Journal of Resources Development and Management
ISSN 2422-8397 An International Peer-reviewed Journal
Vol.17, 2016

The Impact of Training Programs for Faculty Members' Skills Development: A Field Study of Najran University

Hesham Moustafa Kamal-Al-Den* Ahmed Hassan Rakha
Deanship of Development and Quality, Najran University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, PO box 1988, Najran city

The research is financed by Najran University. No. NU/SHED/14/76 (Deanship of Scientific Research at Najran University, Kingdome of Saudi Arabia)

Abstract
This research aimed to assess the impact of training programs at the Deanship of Development and Quality-Najran University (DDQ-NU) on the development of faculty members' skills from their perspective according to variables gender, faculty, academic rank, and years of experience. Researchers used a descriptive method and designed a questionnaire composed of 42 items distributed on four domains: (job performance, group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained). The sample of the study consisted of 175 faculty members at Najran University who responded to the questionnaire. The most important results that there is a positive impact of training programs in DDQ-NU on improving faculty members' skills.
Keywords: Evaluation, Faculty members, Human development, Saudi universities, Training Programs

1. Introduction

Many of the universities around the world and some Arab countries took substantial steps towards the development of faculty members' skills. And for this purpose, they established specialized centers assigned to planning, implementing, and evaluation of professional training programs for faculty members. (Jrno & Saleh 1996)

Training faculty members' process became the basics to improve higher education and performance; because of its great importance in developing the skills and behavior of faculty members; to be more efficient and effective in meeting the university's needs. Which can be reflected in increase University's ability, to achieve the educational goals desired. (Al-Bakr 2001).

In addition, Saudi universities began in dealing with faculty members as a product need to receive continuous high quality training. Therefore, it focused on establishment of units for developing faculty members and administrative staff skills to ensure continuous improvement of academic and administrative capabilities through human development. (Al-Harbi 2006).

The evaluation process is one of the main stages of the training programs, which attempt to determine the achieved objectives of the training programs, and diagnosed weaknesses and strength points in the training program.

(Leopold 2002) see that training evaluation process is an important activity cannot be separated from the rest of training activities, which is a continuous activity should be given special care to ensure the effectiveness of the training. Thus, universities become a claim to measure the training impact and make sure that later radically changed significantly in the performance of faculty members. (Bishi 2009) explains that the training evaluation process begins by identifying training needs and continue to the end of the training program, and after the end of a defined period of time in order to verify that the training program had achieved its objectives or not. (Tilbani et.al. 2011) adds that this process helps senior management in the university to take appropriate decisions in the light of the results of training.

1.2 State of the problem

Najran University adopted continuous training strategy and established skills development unit in the Deanship of Development and Quality aims to improve the efficiency of administrative and academic staff, and thus ensure a better quality of educational outcomes to meet the requirements of the National Commission Academic Accreditation & Assessment (NCAAA) Standards.

The importance of this research to assess the impact of training programs in DDQ.NU from the viewpoint of faculty members, to ensure their implementation as planned, and identify the achievements of the desired goals. As well as improving the training process in the future and find out the necessary adjustments to increase their effectiveness.

1.3 Research Objective

Assess the impact of training programs at the Deanship of Development and Quality-Najran University (DDQ-NU) on the development of faculty members' skills from their perspective according to variables gender, faculty, academic rank, and years of experience.

1.4 Research Questions

- What is the reality assessing the impact of training programs at DDQ-NU from the viewpoint of faculty members?
- Are there significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to Gender variables?
- Are there significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to faculty variables?
- Are there significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to academic rank variables?
- Are there significant differences ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to years of experience variables?

1.5 Research terminology

1.5.1 Evaluation

Evaluation is the systematic acquisition and assessment of information to provide useful feedback about some object. (Trochim 2006)

1.5.2 Impact Evaluation

Impact evaluation is broader and assesses the overall or net effects – intended or unintended – of the program as a whole. (Zinovieff 2008)

1.5.4 Training Programs

Ongoing activities planned by skills development unit in the deanship of Development and Quality-Najran University, which aims to provide human resources with knowledge, skills, capabilities, and change their behaviors and trends in a positive way. (Operational definition)

1.5.3 The impact of training

The impact of training defined as the process of estimating the outcomes acquired by the trainees, and the level of their performance to work after passing the training program, by comparing their performance with pre-defined rates and standards, to determine the pros of the training program, and the level of trainee's efficiency at work after getting training. (Mohamed 2002)

1.6 Reviews of Related Literature

Many researchers have tried to find the impact of Training Programs for skills development, Such as:

(Al-Aklapy 2012) This study aimed to shed light on the importance of training in government institutions, and the effectiveness of training programs in bringing about change in public institutions. The most important recommendations of the study: Should continue to inventory and selection of training needs analysis and review of the link training objectives and activities of the real problems and the actual needs.

(Eedan 2012) This study aimed to provide a conceptual framework for training program and evaluation of its effectiveness in achieving its objectives. One of the main recommendations of the study to define all training needs in all aspects of the organization. Concern the process of evaluating training programs the adoption of accurate and unbiased information. In addition, using an accurate scientific method depends on multiple sources for evaluation.

(Al-Kanani and Buraikan 2011) This study aimed to identify the degree of benefit of training programs provided by higher education development center at King Abdul-Aziz University Center, as well as recognizing the achievements of the six units in the center of the desired goals in the development of the educational process. One of the main recommendations of the study: Need to focus on training programs derived from global centers in the preparation of faculty members to accommodate changes and new technologies in the educational process. The selection of topics and workshop programs that are consistent with faculty members needs with enlighten trainers and trainees various aspects of the training programs in terms of objectives, content, implementation mechanisms, and methods of evaluation.

(Al-Tarawneh 2010) This study aimed to identify the extent of commitment to implement phases of the training process and its impact on areas of performance (productivity, creativity, efficiency of implementing tasks, decision-making, and task planning) in some government departments and security forces in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. One of the main recommendations of the study: the need for Concern training program evaluation. To find out the impact of training on the performance of employees at the end of the training program and then follow up on the performance of employees in the workplace.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Research Methodology

This research used Descriptive method. This design used to obtain information concerning the status of the

phenomena to describe, "What exists" with respect to variables or conditions in a situation (Cooper and Schindler 2008).

2.2 Research population & Sample Design

The Research population Consists of all faculty members in Najran University. In addition, the research sample consisted of 175 faculty members who have been selected randomly. Table (1) shows sample Characteristics according to variables (Gender, Faculty, Academic rank, Years of Experience).

Table 1. Sample Characteristics according to research variables

Variable	Level	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	156	89%
	Female	19	11%
	Lecturer	48	27%
	Assistant Professor	65	37%
	Associate Professor	27	15%
	Professor	35	20%
Faculty	Hutments & Arts	85	48%
	Scientific	90	52%
Experience	From (1-5) years	113	64.5%
	From (6-10) years	27	15.4%
	More than 10 years	35	20.1%

2.3 Data Collection tools

Through previous studies and scientific research references associated with assessment the impact of training programs, the researchers developed a questionnaire depending on "Treadway Parker model ". (Mohammed 2005) pointed out that this model is a way of rating types of assessment according to the information collected, where the division of information and study into four groups:

- Job Performance: Assess the progress of persons at work, and determine the extent of the program's contribution to the development of work performance, including work product, its quality, timeliness, and cost savings. In addition to the observable behavior in the work location changes which refers to performance improvement.
- Group Performance: This type of evaluation determines the impact of the program on a group of participants or in which the potential impact of the program on the institution as whole works.
- Participant Satisfaction: This type of evaluation determines the degree of participants` satisfaction about the contents of the program, training methods, and their view about what they have learned.
- Participant Knowledge Gained: this type of evaluation determines the quality of methods, facts, skills, and the amount of knowledge that participants absorbed.

The questionnaire consists of (42) items distributed on four Treadway Parker model domains: job performance, group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained. Moreover, it designed on Quintet Likert scale.

2.3.1 Questionnaire Validity

Researchers used content Validity by distributing the questionnaire to (13) experts, who reviewed the questionnaire to give their comments and opinions about the items of questionnaire through the following points:

- Appropriate items of its domain.
- The accuracy and integrity of the language of each item.
- Make sure that the questionnaire is generally appropriate to assess The Impact of Training Programs for faculty members' skills development.

In the light of the experts' observations and suggestions, researchers modified the language of some items and rearrange. They have not made any modifications in the number of domains and items, to become the final image of the questionnaire include (four domains) by (42 items).

2.3.2 Questionnaire Reliability

Researchers used Cronbach's alpha coefficient to verify the Questionnaire Reliability. The Reliability coefficient of the whole domains has reached (0.95). This value is high stability and sufficient for the objectives of this research and scientific research purposes.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Present results of the first Research question " What is the reality assess the impact of training programs at DDQ-NU from the viewpoint of faculty members?"

To answer the first question, means and Std. Deviation of faculty members' responses about the impact of

training programs at DDQ.NU were calculated as mentioned in Table 2

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviation of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU

No	Rank	Domains	Mean	Std. Deviation	Level
1	1	Job Performance	3.98	0.68	High
2	4	Group Performance	3.87	0.58	High
3	3	Participant Satisfaction	3.81	0.62	High
4	2	Participant Knowledge Gained	3.76	0.57	High
The tool as a whole			3.86	0.58	High

Table 2. Showed that the impact of Training Programs for faculty members' skills development achieved high impact of (3.86) and a standard deviation of (0.58). The general level of the training impact was high.

The result showed that the highest mean was 3.98 (SD=0.68) for "job performance", that indicate that all respondents agree that the training programs increased the level of their Job performance. The second mean was 3.87 (SD=0.58) for "group performance". The third mean was 3.81 (SD=0.62) for "participant satisfaction ". And finally mean was 3.76 (SD=0.57) for "participant knowledge gained"

3.2 Present results of the second Research question "Are there significant differences (α ≤ 0.05) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to gender variable?"

Table 3. Means, Std. Deviation and t-test of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to the gender

Domains	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.
Job Performance	Male	156	3.19	0.63	-1.790	0.032
	Female	19	3.41	0.46		
Group Performance	Male	156	3.18	0.62	-1.792	0.037
	Female	19	3.45	0.48		
Participant Satisfaction	Male	156	2.92	0.72	-1.921	0.028
	Female	19	3.25	0.67		
Participant Knowledge Gained	Male	156	2.84	0.85	-2.655	0.007
	Female	19	3.26	0.62		
The tool as a whole	Male	156	3.06	0.43	-2.233	0.013
	Female	19	3.29	0.42		

Table 3. Showed that there are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of (α = 0.05) according to the gender. That result indicates to males and females' participants were satisfied of the effectiveness of training programs in the development of their various skills.

3.3 Present results of the second Research question "Are there significant differences (α ≤ 0.05) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to the *faculty variable (scientific, humanity)?"*

Table 4. Means, Std. Deviation and t-test of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to the faculty (scientific, humanity)

Domains	Scientific		Humanity		T	Sig.
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Job Performance	3.77	0.53	3.69	0.65	1.08	0.28
Group Performance	3.76	0.54	3.67	0.65	1.13	0.26
Participant Satisfaction	3.67	0.61	3.76	0.54	1.52	0.10
Participant Knowledge Gained	3.81	0.63	3.64	0.76	1.83	0.07
The tool as a whole	3.78	0.54	3.67	0.65	1.44	0.15

Table 4. Shows that there are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance (α = 0.05) of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU based on faculty.

That result indicates that faculty members' from science and humanities faculty together were satisfied with the training programs provided to them. This result can be explained in the light of the keenness of deanship development and quality to meet all training needs of faculty members regardless of their specialization theoretical and practical equally.

3.4 Present results of the second Research question "Are there significant differences (α ≤ 0.05) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to academic Rank variable (professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and lecturer)?"

Table 5. Means of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to academic Rank variable

No	Domains	Means			
		Lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
1	Job Performance	3.50	3.50	3.44	2.76
2	Group Performance	3.18	3.14	3.21	3.31
3	Participant Satisfaction	2.94	2.83	3.06	3.10
4	Participant Knowledge Gained	2.87	2.82	2.59	3.17
5	The tool as a whole	3.11	3.05	3.07	3.09

Table 5. Showed that the mean faculty members' responses about impact of Training Programs for faculty members' skills development according to academic rank ranged from 3.05 to 3.11. This refers to a high degree of effectiveness of the training programs on developing their various skills.

Table 6. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to academic Rank

Domains	Source	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job Performance	Between Groups	14.714	4.905	14.902	0.000*
	Within Groups	52.331	0.329		
	Total	67.045			
Group Performance	Between Groups	0.661	0.220	0.573	0.634
	Within Groups	61.138	0.385		
	Total	61.799			
Participant Satisfaction	Between Groups	1.902	0.634	1.212	0.307
	Within Groups	83.128	0.523		
	Total	85.030			
Participant Knowledge Gained	Between Groups	4.435	1.478	2.100	0.102
	Within Groups	111.928	0.704		
	Total	116.363			
The tool as a whole	Between Groups	0.086	0.029	0.145	0.933
	Within Groups	31.312	0.197		
	Total	31.398			

Table 6. Shows that there are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of (α = 0.05) in group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained according to academic rank. While there are statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses at the level of (α = 0.05) in the job performance domain. To clarify the statistical marital differences between the means, researchers used Scheffe's test (multiple comparisons) as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Multiple Comparisons (Scheffe' test) of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to academic Rank

Domains	Variables	lecturer	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor
Job Performance	Assistant Professor	0.00*		
	Associate Professor	0.06	0.06	
	professor	0.74	0.74	0.68
Group Performance	Assistant Professor	0.04 *		
	Associate Professor	- 0.03 *	- 0.07 *	
	professor	- 0.13 *	- 0.17 *	- 0.10 *
Participant Satisfaction	Assistant Professor	0.11		
	Associate Professor	- 0.12 *	- 2.23 *	
	professor	- 0.16 *	- 0.27 *	- 0.04 *
Participant Knowledge Gained	Assistant Professor	0.05		
	Associate Professor	0.28	0.23	
	professor	2.70	- 0.35 *	- 0.58 *
The tool as a whole	Assistant Professor	0.06		
	Associate Professor	0.04 *	- 0.02 *	
	Professor	0.02 *	- 0.04 *	- 0.02 *

Table 7. Shows that about job performance domain, the result shows that the mean sample responses of assistant professors and lecturers larger than other academic ranks. Researchers due this result to assistant

professors and lecturers' participation rate in the training programs were more than other academic ranks; therefore, they were more benefit from it.

3.5 Present results of the second Research question "Are there significant differences (α ≤ 0.05) in the responses of faculty members about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to Years of Years of Experience variable (From (1-5) years, from (6-10) years, and more Than 10 years)?"

Table 8. Means of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to Years of Years of Experience

No	Domains	Means		
		From (1-5) years	From (6-10) years	More than 10 years
1	Job Performance	3.56	3.73	3.18
2	Group Performance	3.09	3.24	3.27
3	Participant Satisfaction	2.88	2.95	3.03
4	Participant Knowledge Gained	2.84	2.82	2.95
The tool as a whole		3.07	3.16	3.10

Table 8. Showed that the mean faculty members' responses about impact of Training Programs for faculty members' skills development according to Years of Years of Experience ranged from 3.07 to 3.16. This refers to a high degree of effectiveness of the training programs on developing their various skills.

Table 9. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to Years of Experience

Domains	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job Performance	Between Groups	9.065	3	3.022	8.075	0.000*
	Within Groups	63.239	169	0.374		
	Total	72.303	172			
Group Performance	Between Groups	0.748	3	0.249	0.658	0.579
	Within Groups	64.074	169	0.379		
	Total	64.822	172			
Participant Satisfaction	Between Groups	0.715	3	0.238	0.451	0.717
	Within Groups	89.367	169	0.529		
	Total	90.081	172			
Participant Knowledge Gained	Between Groups	0.454	3	0.151	0.217	0.885
	Within Groups	117.935	169	0.698		
	Total	118.389	172			
The tool as a whole	Between Groups	0.350	3	0.117	0.602	0.615
	Within Groups	32.732	169	0.194		
	Total	33.081	172			

Table 9. Shows that there are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of (α = 0.05) in group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained according to years of experience. While there are statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses at the level of (α = 0.05) in job performance domain. To clarify the statistical marital differences between the means, researchers used Scheffe's test (multiple comparisons) as shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Multiple Comparisons (Scheffe' test) of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to Years of Experience

Domains	Experience (I)		Experience (j)		Mean Difference (I-J)
	Source	Mean	Source	Mean	
Job Performance	From (1-5) years	3.56	From (6-10) years	3.73	0.17
			More than 10 years	3.18	-0.38 *
	From (6-10) years	3.73	More than 10 years	3.18	- 0.55 *
Group Performance	From (1-5) years	3.09	From (6-10) years	3.24	0.15
			More than 10 years	3.27	0.18
	From (6-10) years	3.24	More than 10 years	3.27	0.03 *
Participant Satisfaction	From (1-5) years	2.88	From (6-10) years	2.95	0.07
			More than 10 years	3.03	0.15
	From (6-10) years	2.95	More than 10 years	3.03	0.08
Participant Knowledge Gained	From (1-5) years	2.84	From (6-10) years	2.82	- 0.02 *
			More than 10 years	2.95	0.11
	From (6-10) years	2.82	More than 10 years	2.95	0.13
The tool as a whole	From (1-5) years	3.07	From (6-10) years	3.16	0.09
			More than 10 years	3.10	0.03 *
	From (6-10) years	3.16	More than 10 years	3.10	- 0.06 *

Table 10. Shows that there are statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU according to years of experience in the tool as a whole as follows:

- There are statistically significant differences between faculty members experienced (1-5) years and experienced more than 10 years in favour of who experienced more than 10 years.
- There are statistically significant differences between faculty members experienced (6-10) years and experienced more than 10 years in favour of who experienced (6-10) years.
- There are statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses between who experienced (6-10) years and experienced more than 10 years in favour of who experienced (6-10) years.

There are statistically significant differences in "participant knowledge gained domain" between faculty members' experienced (1-5) years and who experienced (6-10) years in favour of who experienced (6-10) years, while there are no statistically significant differences in other areas years' experience.

There are statistically significant differences in " Job Performance domain & the tool as a whole " between faculty members' experienced (1-5) years and who experienced more than 10 years in favour of who experienced (1-5) years, while there are no statistically significant differences in other areas years' experience.

There are statistically significant differences in " Job Performance domain & the tool as a whole " between faculty members' experienced (6-10) years and who experienced more than 10 years in favour of who experienced (6-10) years, while there are no statistically significant differences in other areas years' experience.

Finally table (10) shows when using a verbal way for the bilateral differences, the result showed statistically significant differences among all levels of experience in favor of the longest experience which help them on an accurate assessment of the impact of training programs

4. Conclusion

- Faculty members in Najran University are satisfied with the effectiveness of training programs provided by the DDQ-NU in every domain of training.
- From the perspective of faculty members, the highest degree of the effectiveness of training programs was in the domain of "job performance".
- There are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) according to the gender in Job performance Domain.
- There are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained according to the gender.
- There are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) of faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU based on faculty (scientific, humanity).
- There are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of ($\alpha = 0.05$) in group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained according to academic rank.

- There are statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses at the level of (α = 0.05) in job performance domain according to academic rank in favor of assistant professor and lecturers.
- There are no statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses about the impact of training programs at DDQ.NU at the level of (α = 0.05) in group performance, participant satisfaction, and participant knowledge gained according to years of experience.
- There are statistically significant differences in faculty members' responses at the level of (α = 0.05) in job performance domain in favor of faculty members who experience (from 5 years to less than 11 years).

5. Recommendations

- Establish a department to measure the impact of training programs be affiliated with a skills development unit, aims to measure the effectiveness of training programs during and after the training process to ensure the continuous improvement process.
- Interestingly the results of measuring the impact of training programs to ensure the achievement of the desired objectives, and to achieve customer satisfaction.
- Disseminate the culture of measurement and accept trainees opinions, in order to clarify the weaknesses and strengths in training programs, and identify the trainee's needs to improve and develop training programs
- Customize great rewards for excellence trainers and trainees in training programs.

6. Acknowledgment

We are thankful to the Deanship of scientific research in the Najran University for providing financial support for this research.

References

Al-Aklapy, Ayed (2012), the role of training in bringing about change in government public institutions, Renaissance, Volume XIII, the second issue, pp. 101-132.

Al-bakr, Fawzia (2001). Scientific and professional growth of university staff members Reality and constraints: Survey Study of faculty staff members in some Universities and colleges for girls in Riyadh. Gulf Arab message. vol. 22. No. 81.

AL-Harbi, Haya (2006). Development departments and their role in the sustainable professional development for faculty members in Saudi universities. Journal of Studies in University Education. No.13. pp.309-318.

Al-Kanani, Ahmed & Braikan, Faten (2011). The benefit from the training programs offered to faculty members in the educational process development of the King Abdul Aziz University. Journal of the faculty of Education in Zagazig University: Number 71, Part I, April 2011.

Bishi, Mohammed (2009). 'Introduction and methods of measuring the impact of training. International Conference for Administrative Development: Distinctively performance in the governmental sector, Riyadh.

Cooper, D R & Schindler, P S. (2008). Business Research Methods. A McGraw publishing Company Limited.

Eedan, Ahmed (2012). Evaluation of the credibility of the training programs by measuring outputs. Anbar University of Economic and Management Sciences Journal. Vol. 4 No. 8, pp. 241-261.

Gerno, Dakhel & saleh, mahdy (1996). The role of the development of Teaching Methods and university Training Centers in the rehabilitation and training of university Teaching Member. General Secretariat of the Association of Arab Universities', Association of Arab Universities Magazine. No. 90.p.146.

Leopold, J (2002). Human Resource in organizations, personnel education. Prentice Hall International. New Jersey.

Mohamed, Mansour (2005), Evaluation of the training process for employees and technical colleges Gaza districts from the viewpoint of the trainees. Master Thesis. The Islamic University in Gaza. Faculty of Commerce.

Mohammed, Rashid (2002). Training outcomes and their importance in development. Working paper submitted by Saudi Technical Conference for the second organized by the General Organization for Education and Vocational Training. Riyadh.

Tarawneh, Tahseen (2010). Commitment to implement phases of training and its impact in the areas of performance of employees. Arab Journal of Security Studies and Training, Vol. 26, No. 51.253-284.

Telbani, Abdulhadi (2010). The process of evaluating training programs in the local authorities in the southern governorates. Master's thesis, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences. Palestine. Al-Azhar University Gaza.

Trochim, William M.K. (2006). Introduction to Evaluation. [Online] Available: http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/intreval.php (December 19, 2015).

Zinovieff, Michael A. (2008). Review and Analysis of Training Impact Evaluation Methods, and Proposed Measures to Support a United Nations System Fellowships Evaluation Framework. [Online] Available: http://esa.un.org/techcoop/fellowships/SFOMeeting/ParticipantArea/BackgroundDocuments/6_REVIEW%20report%20FINAL%20.pdf (December 19, 2015)

First A. Author Dr. Hesham Kamal-Al-Den, Egypt, Date of Birth 02/10/1969, Assistant Professor, Coordinator of Skills Development Unit in the deanship of development & quality at Najran University- Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, , Assistant Professor in the deanship of development & quality at Najran University- Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, , PhD in Arts from Mansoura University - Egypt in 2006. Address: Najran university- Najran city - Kingdome of Saudi Arabia, PO (1988), Postal Code (11001)

Second A. Author Dr. Ahmed Rakha, Egypt, Date of Birth 30/1/1979, Assistant Professor, Coordinator of technical office in the deanship of development & quality at Najran University- Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, , PhD in Physical education from Suez Canal University - Egypt in 2010. Address: Najran university- Najran city - Kingdome of Saudi Arabia, PO (1988), Postal Code (11001)