

*

"

(298)

(222)

.(2014/2013)

($\alpha \leq 0,05$)

.(10)

.(10-6)

. 2014/11/12 :

.2015

. 2014/5/27 :

*
©

**A PROPOSED SUPERVISORY MODEL FOR EVALUATING
ISLAMIC EDUCATION TEACHERS AT GOVERNMENTAL
SCHOOLS IN JORDAN**

Mohammad Amin" Hamed Al-Qudah

ABSTRACT

The study aimed at building a proposal supervisory model for evaluating Islamic education teachers at governmental school in Jordan. The sample consisted of (222 males) and (298 females) teachers during the second academic semester (2013/ 2014). Data were analyzed by using means, standard and Uni-variance (Scheffe) to test the significance of the differences, and the factor analysis to measure saturation and prevalence of the proposed model.

The results of the study showed that the satisfaction estimation for Islamic education teachers at governmental schools in Jordan regarding the proposed supervisory model for their evaluation was so high. In addition, the study show significant statistical differences at ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) regarding the satisfaction degree of Islamic education teachers at governmental Schools in Jordan about the proposed model which are attributed to the effect of experience. This result was for the benefit of those who possess (6- 10) and those who have (10 years and more) of experience. Based on the results of the uni factor analysis for the items of evaluating Islamic Education Teachers at governmental schools in Jordan. Accordingly, the remaining items represent the proposed supervisory model to evaluate Islamic education Teachers at governmental schools in Jordan. In the Light of the above results, the Study recommended the proposed supervisory model to evaluate Islamic education teachers at governmental schools in Jordan should be applied by the Ministry of Education.

Key words: Supervisory Model, Islamic Education Teachers, Jordan.

.2015

.(1996)

.(2002)

.(2008)

.(2007)

)

.(2002

.(2008)

.(2007)

.(2003)

(2000)

(2002)

(2004)

(2000)

(20)

(30)

(30)

%86

%70

:

:

-1

($\alpha \leq 0,05$)

-2

-3

:

:

-

. : -
:
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
.
:
(1986) .(2005) :
:
.
:
) (:
:
:
(:
:
(2007)

.(2002)

:
: (Boyan, 1988)

()

.1

. 2013/2012

.2

:

: (2007)

: (2008)

:

:(2002)

:(1962-1921)

:(1975 -1962)

1962

:(-1975)

(1975) 7-4

:

(2007)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

-7

:

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

: :

(2000)

-

:

.

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

: :

(2008)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

:

:

(2006)

.

:

	-1
.	-2
.	-3
.	-4
.	-5
.	-6
:	:
(2008)	

	-1
.	-2
.	-3
.	-4
.	-5
.	-6

.2015

:() :

(2008)

:

-1

-2

-3

-4

-5

-6

-7

-8

(2007)

:

:(

):

:

" "

" "

"

"

()

-1

()

-2

()

-3

()

-4

()

() :

.Effective Teachers

: ()

Formative Self Evaluation -1

-2

-3

Evaluation

(2003)
Assessment

.
:
.

:

(2010)

:

-1

()

-2

.()

-3

.()

: (2002)

: (2007)

:

(2003)

:

-1

-2

:

-3

-4

-5

-6

-7

-8

:

: (2003)

:Learning Evaluation -1

:Teaching Evaluation -2

:Subjects Evaluation -3

:Educational Programs Evaluation -4

: -5

: (2007) -1

-2

-3

.() -4

-5

-6

-7

-8

	:	
:	(1990)	
	:	:
:		
	:	-1
	:	-
		-
		-
		-
		-
	:	-
		-
		-
		-
		-
	:	-2

	:	
		-
()		-
		-
		-
	:	
		-
		-
		-
		-
	:	:
	:	
	:	-1
	:	
		-
" "		-
		-
" "		

: -2

:

-

.

-

.()

-

.

:

-3

"

"

:

-4

.

:

:

:

:

-1

()

:

"

" "

"

:

-2

." " " " ;

: : " " :

: -1

: . -2

: : :

: **-1**

()
(...)

: **-2**

(...)

: : :

: **-1**

" " " "

:() -2

"

"

:

:

:

:

-1

.

:

-2

.

:

-3

.

:

:

:

:

-1

.

:

-2

.
: : :

: **-1**

.()

:() **-2**

(2002)

		(350)	(30)	
		(21)		(46)
	" :			
				(2002)
	(165)			
				:
	.(0,64)			
	(0,64)	(0,66)		(0,71)
			.(0,58)	
				(2003)
(882)	(318)	(173)		
:				
				:

(2006)

(500)

:

(2006)

(169)

":

"

(2007)

(925)

(300)

(198)

(2007)

(455)

(2009)

(2061)

(2011)

(0.79 -0.1)

(0.79 -0.2)

.(0.76 - 0.11)

(0.69)

(0.37)

Baltimore) (BCPSS)

(McConney, 2003)

(City Public School System

(183)

%26

(BCPSS)

%47

%24

(Ives & Rowley, 2005)

(21)

(12)

(Miranda, 2006)

(14)

(19)

(18)

:

"

(Bouchahamma, 2007)

(382)

" (Caires & Almeida, 2007)

(244)

(Oghuvbu, 2007)

(855)

(645)

Brandt, Mathers,)

(216)

(13)

(Oliva, Brown, & Hess, 2007

(140)

(Lansman, 2007)

(190)

(Smith & Tillema, 2007)

() Portfolio

:

(350)

" (Tamara & Carol, 2008)

"

(177)

:

:

(2113) (4752)
 . 2013/2012 (2639)

(298) (222) (520)
 (1) %10

(1)

	10	10 - 6	6	
520	245	216	59	

(2006)
 (43) .(2000) (2006)
 ()

3.67 - 2.34

2.33 - 1

5 - 3.68

:

)

(2,4,8)

.(

(4 3)

(9 7 6 3 2 1)

(5 4 3)

(%80)

(43)

:

(Cronbach Alpha)

(2)

(40)

(2)

0.83	
0.84	
0.82	
0.83	
0.78	
0.87	

(10 - 6) (6) :

:

:

:

.(10)

:

:

:

:

Principal)

:

(Component Analysis

:

:

:

:

:

: :

(3)

:(3)

()

	1	0.33	4.47		2
	2	0.40	4.46		4
	2	0.38	4.46		3
	4	0.45	4.43		1
	4	0.37	4.43		5
		0.26	4.45		

(3)

(0.33)

(4.47)

" "

"

(0.45) (0.37)

(4.43)

"

.(0.26)

(4.45)

(2007)

(2006)

: :
: -1

(4)

(4)

	1	0.52	4.62		1
	2	0.50	4.56		12
	2	0.54	4.56		5
	2	0.56	4.56		6
	5	0.62	4.50		7
	6	0.56	4.46		4
	7	0.58	4.45		3
	8	0.55	4.42		8
	8	0.60	4.42		9
	9	0.54	4.39		2
	10	0.62	4.38		10
	11	0.59	4.32		11

(4)
() (1)
(0.52) (4.62)

() (11)
(.0.59) (4.32)

: -2

(5)
(5)

	1	0.58	4.56		1
	2	0.62	4.52		5
	3	0.55	4.43		2
	4	0.60	4.34		4
	5	0.75	4.30) (...	3

(5) (1)

(0.58) (4.56)

) (3)

((...)

: -3

(6)

(6)

	1	0.54	4.62		9
	2	0.53	4.55		1

.2015

	3	0.54	4.48		8
	4	0.56	4.45	.	6
	5	0.56	4.44	.	5
	6	0.56	4.43	.	4
	7	0.61	4.41	.	7
	8	0.62	4.39	.	3
	9	0.54	4.35	.	2

(6)

() (9)

(0.54)

(4.62)

) (2)

(4.35)

(

.(0.54)

: -4

(7)

(7)

	1	0.55	4.61		8
	2	0.57	4.60		7
	3	0.56	4.52		1
	4	0.58	4.45		6
	5	0.60	4.41		3
	6	0.57	4.40		5
	7	0.64	4.37		4
	8	0.56	4.35		2

(7)

(4.61)

(

) (8)

) (2)

(0.55)

.2015

(8) .(0.56) (4.35) (

(4.61) ()

() (2)

(4.35)

: -5

(8)

(8)

	1	0.63	4.59		1
	2	0.61	4.48		9
	2	0.63	4.48		3
	4	0.56	4.47		5

	5	0.54	4.44		4
	5	0.55	4.44		6
	6	0.58	4.38		2
	7	0.56	4.37		8
	8	0.52	4.26		7

(8)

() (1)

(0.63) (4.59)

) (7)

(4.26)

(

.(0.52)

:

:

($\alpha \leq 0,05$)

(

(9)
(9)

0.44	4.31	6	
0.35	4.43	10 - 6	
0.36	4.47	10	
0.37	4.43		
0.41	4.37	6	
0.29	4.46	10 - 6	
0.33	4.50	10	
0.33	4.47		
0.58	4.29	6	
0.34	4.48	10 - 6	
0.35	4.48	10	
0.38	4.46		
0.53	4.30	6	
0.42	4.44	10 - 6	
0.46	4.46	10	
0.45	4.43		
0.44	4.32	6	
0.38	4.49	10 - 6	
0.40	4.47	10	
0.40	4.46		
0.36	4.32	6	
0.24	4.46	10 - 6	
0.25	4.48	10	
0.26	4.45		

(9)

(10)

(10)

*0.02	4.24	0.58	2	1.15		0.96
*0.02	3.90	0.43	2	0.85		
*0.00	6.10	0.90	2	1.80		
0.06	2.82	0.59	2	1.18		
*0.01	4.30	0.69	2	1.38		
*0.00	8.17	0.56	2	1.15		
		0.14	517	70.39		
		0.11	517	56.53		
		0.15	517	76.45		
		0.21	517	108.25		
		0.16	517	82.99		
		0.07	517	36.48		
			519	71.54		
			519	57.38		
			519	78.25		
			519	109.43		
			519	84.37		
			519	37.63		

(10)

()

(11)

(11)

		2	1	
0.02	0.16	10	6	
0.02	0.13	10	6	
0.01	0.18	10	6	
0.00	0.19	10 - 6		
0.03	0.15	10	6	
0.02	0.16	10 - 6		
0.00	0.15	10	6	
0.00	0.14	10 - 6		

: (11)

(6)

:()

.(10)

(10)

(10)

(6)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \cdot \\
 & (\quad 10) \quad \quad \quad : (\quad \quad) \\
 & \quad (\quad \quad 10) \quad \quad \quad (\quad 6 \quad) \\
 & \quad (\quad 6 \quad) \quad \quad \quad (\quad 10 - 6) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \cdot (\quad 10 - 6) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad (\quad 10 - 6) \\
 & \cdot (\quad 10) \quad \quad (\quad 6 \quad) \\
 & 10) \quad \quad \quad (11) \\
 & (\quad 10) \quad \quad \quad (\quad 6 \quad) \quad \quad (\\
 & (\quad 6 \quad) \quad \quad (\quad 10 - 6) \\
 & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \cdot (\quad 10 - 6)
 \end{aligned}$$

(Principal Component Analysis)

$$(12) \quad (\quad \quad)$$

(12)

%	%		
21.49	21.49	9.24	1
29.21	7.72	3.32	2
35.87	6.67	2.87	3
41.01	5.140	2.21	4
45.57	4.56	1.96	5
49.36	3.79	1.63	6
52.72	3.37	1.45	7
55.85	3.13	1.35	8
58.62	2.76	1.19	9
61.21	2.60	1.12	10
63.73	2.52	1.09	11
66.20	2.47	1.06	12
68.38	2.18	.934	13
70.45	2.07	.89	14
72.45	1.10	.86	15
74.20	1.76	.76	16
75.91	1.71	.74	17
77.51	1.60	.69	18
79.05	1.54	.66	19
80.49	1.44	.62	20
81.81	1.32	.57	21
83.06	1.26	.54	22
84.27	1.20	.52	23
85.43	1.17	.50	24
86.49	1.06	.46	25
87.53	1.04	.45	26
88.53	.99	.43	27
89.51	.98	.42	28
90.48	.97	.49	29
91.40	.92	.39	30
92.26	.87	.37	31
93.12	.85	.37	32

%	%		
93.92	.81	.35	33
94.65	.73	.31	34
95.36	.71	.31	35
96.05	.69	.30	36
96.71	.66	.28	37
97.37	.66	.28	38
98.01	.64	.28	39
98.58	.57	.25	40
99.14	.56	.24	41
99.64	.50	.21	42
100.00	.37	.16	43

) (9.24) (12) (12) (

(13) (%21.49)

(13)

12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
0.39	-0.04	0.07	0.09	-0.48	-0.04	0.13	0.20	-0.05	0.38	0.19	0.36	1
0.38	-0.22	-0.10	0.24	0.14	0.04	0.23	0.03	0.03	0.41	0.06	0.47	2
0.30	-0.07	0.03	0.19	-0.22	-0.18	0.16	0.21	0.10	0.39	0.16	0.41	3
-0.17	0.19	-0.07	0.21	0.15	-0.23	0.12	0.22	0.08	0.13	0.04	0.57	4
-0.21	0.12	0.01	0.10	0.14	-0.29	0.07	0.16	-0.02	0.34	-0.03	0.51	5
-0.33	0.03	-0.13	-0.08	0.07	-0.14	0.10	0.17	0.02	0.52	-0.00	0.43	6
-0.22	-0.06	0.23	-0.37	-0.02	0.05	0.17	0.10	-0.03	0.40	0.10	0.42	7
0.03	-0.09	-0.03	-0.55	0.04	0.12	0.13	0.05	0.26	0.34	-0.00	0.42	8
-0.06	-0.26	0.05	-0.26	-0.09	0.20	0.29	-0.22	0.370	0.20	0.11	0.42	9
0.09	0.26	0.43	-0.00	-0.11	-0.10	-0.41	0.09	0.24	0.13	-0.10	0.32	1
0.15	0.14	-0.02	-0.05	0.30	0.03	-0.47	-0.05	0.28	0.17	-0.11	0.37	2
0.04	0.23	0.01	-0.05	0.19	0.13	-0.40	0.02	0.35	0.11	-0.07	0.45	3
0.16	0.00	0.05	-0.05	0.00	0.22	-0.23	-0.04	0.42	0.06	-0.19	0.46	4
-0.13	-0.08	-0.18	0.18	-0.21	0.23	-0.10	-0.26	0.48	0.00	-0.13	0.46	5
-0.14	-0.11	-0.22	0.22	-0.27	0.13	-0.16	-0.35	.36	.00	-0.16	0.47	6
-0.19	0.03	0.20	0.12	-0.30	-0.11	-0.14	-0.26	-0.30	0.07	-0.04	0.54	7
0.03	0.09	-0.09	0.21	0.16	-0.15	-0.07	-0.42	-0.20	0.18	-0.18	0.47	8
0.07	-0.05	0.09	-0.00	-0.09	-0.03	-0.09	-0.42	-0.31	0.11	-0.11	0.55	9
0.09	-0.06	0.01	-0.12	0.07	0.00	0.02	-0.36	-0.42	0.08	-0.29	0.50	10
0.02	0.11	0.07	-0.18	0.00	-0.06	-0.00	-0.35	-0.38	0.07	-0.16	0.50	11
-0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.05	0.07	-0.17	0.13	-0.45	-0.14	-0.07	-0.26	0.47	12
-0.23	-0.06	0.40	0.19	-0.16	0.09	-0.08	0.34	-0.04	-0.18	0.24	0.45	1
-0.02	-0.22	0.23	0.16	0.37	0.11	0.08	0.25	-0.04	-0.14	-0.34	0.48	2
0.03	-0.18	0.05	0.06	0.19	0.14	0.01	0.23	-0.15	-0.12	-0.45	0.50	3
0.01	-0.18	0.11	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.23	-0.09	-0.21	-0.40	.56	4
0.01	-0.08	-0.10	-0.14	-0.09	0.04	0.03	0.30	-0.07	-0.18	-0.42	0.56	5
-0.02	0.15	-0.24	-0.16	-0.09	0.08	0.08	0.25	-0.10	-0.20	-0.47	0.45	6
0.07	0.26	-0.24	-0.08	-0.22	-0.03	0.17	0.18	-0.11	-0.19	-0.36	0.56	7
-0.02	0.36	-0.33	0.02	-0.16	0.02	0.21	0.14	0.08	-0.24	-0.26	0.46	8
0.13	-0.10	0.12	0.16	0.10	0.10	0.24	-0.08	0.17	-0.30	-0.17	0.45	9

12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
0.11	0.13	0.04	0.08	-0.22	0.27	-0.15	0.05	-0.28	0.03	0.42	<u>0.44</u>	1
0.16	0.14	-0.13	0.08	<u>0.36</u>	0.35	0.01	<u>0.60</u>	-0.25	0.09	0.33	0.35	2
-0.08	0.08	0.10	0.05	-0.01	0.45	-0.02	0.05	-0.34	0.03	<u>0.47</u>	0.39	3
-0.04	0.17	-0.08	-0.02	0.07	0.35	0.01	0.09	-0.18	-0.06	<u>0.48</u>	0.42	4
-0.31	.033	-0.13	.121	.020	.247	.221	-.111	.080	-.141	.450	<u>.462</u>	5
-0.12	-0.08	-0.05	-0.01	-0.21	-0.21	-0.30	0.20	-0.09	-0.18	0.33	<u>0.48</u>	1
-0.08	-0.18	-0.22	0.13	0.24	-0.25	-0.19	0.08	-0.02	-0.12	0.30	<u>0.53</u>	2
-0.08	-0.26	-0.16	-0.04	-0.02	-0.19	-0.20	0.13	-0.01	-0.22	0.39	<u>0.56</u>	3
0.06	-0.30	-0.13	-0.20	-0.02	-0.17	-0.20	0.06	-0.05	-0.23	0.36	<u>0.51</u>	4
0.15	-0.03	-0.08	-0.17	0.03	-0.23	-0.15	0.03	-0.05	-0.27	0.31	<u>0.53</u>	5
0.19	0.26	0.15	-0.21	0.12	-0.24	0.15	-0.06	0.06	-0.37	0.24	<u>0.42</u>	6
-0.02	0.11	0.22	0.05	0.08	-0.17	0.36	-0.13	0.29	-0.36	0.29	<u>0.51</u>	7
0.03	0.14	0.14	0.11	0.06	-0.18	0.30	-0.11	0.36	-0.40	0.31	<u>0.45</u>	8

(38) (13)

(0.3)

(6) () (1)

() (2) ()

() () (3,4)

()

(

:

				:	
				.	1
):	2
				.(3
				.	4
				.	5
				.	6
				.	7

				:	
				.	1
				.	2
				.	3
				.	4
				.	5
				.	6
				.	7
				.	8
				.	9
				.	10
				.	11
				.	12

:					
					1
					2
					3
					4
				:	
					5
					6
					7
					8
					9
:					
					1
					2
)	3
				(....	4
					5
:					
					1
					2
					3
					4
					5

:

:

-

-

-

(1996)

/

(2000)

(1)

(2002)

(2002)

.65-41 (2)29

:

(2007)

(3)

(2005)

		(2000)
	:	(2007)
		(1986)
(4)3		(2002)
		.92-52
		(2008)
		(2000)
		(1990)
		(2006)
	:	(2007)
	:	(2008)
		(2006)
		(2007)

: (2002)

(2003)

(2006)

(2002)

(2011)

(2004)

: (3) (2003)

(2007)

Brandt, CH, Mathers,C, Oliva, M, &Hess,J(2007), Examining district guidance to school on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest Region, REL Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory At Learning Point Associates, Rel 2007- No.030.

Bouchamma, Yamina, (2007), Evaluating Teaching Personnel, Which Model of Supervision do Canadian Teacher Prefer? School Administration, Vol.8(4).p11-34.

Boyan, Norman J. (Editor) (1988), Handbook of Research on Educational Administration. New York: Longman.

-
- Caires, S. & Almedia (2007), Positive Aspects of the Teacher Training Supervision: The Student Teachers Perspective. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 22(4):515-528.
- Ives, Glenice & Glenn Rowley. (2005), Supervisor Selection or Allocation and Continuity of Supervision: Ph. D. Students Progress and Outcomes School of Nursing & Midwifery Monash University Australia, Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Australia *Studies in Higher Education*. Vol 30(5), pp 535-555.
- Lansman, Roberta Rosalin (2007), A Case Study of Teacher Evaluation and Supervision at aHigh – achieving Urban Elementary School. Ed,D University of Southern California, California, USA
- McConney, Andrew, (2003), Quest for Quality, Recruitment, Retention, Professional Development, and Performance Evaluation of Teacher and Principals in Baltimora Citys Public School, Florida Gulf coast University. Evaluation and Research Group Office (ERGO).
- Miranda, Denise,A. (2006), A case Sutdy of the California Teacher Evaluation System and Impact Upon Teacher Practice in an Alternative Education High- performing Urban High School. Ed.D, University of Southern California, California, USA.
- Oghuvbu, Enamiroro, Patrick (2007), Determinants of Effective and Ineffective Supervision in School: Teachers Perspectives. Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies Delta State University.
- Smith, K, & Tillema, H, (2007), Use of Criterria in Assessing Teaching Portfolios: Gudgemental Practices in Summative Evaluation Scandinavian: *Journa Educational Research*, Vol.51. pp103-140.
- Tamara L. Kaiser, Carol F. Kuechle r. (2008), Training Supervisors of Parishioners: Analysis of Efficacy. *Clinical Supervisor*. 27(1). P76-96