

2006/10/22 :

2005/6/25 :

:

:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

% 86

:

-4 . -3 . -2 . -1
(224)

:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

1

2

3

4

.5

Abstract A teacher is considered one of the inputs of the educational system. This is why advanced nations give him a great importance by improving and developing his professional performance.

School as a Training Unit the is one of the unncentral pioneer projects aiming at developing and improving teachers professionally.

The main role of a school is, defining the training object, the trainer, time and place. So the programme fulfils the needs of teachers.

The research aims to:

- 1 Identifying the training needs of teachers.
- 2 Identifying the reality of "STU" programmes.
- 3 Identifying the SWOT in the "STU" programmes.
- 4 Having a future vision of the "STU" programmes.

The researcher used analytical descriptive method, built valid questionnaire . Used Alpha Cronbakh to be sure of its stability in general where its mean was 86%. Used judge validity and interior consistency to prove its validity which was statistically significant at 1%:

The four fields are:

- 1 Teachers' evaluation.
- 2 Trainers' evaluation.
- 3 Resident supervisor's evaluation.
- 4 Training programmes evaluation.

The questionnaire contains "36" items. And it was applied at a sample of "224" teachers "research society" and reached the following results:

- 1 The teachers really participate in choosing trainers and subjects which give them confidence.
- 2 There are many strong points to be strengthened.
- 3 Few weak points to be avoided.
- 4 Finding ways to identify teachers' needs.
- 5 Finding more effective teaching and evaluation methods.

The researcher suggests:

1. teachers should participate more effectively in choosing training subjects and trainers.
2. This programme should continue even if on self dependence, to improve and develop teachers' professional performance .Besides, strong points to be strengthened, weak points to be avoided.
3. More coordination and planning are needed.
4. More effective ways are needed for specifying teachers' needs.
5. More effective methods are needed for teaching and evaluation.

The researcher recommends:

- 1- Building educational program's fulfilling teachers needs depending on planning, clear vision, present and future.
- 2- Improving Educational Faculties inputs.
- 3- Improving Educational Faculties outputs.
- 4- Establishing research centers for improving the present pre& post training system.
- 5-Improving educational administration working in teacher's education fields.

(...)

(95:1995)

(DONOVAN, et.al.,1987)

(JOYCE,et.al.,1993)

(283:1989

)

(SYKES,1996)

(78-68: 1991)

:

:

(488-449: 1996)

:

.1
.2
.3
.4

:

:

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

:

"

"

.2004

:

:

-1

(4: 1999

)

:

-2

(414 :1973

)GOOD

()

:

-3

(HITTLEMAN 1976)

:

∴
∴ -
∴ (1981) -1

" "

(265)

∴

∴ (1990) -2

"

"

∴

(184)

∴

: (1991) -3

"

"

(210)

:

-

-

: (1991) -4

"

"

(51)

(70)

(121)

:

: (1993)

-5

(169)

(25)

: (1994)

-6

(150)

:

:

(1995)

-7

"

"

:

(57)

(83)

(140)

: (1995) -8

:

: (1996) -9

(112)

(33)

:
:
: (1997) -10
"

(105)
(%64)

: -
(Donovan & others 1987) -1
"

(35) (64)
(1669) (29) ()
(28)

: (Butler 1992) -2
"

(21) (42)

25-5

: (Day 1997) -3

: (San 1999) -4

(14) (31)
(657)

(17)
(352) (305)

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

-7

. (1981)

.(1990)

. (1991)

.(1993)

(1991)

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

		.(1994)	-7
		.(1992) Putlar (1995)	
. (1997)	(1996)		-8
		. (1997) Day	-9
	(1987) Donovan		-10

:

-1

-2

:

-3

-4

:

-
-
-
-
-

(12) (14)
(25) (1650) (18)
(%14) (66)
(224)

:

1

2

-

-

: -2

-1

-2

: -3

-

" (351-348: 1987)

"

" (78-68: 1991)

"

"(156-129: 1994)

"(179-116: 1993)

" (256-221 :1992)

) ."

" (205-195: 1997

"

-5

:

/

:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13

:

/

:

	8		1
	9		2
	10		3
	11		4
	12		5
	13		6
	14		7

			:	:
		(224)		
4	6)	()		
		(4	
		:	:	
		(224)		
		:	:	
(9)	(36)	"	"	
		:		
				-1
		:		
				-1
				-2
				-3
		:		
				-2
		:		
				-
		:		
				-1
				-2
				-

(36)

(9)

:

(30)

(1)

(1)

	A1	B1	C1	D1	ToT	
A1	Pearson Correlation Sig (2. tailed) N	1 .013 30	.450* .013 30	.557** .001 30	.260 .165 30	.762** .000 30
B1	Pearson Correlation Sig (2. tailed) N	.450* .013 30	1 .000 30	.615** .000 30	.394* .031 30	.765** .000 30
C1	Pearson Correlation Sig (2. tailed) N	.557** .001 30	.615** .000 30	1 .046 30	.368* .046 30	.857** .000 30
D1	Pearson Correlation Sig (2. tailed) N	.260 .165 30	.394* .031 30	.368* .046 30	1 .000 30	.654** .000 30
ToT	Pearson Correlation Sig (2. tailed) N	.762** .000 30	.765** .000 30	.857** .000 30	.654** .000 30	1 .000 30

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

: -3

(2)

: (2)

0.83	-
0.78	-
0.79	-
0.76	-
0.86	

. %86

:

: (spss)

-1

-2

-3

:

:

1

2

3

:

- -

:

(3)

8	68.39	0.96	3.42	766		1
9	58.30	0.89	2.92	653		2
5	70.54	0.73	3.53	790		3
7	69.20	0.77	3.46	775		4
6	70.09	0.65	3.50	785		5
3	73.48	0.72	3.67	823		6
2	73.84	0.73	3.69	827		7
4	72.32	0.79	3.62	810		8
1	74.91	0.91	3.75	839		9
	70.12	0.52	3.51	7068		

(4)

9	57.32	1.05	2.87	642		1
3	84.11	0.77	4.21	942		2
1	85.54	0.67	4.28	958		3
5	77.41	0.77	3.87	867		4
2	84.20	0.82	4.21	943		5
4	82.32	0.81	4.12	922		6
6	76.70	0.75	3.83	859		7
8	68.84	1.01	3.44	771		8
7	71.34	0.89	3.57	799		9
	76.42	0.41	3.82	7703		

(5)

:

5	73.21	0.84	3.66	820		1
4	74.29	0.94	3.71	832		2
8	67.68	0.95	3.38	758		3
9	58.84	1.07	2.94	659		4
3	75.63	0.95	3.78	847		5
7	68.04	1.17	3.40	762		6
2	79.46	1.07	3.97	890		7
1	81.07	0.80	4.05	908		8
6	71.61	0.95	3.58	802		9
	72.20	0.60	3.61	7278		

(6)

:

9	54.38	1.11	2.72	609		1
3	82.68	0.95	4.13	926		2
2	83.48	0.83	4.17	935		3
1	86.70	0.81	4.33	971		4
6	78.66	0.80	3.93	881		5
5	80.54	0.79	4.03	902		6
4	81.52	0.63	4.08	913		7
7	76.52	0.95	3.83	857		8
8	63.30	1.30	3.17	709		9
	76.42	0.43	3.82	7703		

:

(2)

(9) (6)

(9) (8)

) (3.75) (3.62) : (9) (8) (7)
(3.17) (3.83) (4.8) (371) (357) (3.83

(7) (6) (5) (4) (1)
(3.83) (4.16) (4.20) (3.87) (4.25)
) (3.66) (8) (1)
(4) (3) (2) (1) (4.5

(3)

(3)

-5
-6
-7
-8
-9
-10
-11
-12
-13
:

-1

-2

•

•

-3

•

•

•

-4

-5

.()

()

-6

:

:

:

-1

-2

-3

		:	-
"	" : (1996)		.1
	(488 - 449)	_____ 8	
		" : (1994)	.2
	:	_____ "	
		(156 - 129)	31
		" : (1997)	.3
	:	_____ "	
		(63 - 17)	65
	" : (1989)		.4
		.283 "	
	" : (1995)		.5
1 24		_____ "	
		(35 - 22)	
	" : (1990)		.6
		"	
1	_____ 1990	18 - 15	
		(75 - 49)	
	" : (1991)		.7
-208) 31 8	:	_____ "	
			(232
	" : (1995)		.8
(455 - 417) 1 19	:	_____ "	
	" : (1995)		.9

"	_____	95
":(1993)		.10
"	_____	
":	1993 14 - 12	

	(179 -116)	
":(1991)		.11
"	_____	
(78 -68) 1 11		
"	_____	
":(1999)		.12

- :
-
13. Butler, Jim (1992) . " **Teacher Professional development an Australian Case study** ." Journal of education for teaching, Vol 18, No 3 p.p . 252-278 .
 14. Carter v. Good (1973). Dictionary of Education, (3rd.Ed; New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Compeny,
 15. Day, Christopher (1997). " **Being professional in schools and universities : limits, purposes and possibilities for development** " . British Education Journal, vol 23, No2 p.p .:515- 574
 16. Donovan , James & others (1987). " **The impact of staff development on implementation and student achievement** ", The Journal Of Educational Research, vol 80,No6 p.p. :125-157 .
 17. Hittleman, Daniel, R (1976): "Amodel for acompetency based teacher", (Perparation Program , Teachered . Fornm) Vol.4,No,12 P.2.
 18. Joyce, Bruce & Others(1993): "**The self learning school, Alexandria Virginia**": ASCD
 19. San, Myint (1999) . " **Japanes beginning teachers perceptions of their preparation and professional development** " , Journal of

Education For Teaching , vol 25, No1 p.p. : 255-289 .

20. Sykes, G (1996): "**Reform as professional development**",Phi Dettakappa, Vol 77, No. 7 p.p. :362-382 .

(1)

-

/

/

"

-

"

:
(x)

.1

		x		

: -

						1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7

: -

						1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9

:

-

						1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9

: -

						1
						2
						3
						4
						5
						6
						7
						8
						9

(2)

. .1
. .2
. .3
. .4
. .5
. .6
. .7
. .8
. .9