Journal of Education and Practice
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.8, No.21, 2017


# The knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran

Dr. Mohammed Mohammed Ahmed Ebied

Assistant Professor of Educational Technology, College of Education - University of Najran

Email: drebied2010@yahoo.com

**Abstract:**

Many individuals and institutions have sought to adopt specific criteria to judge the quality of e-courses that are still absent from many faculty members, although they need to use these e-courses in their curriculum. The current research aim to explore the knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran. The researcher used descriptive method. The research sample is 70 faculty members from various faculties of Najran University. The researcher relied on the use of a questionnaire as a data collection tool based on Quality Matters standards that consisted of 8 main standards and (43) sub-standards for e-courses. The research findings that the faculty members at the University of Najran has high level of knowledge of e-courses quality standards.

**Key Words:** E-courses - Quality standards – Quality Matters - University of Najran

## Introduction:

Everyone seeks to improve personal and institutional performance, due to verifying the best results and achieving the desired goals by adopting a set of standards and procedures that are regular and systematic in order to be judged through performance indicators and rubrics to verification of standards that adoption by specific entities.

The quality of education aims to improve the educational services offered to students to upgrade the characteristics of educational tools, products and services to meet the needs of students and achieve their aspirations and achieve a high degree of satisfaction with students on the educational tools provided. The quality of education means the provision of educational services of a high level of quality and specifications at the local and global levels according to the standards that are based on their implementation within the educational institution where all elements of educational process are taken into consideration such as educational content and environment, teachers, students, parents and society.

With the increasing interest in the use of e-learning tools in higher education, which has become one of the most important technological innovations where e-learning systems have become an essential part of any higher education system at present, that adoption on e-courses mainly in university teaching and spread through a wide range through technical expertise and other personal judgments, but not based on specific criteria through which to judge the quality of the e-course and the availability of educational and technical aspects in the design and production and employment in the classroom or through distance education.

Therefore, many individuals and institutions have sought to adopt specific criteria to judge the quality of e-courses that are still absent from many faculty members, although they need to use these e-courses in their curriculum.

At the local level, the National Center for e-Learning and Distance Education (2012, 2) pointed to the need to apply the quality standards in any educational system, especially in the case of using the e-learning

system, which must be based on the adoption of international quality standards to maximize the benefits of the possibilities offered by its applications and technologies for the educational process and ensure the production and employment of e-learning courses on a fixed basis to achieve the best results of learning outcomes.

While Ossiannilsson (2009, 132-140) recommended that e-learning be subject to a set of criteria that achieve the quality and attractiveness of the e-learning environment, which should cover the elements of e-learning, including e-courses, e-learning environment, virtual classes, interaction within the courses and within the management system Learning.

According to (Kurilovas, 2009; Stracke, 2009) the quality elements of e-course design are course reference, general information about the course, content design, multimedia design, objectivity and consistency, accessibility, aides and guidance, interactive and educational control, precision and safety, modernity and cost.

Several studies have addressed the quality of e-courses, including More and Pinhey (2006), which designed a quality tool consisting of eighteen main areas for assessing the quality of e-learning courses. These areas were (previous requirements, technological requirements, objectives and outcomes, the activities that support the learning process, the assessment and evaluation, the diversification of interaction and communication aids, the identification of the course content, supporting means for learners, learners feedback on a continuous and timely basis, appropriate presentation or scrolling, expectations of learners' participation through the discussion or conversation tool, and to provide learners with degrees that reflect their progress in self-learning, presentation of course content, and the ability to good navigate the course, optimal use of multimedia, scheduling office hours to online meeting learners or to develop the course, and the possibility of reusing the program).

While the Khalil (2008) study aimed to determine the specifications of the e-course in the light of quality standards. The researcher used the descriptive approach in determining the e-course quality standards and used the semi-experimental method to measure the effectiveness of e-course in educational technology to develop the cognitive and performance aspects of the college of education students. The sample consisted of 40 students at Mansoura University, Egypt. The study findings were the list of quality standards of e-courses, which were (15) standards. The study findings also there were statistically significant differences at the level of (0.01) between the mean scores of the experimental group students and the control group in the post-application of the achievement test in favor of the experimental group.

Al Saidi (2010) study aims to build a list of educational design quality standards and indicators for e-courses design, and to explore the extent to which the quality of e-courses instructional design is achieved. The study followed the descriptive method and its sample was formed from 151 students in the distance learning program for the academic year 1430/1431AH. The questionnaire was used as a data collection tool. The study findings were: develop a list of e-course instructional design quality standards and its indicators in 7 main domains with 20 standards and 163 sub- indicators. All these standards were achieved in e-course. The standards of e-course has a comprehensive and clear description before it begins, and the objectivity of the standards were achieved with a high degree, while the other 18 standards have achieved with a medium degree. In addition, there are 8 indicators haven't been achieved.

The study of Assaf (2014) aimed to assess the quality of e-courses in the light of the teaching design standards according to ADDIE model from the perspective of the faculty members of the University of Jordan by preparing a list of teaching design standards related to the quality of e-courses offered through the Internet, and explore to what extend these standards are achieved in the e-courses offered at the university. The study used the descriptive approach. The sample consisted of (288) faculty members from King Abdullah II College of Information Technology, Faculty of Engineering and Technology, and Foreign Languages College at the University of Jordan for the 2013-2014 academic year. The questionnaire was prepared as a tool to measure the degree of quality of e-courses, it consisted of (63) statements divided into five main areas. The study findings: revealed that the degree of achievement of the e-courses quality in according with teaching design standards totally score was medium, where the domain of "design phase" ranked first, while the area of "implementation phase" in the fifth and final. The study found that there were statistically significant differences due to the influence of gender in the design and the implementation phases and the total score. The differences were in favor of females, while no differences were found in the other fields.

Al-Qahtani and others (2015) study aim to develop a list of quality standards to control e-courses that are published on the portal of the University of Najran, where it was proposed a list of quality standards and reviewed to a sample of faculty members of the university with expertise in developing e-courses to ensure the

relevance of the proposed standards were unanimous faculty members on the importance of all the proposed standards, which numbered 7 main standards included 35 sub-standards or performance indicators. Researchers then reviewed and examined (60) e-courses that have been published on the portal of Najran University throughout the second semester of the 1433/1434AH. The study findings: the majority of the proposed standards were not available in all courses that have been examined, underscoring the importance of designing e-courses in the light of a set of standards to ensure the quality of those courses.

The European Foundation for Distance Teaching in the European Union (EADTU, 2009, 1-34) has identified a number of standards that dealt with the design and teaching of courses, the design of e-courses and the modes of support provided to learners and the tools given to the teacher to manage e-learning. These standards are recognized by all institutions of higher education in Europe and are applied to e-learning courses and blended learning courses. They include six core areas: strategic management; curriculum design; course design; course delivery; student support; and staff support through 33 sub-standards.

One of the most important international organizations that have set standards for e-courses is Quality Matters, the world's leading provider of quality assurance tools and processes of e-courses. QM standards are based on best practices and research results and are updated periodically. The subscription includes three basic services: The QM scale is fully utilized for the quality of e-courses; the review is carried out through the global review of courses and the preparation of internal auditors; and finally the professional development, which aims at the professional development of the faculty members. This organization is the world's first specialist in the quality of e-courses specifically, not e-learning in general, like the rest of the institutions. It has established the following eight general standards: 1. Overview and Introduction, 2. Learning Objectives, 3. Assessment and Measurement, 5. Learner interaction and participation, 6. Course technology, 7. Learner support, 8. Accessibility, which included 43 sub-standards for e-learning courses, which will be the focus of current research. The Instructional Design Standards (QM) aims to create a good instructional design to ensure that students are adequately supported in learning through e-courses (Quality Matters, 2014).

E-learning and e-courses are still a path of doubt, debate and comparison to their effectiveness for face-to-face learning in traditional classrooms (Bidwell, 2013; Jaschik & Lederman, 2014). Many studies have that concerned with e-learning and face-to-face traditional education confirmed that there weren't significant differences between learning patterns which supports and encourages the use of e-learning (Jaggars & Bailey, 2010; Means et al., 2010). Several studies have been undertaken, leading to a new approach that calls for improving the traditional face-to-face learning environment and e-learning, rather than comparisons that didn't found new, inconclusive decisions to favor either learning model.

The researcher believes that the adoption of specific standards for the production and employment of e-courses is supportive of faculty members where the standards are used as reference sources refer to the design, production and employment of e-courses, and if we want the quality of the course and its ability to achieve the best learning outcomes, there must be standards to be judged and also ensures the quality of e-courses, especially since e-courses have become a fundamental part of learning in higher education, which requires the need to maintain the quality of these courses through standardized international standards and not individualized standard tests.

**Research goals:**

The aim of this research is to explore the knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran.

**Methodology:**

**Research population:**

The current research population is all faculty members at Najran University in southern Saudi Arabia.

 

**The participants:**

The research population was selected to be the sample of the current research. The researcher contacted the faculty members and sent the electronic questionnaire (the current research tool). The questionnaire was answered by 70 faculty members from various faculties of Najran University. The sample of the study is described according to the demographic data targeted in the present study:

Table (1) Description of the research sample by gender

| Gender | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 53 | 75.71% |
| Female | 17 | 24.29% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

It is clear from table (1) that the sample participating in the research was distributed according to gender to males (53) faculty members represent (75.71%) of the sample participating, where females were (17) faculty members represent (10.71%) of the sample participating in the research.

The sample according to college type is shown in the following table:

Table (2) Description of the research sample by college type

| college | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Theoretical | 55 | 78.57% |
| Practical | 15 | 21.43% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

It is clear from table (2) that the sample participating in the research was distributed according to college type to participants from theoretical colleges (55) faculty members represent (78.57%) of the sample participating. The practical colleges were (15) faculty members represent (21.43%) of the sample participating in the research.

The sample according to degree is shown in the following table:

Table (3) Description of the research sample by the degree

| Degree | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Assistant Professor | 59 | 84.29% |
| Associate Professor | 5 | 7.14% |
| Professor | 6 | 8.57% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

It is clear from table (3) that the sample participating in the research was distributed in terms of degree to the participants of Assistant Professor (59) faculty members represent (84.29%) of the sample participating, as associate professor, there were (5) faculty members represent (7.14%) of the sample, and professor were (6) faculty members represent (8.57%) of the sample participating in the research.

The sample according to the possession of one e-course at least as shown in the following table:

Table (4) Description of the research sample by possession one e-course at least

| You have at least a course you teach electronically: | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 62 | 88.57% |
| No | 8 | 11.43% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

 

It is clear from table (4) that the sample participating in the research who have at least one e-course were (62) faculty members represent (88.57%) of the sample participating, where the faculty members who haven't at least one course are (8) represent (11.43%) of the sample participating in the research.

The sample according to training courses obtained by the faculty member in e-learning shown in the following table:

Table (5) Description of the research sample by of training courses obtained by the faculty member in e-learning

| Training courses in e-learning: | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Didn't get training | 10 | 14.29% |
| Less than three courses | 36 | 51.43% |
| From 3 to 5 courses | 15 | 21.43% |
| More than 5 courses | 9 | 12.86% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

It is clear from table (5) that the sample participating in the research in terms of training courses obtained by the faculty member in e-learning, that those who "did not receive training" were (10) faculty members by represent (14,29%) of the sample participating, where who have "Less than three courses" were (36) members represent (51.43%) of the sample participating, and who have training "From 3 to 5 courses " were (15) members represent (21.43%) of the sample participating, finally those who received training "more than 5 courses" were (9) members represent (12.86%) of the sample participating.

The sample according to type of training courses: (can choose more than one option), shown in the following table:

Table (6) Description of the research sample by type of training courses

| Training courses type | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Workshops | 39 | 46.99% |
| practical training | 33 | 39.76% |
| Educational seminars | 11 | 13.25% |
| Total | 83 | 100.00% |

Table (6) shows that the sample participating in the research in terms of the type of training courses: (Participants can choose more than one option), Participants that those who got "workshops" were (39) members represent (46,99% ) of the sample participating, where those who got "practical training" were (33) members represent (39.76%) of the sample participating, where those who got "Educational seminars" were (11) members represent (13.25%) of the sample participating.

The sample according to the degree of utilization from training courses in the development of e-courses, shown in the following table:

Table (7) Description of the research sample by the degree of utilization of training courses in the development of e-courses

| The degree of utilization from training courses in the development of e-courses: | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Less than 30% | 12 | 20.00% |
| From 30 - 70% | 31 | 51.67% |
| More than 70% | 17 | 28.33% |
| Total | 60 | 100.00% |

Table (7) shows that the sample participating in the research in terms of the degree of utilization from the training courses in the development of e-courses, that those who benefited by "less than 30%" were (12) members represent (20%) of the sample participation, where who benefited by " From 30 - 70%" were (31)

members represent (51.67%) of the sample participating, finally, those who benefited by "more than 70%" were (17) members represent (28.33%) of the sample participating.

The sample according to degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the college, shown in the following table:

Table (8) Description of the research sample by the degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the college

| Degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the college | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Less than 30% | 24 | 34.29% |
| From 30 - 70% | 33 | 47.14% |
| More than 70% | 13 | 18.57% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

Table (8) shows that the sample participating in the research in terms of degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the college, the participants with degree of satisfaction by "less than 30%" were (24) members represent (34.29%) of the sample participating, and those who have a degree of satisfaction by "30 - 70%" were (33) member represent (47.14%) of the sample participating. Those who have a degree of satisfaction by "more than 70%" number (13) member of the faculty members by (18.57%) of the sample participating.

In terms of degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the Deanship of e-learning, shown in the following table:

Table (9) Description of the research sample by the degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the Deanship of e-learning

| Degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the Deanship of e-learning | Frequency | Ratio |
|---|---|---|
| Less than 30% | 23 | 32.86% |
| From 30 - 70% | 37 | 52.86% |
| More than 70% | 10 | 14.29% |
| Total | 70 | 100.00% |

Table (9) shows that the sample of the study participating in the research in terms of degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the Deanship of e-learning, that the participants with degree of satisfaction by "less than 30%" were (23) members represent (32.86%) of sample participating, and those who have a degree of satisfaction by "30 - 70%" were (37) members represent (52.86%) of the sample participating, and those who have a degree of satisfaction by "more than 70%" were (10) members represent (14,29%) of the sample participating.

**Research Tool:**

In this research, the researcher relied on the use of a questionnaire as a data collection tool, which is designed to answer the research questions and achieve its objectives. The researcher reviewed the previous studies in the field of quality standards of e-learning courses, to identify their objectives and questions, and use it to link with the axes of the questionnaire, in preparation for submission to a number of reviewers to poll their opinions on the questionnaire and its validity, where the questionnaire was divided into two parts: the demographic data and the second: the areas of the questionnaire as the following:

**1. Demographic data**

The researcher has identified the demographic data (gender - type of college - degree - the member's possession of one e-course at least - the training courses obtained by the faculty member in e-learning - the type of training courses - the degree of utilization from training courses in the development of e-courses - Degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the college - Degree of satisfaction with the technical support provided by the Deanship of e-learning).

**2. Axis of the questionnaire:**

The researcher adopted in developing the questionnaire on Quality Matters standards that has the eight-main standards: 1. Overview and introduction, 2. Learning objectives, 3. Assessment and measurement, 4. Learning materials, 5. Learner interaction and participation, 6. Course technology, 8. Learner Support, 8. Accessibility, which included (43) standards for e-courses.

**Tool Validation:**

The tool was presented to a group of reviewers consisting of (4) faculty members in the field of instructional technology. The researcher responded to the opinions of the reviewers and made the required changes which were written changes and some linguistic and spelling errors, the questionnaire in final consisting of 8 axes and 43 statements representing sub-standards, in addition to demographic data.

**Tool Reliability:**

The researcher used the Cronbach's alpha method to find the coefficient of reliability questionnaire and its axes on the basis of the calculation of the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each of the axes and the overall grade. The total coefficient of reliability of the questionnaire was (0.943), which is a high value indicating that the questionnaire has a high degree of reliability that assures the researcher of its application to the sample of the study.

**Results:**

The current research aims at explore the knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran, therefore, the researcher analyzed the responses of the participants in the study on the questionnaire axes as shown in the following tables:

Table (10) General design of the course is shown to the student from the beginning of the course

| N | Sub-standards | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Having clear instructions on how to start the course | 3.63 | .935 |
| 2 | The existence of a summary to provide the student what the course aims and its various components | 3.79 | .946 |
| 3 | Communication policies (forums, e-mail, etc.) are public and clear | 3.59 | .955 |
| 4 | The course instructor provide himself in a clear statement (available on the site of the course) | 3.61 | 1.081 |
| 5 | The instructor ask learner to identify himself to his colleagues in the course | 3.07 | 1.171 |
| 6 | Clarification of prior knowledge requirements | 3.47 | .928 |
| 7 | Explain the minimum technical skills expected to be mastered by the student to advance the course easily | 3.61 | .873 |
| Standards1: the general design of the course is shown to the student from the beginning of the course | | 3.54 | .734 |

Table (10) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of the general design standard of the course is shown to the student at the beginning of the course, ranging between (3.07 - 3.79), and the mean of this axis is (3.54). According to the scale, this degree is high.

 

As for the 2nd standard: Learning outcomes are clearly stated and explained is shown in the following tables:

Table (11) The learning outcomes are clearly stated and explained

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Course objectives describe measurable learning outcomes | 3.80 | .844 |
| 2 | Unit-level objectives describe measurable learning outcomes that are consistent with course objectives | 3.84 | .879 |
| 3 | All goals are clearly articulated and tailored to the students' level | 3.86 | .856 |
| 4 | There is clear instruction for students on how to achieve learning outcomes | 3.46 | 1.017 |
| 5 | Objectives are tailored to program outputs | 3.74 | .958 |
| Standard 2: learning outcomes are clearly stated and explained | | 3.74 | .718 |

Table (11) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of the learning outcomes standard are clearly stated and explained, ranging from (3.46 - 3.86), and the mean of this axis is (3.74). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the 3rd standard: evaluation strategies use standardized tools to measure the effectiveness of learning, assess students' progress in relation to stated learning goals, and are designed to be an integral part of the learning process, as shown in the following table:

Table (12) Evaluation strategies

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | All selected assessment tools (homework, tests, self-tests, etc.) measure learning outcomes that are announced and consistent with the materials and activities in the course | 3.89 | .986 |
| 2 | Policy marks (method of split and addressing scores) are clearly stated | 4.11 | .877 |
| 3 | The existence of criteria and methods for assessing the work and participation of students are well defined and explained | 3.83 | .992 |
| 4 | The selected assessment tools are suitable for content, varied, and sequentially structured | 3.83 | .884 |
| 5 | Provides self-assessment tests and practical duties, with feedback to students at a convenient time | 3.73 | 1.048 |
| Standards 3: evaluation strategies | | 3.88 | .809 |

Table (12) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of the evaluation strategies ranged between (3.73 - 4.11), and the mean of this axis is (3.88). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the 4th standard: the teaching materials are comprehensive enough to achieve the stated objectives of the course and the learning outcomes, shown in the following table:

Table (13) The teaching materials are comprehensive enough to achieve the stated objectives of the course and learning outcomes

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Educational materials contribute to the achievement of learning outcomes declared at the level of the course and at the unit level | 3.89 | .790 |
| 2 | The relationship between learning materials and learning activities is clearly explained to the student | 3.64 | .743 |
| 3 | Educational materials are characterized by diversity and richness, the level of details is appropriate, they represent the latest scientific developments in the field | 3.54 | .896 |
| 4 | All materials and resources in the course are documented (references and sources used) | 3.99 | .925 |
| Standard 4: Teaching materials are comprehensive enough to meet the stated objectives of the course and learning outcomes. | | 3.76 | .690 |

Table (13) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of the teaching materials are comprehensive enough to meet the stated objectives of the course and learning outcomes, ranging from (3.54 - 3.99), and the mean of this axis is (3.76). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the 5th standard: employment a meaningful interaction between the learner and the instructor, the learner and the learner, and between the learner and the course materials. shown in the following table:

Table (14) employment a meaningful interaction between the learner and the instructor, the learner and the learner, and between the learner and the course materials

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Learning activities stimulate learning objectives | 3.69 | .733 |
| 2 | Learning activities promote interaction between students, and between students and instructor, students and course materials | 3.69 | .843 |
| 3 | Clear criteria and information are available on the availability of the course instructor and the time required to respond to students (eg, the maximum time required to respond to e-mail by the instructor, and the time required to announce grades) | 3.86 | .785 |
| 4 | Requirements for student interaction are detailed and clear (eg number of posts required in a given forum, size and timing of participation) | 3.49 | 1.073 |
| Standard 5: employment meaningful interaction between learner and instructor, learner and learner, learner and course materials, to motivate learners, enhance academic commitment and personal development | | 3.68 | .647 |

Table (14) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of employment a meaningful real interaction between learner and instructor, learner and learner, and between the learner and the course materials, ranged from (3.49 - 3.86), and the mean of this axis is (3.68). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the 6th standard: the use of navigation mechanism in the course and the techniques used to enhance the interaction of students and the emphasis on access to resources and teaching materials, shown in the following table:

Table (15) The use of the navigation mechanism in the course and the techniques used to enhance student interaction and the emphasis on access to resources and teaching materials

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The tools and media used support learning objectives and are carefully selected to deliver course content | 3.71 | .801 |
| 2 | The tools and media used support the student's interaction and linked to the course and lead to be an active learner | 3.66 | .883 |
| 3 | Navigation (move between sections) it is logical, consistent, and effective for students to have access to all the techniques needed by the course (such as Java, certain file presentation tools such as PDF, MP3, etc.), with clear instructions on how to access and use these techniques and tools | 3.31 | .971 |
| 4 | Course components are compatible with modern standards for information delivery modes (virtual classes - video conferences - forums - blogs - YouTube - social networking) | 3.53 | 1.003 |
| 5 | Provide sufficient and easy information on how to access course resources. (Eg, books, CDs, if any, and subscriptions to specialized sites such as libraries and periodicals) | 3.57 | .910 |
| 6 | The course design utilizes the tools and media available as much as possible (such as compressing files instead of uploading them in their original format, and using modern and commonly used file formats such as MP3, MP4) | 3.39 | 1.026 |
| Standard 6: The use of the navigation mechanism in the course and the techniques used to enhance student interaction and the emphasis on access to resources and teaching materials | | 3.53 | .737 |

Table (15) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of the use of the navigation mechanism in the course and the techniques used to enhance student interaction and the emphasis on access to resources and teaching materials ranged from (3.31 - 3.71), and the mean of this axis is (3.53). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the 7th standard: the course facilitates the student access to the services of the institution necessary for success, is illustrated in the following table:

Table (16) The course facilitates the student access to the services of the institution necessary for success

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Course instructions indicate the student's technical support and how to obtain it, either directly or through a link to this information and instructions (list of support services, technical questions and answers, support telephone numbers, etc.) | 3.43 | .926 |
| 2 | Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution’s academic support services and resources can help learners succeed in the course and how learners can obtain them | 3.66 | .883 |
| Standard7: The course facilitates the student access to the services of the institution necessary for success | | 3.54 | .774 |

Table (16) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of the course facilitates the student access to the services of the institution necessary for success, ranged between (3.43 - 3.66), and the mean of this axis is (3.54). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the 8th standard: all students can access the components of the course, shown in the following table:

 

Table (17) All students can access the course components

| N | Sub-standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The course takes into consideration the criteria for people with special needs and complies with the institution's policy regarding access to blended courses and full e-courses | 3.16 | 1.044 |
| 2 | Course pages and materials contain alternatives to audiovisual content (examples: alternative text for each image, text of audio lectures) | 3.51 | .913 |
| 3 | The links in the course must be described well enough, so that the student knows what he will find in the sites before clicking on the links and the student suffering from the vision problems can understand the links by the screen reader | 3.30 | 1.040 |
| 4 | The course provides easy reading of information from the screen and thus enables the ability to run screen readers effectively for students who need them (examples: font size, font color, white spaces and formatting). | 3.87 | .760 |
| Standard 8: all students can access course components | | 3.45 | .718 |

Table (17) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of related to a standard of all students can access course components, ranging from (3.16 - 3.87), and the mean of this axis is (3.45). According to the scale, this degree is high.

As for the knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran in general is illustrated in the following table:

Table (18) the knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran

| N | Standard | Mean | standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | the general design of the course is shown to the student from the beginning of the course | 3.54 | .734 |
| 2 | learning outcomes are clearly stated and explained | 3.74 | .718 |
| 3 | evaluation strategies | 3.88 | .809 |
| 4 | Teaching materials are comprehensive enough to meet the stated objectives of the course and learning outcomes | 3.76 | .690 |
| 5 | employment meaningful interaction between learner and instructor, learner and learner, learner and course materials, to motivate learners, enhance academic commitment and personal development | 3.68 | .647 |
| 6 | The use of the navigation mechanism in the course and the techniques used to enhance student interaction and the emphasis on access to resources and teaching materials | 3.53 | .737 |
| 7 | The course facilitates the student access to the services of the institution necessary for success | 3.54 | .774 |
| 8 | all students can access course components | 3.45 | .718 |
| Mean | | 3.65 | .589 |

Table (18) shows that the arithmetic mean of the responses of the research sample on the knowledge of e-courses quality standards among faculty members at the University of Najran, ranged between (3.45 - 3.88), and that the mathematical mean of the total standards is (3.65). According to the scale, the faculty members at the University of Najran has high level of knowledge of e-courses quality standards.

**Discussion:**

Najran University is located in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the border area with the State of Yemen and in the last three years increased the military operations in the region, which called on the administrators of the university to make e-learning as one of the basic options for learning at the university and even as a preferred choice and strengthened the ability of faculty members to use and employ E-learning in teaching courses for students.

E-courses didn't necessarily mean it's useful when compare with traditional classroom learning, and this is confirmed by Pinto and Anderson (2013) they state that students' perceptions show that they are neutral in their expectations for traditional courses and e-courses, Electronic courses may be effective and may not be in other courses where cannot recommend using e-courses at all.

The results of the study showed that only 28.33% of the participants benefited from e-learning courses by more than 70%, as these courses were general and not related to the production and design of e-courses. This is in line with McQuiggan (2007) who refer to faculty members training of the design and employment of e-courses is a challenge facing educational institutions, especially since the majority of faculty members are not specialists in instructional technology and may have little knowledge of the techniques of producing and designing e-courses.

However, 51.67% of the sample of the study saw that they benefited from 30-70% of the training. This is consistent with many studies that emphasized the effectiveness of professional development programs in improving the ability of faculty members to design and use e-courses. (Shea et al. 2005; Kim and Bonk, 2006)

As for the first standard related to the general design, which confirmed that the research sample has a high degree of knowledge of this standard, it may be because this standard is general information about the course. The training can easily contribute to increasing the awareness and skill of the faculty members in designing the course including introduce students to the learning requirements in the course through the sub-standards related to the course instructions, summary of goals and communication policies between students and faculty members.

With regard to the second standard, learning outcomes are declared and explained clearly and thoroughly. This is an educational basis for all those who are interested in teaching. The clarity of the goals leads to the achievement of learning outcomes accurately and in a short time and thus become measurable, verifiable and suitable for the learner. Where (Ralston-Berg, 2014; You et al., 2014) confirmed that faculty members always set measurable learning goals that are easy to assess and accurately deliver learning outcomes. Thus, the evaluation process is subject to specific and codified strategies that the faculty member wishes to announce to students from the beginning of the teaching of the online course (Batchelder, 2009; Bean, 2009). This has made the faculty members have knowledge of the evaluation strategies standard and this is also related to the quality of teaching which is keen to at the University of Najran, which seeks to obtain academic accreditation and the application of quality standards of the National Organization for Measurement and Evaluation.

The course may be designed electronically, but it is relatively boring, so the training programs were designed to prepare faculty members to provide good educational materials designed to conform to the learning outcomes, and that these educational materials from authentic resources specific references and characterized by diversity and this would bring the pleasure of learning to students. The educational materials are the core curriculum, for these educational materials depends on the quality of the effectiveness of the e-course directly, so the main interest of the faculty member is to improve the quality of the e-course through the improvement of educational materials provided by it. (Saidi, 2011)

The fifth standard is to employ a meaningful interaction between the learner and the teacher, the learner and the learner, and between the learner and the course materials, which the study sample confirmed in a high degree. This may be due to the fact that the e-course includes many tools such as e-mail, forums, blogs and discussion board that increase the students interaction in the course, which is confirmed by Abu khatwa (2011) on the need to include a good e-course activating the tools of interaction between the teacher and student and between students and each other and between students and the same course materials.

The sixth, seventh and eighth standards related to navigation, interaction and accessibility, which received a high degree of knowledge among faculty members, because the Blackboard program provides many tools that facilitate navigation, interaction and direct and indirect access between students and faculty members to achieve a high degree of activity for the learner, Ramoud (2012) emphasized that e-courses are organized and well-designed to meet students' needs through a variety of tools that facilitate interaction among them and facilitate access to available educational materials. It also provides technical support and easy access to the services provided by technical officials for e-learning at the university.

**Recommendations and proposals:**

1. Training the faculty members on the standards in the present study to design high quality e-courses.
2. Integrating the quality Matters standards of e-courses within the total quality standards at Najran University.
3. Measure the effectiveness of meeting the quality Matters standards in the design of e-courses to achieve learning outcomes.
4. Conducting comparative studies between the e-courses at the University of Najran and e-courses produced by Quality Matters to identify the differences and use them in improving the design of e-courses at Najran University.
5. Conduct a study to identify the training needs of faculty members regarding the e-courses quality standards approved by Quality Matters in actual design of e-courses.

**References:**

1. Abu Khatwa. A.M.E. (2011). Quality assurance standards in the design and production of e-courses. A scientific paper presented at the Second International Conference on e-Learning and Distance Education held at the National Center for e-Learning and Distance Education.
2. Al-Qahtani, M., Ibrahim, A., Sharif, N. (2015). Quality regulators and standards in the production of e-courses to contribute to building the knowledge society. Analytical study . University of Najran. The Resalt of Arab Gulf - Saudi Arabia, 36 (136): 87-102.
3. Assaf, I.M. (2014). Evaluation of the quality of e-courses in according with the teaching design standards according to the ADDIE model in teaching from the perspective of the faculty members of the University of Jordan. Master Thesis, College of Graduate Studies, University of Jordan.
4. Batchelder, L. (2009, October). Do learners really need learning objectives? Retrieved from http://www.bottomlineperformance.com/do-learners-really-need-learning-objectives/
5. Bean, C. (2009, July). Our objection to learning objectives. Retrieved from http://www.kineo.com/us/resources/top-tips/learning-strategy-and-design/our-objection-to-learning-objectives
6. Bidwell, A. (2013, September). Employers, students remain skeptical of online education. US News. Retrieved from http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2013/09/20/employers-students-remain-skeptical-of-online-education
7. Bidwell, A. (2013, September). Employers, students remain skeptical of online education. US News. Retrieved from http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2013/09/20/employers-students-remain-skeptical-of-online-education
8. European Associations of Distance Teaching University. (EADTU). (2009). Final report of the FUTURA (Future of University Teaching: Update and a Roadmap for Advancement) project. Quality Assurance of E-Learning, Helsinki, ENQA Publications.
9. Jaggars, S., & Bailey, T. R. (2010). Effectiveness of fully online courses for college students: Response to a Department of Education meta-analysis. Retrieved from http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/download/fedora_content/download/ac172121/CONTENT/effectiveness-online-response-meta-analysis.pdf
10. Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2014). The 2014 Inside Higher Ed Survey of Faculty Attitudes on Technology: A study by Gallup and Inside Higher Ed. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/download/form.php?width=500&height=550&iframe=true&title=Survey%20of%20Faculty%20Attitudes%20on%20Technology&file=IHE-FacTechSurvey2014%20final.pdf
11. Khalil, H.H. (2008). List of e-learning quality standards for e-course design across the Internet. Unpublished Master Thesis, Faculty of Education, Mansoura university, Egypt.
12. Kim, K., & Bonk, C. J. (2006). The future of online teaching and learning in higher Education: The survey says. Educause Quarterly, 29 (4), 22-30.
13. Kurilovas, E., (2009). Evaluation and Optimization of e-Learning Software Packages: Learning Object Reposi¬tories. In: Proceedings of the 4th In-ternational Conference on Software Engineering Advances (ICSEA2009). Porto, Portugal, September 20-25, 2009, pp. 477-483.
14. McCarty, C., Bennett, D., & Carter, S. (2013). Teaching college microeconomics: online vs. Traditional classroom instruction. Journal of Instructional Pedagogies, 1-13. Retrieved from http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/121419.pdf
15. McQuiggan, C. A. (2007). The role of faculty development in online teaching's potential to Question teaching beliefs and assumptions. Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 10 (3). Retrieved from Http://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall103/mcquiggan103.htm

16. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2009). Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies. US Department of Education.
17. More, N. & Pinhey, K. (2006). Guidelines and Standards for the Development of Fully Online Learning Objects. Interdisciplinary Journal of Knowledge and Learning Objects, 2, (3): 95-103
18. National Center for e-Learning and Distance Education. (2012). Quality in e-learning environments, vision of the National Center for e-learning and distance learning. Riyadh, the Center issued the vision of the National Center for distance e-learning.
19. Ossiannilsson, E. (2009). benchmarking e-learning in higher education. Quality Assurance of E-Learning, Helsinki, ENQA Publications.
20. Pinto, M. B., & Anderson, W. (2013). A little knowledge goes a long way: student expectation and satisfaction with hybrid learning. Journal of Instruction Pedagogies, 1-12. Retrieved from http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/121376.pdf
21. Quality Matters. (2014). Introduction to the Quality Matters Program. Retrieved from https://www.qualitymatters.org/sites/default/files/Introduction%20to%20the%20Quality%20Matters%20Program%20HyperlinkedFinal2014.pdf
22. Ralston-Berg, P. (2014). Surveying student perspectives of quality: Value of QM rubric items. Internet Learning, 3 (1), 117-126.
23. Ramoud, R.A. (2012) Quality of e-learning. e-learning magazine, Mansoura University, Egypt.
24. Saidi, O.S.M. (2011). Evaluating the quality of online courses in the light of educational design standards (KAUST model). Unpublished PhD thesis, Faculty of Education, King Abdulaziz University.
25. Shea, P., Pickett, A., & Li, C. S. (2005). Increasing access to higher education: A study of The diffusion of online teaching among 913 college faculty. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 6 (2). Retrieved from Http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/238/493
26. Stracke, C.M. (2009). Quality Development and Standards in e-Learning: Benefits and Guidelines for Implementations; In: Proceedings of the ASEM Lifelong Learning Conferencing: e-Learning and Workplace Learning. Bangkok (Thailand).
27. You, J., Hochlberg, S. A., Ballard, P., Xiao, M., & Walters, A. (2014). Measuring online course design: A comparative analysis. Internet Learning, 3 (1), 35-52.