

MODEL OF FIELD TRAINING REDESIGN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION AND POLICE STUDIES BASED ON STUDENT EVALUATION

Boban Milojković, PhD

Saša Milojević, PhD¹

Bojan Janković, PhD

University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies, Belgrade, Serbia

Bojan Mitrović, PhD

Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia

Introduction

At the beginning of the 21st century, evaluation and quality of the teaching process grew into significant policy issues in education around the world while acting as powerful governance mechanisms at the national and transnational levels (Anđelković-Pešić et al., 2012; Gurova et al., 2015). According to Holland (2005), enhancing the quality of primary, secondary, and higher education is becoming increasingly crucial by fully implementing internal and external control strategies and regularly monitoring and evaluating all aspects of the educational process.

The evaluation of the educational process represents a specific pedagogical phenomenon (Matijević, 2005; Španja, 2019). There are numerous definitions, divisions, and evaluation models, so it is not easy to single out its unique conceptual definitions and modalities (Patton, 2002). Evaluation results from monitoring and research to understand teaching practice in the context of improving teaching to develop, change, adapt, improve, and achieve the desired results. Such evaluation can be considered one of the elements in the cycle of reflexive review, understanding, and changing practice (Gibbs, 1988). Also, we can say that evaluation is part of the teaching process that includes permanent, organised, and systematic monitoring and analysis of teaching in order to understand the process of teaching itself and the measure of achieving its achievements (Franceško et al., 2002), i.e., to change and improve teaching practice, to adapt teaching to the needs and capabilities of students, teaching performers and circumstances in the environment, then to achieve the desired long-term and short-term goals, to change the plan and improve the program, and for the performers of teaching to develop as teachers.

During class preparation and planning, formative and summative evaluations assess progress. Bearing in mind who performs the evaluation, we distinguish *internal evaluation and self-evaluation* – performed by the subjects of the teaching process and *external evaluation* – performed by someone not participating in the teaching process. Conditionally, these types of evaluation belong to the unified term *institutional evaluation*. Planning and organising a continuous process of institutional evaluation requires adequate preparation of the subjects of evaluation, development of instruments for conducting evaluation and collecting, processing, analysis, submission, and presentation of reports. Teaching evaluations are not commonly used to enhance institutions' teaching quality. We must recognise the

¹ sasa.milojevic@kpu.edu.rs



value of these evaluations as they are an effective means of identifying areas of improvement. Ensuring their appropriate use is crucial. Often, teachers perceive evaluations as an administrative obligation, external control or formal care of the system instead of a way of improving quality. Evaluating teaching in Serbian universities relies solely on standardised student questionnaires. Unfortunately, these questionnaires contain questions that do not help improve the quality of teaching. The purpose of such an established evaluation is for the evaluated teacher to receive a “certificate” that he presents when choosing a vocation, whereby the criteria for the title selection do not give this data sufficient importance (Stančić, 2014).

Considering the evaluation cycle phases, we distinguish the following evaluations: *ex-ante evaluation* – before the implementation of the program/projects; *on-going* or *interim evaluation* or *mid-term evaluation* – during the performance of the program/project; *ex-post evaluation* – after the implementation of the program/projects (De Rijcke, 2016). At the program level, in addition to performance evaluations, other types of assessment are possible (thematic evaluations, strategic evaluations, evaluations of policies of common interest, theory-based performance evaluations, factual impact evaluations, meta-evaluations/evaluation evaluations), etc. (Tyler, 1989). Also, the term “diagnostic evaluation” is used to record the current state of teaching, especially before the introduction of any changes, so that evaluation experts know how to attribute the possible effects of these changes (Vizek-Vidović et al., 2003, p. 444).

Evaluation can also be seen from the aspect of its organisation and implementation in the formal (educational system) and informal teaching process (teaching in training according to vocational training programs) (Wills, 1994; Despotović, 2010). In both cases, multiple evaluation models determine differences in the evaluation processes.²

Scott (1998) and Herman et al. (1987) identified and categorised seven evaluation models concerning their orientation in the evaluation process – goal-oriented, decision-oriented, research-oriented, participant-oriented, free-oriented, alternative explanation-oriented, and stock-oriented.

After the introductory elaboration of the topic of evaluation, it is necessary to ask the question: What are the characteristics of evaluation in the national education space? Is it characterised by a need for more individualised and flexible approaches to teaching, especially in higher education? Accepting and introducing a modern didactic-methodical standard in the acts regulating the integration of higher European education resolved the earlier mismatch and dysfunctionality in the process and content of higher education teaching. This standard, among other things, is characterised by a new evaluation concept. In this regard, in order to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation in both teaching and management, it was necessary to enhance the reflection of transparency, interaction, and reflection of the newly established student-administration-teacher relationship, ensure the regularity of the evaluation process, the distribution of roles and profiling of the roles of the carriers of this process, as well as the model of communication between them (Handal, 2003).

² Evaluating police training requires continuous planning and timely implementation to yield the expected information. Evaluation should occur throughout the training, at its conclusion, and upon participants’ return to their work duties. Initially, participants’ reactions to the new teaching content are assessed before the training commences. In the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Serbia, evaluation typically occurs before training through a prior knowledge test, during training with daily and weekly assessments, and at the end of training via a comprehensive knowledge test (which provides comprehensive information on the progress made – measuring the attained change in knowledge, skills, and attitudes, crucial for the ongoing refinement of training). Additionally, evaluation is conducted upon participants’ return to their workplaces, three to six months after training, measuring the application of acquired knowledge and skills in their professional roles. More on this; Regulation on vocational training and training in the Ministry of Internal Affairs: Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, 42/2017-5, 56/2018-11, 34/2019-10, 11/2020-9, 24/2021-34, 49/2022-18, 54/2023-5.



Academic quality refers to the availability of diverse learning opportunities and how much they assist students in achieving their academic objectives. It entails verifying the adequacy of conditions such as effective teaching, support, and various learning opportunities to ensure students receive the necessary guidance and resources (Castelluccio & Lanfranco, 2006). In higher education, fostering a quality culture and providing full support for quality assurance measures demands accepting students as complete and equal partners. In other words, the inclusion of students in the quality culture of a higher education institution proves to be very useful (Richardson, 2005; Bruce et al., 2007; Tot, 2013). Students can be the source of many creative ideas, but they should be allowed to express them (Jevremov et al., 2016, p. 293).

What is learned from students when examining their views on teaching are two different things. On the one hand, relatively objective information is obtained, for example, how often they attend classes, how many students regularly come to class, etc. On the other hand, obtaining subjective assessments and evaluations about students' personal experience in the teaching process and how students experienced a particular subject, content, specific teacher, and associate is essential. This situation should not be discouraged, and it is clear that students' subjective experiences are significant in the evaluation and quality control of teaching (Handal, 2003).

Hence, this paper presents the results of a study initiated to explore students' subjective experience of the quality of the teaching process at the University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies, explicitly focusing on the unique forms of teaching field training that set the University apart from competing higher education institutions (Milojević, 2010; Milojević & Janković, 2012; Milojević et al., 2014). Namely, educating staff with university degrees to fill the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Serbia is complex. Future police personnel, during their education, must adopt an extensive fund of theoretical knowledge and acquire a range of practical knowledge and unique skills that serve as a "professional tool". The training process, i.e., exercises with varying intensity and dynamics, enables the acquisition of these skills.

In its original form, field training constitutes fundamental police training conducted outside the headquarters of higher education institutions within the defence and security system. It follows a highly intensive and dynamic all-day program lasting several days. The plan and program of field training at the University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies envision implementing an upgraded model of basic police training. This training focuses on operational police skills, fire training, and the tactical conduct of members of the police of general jurisdiction, followed by training members of police units with specific purposes.

The main objective of the field training is to directly connect the theoretical knowledge acquired at the University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies with the practical actions of members of the police of general jurisdiction, i.e., to expand the existing theoretical knowledge and acquire new practical knowledge and acquire skills necessary for the execution of regular and extraordinary police duties and tasks. Field training also aims to enable students of the University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies to acquire machine-built, morally-volitional habits and psychophysical fitness, as well as a more complete and comprehensive mastering and determination of specific teaching contents within the narrower professional subjects, thus acquiring fire, tactical and topographical competence for solving security tasks in urban and rural geospace, in order to better prepare for work in the Ministry of the interior of the Republic of Serbia.

Bearing in mind the above, the research in question used an evaluation model that belongs to the type of summative evaluation, the implementation of which investigates the level of assurance and quality development of higher police education in the part of unique forms of teaching – field training. This



research aims to determine the attitudes of students of the Belgrade University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies sent for field training on the effectiveness of field training. To define research tasks, we can assess the following:

- a) Assessing students' attitudes about the applicability of the content of field training in future work, its presentation, and the possibility for them to adopt it adequately;
- b) Evaluating the impact of the realised program contents on changing students' training level from thematic units where they acquired practical knowledge and skills in operational police skills and police powers, from training in handling official weapons and police topography.

The obtained students' attitudes indicate their perception of the teaching process, as well as the level and structure of their agreement or disagreement with the projected current concept of teaching and possible problems in the realisation of teaching during field training. One can utilise these data in the general evaluation process, i.e., in self-evaluating the quality of teaching during field training and in the function of a positive approach in redesigning study programs for future generations.

By implementing this research, it is possible to come up with a modality of solutions for improving the didactic-methodical standard of higher police education (Milojković, 2001), thus raising the level and importance of the culture of responsibility of education for the police profession, i.e., considering the possibility of using the results of the quality assessment of higher police education in the development and implementation of functional education policy in national police education (Milojković, 2011).

Research Methods

Based on Donald Kirkpatrick's widely used model for assessing the effects of training, we designed the modalities for summative evaluation. His model observes four evaluation levels, from the participants' primary reaction to the training to the impact of the training itself on organisational performance. This model also examines what students learned in training and whether learning has influenced a positive change in their behaviour in the performance of functional tasks (Kirkpatrick, 1996, p. 54). In principle, when evaluating field training as a unique form of teaching, we measure the following parameters: completion of training, participants reactions or impressions, the effectiveness of knowledge and skills transfer during training, the potential for learning, post-training results, participant completion rates, and the successful transfer and acquisition of knowledge and skills (assessed through knowledge tests aligned with the learning outcomes). Ultimately, after completing the training, we evaluate the results. This assessment gauges the level of success and scope of the training. It measures whether and to what extent the trainees applied the acquired knowledge and skills in practice (assessing behavioural changes) and thus contributed to the benefit of the police organisation.

In this specific case, we assessed student satisfaction with the quality of teaching at the Mitrovo Polje field training centre of the Teaching Centre of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia. We employed testing methods and utilised a survey technique with a concise questionnaire, a standard approach for evaluating students after field training sessions, especially when anticipating a high student turnout. To meet these criteria, we integrated short questionnaires into the evaluation to assess the quality of teaching, a method endorsed by many researchers (Byrne & Flood, 2003). Short questionnaires offer benefits such as reducing resistance, minimising fatigue, boredom, and effort, and positively influencing the subjects' motivation to participate in the study. They also lead to higher voluntary participation rates, increasing the potential for generalising the results. Another specific advantage lies in their facilitation of repeated measurements. However, for short questionnaires to be



effective, they must meet specific requirements regarding reliability and validity (Mužić, 1999). It is important to note that they are suitable only for situations where we need to assess a group phenomenon (Ziegler et al., 2014). This aligns directly with evaluating teaching quality in student assessments (Jevremov et al., 2016, p. 493), the approach employed in this research.

Accordingly, we examined the essential aspects of student assessment of the quality of teaching in-field training. This assessment focused on evaluating the organisation and implementation of teaching, the quality of teaching content, and the pedagogical competencies of the teaching performers in training (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Additionally, it explored the relationship between students' academic characteristics and the evaluation of specific aspects of teaching quality. Previous research investigated the impact of gender structure, study method (on budget or self-financing), field training year, and academic achievement, as these characteristics were identified as significant factors influencing teaching evaluations (Jevremov et al., 2016, p. 495).

Instrument and Scope of Research

A short questionnaire was created based on the available examples from previous research (Milojević et al., 2011; Milojević et al., 2013) and a one-year pilot test in 2015 that corrected its metric characteristics. It consists of three groups of closed questions and one open-type question necessary to achieve a higher-quality instrument. The respondents rated their responses on a three-point rating scale (3 – satisfactory, 2 – I cannot assess, and 1 – not satisfactory). More specifically, students evaluated the following aspects: the didactic-methodically shaped teaching contents studied in field training (engaging, appropriate, purposeful, complex, demanding, oversized); whether the organisation of all-day life and work in field training adequately accommodated teaching activities, extracurricular activities, and security services; the quality and quantity of the equipment they used in field training; the quality of accommodation conditions in the field training; the quality and quantity of nutrition in the field training; and the work and commitment of responsible task holders in field training (teachers, instructors, management and logistics staff).

We use a 1 to 5 scale to assess student achievement scores. The students assessed their knowledge and skills in the subjects of Police Tactics, Police Topography, and Armament with Shooting Classes, as well as their overall impression of Field Training. Following this, they had a section where they could provide suggestions and remarks based on the aforementioned quantitative-qualitative characteristics of field training. Before completing the questionnaire, we gave students comprehensive introductory notes explaining the evaluation's significance and purpose, which enabled students to recognise that their evaluation could impact the redesign of field training for future generations.

Consequently, they perceived the potential for achieving its goal and were thus motivated to complete it. Additionally, we ensure that students can access and complete the survey questionnaire openly and honestly while maintaining anonymity. Between 2016 and 2019, we conducted the research with 416 third-year undergraduates of academic studies in Criminology, constituting 75% of the population sample.

Results and Discussion

Four hundred sixteen students participated in the study. Males (229) were statistically significantly higher ($\chi^2=4,240$; $df=1$; $p=0.039$) than females (187). The students stated that the didactic-methodically shaped teaching contents studied at the Field Training were interesting (398), appropriate accord-



ing to the actual actions of the police (397), purposeful for performing police tasks (398), complex to understand (16), demanding in psychophysical terms (28), oversized by teaching (thematic) units that are realised in field training (95), oversized by time dynamics for realisation in-field training (134). The organisation of all-day life and field training work was good in the implementation of teaching activities (358), extracurricular activities (359), and the performance of security services (360). The quality and quantity of equipment we have longed for in-field training was satisfactory: less in the segment of uniform (250), personal gear (251), and armaments (250). The conditions of accommodation and food at the field training were satisfactory: in the segment of accommodation (326), in the quality of nutrition (199), in the quantity of nutrition (199); the work and commitment of the responsible task holders were satisfactory: teachers with UCIPS (411), instructors from the Ministry of Interior (412), leadership (407), logistics staff (408). Students rated the level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills as very good (3.73 ± 0.68). The best rated were Armament with shooting classes (3.77 ± 0.73), followed by Police Topography (3.73 ± 0.73), and Police Tactics (3.68 ± 0.72). The overall impression of field training was an excellent 3.68 ± 0.67 (table 1).

Table 1 Gender Difference in the Assessment of the Level of Acquisition of Knowledge and Acquired Skills and the Overall Impression of Field Training

	Males [‡]		Females [‡]		Total [‡]		Signifi- cance [#]
	Average	SD	Average	SD	Average	SD	
Police tactics	3.66	0.73	3.70	0.70	3.68	0.72	0.603
Police topography	3.70	0.71	3.75	0.74	3.73	0.73	0.477
Weapons with shooting classes	3.71	0.74	3.84	0.73	3.77	0.73	0.057
Level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills	3.69	0.68	3.77	0.69	3.73	0.68	0.266
Overall Impression of Field Training	3.65	0.66	3.72	0.68	3.68	0.67	0.274

[#]t-test; SD- Standard deviation; [‡] Single-factor analysis of variance ANOVA

Female participants rated the level of knowledge acquired better (3.77 ± 0.73) than males (3.69 ± 0.68), but the difference was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$).

Table 2 The Way of Studying in the Assessment of the Level of Acquisition of Knowledge and Acquired Skills and the Overall Impression of Field Training

	Regular [‡]		Self-funded [‡]		Significance [#]
	Average	SD	Average	SD	
Police tactics	3.86	0.70	3.54	0.70	$p < 0.001$
Police topography	3.89	0.71	3.60	0.71	$p < 0.001$
Weapons with shooting classes	3.90	0.73	3.67	0.73	$p < 0.001$
Level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills	3.89	0.67	3.60	0.67	$p < 0.001$
Overall Impression of Field Training	3.83	0.67	3.56	0.65	$p < 0.001$

[#]t-test; SD- Standard deviation; [‡] Single-factor analysis of variance ANOVA



The formation of an assessment of the level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills and the overall impression of field training statistically significant ($p < 0,001$) has a common influence on the way of studying and years of training. Full-time (budget) students (Table 2) and students who underwent field training in 2019 received significantly better grades compared to students from the previous three years (Table 3). Females gave better scores than males in all rating segments, but the difference was insignificant ($p > 0,05$). Students with a higher average score rated the level of acquired knowledge and the overall impression of field training significantly better.

Table 3 *Time of Training in Assessing the Level of Acquisition of Knowledge and Acquired Skills and the Overall Impression of Field Training*

	2016 ^a		2017 ^b		2018 ^c		2019 ^d		Signifi- cance [#]
	Average	SD	Average	SD	Average	SD	Average	SD	
Police tactics	3.62	0.71	3.47	0.68	3.67	0.67	4.23	0.57	d/a,b,c***
Police topography	3.63	0.69	3.54	0.72	3.72	0.69	4.29	0.55	d/a,b,c***
Weapons with shooting classes	3.66	0.71	3.52	0.67	3.82	0.69	4.42	0.55	d/a,b,c***
Level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills	3.64	0.70	3.51	0.69	3.74	0.68	4.31	0.56	d/a,b,c***
Overall Impression of Field Training	3.60	0.65	3.50	0.67	3.70	0.64	4.16	0.51	d/a,b,c***

[#] Single-factor analysis of variance ANOVA; *** $p < 0,001$

The method of studying (Beta=-0.197; $p = 0,000$) of the training period (Beta=0.265; $p = 0,000$) (Table 4) has a common influence on the level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills.

Table 4 *Multivariate Regressive Analysis*

	Beta	p	R	R ²
Level of acquired knowledge and acquired skills			0.329	0.108
Way of studying	-0.197	0.000		
The period of realization	0.265	0.000		
Overall Impression of Field Training			0.374	0.140
Way of studying	-0.208	0.000		
The period of realization	0.314	0.000		

Among the results obtained, full-time students who conducted field training in 2019 gave the highest average grades for the acquired knowledge and skills and for the Overall Impression of Field Training.

The distribution of the relative frequencies of the most common open response groups expressed through concrete proposals and remarks is: 82 students had no objections to field training (19.7%), 59 students praised the training (14.1%), 38 students especially praised the leadership and teaching staff



(9.1%), for the longer duration of the training declared 124 students (29.8%), objections to poor personal equipment were given by 70 students (16.1), objections to poor food were made by 60 students (14.4%), 58 students suggested more practical exercise (14%), 34 students suggested only morning work (8.1%), 30 students suggested introducing new technical means of police (7.2%), 21 students proposed preparatory training in Belgrade (5%), 19 students proposed to increase training in the natural environment (4.5%), the development of field training manuals was proposed by 13 students (3.1%), 13 students proposed a larger fund of classes in the subjects Police Tactics and Police Topography (3.1%), 10 students declared that the training was too intensive and complex (2.4%), 9 students suggested a higher number of shootings from official weapons (2.1%), 8 students declared that the training was complex and psychophysically demanding (1.9%), 7 students stated that training participants should change more in command roles (1.6%), 8 students suggested to once again participate in field training in the final year of study (1.4%), 5 students suggested hiring a more significant number of instructors from the service (1.2%), 3 students declared that they expected more from field training (0.8%), while only one student replied that he was not interested in field training (0.2%).

The students expressed overwhelming satisfaction with their teaching contents' engaging, appropriate, and purposeful nature. They found the material easy to comprehend and noted a sense of relaxation regarding psychophysical demands, content, and timing. Additionally, they commended the well-organised structure of the all-day activities during field training. The extensive experience and dedicated efforts of those responsible for preparing, organising, and conducting the field training contributed to this positive feedback. A smaller group of 28 students pointed out that field training posed significant psychophysical challenges.

Furthermore, inadequate individual preparation for field training may account for approximately a quarter of the students finding the content and duration of the training overwhelming. The deterioration of the required equipment in the field and the inability to adequately replace it have led to its lower quality and quantity. The majority of students expressed contentment with the accommodation conditions during Field Training. However, nearly 50% of surveyed students believed that the quality and quantity of nutrition required improvement, likely due to the limited supply of food items in the camp room used by the University as an external user. Within this survey segment, students awarded high marks to those responsible for tasks in field training, reflecting their professional dedication and maximum effort. These findings align with the results of earlier research (Milojević et al., 2011; Milojević et al., 2013).

Improved collective and individual preparation, an innovative study program, the involvement of a more significant number of teaching contractors, and enhanced logistical provision of training may account for the fact that students assigned higher grades to the level of acquired knowledge and skills, as well as their overall impression of field training, compared to previous research (Milojević et al., 2011; Milojević et al., 2013).

The examined effects of the gender structure, the method of study, the years of implementation of field training, and academic achievement stood out as significant correlates of the evaluation of teaching, which was confirmed by many earlier studies (Franceško et al., 2002; Handal, 2003; Richardson, 2005; Milojević et al., 2011; Biggs Tang, 2011; Anđelković-Pešić et al., 2012; Milojević et al., 2013; Jevremov et al., 2016; De Rijcke et al., 2016). Statistical significance ($p < 0.001$) undeniably confirms the influence on the formation of assessments regarding the level of acquired knowledge and skills. Regular (budget) students who attended field training in 2019 gave significantly higher grades on the overall impression of field training, with women consistently outscoring men in all rating segments. The joint influence on these ratings stems from the study method and years of training. However, the difference was



not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). Students with a higher average score rated the level of acquired knowledge and the overall impression of field training significantly better. The results indicate that it is impossible to ignore the effect of student academic and other characteristics when assessing the quality of teaching and study programs. In other words, “the curriculum can no longer be designed for the needs of a homogeneous population”. The assumptions about the diversity of assessments of the quality of teaching depending on the academic and even sociodemographic characteristics of students are mainly based on theoretical determinations or attitudes according to which the quality of education and teaching is tricky to define and predominantly depends on who observes and evaluates the teaching (Jevremov et al., 2016).

Conclusion

Assessing field training at the University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies is crucial for ascertaining whether participants have mastered the training, if learning outcomes have been achieved, and if adjustments are necessary to improve training for future generations.

The following factors influenced the results of the field training evaluation: the specifics of the organisation, temporal and geospatial conditions for executing the training, modern and well-structured teaching content, and the quality and motivation of both training participants and non-teaching staff responsible for its execution. Additionally, results were influenced by the trainees’ psychophysical and moral-volitional characteristics, their acquisition and applicability of acquired knowledge and skills, and the quality and quantity of logistical support for field training.

The research revealed that regular students, those with higher average grades, and students who completed field training in 2019 gave the highest average grades for the studied teaching content, acquired knowledge and skills, and their overall impression of field training. Additionally, a significantly smaller number of students objected to the organisation and implementation of field training. The evaluating data thus obtained have become the starting point for the improvement and changes in the teaching practice of teaching performers in-field training. Based on the analysed evaluation results, it is necessary to redesign the field training study program in the upcoming school year, which should include almost all suggestions and objections of students. This means it is necessary to redesign program content, specific changes in the organisation, and implementation of teaching, as well as the work of students and teachers, management, and logistics staff.

The University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies, based on the research results, initiated a redesign of the field training program. The redesign encompassed the following modifications:

- Increased of the duration of field training from 10 to 14 days;
- Introduced preparatory training in Belgrade at the University of Criminal Investigation and Police Studies for four days before the commencement of training at the Mitrovo Polje teaching centre;
- Increased the number of service instructors involved in field training from 4 to 9;
- Raised the budget for classes related to the subjects Police Tactics/Police Topography from the previous 75/16 to 96/31;
- Integrated all theoretical content into the preparatory training in Belgrade, eliminating the need for theoretical classes during the curriculum implementation at the Mitrovo Polje teaching centre;



- Expanded the number of firearm drills conducted during field training at the Mitrovo Polje teaching centre from 7 to 11, and
- Invested significant resources in procuring new work uniforms and associated equipment for students and acquiring modern technical resources utilised by the police.

In the upcoming period, we plan to:

- Develop a Field Training Manual, and
- Modify the study programs to facilitate field training twice during schooling instead of conducting it only once.

Maksimović and Cenić (2013) advocate for the continuation of this type of evaluation, which can benefit from insights gained through action research. Action research embodies a flexible process where we alternate between taking action (implementing change and improvement) and conducting research (acquiring understanding and knowledge) to enhance teaching practice and refine our comprehension. The consensus endorses this approach. The action's common elements across all provisions entail conducting research in an actual educational situation, setting practice as a research goal, and involving participants in that situation at all stages of the research.

In addition to the above methodological approach, it is necessary to make the evaluation results visible to students in the evaluation of the Field Training. Then, it is necessary to include in the future evaluation process the colleagues/instructors from the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia as actors of the teaching process, but also the colleagues from the Department of Criminology and the scientific professional public as critics, which would improve cooperation among various actors in the process of designing the evaluation process and considering its results.

References

- Andelković-Pešić M., Janković-Milić V., Stanković J. (2012). Ocena kvaliteta nastavnog procesa u visokom obrazovanju. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 61(1), str. 51-66.
- Biersteker, T. (2016). Self-Assessment Reviews and External Evaluation Exercises in IR Education. *International Studies Review*, 341-345
- Biggs, J. B. & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for Quality Learning at University – What the Student Does* (4th edition). Maidenhead: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
- Brus, S., Komljenović, J., Mac Síthigh, D., Noope, G. & Tück, C. (2007). Student Participation in QA: Strengths and Challenges. In L. Bollaert, S. Brus, B. Curvale, L. Harvey, E. Helle, H. T. Jensen, J. Komljenović, A. Orphanides & A. Sursock (Eds.), *Embedding Quality Culture in Higher Education* (pp. 53–58). Brussels: European University Association asbl.
- Byrne, M., Flood, B. (2003). Assessing the Teaching Quality of Accounting Programmes: an evaluation of the Course Experience Questionnaire. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp.135-145.
- Castelluccio, C. & Lanfranco, M. (2006). Quality Assurance in United Kingdom Higher Education. A Case Study: The London Metropolitan University. In C. Orsinger (Ed.), *Assessing Quality in European Higher Education Institutions* (pp. 23–50). Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- De Rijcke, S., Wouters, P. F., Rushforth, A. D., Franssen, T. P., & Hammarfelt, B. (2016). Evaluation practices and effects of indicator use – a literature review. *Research Evaluation*, 25(2): 161-169.



- Despotović, M., (2010). *Razvoj kurikuluma u stručnom obrazovanju*, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Beograd.
- Franceško, M., Kodžopeljić, J i Mihić, V. (2002). Neki socio-demografski i psihološki korelati motiva postignuća. *Psihologija*, 35 (1-2), 65-79.
- Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by Doing: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Methods*. Further Education Unit. Oxford: Oxford Polytechnic.
- Gurova, G., Piattoeva, N., & Takala, T. (2015). Quality of Education and Its Evaluation: An Analysis of the Russian Academic Discussion. *European Education*, 47, pp. 346-364.
- Handal, G. (2003). *Studentska evaluacija nastave – Priručnik za studente i nastavnike visokoškolskih ustanova*, (prevod), Ministarstvo prosvete i sporta Republike Srbije, Beograd.
- Herman, L. J., Morris, L. L. & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1987). *Evaluation Handbook*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Holland, P. (2005), The Case for Expanding Standards for Teacher Evaluation to Include an Instructional Supervision Perspective, *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 18: 67–77.
- Jevremov D, T., Lungulov, B., Dinić, B.. (2016). Zadovoljstvo studenata kvalitetom nastave-efekti godine studija i akademskog postignuća. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 65(3), str. 491-508.
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Revisiting Kirkpatrick's four-level-model. *Training & Development*, 1, 54-57.
- Maksimović, J., Cenić, D. (2013). Akciona istraživanja u nastavi i kvalitet vaspitno-obrazovanog procesa. U: Tematski zbornik radova, Naučni skup „Nastava i učenje“ – kvalitet vaspitno-obrazovnog procesa, Učiteljski fakultet u Užicu, 8. novembar 2013, str. 309–318.
- Matijević, M. (2005). Evaluacija u odgoju i obrazovanju. *Pedagogijska istraživanja*, 2(2): 279-298.
- Milojević S., (2010). Optimizacija modela posebnih oblika nastave na Kriminalističko-policijskoj akademiji, *Bezbednost*, 51(3), str. 25-55.
- Milojević S., Janković, B., (2014). Uticaj terenske obuke na osposobljenost studenata Kriminalističko-policijske akademije za primenu vatrenog oružja kao sredstva prinude. Tematski zbornik radova nacionalnog značaja „Struktura i funkcionisanje policijske organizacije (III)“, Kriminalističko-policijska akademija, Beograd, str. 145-148.
- Milojević S., Vučković G., Janković B., (2011). Analiza stavova studenata kriminalističko-policijske akademije o efektivnosti terenske obuke u letnjim uslovima, *Bezbednost*, 52(2), str. 46-65.
- Milojević, S., Janković, B., (2012). Geneza terenske obuke kao posebnog oblika nastave na Kriminalističko-policijskoj akademiji, Tematski zbornik radova „Struktura i funkcionisanje policijske organizacije“
- Milojević, S., Janković, B., Petrović, D., (2013). Uticaj osnovnih parametara populacije studenata Kriminalističko-policijske akademije na evaluaciju terenske obuke u letnjim uslovima“, Tematski zbornik radova „Struktura i funkcionisanje policijske organizacije (II)“, str.
- Milojković, B., (2001). Didactical and methodical standard of teaching topography at Police academy in Belgrade. *NBP*, 7(2), str. 83-101.
- Milojković, B., (2011). Contribution of police topography to development of higher police education in Serbia, In: Proceedings of International Scientific Conference Archibald Reiss Days, 03.- 04. 03. 2011., Academy of Criminalistic and Police Studies, Belgrade. str. 89-98
- Mužić, V. (1999). *Uvod u metodologiju istraživanja odgoja i obrazovanja*. Zagreb: Educa.



- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. California: Sage Publications.
- Richardson, T. E. J. (2005). Instruments for obtaining student feedback: a review of the literature. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 387-415.
- Scott, D. (1998). Qualitative approaches to evaluations of health-promoting activities. U: D. Scott and R. Weston (Eds.). *Evaluating Health Promotion* (pp. 31-49). Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.
- Španja, S. (2019). Evaluacija kao pedagoški fenomen. *Školski vjesnik*, 68(1), 261-278.
- Stančić, M. (2015). Nastavničke refleksije o evaluaciji sopstvenog rada. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, vol. 64, br. 4, str. 697-713.
- Tot, D. (2013). *Kultura samovrednovanja škole i učitelja*. Zagreb: Učiteljski fakultet sveučilišta u Zagrebu
- Tyler, R. W. (1989). *Educational evaluation: Classic works*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Vizek-Vidović, V., Vlahović-Štetić, V., Rijavec, M., Miljković, D. (2003). *Psihologija obrazovanja*. Zagreb: IEP-VERN.
- Wills, M. (1994). Managing the training process: putting the basics into practice. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 18(6), 4-28.
- Ziegler, M., Kemper, C. J. & Kruyen, P. (2014). Short Scales – Five Misunderstandings and Ways to Overcome Them. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 35(4), pp. 185–189.
- Уредба о стручном оспособљавању и усавршавању у Министарству унутрашњих послова. Службени гласник Р Србије, 42/2017-5, 56/2018-11, 34/2019-10, 11/2020-9, 24/2021-34, 49/2022-18, 54/2023-5.