

THE BOLOGNA REFORM OF SUBJECT TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE NEWLY FOUNDED STATES IN THE TERRITORY OF THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA*

*Edvard Protner***

Department of Pedagogy, Faculty of Arts
University of Maribor, Slovenia

Zdenko Medveš

Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Štefka Batinić

Croatian School Museum, Zagreb, Croatia

Suzana Miovska Spaseva

Institute of Pedagogy, Faculty of Philosophy,
Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia

Igor Radeka

Department of Pedagogy
University of Zadar, Croatia

* *Note.* The authors of this article come from all the states that made up the former Yugoslavia, except Kosovo, where we found no-one to participate. The work was carried out in the following way – all members of the working group first prepared the analysis of the development and current trends of subject teacher education in their own countries, and then the contributions were synthesised by Edvard Protner and Zdenko Medveš. The final version of the text is based on content and editorial revisions by all authors as group members. The research has been produced through earlier cooperation of authors from the working group *Teacher Education in Europe – History, Structure and Reform* within the International research project *4/25 Historische comparatistischen Forschungen zur Entwicklung der Lehrerbildung/Historic comparative research for development of teacher education!*. The project is an integral part of a larger project at Eötvös Lorand University in Budapest and is supported by the European Union and European Social Fund (no. TÁMOP 4.2.1./B-09/KMR-2010-0003). The results of cooperation within the project consist of two parts: the historical development of teacher training in the former Yugoslavia and current reform processes (Protner *et al.*, 2012). In this article, we provide a substantially revised analysis of the implementation of the Bologna reform in education of subject teachers in elementary and secondary education.

** E-mail: edvard.protner@um.si

Vera Spasenović

Department of Pedagogy and Andragogy
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Snježana Šušnjara

Department of Pedagogy, Faculty of Philosophy,
University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

Vučina Zorić

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Montenegro
Montenegro

Nataša Vujišić Živković

Department of Pedagogy and Andragogy,
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract. The article provides an overview of carrying out the principles of the Bologna reform in the education of subject teachers in the newly founded states in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Drawing upon official documents, particularly laws and by-laws, study programmes and constituent documents of individual universities, the comparative analysis of the reform processes between 2004 and 2013 is made within a relatively homogeneous area in teacher education that existed before the break-up of the former joint state. Positive effects and weak points of the reform activities are observed and detected. The analysis has shown that by implementing the Bologna process the differences in the training of subject teachers among the states and universities, and even among individual universities, increased significantly compared to the previous state of education. This is evident not only in the simultaneous implementation of different models (i.e., the duration of studies (3+2, 4+1, 5+0)), but also in concurrent application of simultaneous and successive forms of acquiring teacher competences, different academic titles, and particularly in the greatest issue – different levels of education at which teachers acquire teaching competences for the same teacher profile.

Key words: teacher education, subject teachers, Bologna process, former Yugoslavia, comparative analysis.

The history of teacher training in the states of the former Yugoslavia reflects developments over the centuries, which resulted in highly diverse system solutions. This diversity was caused by great differences in the political, cultural and economic situation of the nations that were in one way or the other subordinated to the impact of the Habsburg (later Austrian-Hungarian) monarchy in the northwest and the Ottoman Empire in the southeast of the territory. However, on the eve of the Bologna Process, teacher training in all states founded in the territory of the former Yugoslavia was systematically

and uniquely arranged. The essence of this uniqueness can be seen in the fact that the same educational profiles for subject teachers at elementary and secondary levels were trained at the university level, based on the recognition of the unique profile of teachers of general subjects in elementary and secondary schools.

The arguments against these two profiles (i.e., for the unique profile) came from different faculties, which traditionally organised university studies for secondary school teachers, thereby particularly relying on the previously commonly established practice that teachers educated at universities should on a large scale teach in senior elementary school grades. These faculties reinforced the arguments against the dual profile of teachers by the fact that the study programmes after the 1970s were expanded by appropriate pedagogical and psychological knowledge covering the overall developmental school age, of both children and adolescents, then by special didactic knowledge for teaching in elementary school, as well as by student teaching practice, separately in training facilities for elementary and secondary schools (Medveš, 2005).

The dilemma on the unique or dual profile of teachers for elementary and secondary school was solved on the political level. However, it seems that the decision was based more on financial reasons and the rationalisation of the higher education network than content and conceptual reasons relying on the belief that higher value was provided by the unique profile or a conscious decision to remove historic dualism (Medveš, 2005). In 1985, the Slovenian Ministry of Education made a decision that training providers of the unique profile of subject teachers for elementary and secondary school should be those faculties that traditionally educated secondary school teachers (the faculties of Philosophy, Bio-technology, Natural and Mathematical Sciences, Kinesiology, Art academies, etc.). At universities that included such faculties (e.g., in Ljubljana), this decision significantly reduced the effect of the newly established Pedagogical Faculty, since it came down to the training of class teachers, special pedagogues and some profiles of two-subject teachers given up by other faculties (Medveš, 2005). Hence, pedagogical academies and later pedagogical faculties experienced the most negative consequences as a result of the unifying of profiles of subject teachers in elementary and secondary schools, even though they were the ones who initiated this idea. The political solution was not good for them in the end.

Such teacher training development approach was typical of other republics of the former Yugoslavia. The transition of subject teacher training to the university level started in the 1970s – in Serbia in 1971 (Trnavac, 2004), in Montenegro in 1977 (Delibašić, 2003), in Croatia in 1978 (Rosić, 2009), and in Macedonia in 1982 (Kamberski, 2000). In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the law had required higher education for all elementary school teachers since 1990, but this requirement was accomplished after 1996 (Smajkić, 2004). It can be assumed that pedagogical academies or higher pedagogical schools in

all states of the former Yugoslavia were the main driving forces of the development of university training of all profiles of teachers in the process of their transformation into pedagogical faculties.

In all states of the former Yugoslavia teacher education has been faced with certain changes after the implementation of the Bologna reform. This article provides an overview of carrying out the principles of the Bologna reform in the training of subject teachers in the former Yugoslav countries and discusses some of the conceptual dilemmas brought by today's solutions. The analysis of the reform processes between 2004 and 2013 is primarily based on official documents, particularly laws and by-laws, study programmes and constituent documents of individual universities.

HOW SHOULD WE SEE THE BOLOGNA LEVELS?

Towards the end of the 1990s, on the eve of the setting up of the Bologna declaration, in all newly founded states in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, all profiles of teachers in primary and general education, and in academic theoretical subjects at secondary schools were educated at the university level (eight semesters of study) – the level ISCED 5A (ISCED 1997) (Medveš, 2001, 2006). The implementation of the Bologna process in various states of the former Yugoslavia took place differently and at different times. The first years of study of the first university level in line with the Bologna Process were introduced earliest in Montenegro and Macedonia in the 2003/04 academic year. One year later, Slovenia started its Bologna reform. From the following academic year, 2005/06, all studies in Croatia were aligned with the Bologna declaration. The same year marked the beginning of the reform in Serbia. Macedonia signed the Bologna declaration in 2003 and immediately after that the European credit transfer system was introduced in undergraduate and post-graduate studies. However, the changes were enacted by adopting the new law on higher education only in 2008 (Zakon za visokoto obrazovanie, 2008). The University of Tuzla, followed by the University of Mostar, was the first in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to start with these activities, and in autumn 2004, they were joined by the University of Sarajevo and the University "Džemal Bijedić" from Mostar. From the 2005/06 academic year, the Bologna system has been implemented at almost all universities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (European Training Foundation, 2009).

Two approaches to the comparison of pre-Bologna and Bologna levels

In the preparation of the legislation for the implementation of the Bologna process in the states of the former Yugoslavia, two approaches were developed to transform the pre-Bologna study levels to Bologna bachelor and master

levels.¹ The first interpretation is based on the assumption that the “Bologna master” is a post-graduate level, which is related, that is, equal to pre-Bologna post-graduate studies in the system of qualification levels. The pre-Bologna post-graduate studies were known throughout the territory of the former Yugoslavia as the first post-graduate level. They were characterised as the first level of studies on the path to a PhD. According to this interpretation, the acquiring of academic titles in the Bologna system would be *exclusive to the first level* (bachelor), either through college or university programmes. In line with such an understanding, all of the academic vocational-professional qualifications available at the higher and university level of education are found at the first level (bachelor) (e.g., a graduate engineer, a university degree engineer, as well as a professor) (Zgaga, 2003), except for the so-called regulated occupations (Medicine, Architecture, etc.), for which education is organised on the master level in a continuous duration of five years without the first level. This interpretation could have potentially jeopardised the level of achievement in teacher training over the last twenty years when it was equivalent in the level of education to that of the regulated professions. This is also the reason why it was perceived as a threat since the training of all teachers from former university graduate levels would be transferred to higher vocational or university levels of the first Bologna level.

In the beginning, this happened in all the states with the Yugoslav heritage, except in Croatia and Slovenia. In Serbia, the Bologna study system was introduced in 2005. It is interesting that the Law of 2005 in Serbia (Zakon o visokom obrazovanju, 2005) abolished the term “university” in its title and not by accident, given that the intention of the legislator was to integrate all forms of higher education as much as possible. The decisions on this were made by experts involved in creating education policies with very little cooperation within the academic community. It was also envisaged that the title “graduated” would be given only after the second study level (*ibid.*). However, under the pressure of the scientific and professional public, the amendments to the Law on Higher Education (Zakon o izmenama i dopunama Zakona o visokom obrazovanju, 2010) were introduced in 2010, stating that the title “graduated” be acquired after university study of the first level, lasting for 4 years and with the scope of 240 ECTS. Given that until 2005 the title “graduated” was granted after 4 years of study, as well as being in line with the currently valid and still not changed rulebooks, this title was granted for teachers. In other

¹ Prior to the Bologna reforms, higher education in the territory of Yugoslavia was divided into four levels: the first level = high or higher vocational school (2 to 3 years), the second level = university (from 4 to 6 years), the third level = master of science as the first post-graduate level (2 years), the fourth level = PhD as the second post-graduate level (2 years). Introducing the Bologna system envisaged the transfer from four to three levels. The identification of the first and the last Bologna level (bachelor and doctorate) is simple, while the second level (master) opened up the issue of whether it suits the pre-Bologna university level or the pre-Bologna master of science.

words, the master level was not needed for teacher profession. However, the new education-related law adopted in 2009 (Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja, 2009) defined that from 2012 the second (master) level studies would be the requirement for working in schools.

In Macedonia, the amendments to the law (Zakon za izmena i dopolnivanje na Zakonot za osnovno obrazovanie, 2004) determined that elementary school teachers should be selected among those who completed undergraduate university studies and acquired the title bachelor. Croatia and Slovenia implemented the Bologna reform based on different interpretations of the levels of education; in these states, bachelor and master levels have the character of training, which allows for the acquisition of academic and professional occupations in a particular profession (Zakon o znanstvenoj djelatnosti i visokom obrazovanju, 2003; Zakon o visokem školstvu, 2006). The real bachelor diplomas are thus equivalent to the requirements after three years of pre-Bologna education, and the real master diplomas are equivalent to the requirements (rights) of pre-Bologna university education. In line with such an interpretation, in Croatia (Zakon o akademskim i stručnim nazivima i akademskom stupnju, 2007) and Slovenia (Zakon o organizaciji in financiranju vzgoje in izobraževanja, 2007), the training of all subject teachers was positioned on the second Bologna (master) level. Only Croatia was consistent in defining the levels as set by the law: the first level as *undergraduate*, the second level as *graduate* and only the third as *post-graduate* (Zakon o znanstvenoj djelatnosti i visokom obrazovanju, 2003). Teachers are thus trained at the graduate level – master diploma (Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi, 2008). In Slovenia there are two post-graduate levels: master and doctoral studies. Elementary and secondary school teachers are trained on the (first) post-graduate level, so they have to have a master diploma (Zakon o organizaciji in financiranju vzgoje in izobraževanja, 2007). Thus, in Slovenia in 2004, the training of all teachers for elementary and secondary schools was, for the first time in history, at least formally, raised to the post-graduate level, while the actual training is comparable to the solutions in Croatia and other European countries that require elementary and secondary school teachers to have the second level diploma with an overall duration of 5 years (300 ECTS).

In Montenegro, the Bologna study system is quite specific and is probably the most unique version of implementing the Bologna levels in the world. Namely, for most study programmes (except, for example, pre-school class teachers who have 4+1) the model of 3+1+1 is used, that is, the *basic* level (3 years), the *post-graduate specialist* level (1 year) and the *post-graduate master* level (1 year) (Zakon o visokom obrazovanju, 2003). The level of teacher training was thus raised to the post-graduate specialist level (the duration 3+1, i.e., 240 ECTS), while the master level remains for teachers only as an option for further training, and not as a condition for finding employment at schools.

The education in Bosnia and Herzegovina is under the entity jurisdiction, with a limited umbrella structure on the state level. Thus, on the entity level, the Federal Ministry of Education and Science of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Srpska are held responsible for training. As for the dominant model of the duration of the first and second levels, Bosnia and Herzegovina belongs to the group of states that accepted the combined model (3+2 and 4+1). As the Bologna Process was gradually introduced in practice, some faculties noticed that the 3+2 model had certain advantages over the 4+1 model, and for some time delivered teaching following both models, which has persisted until today (Federalno ministarstvo obrazovanja i nauke, 2010). In principle, universities and their organisational units make decisions on the length of the first and the second levels starting from the General Law on Higher Education in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Okvirni zakon o visokom obrazovanju u Bosni i Hercegovini, 2007), which sets a minimum of three years for the first level and a maximum of five years for the second level. In the Republic of Srpska, the system of public administration in the education sector is more centralised and therefore the implementation model is more coherent (EU CARDS, 2005).

It should be mentioned that in Bosnia and Herzegovina the key issue is the validity of qualifications after three or four years on the first level. The advocates of the 3+2 model agree that three-year studies are predominantly introductory by character, and hence do not provide real competence for jobs that were once dimensioned by the four-year non-cyclical studies (the qualification of a *university degree*). On the other hand, the first level of three years is not equal to the former college degree, either of two or three years of studies. The current situation confuses potential employers and unfairly underestimates graduated students from the first Bologna level (bachelor) in relation to their former diplomas of the first level (a lawyer, a plant engineer, etc.) (Federalno ministarstvo obrazovanja i nauke, 2010). There is a similar situation regarding the differences in teacher education between parts of the Republic of Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In some parts of the country, teacher employment is conditioned by four-year studies at the first cycle, while in others the Master diploma is required.

Given the different interpretations and classifications of educational levels, these levels are not adequate for the comparison of teacher training among the states. It is more realistic to compare the solutions in different states by contrasting the duration of training, i.e., the number of ECTS. Such a comparison indicates that a master diploma (5 years of study, i.e., 300 ECTS) is a requirement for teacher employment in elementary and secondary schools in Croatia and Slovenia (and since 2012 in Serbia as well), while in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Macedonia the requirement is a university diploma on the first level (4 years of study, i.e., 240 ECTS). Different views and solutions indicate that the implementation of the Bologna process has not

been finished yet. Furthermore, in Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina, there are no signs pointing to changes.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BOLOGNA REFORM IN SUBJECT TEACHER EDUCATION

Basic standard

In the process of introducing the Bologna reform all states preserved the pre-Bologna structure of the training profiles of subject teachers. This is significant since even after the implementation of the Bologna process the uniqueness/sameness of the profile of the elementary and secondary school subject teacher was preserved, which can be considered as a very valuable achievement. On the other hand, introducing the Bologna system caused major differences between the states already on the same level in terms of how the training of teachers of the same professions is organised. This illustrates our initial hypothesis that the implementation of the Bologna ideas missed its target: the harmonisation of higher education systems.

The differences between the states include the length of training and the scope of ECTS. Croatia, Slovenia and some parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Serbia since 2012, require subject teachers in elementary and secondary schools to complete the second (master) level (300 ECTS), whereas all other states in the territory of the former Yugoslavia require subject teachers to obtain a university education at the first level (240 ECTS).

Other states developed master studies for teachers only as an option for upgrading studies, and not as an obligation for employment. However, Serbia deviates from this requirement, since the 2009 Law (*Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja*, 2009) envisages that graduated students who want to be subject teachers have to acquire by 2012 a diploma of the second Bologna level and have a minimum of 30 ECTS of pedagogical, psychological and didactic content and 6 ECTS of practice.

On the other hand, in Bosnia and Herzegovina there is, as an exception, an option of acquiring a professional title “professor” in line with the study programme with only 180 ECTS (e.g., in Banja Luka in the Republic of Srpska at the Faculty of Philosophy for titles, such as the Professor of Philosophy) (Faculty of Philosophy, University of Banja Luka, n. d.).

We can conclude that after the introduction of the Bologna reform the basic standard of training for the employment of subject teachers varies by 120 ECTS among the states in the territory of former Yugoslavia. Compared to the required level of training, it is different for the two levels in the classification of occupations and qualifications (from ISCED 6 to ISCED 7) (according to ISCED 2011), and not only among the states, but also among universities within the same state and among faculties within the same university. This

provides evidence in favour of our hypothesis that the Bologna process, due to different interpretations and comparisons of the pre-Bologna and Bologna levels, had greater consequences in terms of the entropy of the system than the harmonisation of higher education systems.

The organisation of studies

In the majority of the new Yugoslav states teacher training is organised mainly as a two-subject study programme. The organisation of the two-subject study is based on the tradition according to which the study of both subjects is equally valuable. In other words, there is no major or additional study subject, but each profession makes up an equal part of the curriculum intended for the professional part of the study. The same model of study of two equally valuable subjects for subject teachers is traditionally used in Croatia and Slovenia, which is evident from the analysis of all 300 ECTS, implying both levels of training (bachelor and master) together. The scope of each of the subject professions within 300 ECTS is 120 ECTS, while the remaining 60 ECTS comprise the pedagogical module, which allows for the acquiring of teacher competences and consists of teaching methods for both subjects in addition to pedagogical and psychological subjects (Faculty of Education University of Ljubljana, n. d.; University of Zadar, n. d.; Faculty of Philosophy University of Zagreb, n. d.).

Subject teacher training in all other states (except Croatia, Slovenia and some parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina) in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, requiring university education on the first level (240 ECTS) for teacher employment, is based on simultaneous study. This means that professional-subject and pedagogical-psychological-methodical knowledge is continuously distributed during the studies. The layout of knowledge is set by the study programmes, which are, as a rule, decided by universities. That is why the solutions differ greatly and Serbia is a good example of such practice. The training of subject teachers in Serbia takes place in different ways. Some faculties provide the option of enrolment in the teaching section at the beginning of the first level of study (Faculty of Chemistry University of Belgrade, n. d.), whereas some organise pedagogical studies only at the second level, and therefore offer a teaching module on the master level (Faculty of Biology University of Belgrade, n. d.; Department for Mathematics and Informatics University of Novi Sad, n. d.). On the other hand, some faculties treat subjects from pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodical fields as compulsory courses (e.g., Faculty of Physics University of Belgrade) and some as elective courses (e.g., Faculty of Science and Mathematics University of Nis, n. d.). In Montenegro, students master the pedagogical-psychological group of subjects in different ways, and this issue is not systematically solved. Namely, they almost always get this group of subjects at postgraduate specialist studies, and their part ranges from 14 to 24 ECTS. Teaching subjects from this

field are obligatory, but they differ depending on the study programme and the faculty.

The undergraduate training of subject teachers in Macedonia is also implemented in different ways: some faculties offer the teaching section at the beginning of the first cycle (Faculty of Science and Mathematics UKIM-Skopje, n. d.), while others offer elective modules during the study period (Faculty of Philology UKIM-Skopje, n. d.). There are also differences within the same faculty: at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Skopje some institutions allow for the selection of teaching professions via packages of elective subjects (Institute of History) leading to the title “graduated professor” (e.g., of History), and at some institutes those subjects are integrated into the study programme and directly lead all students to the title “graduated professor” (of Philosophy, for example).

These examples have clearly shown how the introduction of the Bologna reforms increased the differences among universities within states, and even among professions within the same university. At the University of Ljubljana, we can find the following implementation models in the call for enrolment for the 2012/13 academic year (Ministrstvo za visoko šolstvo znanost in tehnologijo, 2012):

- At the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics in the training of (one-subject) Mathematics teachers, the pedagogical module is distributed simultaneously with the Mathematics profession, following the model of a unique five-year master study (degree) (5+0);
- At the Faculty of Education in Ljubljana, a (two-subject) Mathematics teacher in combination with Physics or IT or Technical Studies is trained simultaneously by the 4+1 model, whereby the faculty already on the first level awards the professional title “professor of Mathematics and other profession”;
- At the majority of other faculties, as well as art academies, teacher training is organised by the successive model (3+2), so that at the first level the diploma of the profession is awarded, and on the second the title “master professor”.

The models of organising teacher training among the states and among universities within the states are very diverse. Both of the most popular study models – that is, 3+2 and 4+1 – are in use, in addition to the 5+0 model, which is used by some schools as an exception, while in Montenegro the specific model used is 3+1+1. There are cases in which the same university organises pedagogical studies of different professions using both models. Moreover, different models are even used at the same faculty, which leads to numerous difficulties. For example, at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Zagreb, the models 3+2 and 4+1 are used simultaneously. Given that teaching competences for subject teachers in Croatia are acquired exclusively on the graduate level, teaching studies comply with the 4+1 model, in which the

entire graduate year of study is dedicated to the teaching module. It causes big problems since the continuation of studies in more specialised professions leads to student overload by exceeding the granted 60 ECTS.

In practice, among various models the 3+2 model dominates to a significant percentage in all states (except Serbia), while the 4+1 model (dominant in Serbia and Macedonia) is less present, and the model of the homogenous five-year study for subject teachers is in the minority, or even an exception (registered only for “master professors of Mathematics” in Slovenia).

Pedagogical module

It is interesting that among states and universities there is a high conformity of content in the pedagogical module for subject teacher training. Everywhere the module covers pedagogical and psychological disciplines, general and specific didactics and practice in elementary and secondary schools. In most examples, the pedagogical module includes a minimum of 60 ECTS. As we will see, there are differences as well, since some states did not determine the pedagogical module for subject teachers on the system level as a whole, but left it to universities (for example, Montenegro).

Our analyses have shown that the successive distribution of the pedagogical module and other academic subjects creates problems in master training of two-subject teachers with the 4+1 model, since the subject profession requirements as a whole 120 + 120 ECTS are divided into 4 years for the first level, which means that the one-year master programme with the pedagogical module comprises 60 ECTS. Therefore, it can be concluded that the 4+1 model is by no means appropriate for the training of two-subject (double-major) teachers.

From the provision of elective subjects at certain faculties, it is seen that the successiveness of pedagogical, psychological, andragogical and other academic subjects is not derived rigidly and consistently. Hence, it is common practice for universities to provide students with options from pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodological subjects as part of elective subjects on the first level. Practice is very different in different states, and even at universities within the same state. Alongside the successive models some faculties also allow simultaneous mastery of the group of pedagogical-psychological-methodological subjects, especially within elective subjects.

In terms of content, the pedagogical module is a positive step ahead. It is based on the concept of a unique profile of subject teachers for elementary and secondary schools. The problem is the scope of student practice in elementary and secondary schools. In Slovenia, the scope of practice is 15 ECTS (Merila za akreditacijo študijskih programov za izobraževanje učiteljev, 2011), and in Serbia 6 ECTS (Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja, 2009), while in other states (Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina) it is not determined on the national level, thus leaving the decision to each university, and often to

the faculty (which has led to great differences in the length of practice). The situation is similar in Montenegro, but the practice is not expressed in ECTS but instead comprises 3–7 weeks during the studies (Vujačić *et al.*, 2006). A relatively small scope of practice during the studies is partially compensated for by the first employment of teachers in an elementary or secondary school, where they start working as interns, that is, under the tutorship of a mentor.

In some states, as in Slovenia, the provisional scope and content of the pedagogical module are determined on the national level by special criteria for accreditation of pedagogical study programmes, set by the National Committee for accreditation of study programmes (Merila za akreditacijo študijskih programov za izobraževanje učiteljev, 2011) for the preparation and verification of the pedagogical module. In Croatia, the number of credits of the pedagogical module is determined by the law (*Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi*, 2008). Based on this law, the relevant Minister should have approved (among numerous rulebooks) within six months the rulebook for setting the criteria for acquiring teaching competences. Given that this rulebook, as well as other rulebooks, had not been adopted by the time this paper was prepared, the content of the module and the ratios between general pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodological knowledge are decided by universities and faculties. In Serbia, the scope of the pedagogical module is determined by the law (*Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja*, 2009), and elaboration of the content and ways of training delivery is left to higher education institutions. In Montenegro, this issue has not been systematically solved on the state level, so at the end the decision on the pedagogical module is in the hands of the university, which is also true for Bosnia and Herzegovina, where there is still no conformity regarding the pedagogical module and the number of ECTS credits. New institutions, as well as existing, are characterised by large differences in understanding the meaning and the scope of pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodological knowledge, that is, the knowledge of subject teaching in teacher training programmes (Kreso *et al.*, 2006). At a certain number of faculties practice teaching is completely neglected (Dizdar, 1998).

Professional titles

Professional titles of teachers vary greatly among the states. Subject teacher training in Croatia and Slovenia, where the second level is required for employment at schools, is regulated by the simultaneous model. First, the diploma of the first level (bachelor) in a certain academic profession is acquired, and then master studies are continued on the second level consisting of the so-called pedagogical module (Pedagogy, Psychology, Didactics and Methodology, with pedagogical practice). The successiveness of study models can be seen from the structure of study programmes of certain faculties, and especially from the granted academic titles. In this case, graduated students

in Croatia acquire the academic title of “university bachelor” after the completion of the first level, while in Slovenia they acquire the academic title “graduated” of a suitable profession. Also, in Slovenia the title “professor” is acquired on the first level if there is a pedagogical study on the first level (for example, the professor of Pedagogy), and on the second level the academic title “master professor” is acquired by completing the pedagogical section (Zakon o strokovnih in znanstvenih naslovih, 2006).

Some pedagogical faculties in Slovenia do not even deliver the “non-pedagogical” studies, and on the first level, upon the completion of university programmes of four-year training (240 ECTS), they grant the academic teaching title “professor of *subject A* and *subject B*”, and on the second level “master professor of *subject A* and *subject B*” (Faculty of Education University of Ljubljana, n. d.). In this example, the academic teaching title on the first level is also misleading, as this “professor/teacher” is unable to teach or work in schools, because the requirement for teacher employment is the completed second Bologna level.

In Croatia, in spite of the dissatisfaction of the teaching profession at the beginning of the Bologna process, the traditional title “professor” was lost. Namely, upon the completion of bachelor studies graduated students are granted the academic title of an appropriate profession (“university Bachelor of Geography”, “university Bachelor of Mathematics”, etc.). On the second level all graduated students are granted the title of the master of a certain profession and are not given a specific title for pedagogical programmes (diplomas). Only from the diploma supplement of each graduated student it is possible to determine if there are 60 ECTS stipulated by the law for acquiring teaching competences (i.e., whether the student completed the teaching section). Regardless of this, in public, educational and political communication between schools and the relevant Ministry the traditional title “teacher” was kept as a collective term for all profiles of teachers, and then the term “elementary school teacher” for teachers of elementary schools and “professor” for secondary school teachers. The same applies for all other states except Slovenia, which is the only state that kept the title “professor” as a system solution for graduates of pedagogical sections on the first level, and “master professor” on the second level. The academic title shows that the graduated student has successfully completed the entire pedagogical module.

Practices vary in other states, but the term “professor” disappeared as a rule from the title of graduated students of pedagogical sections, although there is a possibility, as mentioned, that the title “professor” is granted upon the completion of some pedagogical sections (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Serbia). Graduate students of pedagogical sections are granted in certain disciplines on the first level the title “graduated” with the specified profession, and on the second level “master” with the specified profession. Only from the diploma supplement it is possible to reconstruct whether the candidate has successfully completed the pedagogical module and whether

he/she meets the requirements for teachers. The specific case is Montenegro, where students are granted the title “bachelor” after the diploma of the three-year study, after post-graduate specialist studies (3+1) the title “graduated”, and after master studies (3+1+1) the title “Master of Science” or “Master of Arts” (Pravila studiranja na postdiplomskim studijama, 2006). However, the master level (3+1+1) for teachers is only an option, an opportunity to upgrade the studies, and not a pre-condition for employment as a teacher. As there is no specific title for pedagogical diplomas, in Montenegro only the diploma supplement serves to determine whether the graduate student completed the “pedagogical module”. If he/she did not, he/she has to achieve it when taking the expert exam (ibid.).

In the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, at the University of Sarajevo, upon the completion of the first cycle students are granted the title “bachelor”, and upon the second “master” of an appropriate profession. In Banja Luka (the Republic of Srpska), at the Faculty of Philosophy, professor titles are granted (e.g. “professor of Philosophy” (180 ECTS), “professor of History” (240 ECTS), “graduated psychologist” (180 ECTS). Upon the completion of the first cycle of studies, the candidate can enrol in the same faculty in the second cycle lasting for one year (60 ECTS) or two study years (120 ECTS), depending on the duration of the first cycle.

In Macedonia, by the amendments to the law of 2011 (Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovното obrazovanie, 2011) it is envisaged that pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodological training is mandatory for work in elementary and secondary schools for all teachers who complete the first level of non-teaching studies. The law also regulates the number of credits of the pedagogical module (30 ECTS). The implementation of these changes started on 1st January 2013.

In Macedonia and Serbia, if there is organised teacher training within university programmes on the first level, it is possible to grant either the academic title “graduated” or the title “professor” with the specified profession. Regardless of differences in titles, all of them meet the requirements for working at schools as teachers. Similar to Croatia, in these cases the diploma supplement serves as the document which shows whether the student completed the envisaged pedagogical module during his/her studies. As mentioned, in Serbia, starting from 2012 the first level of education is no longer sufficient, but instead subject teachers have to have the second level diploma.

CONCLUSION

Key statements

During the analysis of the current state of teacher training in the new states in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, we stated the key conclusions, open issues and challenges. The comparison of several states at the same time allows for immediate comparison of the implementation of the idea of the Bologna Process under different circumstances. Thus, it is recognised what processes are the result of the implementation of the Bologna Process. The analyses and comparison have clearly shown that the Bologna process was accompanied by a high level of entropy, instead of strengthening the integrity of the area of higher education in south-eastern Europe. Consequently, the solutions among the states, and even among universities within the states, became even more diversified than before the reforms. There is no common denominator for teacher training created as a result of *the Bologna declaration* and its later upgrading (by implementing the idea of the *European Higher Education Area*) at the Ministers' meetings of the signatory states in Prague (2001), Berlin (2003), Bergen (2005), London (2007), Leuven (2009), Budapest and Vienna (2010), and then Bucharest (2012).

When outcomes are determined based on the comparative analysis of the implementation of the Bologna process in the new states in the territory of the former Yugoslavia, we can conclude that the implementation has had positive, but also doubtful effects.

Positive effects

(1) The standard of teacher training has been preserved or even raised to the diploma level wherever the second (master) Bologna level (300 ECTS) is required for the teaching profession. This applies to Croatia, Slovenia and some parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina from the beginning of introducing the Bologna reform, as well as for Serbia since 2012. Other states set the threshold for the teaching license at the first level of university programmes (240 ECTS), although there are places where the completed study programme of the first level with only 180 ECTS is accepted for teachers, which, in terms of the standard, is a step back in comparison to the situation prior to the Bologna reform. At the same time, it should be noted that opportunities for further teacher training on the second Bologna level were developed at places where it is not a requirement for teacher employment. An important step forward is the introduction of doctoral studies for teachers in their narrow field of expertise, which usually means the area of methodology of teaching.

(2) It is important that the model of the complete and unique profile of subject teachers for elementary and secondary schools was preserved in the Bologna reform. An even more significant step is the high-quality content up-

grade of the model of the unique subject teacher profile for higher levels of elementary and secondary schools. This is reflected in the requirement that the teacher has to be professionally and methodically trained for teaching on both school levels. The idea that students of the pedagogical section in the study have to comprehend the content, requirements and objectives of teaching of a particular subject in elementary and secondary schools is re-enforced, and so they have to be practically trained for work on both school levels. Thus, the historical dualism in dividing teachers against the school vertical has been overcome not only formally, but also in terms of quality.

(3) The share of pedagogical, psychological and didactic-methodological content (pedagogical module) in teacher training for general subjects was increased and relatively integrated. In most states the share of knowledge has been particularly increased in the preparation of teachers of vocational theory subjects in vocational and craft schools. At the same time, such a step is the contribution towards reducing the horizontal differences in teacher training in different professions or vocational sectors (general or vocational theoretic sectors).

Open issues and challenges

(1) The Bologna levels have not been clearly identified in the comparative methodology and taxonomy used for the classification of teacher training and qualifications. If we consider this issue from the position of the overall European Higher Education Area, the level on which teachers are trained for elementary and secondary schools still remains vague. Actually half of the new states (Croatia, Slovenia, parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia after 2012) in the territory of the former Yugoslavia opted for the master diploma, and other states (parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro) for university study on the first level. The issue of classifying teacher training into Bologna levels remains current due to international comparisons. With the harmonisation of training with learning outcomes a series of issues has been addressed, among which a particularly important one is whether it is possible, given the differences in interpretation of study levels, to achieve harmonised teacher training in the European Higher Education Area. This is of particular relevance for the European Qualification Framework, which was adopted in 2008 and which asks for the distribution of qualifications in line with the level of the competences achieved. Therefore, it is hard to accept the situation at the territory of the former Yugoslavia as an optimal and final solution, considering that teachers are trained for the same job at two, or even three different training levels.

(2) Differences in training subject teachers are the most difficult problem. By introducing the Bologna reform, the main requirements for employment of subject teachers started to vary from state to state, that is, for universities with a requirement of 120 ECTS (e.g., the training of a Philosophy teacher

ranges from 180 to 300 ECTS). For the time being, it is not possible to interpret these differences clearly in relation to the European Qualification Framework, since the national Qualification Frameworks have not yet been adopted everywhere, but it can be assumed that the training of subject teachers is different for the three levels of classifications of occupations and qualifications, not only among the analysed states, but also among universities within the same state. The analysis allows for a hypothetical conclusion that it is possible to preserve the standard of training of subject teachers from the pre-Bologna period only in master level programmes. In some states, the introduction of the “Bologna” study programmes increased the scope of the “pedagogical module” as much as 100% (from half a year to one year – e.g., in Slovenia), which has contributed to the quality of pedagogical, psychological, didactic and methodical training of subject teachers. This is particularly important for some teaching profiles trained for work in elementary and secondary schools. The increase of the scope of the pedagogical module is professionally sustainable only within the master programme, since the increase of the module on the undergraduate level in the old programme dimensions would be at the expense of thorough academic professional qualifications, which would be unduly in professional terms.

(3) The key dilemma of the Bologna process is related to the thesis of the Bologna declaration on the compulsory division of training into two clearly recognisable levels (which were later upgraded by the third one, doctoral), which has resulted in the development of different models of studies – known as models 3+2, 4+1, 5+0 or 3+1+1, applied by Montenegro. There are specific difficulties among different states, such as Croatia and Slovenia, which opted for teacher training on the second level by the 3+2 model, and particularly in those states that chose the 4+1 model, as shown on the example of some subject teacher profiles (in Slovenia also class teachers). The division into two levels is non-functional – given that the pedagogical section on the first level is not recognised in the labour market – which is explicitly required by the Bologna declaration. Therefore, a replacement of the models 3+2 and 4+1 with the 5+0 model should be reconsidered for all profiles of teachers, especially for class teachers, and then for subject teachers trained to teach two or more subjects. The model of a unique master study (5+0) of the Bologna declaration was envisaged from the beginning for the so-called regulated professions. Teaching professions are in fact regulated on the state level. Thus, the possibility and requirements should be solved on the system level for the transfer of students (after the third year of study as a rule) from the overall five-year pedagogical sections to independent master studies of other professions and vice versa (the transfer from non-pedagogical to pedagogical sections). The unique five-year master programme should allow for a simultaneous distribution of pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodological and other professional academic content, which would direct academic professions more strongly towards acquiring teaching competences.

(4) With the introduction of the Bologna process, the term “professor” was abandoned in the titles of students graduating from pedagogical sections. The title “professor” was preserved only by Slovenia as a system solution stipulated by the law. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia and Serbia kept it only in some pedagogical sections because of the decisions of certain universities, and Croatia and Montenegro abandoned it completely. Instead of the internationally affirmed title, graduated students of different sections of the pedagogical profession as a rule acquire the same title as graduates of non-pedagogical sections: after the first level they are granted the title “bachelor”, and “master” on the second level. Only from the diploma supplement is it possible to reconstruct whether the candidate has successfully completed the pedagogical module during studies and whether he/she meets the requirements for teachers. Thus this established profession loses its recognition. When one adds the fact that pedagogical-psychological and didactic-methodical knowledge is now more often acquired during the preparation for the state license exam, it is clear that the dissolution process of the substance of the profession begins by gradual abolishment of continuous training.

References

- Delibašić, R. (2003). *Filozofski fakultet u Nikšiću*. Nikšić: Svetigora.
 Department for Mathematics and Informatics University of Novi Sad (n. d.). Retrieved May 20, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.dmi.pmf.uns.ac.rs/en>.
- Dizdar, S. (1998). *Razvoj i perspektive u obrazovanju nastavnika u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: Federalno ministarstvo za obrazovanje, nauku, kulturu i sport.
- EU CARDS (2005). *Funkcionalni pregled sektora obrazovanja u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Retrieved July 20, 2013 from the World Wide Web http://www.unze.ba/download/ects/Funkcionalni%20pregled_sektora_obrazovanja_u_BIH.pdf.
- European Training Foundation (2009). *Bosnia and Herzegovina – ETF Country Plan 2009*. Retrieved July 10, 2011 from the World Wide Web [http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125753900361541/\\$file/NOTE7N5DKB.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/webatt.nsf/0/C12578310056925BC125753900361541/$file/NOTE7N5DKB.pdf)
- Faculty of Biology University of Belgrade (n. d.). Retrieved May 21, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.bio.bg.ac.rs/?jez=eng>.
- Faculty of Chemistry University of Belgrade (n. d.). Retrieved May 25, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.chem.bg.ac.rs/studije/3-sr.html>.
- Faculty of Education University of Ljubljana (n. d.). Retrieved September 15, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.pef.uni-lj.si/index.php?id=12>.
- Faculty of Philology UKIM-Skopje (n. d.). Retrieved September 10, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.flf.ukim.edu.mk>.
- Faculty of Philosophy UKIM-Skopje (n. d.). Retrieved July 25, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.fzf.ukim.edu.mk>.
- Faculty of Philosophy University of Banja Luka (n. d.). Retrieved September 12, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://ff.unibl.org/index.php>.
- Faculty of Philosophy University of Zagreb (n. d.). Retrieved September 17, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://czon.ffzg.unizg.hr/dok/ljetni2011-12.pdf>
- Faculty of Physics University of Belgrade (n. d.). Retrieved December 15, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.ff.bg.ac.rs/Engleski/TeachingCurriculum06.pdf>
- Faculty of Science and Mathematics UKIM-Skopje (n. d.). Retrieved July 22, 2013 from the World Wide Web <http://www.pmf.ukim.edu.mk>

- Faculty of Science and Mathematics University of Nis (n. d.). *Study Program Geography: Basic Academic Studies*. Retrieved December 23, 2013 from the World Wide Web http://www.pmf.ni.ac.rs/pmf/studije/geografija/akad_osn/geograf2008.php
- Federalno ministarstvo obrazovanja i nauke (2010). *Informacija o provedbi Bolonjskog procesa u Federaciji Bosne i Hercegovine*. Mostar: Federalno ministarstvo obrazovanja i nauke BIH, Sektor za visoko obrazovanje, nauku i tehnologiju.
- Kamberski, K. (2000). *Preduchilishnoto i osnovnoto vospitanie i obrazovanie vo Republika Makedonija (razvoj, sostojbi i perspektivi)*. Skopje: Filozofski fakultet.
- Kreso, P. A., Muratović, H., Rangelov-Jusić, R. & Trbić, Dž. (2006). Nacionalni izvještaj Bosna i Hercegovina. In P. Zgaga (Ed.), *The Prospects of Teacher Education in South-East Europe* (pp. 171–207). Ljubljana: Centre for Educational Policy Studies.
- Medveš, Z. (2001). Kompatibilnost z evropskimi sistemi. In *Unescov priručnik za uporabo mednarodne standardne klasifikacije izobraževanja Isced 1997: (zbornik prispevkov)* (pp. 109–117). Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo, znanost in šport.
- Medveš, Z. (2005). Izobraževanje učiteljev v bolonjski prenovi. In T. Plevnik (Ed.), *Pomembne teme v izobraževanju v Sloveniji: Prenavljanje pedagoškega študija* (pp. 29–37). Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo, znanost in šport.
- Medveš, Z. (2006). Bolonjski proces med univerzo in uradništvom. *Sodobna pedagogika*, Vol. 57, No. 4, 6–21.
- Merila za akreditacijo študijskih programov za izobraževanje učiteljev (2011). *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, Br. 94.
- Ministrstvo za visoko šolstvo, znanost in tehnologijo (2012). Razpis za vpis v dodiplomske in enovite magistrske študijske programe v študijskem letu 2012/2013. Ljubljana: Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology.
- Okvirni zakon o visokom obrazovanju u Bosni i Hercegovini (2007). *Službeni list Bosne i Hercegovine*, Br. 59.
- Pravila studiranja na postdiplomskim studijama (2006). *Dokumenti* (str. 159–171). Podgorica: Univerzitet Crne Gore.
- Protner, E., Medveš, Z., Batinić, Š., Miovska Spaseva, S., Radeka, I., Spasenović, V., Šušnjara, S., Zorić, V. & Vujisić Živković, N. (2012). The Development of Teacher Training in the States of Former Yugoslavia. In A. Nemeth & E. Skiera (Eds.), *Lehrerbildung in Europa: Geschichte, Struktur und Reform* (pp. 239–266). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Rosić, V. (2009). Obrazovanje učitelja i odgojitelja. *Metodički obzori*, God. 4, Br. 7–8, 19–32.
- Smajkić, S. (2004). *Obrazovanje nastavnika osnovne škole u Bosni i Hercegovini (1946-1986)*. Sarajevo: Pedagoška akademija.
- Trnavac, N. (2004). *Azbučnik i tipologija poznatih školskih institucija*. Beograd: Institut za pedagogiju i andragogiju Filozofskog fakulteta; Gornji Milanovac: Dositej.
- Vujačić, L., Đorđević, J. & Mićović, N. (2006). Nacionalni izvještaj Crna Gora. In P. Zgaga (Ed.), *The Prospects of Teacher Education in South-East Europe* (str. 401–437). Ljubljana: Centre for Educational Policy Studies.
- Zajedničke programske osnove sveučilišnih diplomskih studija za stjecanje nastavničkih kompetencija. Sveučilište u Zadru/University of Zadar (n. d.). Retrieved December 23, 2013 from the World Wide Web http://www.unizd.hr/Portals/44/pdf/zpo_sds_program_2009_10.pdf
- Zakon o akademskim i stručnim nazivima i akademskom stupnju (2007). *Narodne novine Republike Hrvatske*, Br. 107.
- Zakon o izmenama i dopunama Zakona o visokom obrazovanju (2010). *Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije*, Br. 44.
- Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi (2008). *Narodne novine Republike Hrvatske*, Br. 87.
- Zakon o organizaciji in financiranju vzgoje in izobraževanja (2007). *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, Br. 16.

- Zakon o osnovama sistema obrazovanja i vaspitanja (2009). *Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije*, Br. 72.
- Zakon o strokovnih in znanstvenih naslovih (ZSZN-1) (2006). *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, Br. 61.
- Zakon o visokem šolstvu (2006). *Uradni list Republike Slovenije*, Br. 119.
- Zakon o visokom obrazovanju (2003). *Službeni list Republike Crne Gore*, Br. 60.
- Zakon o visokom obrazovanju (2005). *Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije*, Br. 76.
- Zakon o znanstvenoj djelatnosti i visokom obrazovanju (2003). *Narodne novine Republike Hrvatske*, Br. 123.
- Zakon za izmena i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovno obrazovanie (2004). *Sluzben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, Br. 2004/103.
- Zakon za izmenuvanje i dopolnuvanje na Zakonot za osnovnoto obrazovanie (2011). *Sluzben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, Br.18.
- Zakon za visokoto obrazovanie (2008). *Sluzben vesnik na Republika Makedonija*, Br. 2008/35.
- Zgaga, P. (2003). The Bologna Process: Bologna 1999, Prague 2001, Berlin 2003 and What Will Be Next. In F. Buchberger & S. Berghammer (Eds.), *Education Policy Analysis in a Comparative Perspective* (pp. 15–40). Linz: Trauner.

Примљено 15.03.2014; прихваћено за штампу 03.04.2014.

Едвард Протнер, Зденко Медвеш, Штефка Батинић, Сузана Миовска Спасева,
Игор Радека, Вера Спасеновић, Сњежана Шушњара, Вучина Зорић
и Наташа Вујисић Живковић

БОЛОЊСКА РЕФОРМА ОБРАЗОВАЊА ПРЕДМЕТНИХ НАСТАВНИКА
У НОВООСНОВАНИМ ДРЖАВАМА НА ТЕРИТОРИЈИ
БИВШЕ ЈУГОСЛАВИЈЕ

Апстракт

У раду се даје преглед спровођења принципа Болоњске реформе у образовању предметних наставника у новооснованим државама на територији бивше Југославије. На основу званичних докумената, нарочито закона и подзаконских аката, студијских програма и статута појединачних универзитета, спроведена је компаративна анализа реформских процеса у периоду између 2003. и 2014. године у релативно хомогеној области образовања наставника која је постојала пре распада некадашње заједничке државе. Посматрани су и утврђени позитивни ефекти и слабе тачке реформских активности. Анализа је показала да су се, у поређењу са ранијом ситуацијом у образовању, током примене Болоњског процеса знатно увећале разлике у обуци предметних наставника између различитих држава и универзитета, па чак и међу појединим универзитетима. Овакво стање огледа се не само у имплементацији различитих модела (тј. трајању студија (3+2, 4+1, 5+0)), већ и у истовременој примени симултаних и сукцесивних облика стицања наставничких компетенција, различитим академским звањима, а нарочито у најважнијем проблему – различитим нивоима образовања на којима наставници стичу компетенције за исти наставнички профил. *Кључне речи:* образовање наставника, предметни наставници, Болоњски процес, бивша Југославија, компаративна анализа.

Эдуард Протнер, Зденко Медвеш, Штефка Батинич,
Сузанна Миовска Спасева, Игорь Радека, Вера Спасенович,
Снежана Шушняра, Вучина Зорич и Наташа Вуисич Живкович
БОЛОНСКАЯ РЕФОРМА ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЕЙ
В НОВООСНОВАННЫХ ГОСУДАРСТВАХ
НА ТЕРРИТОРИИ БЫВШЕЙ ЮГОСЛАВИИ

Резюме

В работе предлагается обзор проведения принципов Болонской реформы в образовании преподавателей школьных предметов на территории бывшей Югославии. На основании официальных документов, особенно законов и сопровождающих правовых актов, учебных программ и уставов университетов, проведен сопоставительный анализ процессов реформы в период между 2003 и 2014 г. в сравнительно гомогенной сфере образования преподавателей, существовавшей до распада единого государства. Наблюдались положительные эффекты и слабые стороны проведения реформы. Анализ показал, что, по сравнению с прежней ситуацией в образовании, в ходе применения Болонского процесса в значительной мере увеличились различия в плане обучения преподавателей школьных предметов между различными государствами и университетами и даже между университетами в рамках одного государства. Это выражается не только в применении разных моделей структуры и длительности обучения (3+2, 4+1, 5+0), но и в одновременном применении синхронных и последовательных форм приобретения преподавательских компетенций, в разных академических званиях, и особенно в наиболее важной проблеме – различных уровнях образования, на которых преподаватели приобретают компетенции для одного и того же преподавательского профиля.

Ключевые слова: образование преподавателей, преподаватели школьных предметов, Болонский процесс, бывшая Югославия, сравнительный анализ.