Evaluating Effectiveness of Training Program in Eastern Samar State University – Can-Avid: Strengthening its Commitment to Continuous Improvement

Dr. Bernadette R. Barro, Aldrin B. Golondrina

College of Education, Eastern Samar State University, Eastern Samar, Philippines

ABSTRACT

The accountability issue of training and development among employees is evaluating the effectiveness of a training program in order to determine whether it accomplishes its goals and objectives, appraise the value of training, identify training gaps and to get rid of any training that isn't necessary. In this descriptive study, the effectiveness of training program of this university campus is evaluated in terms of faculty participants' and the department head's viewpoints. Using an adapted and modified training effectiveness questionnaire, the faculty's perceived learning right after the activity, application of knowledge and skill acquired three months later, and the department head's evaluation of the faculty's demonstrated learning in terms of its impact on job behavior and job performance were taken into account. Results show faculty participants "agree" that the activity courses have achieved their individual objectives, they have acquired deeper understanding about the subjects of the training program, and their performance level will rise as a result of their attendance to the training.

Further, they "agree" that the TSPs have the full readiness to perform the activity courses, the resource persons are experts within the area of competence, the facilities were equipped with the highest quality standards. In terms of impact on their job performance and their application of learning three months after the conclusion of the activity courses, faculty participants "somewhat agree" they had the chance to make the best use of the skills they have learned from the activity courses and their job performance level have increased as a result of their attendance to the activity courses. Meanwhile, the department heads "somewhat agree" they have noticed an increase in the faculty's performance in the workplace since their attendance to the training and they have noticed indicators that proved faculty participants benefited from the acquired skills in the training. The top two reasons why faculty failed to apply the knowledge and skills learned in the capability trainings are "they haven't had the opportunity" and "they are very busy".

KEYWORDS: effectiveness, evaluation, training program, perceived learning, job performance

INTRODUCTION:

Training is a key part of human resource management that aims to improve faculty members' competency in providing high-quality instruction and services to students. Training has become a significant strategy for improving personnel's ability to deal with the difficulties and opportunities of today's workplace.

Competency training was commonly used as part of a reward package, particularly for employees who were promoted (An, 2015)

According to (Raja, 2014) any training program's ultimate purpose is to transform employees'

knowledge, skills, and attitudes (KSAs) in a way that improves performance outcomes. The accountability issue of training and development of employees is evaluating the effectiveness of a training program in order to determine whether it accomplishes its goals and objectives, appraise the value of training, identify training gaps and to get rid of any training that isn't necessary. Similarly, systematically evaluating a training program is an important step in enhancing its overall quality and determining its influence on the organization. Furthermore, the majority of research suggests that evaluating training in terms of client satisfaction and return on investment, whether assessed in terms of time or money, is critical.

The analysis, design, develop, implement, and evaluate (ADDIE) process includes a phase called training program evaluation. However, appraisal is frequently disregarded or not used to its full potential. This article underlines the necessity of summative evaluation at the end of the training process to assess and ensure the quality, efficacy, and impact of systematic training (Wang, 2006). The learning gained as a result of the seminars and training attended would be put to good use and seen in the faculty members' job performance and attitude. How to generate organizational impact through the use of learning interventions is one of the primary difficulties facing human resource development (Spitzer, 2005.)

The Eastern Samar State University Can-avid campus, through its training and development office, annually conducts capability building programs in the areas of the four university mandates – instruction research, extension, and production - to increase its faculty's knowledge and skills, motivation, participation and performance of these competencies. As an educational institution, it must provide the products and services required to accomplish the desired goals, demonstrating its dedication to continuous development in the fulfillment of its four-fold functions. Stakeholders in organizations are increasingly demanding confirmation of bottom-line effectiveness, or at the very least solid evidence. Measuring efficacy, business value, and return on investment (ROI) are popular subjects these days, especially as upper management scrutinizes training budgets more regularly (Spitzer, 2005.).

Thus, in this study, the researchers intended to evaluate the effectiveness of the training program of this university campus in terms of the perceived learning of the faculty attendees, self-rating assessment of knowledge and skill acquired right after the activity and three months later, and to determine the department head's evaluation in the

demonstrated learning in terms of its impact on job behavior and job performance. The training program consists of training workshops and or seminars conducted by the Training and Development Office in collaboration with the Office of Research and Extension, and attended by the faculty from March 2020 to March 2021.

Specifically, this study is aimed to: [1]determine the demographic profile of training program in terms of category, number of participants, duration of training, training service provider, and nature of activity; [2] describe the profile of faculty participants in terms of gender, age, academic rank, employment status, and base college; [3] determine training effectiveness in terms of faculty participants' perceived learning, application of learning, impact on job performance, and evaluation of training service provider; [4] evaluate training effectiveness based on the department head's evaluation of faculty participant's demonstrated learning and impact on job performance; and [5] determine faculty participants' reasons for failure to apply knowledge and skills learned.

Significance

Assessing effectiveness is an important aspect of the quality management system's process for determining which areas need to be improved. As an ISO-certified university campus, it is critical to provide services that enhance people's personal and professional development. As a result, the outcomes of the training and seminars attended by faculty members should be evaluated to ascertain the return on investment.

METHODOLOGY

In this study, a descriptive survey design was used. The respondents of this study were faculty members from this university campus who attended select seminars and training workshops held between March 2020 and March 2021. The survey instrument was adapted from the Human Resources Management Office's Training Effectiveness Questionnaire using a 7-point Likert scale. The training effectiveness questionnaire was made accessible in both hard copy and Google forms, delivered to faculty participants and department heads, and collected in two parts: one at the end of the training and the other three months later. The data collected from the survey instrument was analyzed using descriptive statistics. The demographic features of training and faculty participants, as well as the faculty participants' proof of evidence of application of information and skills obtained and reasons for failure to apply knowledge and skills taught, were described using frequency counts and percentages. The weighted mean and standard deviation were used to describe the

evaluations of the effectiveness of activity courses by faculty participants and department heads along training variables, while the composite mean and standard deviation were used to characterize the evaluation of the effectiveness of the training program by faculty participants and department heads. The following scale was used to assess and interpret the data collected:

Weight	Range	Interpretation
7	6.22 – 7.00	Strongly agree
6	5.35 – 6.21	Agree
5	4.48 – 5.34	Somewhat agree
4	3.61 – 4.47	Unsure
3	2.74 – 3.60	Somewhat disagree
2	1.87 – 2.73	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.86	Strongly disagree

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Demographic Profile of Training Program along Variables

The university's training program included seminars, training, and/or workshops in the areas of instruction, research, extension, and production, which were held by the following offices: Office of Planning, Research, and Extension (OPRE), Training and Development Office of HRMO in collaboration with all of the university's colleges from March 2020 to March 2021. Table 1 shows the training program's demographic profile as well as training characteristics such as category or area, number of participants, training duration, training service provider, and nature of activity.

In terms of category two (2), forty percent (40%) of the training program was dedicated to research, specifically *"Research Ethics, Protocols, and Standard Operating Procedures*

(SOP)" and *"Basic Research Writing for Lecturers and Newly-Hired Faculty,"* and one (1) each, twenty percent (20%) of the training program was allocated to the remaining areas of extension, production, and instruction, namely *"Measuring Training Effectiveness and Impact*

Evaluation of Extension Projects/Programs", *"IP Awareness, Patent Search and Patent Drafting"*, and *"Transitioning to Digital Instruction and Assessment"*, respectively.

According to the number of participants, 2 out of 5 (40%) of the activity courses were attended by 21 to 40 faculty members, 2 out of 5 (40%) of the activity courses were attended by more than 40 faculty members, and 1 of 5 (20%) of the training were attended by 20 or less faculty members.

Table 1 Profile of Training Program

Training Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Category		
Instruction	1	20%
Research	2	40%
Extension	1	20%
Production	1	20%
Number of Participants		
20 and below	1	20%
21 – 40	2	40%
Above 40	2	40%
Training Duration (days)		
1	2	40%
2	1	20%
3	1	20%
4	1	20%
Training Service Provider		
OPRE	4	80%
HRMO	1	20%
Nature of Activity		
Technical	5	100%
Managerial	0	0%
Supervisory	0	0%

All activity classes lasted fewer than 5 days or 40 hours in terms of training time. Forty percent (2/5) of the activity courses were held on a single day, whereas twenty percent (1/5) were held across two (2), three (3), and four (4) days. As per training service provider, the Office of Planning, Research, and Extension (OPRE) hosted

four out of five (80%) of the activity courses, while the Human Resources Management Office (HRMO) hosted one out of five (20%). All activity courses were classified as technical based on the nature of the activity.

Demographic Profile of Faculty Participants
Table 2 shows the gender, age, academic rank, job status, and basic college profile of faculty members. Males made up 50.61 percent of the population, while females made up 49.39 percent. The bulk of faculty members were between the ages of 21 and 40 (71.60 percent), with 28.40 percent over 40. The majority of the participants (83.54%) were instructors or lecturers, 14.63% were assistant professors, and 1.81 percent were associate or full professors. In terms of employment status, 42.68 percent were on a contract, 24.39 percent were on a temporary assignment, and 32.93 percent were employed on a permanent basis.

In terms of base college, the college of agriculture had 23.78 percent of faculty participants, the college of education had 27.44 percent, the college of computer studies had 18.29 percent, the college of business administration had 22.46 percent, and the college of criminology had 7.93 percent.

Table 2 Demographic Profile of Faculty Participants along activity courses of the training program

Activity Courses	A, n = 45		B, n = 19		C, n = 21		D, n = 23		E, n = 56		COMPOSITE	
Variables	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gender												
Female	20	44.44%	12	63.16%	10	47.62%	10	43.48%	29	51.79%	81	**49.39%**
Male	25	55.56%	7	36.84%	11	52.38%	13	56.52%	27	48.21%	83	**50.61%**
Age												
21 - 30	17	37.78%	7	36.84%	13	61.90%	12	52.17%	21	37.50%	70	**42.68%**
31 - 40	9	20.00%	6	31.58%	4	19.05%	4	17.39%	23	41.07%	46	**28.05%**
41 - 50	7	15.56%	5	26.32%	3	14.29%	4	17.39%	9	16.07%	28	**17.07%**
above 50	12	26.67%	1	5.26%	1	4.76%	3	13.04%	3	1.79%	20	**12.20%**
Academic Rank												
Lecturer	14	31.11%	7	36.84%	17	80.95%	11	47.83%	21	37.50%	70	**42.68%**
Instructor	21	46.67%	8	42.11%	4	19.05%	11	47.83%	23	41.07%	67	**40.85%**
Assistant Professor	9	20.00%	4	21.05%	0	0.00%	1	4.35%	10	16.07%	24	**14.63%**
Associate Professor	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	1.79%	2	**1.22%**
Professor	1	2.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	3.57%	1	**0.61%**
Employment Status												
Contract	14	31.11%	7	36.84%	17	80.95%	11	47.83%	21	37.50%	70	**42.68%**
Temporary	12	26.67%	5	26.32%	4	19.05%	7	30.43%	12	21.43%	40	**24.39%**
Permanent	19	42.22%	7	36.84%	0	0.00%	5	21.74%	23	41.07%	54	**32.93%**
Base College												
Agriculture	12	26.67%	3	15.79%	4	19.05%	6	26.09%	14	25.00%	39	**23.78%**
Education	13	28.89%	5	26.32%	5	23.81%	7	30.43%	15	26.79%	45	**27.44%**
Computer Studies	8	17.78%	4	21.05%	5	23.81%	3	13.04%	10	17.86%	30	**18.29%**
Business Administration	10	22.22%	4	21.05%	5	23.81%	4	17.39%	14	25.00%	37	**22.56%**
Criminolgy	2	4.44%	3	15.79%	2	9.52%	3	13.04%	3	5.36%	13	**7.93%**

Legend
A. Measuring Training Effectiveness and Impact Evaluation of Extension Programs/Projects
B. Research Ethics, Protocols and SOP
C. Basic Research Writing Workshop for Lecturers and Newly-Hired Faculty
D. IP Awareness, Patent Search and Patent Drafting
E. Transitioning to Digital Instruction and Assessment

Faculty Participants' Self-Evaluation along Training Effectiveness Variables
The self-evaluation of faculty participants in terms of perceived learning and impact on job performance at the end of the activity course is shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Faculty participants' evaluation on the perceived learning and impact on job performance along activity course

| Activity Courses | Perceived Learning | | | | | | Impact on Job Performance | | |
| | 1. The activity course has achieved my individual objectives | | | 2. I have acquired a deeper understanding of the training course subject | | | 3. My performance level will rise as a result of my attendance to this training | | |
	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description
A	6.13	0.87	Agree	6.04	0.93	Agree	5.76	1.05	Agree
B	6.26	0.45	Strongly Agree	6.21	0.42	Strongly Agree	6.21	0.42	Strongly Agree
C	6.05	0.67	Agree	6.05	0.59	Agree	6.05	0.67	Agree
D	6.22	0.42	Strongly Agree	6.04	1.22	Agree	5.78	1.17	Agree
E	5.88	1.56	Agree	5.88	1.58	Agree	5.84	1.55	Agree
COMPOSITE	6.11	0.79	Agree	6.04	0.95	Agree	5.93	0.97	Agree

Legend

A-Measuring Training Effectiveness and Impact Evaluation of Extension Program for Lecturers and Newly-Hired Faculty B-Research Ethics, Protocols and IPR Awareness, Patent Search and Patent Drafting C-Basic Research Writing Workshop D-Transitioning to Digital Instruction and Assessment

In terms of faculty participants' perceived learning, they agree that the activity courses have achieved their individual objectives as denoted by the weighted mean score of 6.11 (SD = 0.79). Likewise, they agree that they have acquired deeper understanding about the subjects of the training program as indicated by the weighted mean score of 6.04 (SD = 0.95). With regard to the impact on their job performance, they also agree that their performance level will rise as a result of their attendance to the training as it helped them understand and perform their work better as indicated by the weighted mean score of 5.93 (SD = 0.97).

Meanwhile, the faculty participants' evaluation of training service providers' effectiveness is revealed in Table 3.2. where they agree that the TSPs have the full readiness to perform the activity courses as indicated by the weighted mean score of 5.89 (SD = 1.03).

Table 3.2 Faculty participant's evaluation of training service provider's effectiveness

| Activity Courses | 1. The TSP has the full readiness to perform this activity course | | | 2. The resource person(s) is/are expert(s) within the area of competence | | | 3. The activity course facilities are equipped with the highest standard quality | | | 4. I would recommend other participants to attend this activity conducted by this TSP | | |
	Weighted Mean	Std. Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std. Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std. Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description
A	5.71	1.08	Agree	5.80	0.89	Agree	5.24	1.35	Somewhat Agree	6.31	0.85	Strongly Agree
B	6.21	0.71	Strongly Agree	6.21	0.71	Strongly Agree	5.95	0.97	Agree	6.42	0.51	Strongly Agree
C	6.14	0.65	Agree	5.90	0.94	Agree	4.95	1.75	Somewhat Agree	6.14	0.65	Agree
D	5.70	1.61	Agree	5.83	1.47	Agree	5.52	1.62	Agree	5.87	1.55	Agree
E	5.71	1.08	Agree	5.80	0.89	Agree	5.24	1.35	Somewhat Agree	6.31	0.85	Strongly Agree
COMPOSITE	5.89	1.03	Agree	5.91	0.98	Agree	5.38	1.41	Agree	6.21	0.88	Strongly Agree

Legend

A-Measuring Training Effectiveness and Impact Evaluation of Extension Program for Lecturers and Newly-Hired Faculty B-Research Ethics, Protocols and IPR Awareness, Patent Search and Patent Drafting C-Basic Research Writing Workshop D-Transitioning to Digital Instruction and Assessment

They also agree that the resource persons are experts within the area of competence as denoted by the weighted mean score of 5.91 (SD = 0.98) and that the facilities were equipped with the highest quality standards as implied by the weighted mean score of 5.38 (SD = 1.41). Finally, they strongly agree that they would other faculty members to attend the activity courses conducted by the TSPs as signified by the weighted mean score of 6.21 (SD = 0.88).

Table 3.3 shows the faculty's self-evaluation of the impact on their job performance and their application of learning three months after the conclusion of the activity courses attended. They somewhat agree that they had the chance to make the best use of the skills they have learned from the activity courses as indicated by the weighted mean score of 4.85 (SD = 1.27). They also somewhat agree that their job performance level have increased as a result of their attendance to the activity courses as denoted by the weighted mean score of 5.31 (SD = 1.11). This finding is conforms with the study of (Deligero, 2014) who found that people become more

productive, vigorous, dedicated, and passionate to perform duties and obligations as members of the dynamic academic institution when they have a higher level of work engagement.

Table 3.3 Faculty's Post-Evaluation on Impact Job Performance and Application of Learning

Activity Courses	Application of Learning			Impact on Job Performance		
	1. I had the chance to make the best use of the skills I learned in this activity course			2. My job performance level has raised as a result of my attendance to this activity course		
	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description
A	4.47	1.31	Undecided	4.93	1.25	Somewhat agree
B	5.32	1.53	Somewhat agree	5.26	1.41	Somewhat agree
C	4.67	1.32	Somewhat agree	5.48	0.98	Agree
D	4.70	0.76	Somewhat agree	5.61	0.50	Agree
E	5.07	1.43	Somewhat agree	5.27	1.41	Somewhat agree
COMPOSITE	4.85	1.27	Somewhat agree	5.31	1.11	Somewhat agree

Department Heads' Evaluation of Faculty Demonstrated Learning along Job Behavior and Job Performance

The department heads' evaluation on the faculty's demonstrated learning in terms of impact on job performance is revealed in Table 4. They somewhat agreed that they have noticed an increase in the faculty's performance in the workplace since their attendance to the training as indicated by the weighted mean score of 4.93 (SD = 1.43). Moreover, the department heads somewhat agreed they have noticed indicators that proved faculty participants benefited from the acquired skills in the training as implied by the weighted mean score of 4.86 (SD = 1.48). According to (Laguador, 2014) Affective learning is critical for balancing the application of knowledge and abilities in a work environment where proper attitude and behavior are always required.

Table 4 Department head's evaluation of faculty's demonstrated learning in terms of impact on job performance

Activity Courses	1. I have noticed an increase in the employees' performance in workplace since their attendance to this Activity			2. I have noticed indicators that prove that employees benefit from the acquired skills in the said activity.		
	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description	Weighted Mean	Std Deviation	Description
A	4.44	1.66	Undecided	4.64	1.49	Somewhat agree
B	5.05	1.81	Somewhat agree	4.95	1.78	Somewhat agree
C	4.90	1.30	Somewhat agree	5.24	1.26	Somewhat agree
D	5.48	0.59	Agree	4.65	0.98	Somewhat agree
E	4.77	1.78	Somewhat agree	4.84	1.91	Somewhat agree
COMPOSITE	4.93	1.43	Somewhat agree	4.86	1.48	Somewhat agree

Faculty Participant' Reasons of Failure to Apply Learning

Evidence of faculty applying the knowledge and skills acquired in the training include completed researches, new research and extension project proposals, patent drafts, and integration of digital tools in instruction and assessment. However, in Table 5 shows the reasons why faculty failed to apply the knowledge and skills learned in the capability trainings. When asked why they haven't been able to apply their knowledge and skills, 37.50 percent said they haven't had the opportunity, 37.05 percent said they are very busy, 7.62 percent said others have discouraged their attempts to change, and 3.38 percent said they haven't learned anything they can apply.

Table 5 Faculty Participants' Reasons of Failure to Apply Knowledge and Skills along activity courses

Reasons	A f	%	f	B %	f	C %	f	D %	f	E %	OVER-ALL f	%
1. I have not learned anything I could apply.	4	13.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	3.57	**6**	**3.38**
2. I have not had the chance	18	60.00	6	33.00	10	48.00	7.00	30.43	9	16.07	**50**	**37.50**
3. I was very busy.	13	43.33	6	33.00	9	43.00	9.00	39.13	15	26.79	**52**	**37.05**
Others have discouraged my attempts to change	5	16.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	12	21.43	**17**	**7.62**

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section will conclude the study by summarizing the key research findings in relation to the research aims as well as the value and contribution thereof. It will also review the limitations of the study and propose opportunities for future research. This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the training program of this university campus based on the faculty participants' and the department heads' viewpoints.

The following are the conclusions drawn from the results of this study:

1. Forty percent (40%) of the training program was dedicated for research, participated by either 21 to 40 faculty members or more than 40 faculty attendees, and held within a day. Eighty percent (80%) was hosted by the Office of Planning, Research and Extension, and all (100%) were classified as technical based on the nature of the activity.

2. Faculty participants were even in terms of gender. Majority of faculty attendees were aged between the ages of 21 and 40, either lecturer or instructor, either on contract or temporary assignment. In terms of base college, 27.44 were participated by COEd faculty, followed by CoA (23.78%), CBA (22.46%), CCS (18.29%) and Criminology (7.93%).

3. Right after each activity course, faculty participants considered the training program as effective based on their perceived learning and impact on their performance. They "agree" the activity courses have achieved their individual objectives, they have acquired deeper understanding about the subjects of the training program, and their performance level will rise as a result of their attendance to the training. Likewise, faculty attendees agree the training service providers were effective. They agree the TSPs have the full readiness to perform the activity courses, the resource persons are experts within the area of competence, and that the facilities were equipped with the highest quality standards. Lastly, they strongly agree that they would recommend other faculty members to attend the activity courses conducted by the TSPs.

4. Three months after the conclusion of each activity course, faculty participants considered the training program as somewhat effective. Faculty somewhat agree they had the chance to make the best use of the skills learned from the activity courses, and that their job performance level have increased as a result of their attendance to the training program.

5. The department heads' evaluation on the effectiveness of the training program is somewhat effective based on the faculty's performance in the workplace three months after their attendance to each activity course. They somewhat agree they have noticed an increase in the faculty's performance in the workplace and they have noticed indicators that proved faculty participants benefited from the acquired skills in the training program.

6. Majority of faculty participants' reason of failure to apply learning gained from the training program is either they were very busy or they have not had the chance to apply the knowledge and skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of these findings, the researcher, therefore, recommends the following:

1. Evaluation of training effectiveness may be done through performance-based assessment or outcome-based assessment where concrete evidence or proof of improvement as before and after performance are very evident.

2. The college deans should provide proper allocation of budget in order for all faculty members to have an equal chance to attend the training or seminar.

3. Faculty attendees should conduct echo seminar to share the information learned from expensive training.

4. The attendees may be required not only to submit seminar reports for documentation but they also

need to submit any output relevant to the training participated as evidence of training utilization.

5. Teaching and non-teaching staff should be at the center of all developmental plans and activities if quality education is to become a reality. A responsive curriculum, a physically well-equipped school, and cutting-edge technology are all for naught if the teachers and non-teaching personnel do not perform to their full capacity (Javier, 2012).

REFERENCES

[1] Abouelenein, Y. A. (2016). Training Needs for Faculty Members: Towards Achieving Quality University Education in the Light of Technological Innovations. Educational Research and Reviews.

[2] Amparado, M. A. (2017). Training Needs Analysis of a University in Central Visayas Philippines. IAMURE Multidisciplinary Research.

[3] An, I. (2015). Effectiveness of Training Program Among Liberal Arts Faculty Members in an Asian University. *Asian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*.

[4] Deligero, J. C. (2014). Work Engagement among Employees and Its Relationship with Work Units' Performance of a Higher Education Institution. *International Journal of Management Sciences*.

[5] Hamadne, I. m. (2015). Training Needs for Faculty Members at Al-Albayt University from their Perspectives in the Light of some Variables.

[6] Hassan, M. (2013). The Usage of Training Needs Assessment (TNA) for Academic Staff: An Applied Study for Faculty of Dentistry, Alex, University. Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport.

[7] Javier, F. (2012). Assessing an Asian University's Organizational Effectiveness Using the Malcolm Baldridge Model, .*Asian Journal of Business and Governance*.

[8] Abouelenein, Y. A. (2016). Training needs for faculty members: towards achieving quality university education in the light of technological innovations. Educational Research and Reviews.

[9] Amparado, M. A. (2017). Training needs analysis of a university in central visayaz Philippines. IAMURE Multidisciplinary Research.

[10] Hamadne, I. m. (2015). Training needs for faculty members at Al-Albayt university from their perspectives in the light of some variables.

[11] Hassan, M. (2013). The Usage of Training Needs Assessment (TNA) for academic staff: An applied study for Faculty of Dentistry, Alex, University. Arab Academy for Science and Technology and Maritime Transport.

[12] Hufana, M. C. (2019). Quality Assessment of Don Mariano Marcos Memorial State University - Mid La Union Campus Faculty's Four-Fold Mandate. International Journal of English and Education.

[13] Lacsamana, R. L. (2018). Learning needs assessment of non-teaching personnel as input to human resour development plan. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences.

[14] Laguador, J. M. (2014). Industry-Partners' Preferences for Graduates: Input On Curriculum Development. *Journal of Education and Literature*.

[15] Raja, M. W. (2014). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Teachers Training Programs in Islamabad Model Collages. *Journal of Studies in Education ·.*

[16] Spitzer, D. R. (2005.). Learning Effectiveness Measurement: A New Approach for Measuring and Managing Learning to Achieve Business Results. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*.

[17] Wang, G. G. (2006). Training Evaluation: Knowing More Than Is Practiced. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*.

[18] Yousif, A. A. (2019). (2019). Training Needs Assessment of Academic Teaching Staff in Faculty of Dentistry, University of Gezira, Sudan 2018. Education in Medicine Journal, 11, 31-41.

[19] Yousif, A. A. (2019). Training needs assessment of academic teaching staff in Faculty of Dentistry, University of Gezira, Sudan 2018. Education in Medicine Journal.

[20] Yousif, A., Ahmed, O.Y., & Osman, W.N. (2019). Training Needs Assessment of Academic Teaching Staff in Faculty of Dentistry, University of Gezira, Sudan . (2018). Education in Medicine Journal, 11, 31-41.