identify the Central Importance of Managerial Skills. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(5), 1091-1123

Đurišić-Bojanović, M., i Maksić, S. (2006). Direktor škole – lider ili menadžer, *Nastava i vaspitanje*, (3), 337-437.

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33*(3), 329-351. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764032000122005

Hallinger, P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. *Leadership and Policy in School*, *4*(3), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700760500244793

Hallinger, P., Wang, W.-C., Chen, C.-W., & Li, D. (2015). *Assessing Instructional Leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Springer. http://196.190.117.157:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/47664/409.pdf?sequence=1#page=17

Jovanović, D. (2022). *Teorijske osnove liderstva u obrazovanju*. Filozofski fakultet u Nišu. https://doi.org/10.46630/TOL.2022

Leithwood, K., Louis, K. S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *The Learning from Leadership Project (2004–2009)*. New York: Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful School Leadership: what it is and how it influences pupil learning*. London: DfES Research Report 800.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School Leadership that Works. *Research to Results*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development: Alexandria, Virginia, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning: Aurora, Colorado.

Møller, J. (2009). Learning to share: a vision of leadership practice, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *12*(3), 253-267. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120802684530

Ross, J. A., & Berger, M-J. (2009). Equity and leadership: Research-based strategies for school leaders. *School Leadership and Management*, *29*(5), 461-474. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430903152310

Stanković, M., Ševkušić, G.R., Teodorović, J. (2015). Teorijski pristupi liderstvu u obrayovanju. *Uzdanica, XII*(2), 97-116.

Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J., & Kruger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(3), 398-425. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03253411

UPRAVLJANJE NASTAVNIM PROGRAMOM U VISOKOŠKOLSKOJ NASTAVI

Upravljanje nastavnim programom važna je dimenzija i pretpostavka uspešnog liderstva nastavnika i kvaliteta nastave. Kako bi se obezbedila horizontalna i vertikalna usklađenost pa i razvojna vizija nastave neophodno je sagledati funkcionalne elemente ove dimenzije i u kontekstu visokog obrazovanja. Iz tih razloga koncept upravljanja nastavnim programom je u ovom radu sagledan sa aspekta tri osnovne funkcije: praćenja i vrednovanja nastave, koordinisanja razvoja kurikuluma i praćenja napredovanja studenata od strane univerzitetskih nastavnika i saradnika. S ciljem da se utvrdi da li su i u kojoj meri navedene dimenzije upravljanja nastavnim programom zastupljene na visokoškolskom nivou, istraživanje je sprovedeno na uzorku od 216 studenata četiri fakulteta Univerziteta u Nišu. Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju zavidan nivo zastupljenosti istraživanih funkcija uz statistički značajniju učestalost njihovog ostvarivanja među populacijom saradnika. U okviru pojedinačnih komponenti istraživanih funkcija utvrđena je statistički značajna razlika među nastavnicima pojedinih fakulteta i to u pogledu: nastavnikovog vrednovanja uključenosti studenata za nastavni rad, motivisanja studenata na intenzivnije angažovanje i uključivanje studenata u proces vrednovanja postignuća. S druge strane, saradnike karakteriše različitost pristupa funkciji praćenja i vrednovanja nastave u domenu provere stepena razumevanja sadržaja koji se obrađuje na času. Utvrđene razlike upućuju na zaključak da se istraživane funkcije efikasnije ostvaruju na fakultetima na kojima dominira rad sa manjim grupama studenata i na kojima su naglašeni funkcionalni zadaci nastave. Posmatrano sa aspekta zakonske regulative i normativa za akreditaciju studijskih programa, može se zaključiti da oni pružaju povoljne osnove za upravljanje nastavnim programom, te da se mapiranjem slabosti i strateškim planiranjem budućih aktivnosti ova oblast može značajno unaprediti.

Ključne reči: *upravljanje nastavnim programom, liderstvo nastavnika, praćenje, vrednovanje, razvoj kurikuluma*