

---

## The Satisfaction Level of the Undergraduate Female Students Towards Using E-Courses in Qassim University

Agabat Elnour\*

*Department of Basic Education, Collage of Science and Arts ,ElRass, Qassim University, Quassm, Saudi Arabia*

*Email: a.elnour@qu.edu.sa*

### Abstract

The purpose of this study was to reveal the students' Satisfaction rate quality of general courses across online learning (E. Course) provided to female students during second semester. The descriptive approach was used and a questionnaire on the quality standards of electronic courses was designed consisting of 52 items and targeted 282 students from different disciplines in the College of Science and arts - Qassim University. Some statistical analyses such as means, standard deviations, and ANOVA Tests were performed to analyse the questionnaire. The results indicated that the level of satisfaction with the use The e-learning and for science and arts female students are generally medium, but to varying degrees of one Element to another. The Satisfaction rate of students towards quality of e. Course, not reach the level of 80% in the level of the significance 5%.The study included several recommendations. The most important of them is the necessity of Providing training programs for all university professors and students on how to use e-learning efficiently to enhance their competencies and skills in using these innovative applications.

**Keywords:** e-courses; e-learning; standards of quality; blackboard.

### 1. Introduction

Nowadays, technology and online learning platforms are becoming increasingly necessary. In adapting to this new development, universities have begun to rapidly develop their digital tools and platforms to ensure the quality of continuing education.

---

\* Corresponding author.

Since education is one of the most important tributaries of development, the value of this plan lies in ensuring the continuity of education permanently, even in the absence of direct communication between the teacher and the student. The existence of universities' learning management platforms and their activation of virtual classes, classification of lectures and lessons on these platforms, ensured accessibility from the beneficiaries of the portal contents and various platforms, the publication of scientific and educational content on the portals and platforms, spreading awareness of ways to access, teach and learn in one line courses [2]. Therefore, e-learning is moving from the primary use of information and communications technology towards newer forms of education and training that focus on creativity, collaboration and new skill requirements in a knowledge-based society [8]. This, in turn, requires a major change in educational strategies with a focus on communication technology and the Internet in the context of learning, and the need for cooperation, communication and innovation [4]. However, this change requires an amount of knowledge that is not yet fully available. E-learning is not a recent matter, but there are constraints to its optimum. What has limited the activation of e-learning in higher education institutions is the lack of clarity regarding its goal and the resistance of some members of the faculty, not students, in addition to concerns related to information security. There are many aids to control the quality of evaluation from a distance, and evaluations need not be shortened for tests, noting that we must prepare for e-learning and put in place mechanisms to control its quality, investing in flexible aspects such as content and education management systems instead of buildings and equipment [1]. Aside from empirical evidence, there are also more general or structural reasons to focus on quality from a learner's perspective as well as on services in general. Learning should be considered a co-production process between the learning environment and the learner, and therefore a part of the learner's responsibility. This means that the educational product/result cannot be affected exclusively by the production of the educational processes. So, quality must be defined by the final location of learning services, which is where the learner is located. However, this does not mean that the learner's point of view and preferences must be taken into consideration alone, economic and even legal regulations must also be observed. Developing quality from a learner's perspective means taking learners' preferences as a starting point for developing quality in all other areas [5]. E-learning in the Arab world is currently facing many issues, as this system needs a consensus of strong global standards for acceptance by educational institutions, that emphasise the extent of its ability to meet the needs of society and its continuing compatibility with future developments and changes by subjecting this system to continuous evaluations. In general [3], quality assessment is of top priority for all organisations. It is even more important in educational institutions, where quality is an abstract concept and has many beneficiaries [11]. In this regard, e-learning institutes face more challenges because they are newly developed institutions trying to change the learning model. On the other hand, due to the vital role of e-learning in enhancing the quality of performance in higher education, program developers, policy makers and managers of such institutes and universities should evaluate this type of learning, in order to identify its strengths and weaknesses from the viewpoint of beneficiaries (students) affected directly, to ensure that quality standards are followed. They should then try to consolidate these strengths and address weaknesses [12] to expand the dynamics of higher education in Saudi Arabia. The importance of a student's awareness is the contribution of teachers and institutions to the operation of the online learning process and the introduction of electronic courses to maintain their optimum operation. Thus, from this background, the purpose of this study is to verify learners' perceptions of learning quality across online courses in the faculty of arts and science in Qassim university.

## ***1.2 The Study Problem***

To catch up with the global progress in technology in education, educational systems and technological tools (Blackboard<sup>1</sup>) at the Qassim University provided for the smooth transition from traditional education to e-learning, but the real challenge lies in the production of high-quality educational programs, to improve quality, keeping in line with the urgent social, political, economic and educational needs of our country, and the rapid developments in knowledge. E-learning has become a basic component of distance learning, and to protect the credentials of certificates of the increasing numbers of scholars involved in the system, it must be ensured that its components, inputs, processes and outputs meet international quality standards. It is from this standpoint that this study originated, and its problem was identified in answering the following main question: To what extent do the standards of e-course quality of Qassim University's Faculty of Science and Arts' e-learning system, meet international quality standards, from the perspective of undergraduate female students? Alongside, the following sub-questions arise:

- What is the extent of the College of Science and Arts' female students' satisfaction with the quality of the e-course being provided through Blackboard?
- Determine the degree of compatibility between the e-courses being used at Qassim University alongside the international standards adopted by the university, according to the variables of the study (college, academic level, majors).
- Does the application rate on the quality of e-course at Qassim University exceed the 80% level?

## ***1.3 Objectives of the Study***

The study seeks to achieve the following objectives:

- The extent to which Qassim University applied global standards (quality standard) during the rapid transition from face-to-face learning to e-learning and produced e-courses, from the students' points of view as the first beneficiary of these courses.
- To identify the strengths and weaknesses in applying the international quality standards for the continuous development of course components such as structural material, activities, technology and assessment methodologies, as well as the service of students in improving the quality of e-courses for the next academic year.
- The research may be a cornerstone for further research from faculty members on everything related to the application of quality standards in Qassim University to achieve the quality of learning that will produce students who will be able to apply the knowledge they earn in their daily lives.

## ***1.4 Limitations of the Study***

---

<sup>1</sup>Blackboard is an information system for education management, student follow-up, and monitoring the efficiency of the educational process in an educational institution. The system provides great opportunities for students to communicate with the course outside the lecture hall, anywhere and at any time, through this electronic system that provides various tools.

***This study is limited to assessing the quality of the e-courses that were offered in the second semester of the academic year 2020 entitled Public Courses<sup>2</sup> (, These courses are taught completely electronically and offered at the College of Sciences and Arts, Qassim Universi.***

### ***1.5 Procedural Definitions***

Quality standards for online courses are provided to increase educational opportunities and enhance learning to further the development of teaching and learning online. Many institutes and international organisations have worked to design online course standards such as the California State University Project, Chico , They have developed a strategy to enhance high-quality e-learning environments and, in this framework, the university presented standards for assessing the quality of designing academic courses online. Moreover, Swansea State University [10] in the UK developed guidelines for assessing e-learning courses, a course at King Khalid University in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was chosen by the Quality Matters™ (QM) rubric – “QM Meter Quality” standards 2008–2010 edition [7] – for a set of quality guidelines developed based on the previous study mentioned above, and the recent version of QM’s Online Learning Council (QMOLC, 6th edition) [4]. This tool consists of eight domains and 42 items; the domains are 1. Course Overview and Introduction, 2. Learning Objectives, 3. Student Assessment, 4. Instructional Material, 5. Learning Activities, 6. Learner Interaction, 7. Course Technology and 8. Learner Support.

## **2. Methodology**

### ***2.1 The Population of the Study***

The study population included all the female students of the College of Science and Arts, Qassim University, in a second semester year from the first to the seventh.

#### ***2.1.1 The Study Sample***

A convenience sample [9] of 288 female students from the College of Sciences and Arts in Elrass participated by answering the test items. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the sample according to college, academic year and field of specialisation.

---

<sup>2</sup>General courses in the College of Arts and Sciences, Al-Rass, are complementary courses for specialisation and can be compulsory or optional, according to the general description of the academic department within the college.

**Table 1:** Demographic Segmentation Variables

Variables	Category	Female Learners	%
College	<b>Science</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>63.9</b>
	<b>Arts</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>36.1</b>
Academic year	<b>First year</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>32.6</b>
	<b>Second year</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>34.02</b>
	<b>Third year</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>26.4</b>
	<b>Fourth year</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6.9</b>
Majors	<b>Chemistry</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>14.5</b>
	<b>Education</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>28.5</b>
	<b>Islamic studies</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>30.2</b>
	<b>Others</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>26.7</b>

**Table 2:** Coefficients and Correlation Test between Items

Item No.	Correlation with Domain	Correlation with test	Item No.	Correlation with Domain	Correlation with test	Item No.	Correlation with Domain	Correlation with test
1	.76(**)	.46(**)	15	.79(**)	.42(**)	29	.80(**)	.49(**)
2	.71(**)	.52(**)	16	.81(**)	.48(**)	30	.77(**)	.54(**)
3	.66(**)	.43(**)	17	.86(**)	.44(**)	31	.73(**)	.40(**)
4	.86(**)	.41(**)	18	.74(**)	.49(**)	32	.92(**)	.59(**)
5	.76(**)	.44(**)	19	.62(**)	.64(**)	33	.65(**)	.41(**)
6	.62(**)	.42(**)	20	.83(**)	.47(**)	34	.58(**)	.53(**)
7	.86(**)	.40(*)	21	.76(**)	.56(**)	35	.65(**)	.42(**)
8	.76(**)	.51(**)	22	.62(**)	.42(**)	36	.88(**)	.62(**)
9	.62(**)	.48(**)	23	.73(**)	.65(**)	37	.73(**)	.76(**)
10	.41(**)	.45(**)	24	.76(**)	.64(**)	38	.92(**)	.62(**)
11	.74(**)	.65(**)	25	.62(**)	.47(**)	39	.65(**)	.56(**)
12	.62(**)	.58(**)	26	.86(**)	.56(**)	40	.76(**)	.42(**)
13	.83(**)	.65(**)	27	.87(**)	.59(**)	41	.76(**)	.58(**)
14	.71(**)	.53(**)	28	.78(**)	.53(**)	42	.76(**)	.51(**)

\*Significant at (0.05)

\*\*Significant at (0.01)

**Table 3:** Degrees of Correlation Coefficient between Domains

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Degree</b>
Course Overview and Introduction	.87(**)
Learning Objectives (Competencies)	.76(**)
Assessment and Measurement	.73(**)
Instructional Materials	.79(**)
Learning Activities and Learner Interaction	.82(**)
Course Technology	.91(**)
Learner Support	.89(**)
Accessibility and Usability	.87(**)
*Significant at (0.05)	
**Significant at (0.01)	

Note. As noticed in Table 2 and Table 3, correlation coefficients are significant.

**2.3.2.2 Test stability**

To ensure the test stability, we retested the pilot sample after two weeks, and then we computed the Pearson correlation coefficients. We calculated the consistency coefficient using the internal consistency method, depending on the Cronbach’s alpha.

**Table 4:** illustrates the results we considered appropriate for this study

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Stability</b>	<b>Internal consistency</b>
<b>Course Overview and Introduction</b>	.91	.76
<b>Learning Objectives (Competencies)</b>	.83	.69
<b>Assessment and Measurement</b>	.85	.74
<b>Instructional Materials</b>	.87	.82
<b>Learning Activities and Learner Interaction</b>	.82	.79
<b>Course Technology</b>	.92	.81
<b>Learner Support</b>	.87	.83
<b>Accessibility* and Usability</b>	.88	.85
<b>Course Overview and Introduction</b>	.89	.87
<b>Overall coefficients</b>	.91	.83

**3. Results and Discussion**

To answer the first question of the study, “What is the extent of female students’ satisfaction with the quality of e-course provided through the Blackboard application at the College of Science and Arts?”, we calculated the

mean and standard deviation for all axes and questionnaire items in the general quality of e-courses in light of international standards of e-courses. The following table illustrates the results.

**Table 5:** The Mean and Standard Deviation for all Axes and Questionnaire Items that should Exist for Quality E-Learning General Courses in light of International Standards of E-Courses

No.	Rank	Domain	M	Std.	%
2	1	Learning Objectives (Competencies)	4.05	.25	81.00
3	2	Assessment and Measurement	3.89	.32	77.8
1	3	Course Overview and Introduction	3.82	.33	76.4
5	4	Learning Activities and Learner Interaction	3.72	.29	74.4
7	5	Instructional Materials	3.71	.58	73.8
8	6	Accessibility and Usability	3.69	.373	73.8
6	7	Course Technology	3.67	.29	73.4
4	8	Learner Support	3.59	.36	71.8
		Overall degree	3.77	.241	75.4

As can be seen in Table 5, the method scores run between 3.59–4.05; so, the outcome uncovered that the learners’ fulfilment lies between 71.8–81. . The learning objectives (competencies) score was the highest and placed first (M = 4.05). The result may be due to the effort made by the Deanship of E-Learning for the success of the experience of the public courses that are presented through the Blackboard system as a modern experience, with the goal that the instructive procedure be increasingly essential to the students, in this specific setting. Standing skills or capacities as a portrayal of levels of comprehension or dominance of the student in a particular logical subject/s, and their needs are estimated through the framework of competency-based discovery [6]. This is viewed as one of the most successful instructive assessment components, identified by estimating the encounters and abilities of students accordingly. The model necessitates that the capabilities be initiated at the degrees of both the scholastic program and instructive educational plan, permitting instructors and framework directors to completely control these abilities and follow the rules provided in 2.1, 2.2 and 2.5 of the guidelines table. Along these lines, the model permits students to find out about the instructive objectives or skills identified with the course, through the applicable section in the course rundown to accomplish standard 2.3 of the criteria table, which involves deciding about the instructional procedure. Furthermore, learner support placed last (M = 3.59). The general score of the methods was 3.77. This outcome might be credited to the absence of writing on the subject of e-course quality in light of the fact that it is a cutting-edge idea or because of connectivity issues.

**Table 6:** Mean (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) of Female Students' Responses to Each Item of the Study  
Tool. Enrolment in local colleges

No.	Rank	Items	M	SD	%
10	1	The course learning objectives describe achievable outcomes	4.80	.60	96
30	2	Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning.	4.42	.49	88.4
26	3	The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	4.42	.494	88.4
28	4	The course provides practice exercises that I may complete on my own to master difficult content	4.36	.43	87.2
8	5	All learning objectives or competencies are stated and written clearly	4.36	.44	87.2
41	6	The course grading policy is stated clearly at the beginning of the course.	4.29	.61	85.8
40	7	The course provides alternative means of access to multimedia content in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.	4.29	.62	85.8
38	8	The course design facilitates readability.	4.29	.65	85.8
1	9	The course has clear instructions, explaining how to begin the course and locate and use course tools	4.19	.87	83.8
7	10	The minimum preparation or prerequisite knowledge I need to succeed in the course is clearly stated	4.06	.71	81.2
23	11	The course models the academic integrity expected of learners by providing both source references and permissions for use of instructional materials.	4.05	.73	81.2
19	12	Assessment instruments are sequenced, varied and appropriate for the course level.	4.05	.63	81.2
15	13	The assessments measure the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	4.03	.87	80.6
3	14	Etiquette guidelines for how to behave online are clearly stated	4.03	.57	80.6
1	15	Clear instructions tell me how to get started and where to find various course components	3.98	.97	79.6
5	16	Minimum technical skills expected of me are clearly stated.	3.91	.69	78.2
2	17	I am introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.	3.91	.69	78.2
35	18	Clear description of academic support offered.	3.89	.54	77.8
37	19	Course navigation facilitates ease of use.	3.88	1.2	77.7
11	20	The course contains learning objectives listing what is expected of me, the module/unit describes outcomes that I am to achieve and is consistent with course-level objectives	3.85	.72	77
34	21	Clear description of the technical support offered	3.76	1.19	75.2
8	22	The instructor introduces themselves.	3.73	.71	74.6
31	23	A variety of technology is used in the course.	3.72	1.18	74.4
27	24	Learning activities encourage me to interact with other students	3.72	1.14	74.4
21	25	The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	3.65	.80	73
18	26	The relationship between the use of instructional materials in the course and completing learning activities is clearly explained to me.	3.65	.79	73
6	28	Clearly told what computer skills and digital information literacy skills are expected	3.57	.73	71.4
18	29	Assessments are appropriately timed within the length of the course, varied and appropriate to the content being assessed	3.53	.73	70.6
17	30	Criteria for how my work and participation will be evaluated are descriptive and specific.	3.53	.81	70.6
24	31	The instructional materials represent up-to-date theory and practice in the discipline.	3.53	.59	70.6
9	32	I am asked to introduce myself to the class	3.50	.82	70
33	33	The course provides an orientation opportunity for students to learn the basics of e-learning	3.49	.67	69.8



13	34	The relationship between learning objectives or competencies and learning activities is clearly stated.	3.47	.80	69.4
32	35	The course provides learners with information on protecting their data and privacy	3.45	.66	69
28	36	Learning activities encourage me to interact with my instructors	3.45	.66	69
39	37	The course provides an accessible text and images through files, LMS pages and web pages to meet the needs of diverse learners	3.45	.49	69
14	38	The learning objectives are suited to the level of the course.	3.40	.81	68
	39	Course multimedia facilitates ease of use	3.39	.58	67.8
29	40	The tools used in the course support the learning objectives	3.11	.31	62.2
25	41	A variety of instructional materials are used in the course	3.08	.27	61.6
41	42	Operations service exists and can easily be accessed from any location of the course	2.86	.84	57.2

As seen in Table 7, the mean scores range between 2.86–4.8. The course learning objective achievable outcomes ranked first and scored the highest mean (M = 4.8). This result may be attributed to the fact that the awareness of the e-learning administration at Qassim University are competent in dealing with the students’ need to know. The learning objectives describe what the learner will be able to do after the completion of the course. The setting of clear learning objectives is important because the goals direct the content, materials and teaching methods to ensure that students are ‘understanding’ expectations, assessments and grades based on these goals. The item “Operations service exists and can be easily accessible from any location of the course” ranked last with a mean score of 2.86. This result may be because learners are more or less knowledgeable about these technologies and are easily less satisfied with the services they provide unless they are familiar with them. To answer the second question of the study, “Determine the degree of compatibility between the e-courses used at Qassim University with the international standards adopted by the university, according to the variables of the study (college, academic level, majors)”, we calculated the means and standard deviations for all students according to the variables college, academic level and majors (Table 7).

**Table 7:** Mean (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) for Female Students’ Responses to the Required Quality Standards, according to the Study Variables (College, Academic Level and Specialisation)

Variables	Level	No. of responses	%	M.	Std.	%
College	Science	184	64	3.89	.89	76
	Arts	104	36	3.84	1.19	76.8
Total		288	100	3.86	.99	77.2
Academic level	First	94	33	3.68	1.04	73.6
	Second	98	34	3.91	.97	78.2
	Third	76	26	3.67	.64	73.4
	Fourth	20	7	4.05	.76	81
Total		288	100	3.75	.85	75
Specialization fields	Chemistry	47	16	3.89	.11	76
	Education	82	28.5	3.78	.78	75.6
	Islamic study	77	26.7	3.68	.98	73.4
	Others	83	28.8	3.98	.69	79.6

The previous table shows the average of female students’ responses to the tool as a whole, according to their

specialisations, academic levels and type of college, and the result is acceptable to some extent, ranging between 73.4–81. Furthermore, to calculate the statistical significance of the differences in the arithmetic mean of female students’ estimates on the instrument, as a whole, the three-way ANOVA analysis was employed (Table 8).

**Table 8:** Results of the Three-Way ANOVA Analysis of Female Students’ estimates of the Tool as a whole related to the Quality of E-Learning in Qassim University by Standard (College, Academic Level and Specialisation)

Source of variation	Mean sq.	DR	Sum of sq.	F	Sig.
College	<b>3.19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>.05</b>
Academic level	<b>.53</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.59</b>
Majors	<b>6.78</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>20.32</b>	<b>6.89</b>	<b>.06</b>
College* Academic level	<b>3.24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9.72</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>.266</b>
College* Majors	<b>1.32</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>.61</b>
Majors *Academic level	<b>.74</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6.66</b>	<b>.75</b>	<b>.076</b>
College*Majors *Academic level	<b>2.95</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>26.55</b>	<b>2.99</b>	<b>.075</b>

From Table 8, we can conclude that the statistical significance level of the three-way interaction term is  $p = .075$ . This value is greater than .05, which means that there is no statistically significant three-way interaction between college, majors and academic level. Thus, learners’ satisfaction levels with the e-learning experience are compatible, despite the difference in specialisation, college and academic level. To answer the third question of the study, “Does the rate of applying the quality of e-course at Qassim University during COVID-19 exceed the 80% level?”, we calculated the means and standard deviations of quality of the e-course implementation rate. In addition, we used the t-test to compare the results with the expected level rate (80%). Table 9 (*Means, Standard Deviations, and T-Test Results of Quality of E-Course Rate Compared with the Expected Optimisation Rate (80%)*) illustrates the results.

**Table 9:** Means, Standard Deviations, and T-Test Results of Quality of E-Course Rate Compared with the Expected Optimisation Rate (80%)

Domain	M.	Std.	T. Value	dfr.	Sig.
Course Overview and Introduction	<b>34.24</b>	<b>4.19</b>	<b>-8.33</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Assessment and Measurement	<b>18.66</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>-13.43</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Learning Objectives (Competencies)	<b>24.3</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.001</b>
Instructional Materials	<b>17.95</b>	<b>1.82</b>	<b>-56.31</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Learning Activities and Learner Interaction	<b>14.7</b>	<b>2.32</b>	<b>-1.50</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Course Technology	<b>14.7</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>-34.05</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Learner Support	<b>15.36</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>-25.05</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Accessibility* and Usability	<b>23.06</b>	<b>1.98</b>	<b>-8.00</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>
Overall degree	<b>30.16</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>-17.67</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>.00</b>

In Table 9, we see huge contrasts ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between the nature of e-courses in Qassim University from the point of view of female understudies\ and the normal quality degree of 80% in all fields. By and large, the degree did not exactly meet the 80% quality except for learning objectives (capabilities) that scored a normal (81%). This outcome shows that to arrive at the normal ideal pace of 80% in the e-course quality norm, an organised methodology and authoritative procedural strides for worldwide measures must be followed and assessed by the beneficiary and the administration framework intermittently until the affirmed quality level is achieved locally and comprehensively. Therefore, we recommend scientists to conduct more research to study the quality of e-courses in universities to reach the level of quality improvement by 80%, further clarify the current picture, and enable decision makers to make sound decisions.

#### **4. Conclusion**

This study aimed to find out the level of satisfaction of female students in the College of Science and Arts at Qassim University about the level of quality of e-courses. In this regard, e-learning institutes face more challenges because they are newly developed institutions trying to change the learning model. On the other hand, given the vital role of e-learning in enhancing the quality of performance in higher education, program developers, policy-makers and managers of these institutes and universities must evaluate this type of learning, in order to identify its strengths and weaknesses from the viewpoint of the beneficiaries (students) who are strongly affected Direct, to ensure that quality standards are followed. They should then attempt to consolidate these strengths and address weaknesses to broaden the dynamics of higher education in Saudi Arabia. The study found that there is a good level of quality of electronic courses, but in any case it does not reach the level of 80% from the viewpoint of the female students. To summarise, training has surpassed the significance of e-learning and its detailing to concentrate on its quality, especially after this investigation, which analysed the quality norms of the e-courses at Qassim University. The examination indicated that there is some broad compatibility between the worldwide quality gauges, rules and norms applied in e-courses, which delineate the accomplishment of e-learning involvement at Qaseem University, despite the experience being more novel and not even three years old. Therefore, to keep this up, several factors need to be in place, such as there is a need to set clear principles dependent on universal applications and encounters, provide an unambiguous rundown of enforceable norms and ceaseless follow-ups regarding the nature of e-learning in actuality, characterise techniques essential for globalisation and underscore the persistent assessment of guidelines to incorporate the nature of information sources and procedures, notwithstanding tackling of the material, human and managerial abilities. The creation of a homogeneous group can help quality measures in a solid and beneficial manner.

#### **5. Recommendations**

E-learning has a promising future. Universities will use many of the lessons learned during this period of adoption of e-learning general courses to enhance and broaden the scope of online learning provisions, and according to the findings of this study, we recommend the following plans of action:

- 1- Providing training programs for all university professors and students on how to use e-learning efficiently to enhance their competencies and skills in using these innovative models

- 2- The need for sufficient attention to develop standards of quality of e-learning in light of the growing competition in the applications of this type of education, regionally and globally.
- 3- Conducting follow-up studies on the students at Qassim University and the impact of e-learning on their education .
- 4- Develop a strategic plan to ensure the quality of integrating e-learning at the university level, so that it reflects the actual needs of the faculty, and the requirements and mechanisms for achieving them.
- 5- Develop a university-wide e-assessment system to ensure the provision of electronic indicators for learning outcomes for programs and courses.

### **Acknowledgement**

Gratitude to the faculty members who contributed to the credibility of the evaluation and efficiency of the questionnaire and the administration of the College of Sciences and Arts-Al-Ras-Al-Qassim University. Furthermore, thanks to the students who volunteered to answer the study questionnaire.

### **References**

- [1]. Al-Mousa, A. ETEC "organizes a virtual talk on quality of distance education during corona pandemic,".2020, [online],available <https://etec.gov.sa/ar/Media/News/Pages/Quality-of-distance-education-under-the-Corona-pandemic.aspx> [Accessed Feb, 2021] .
- [2]. Al-Ali, A. S., et al." Introduction to knowledge management". Dar Al-Masirah. Amman. 2006. Pp. 231.
- [3]. Al-Bishi, A. "A proposed proposal for a training program for faculty members at King Khalid University on using the requirements of the e-learning environment in light of their training need "Ph.D. Dissertation, King Khalid University. Saudi Arabia. 2010.
- [4]. CSU:"Rubric for online instruction developed". CHICOR,2002. [Online], available <http://www.csuchico.edu/tlp/resources/rubric/rubric.pdf>.
- [5]. **D. Ehler " Quality in e-learning from a Learner's Perspective,"**European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning, Vol. 9.Pp.23 , 2004.[online], available <https://journals.openedition.org/dms/2707#quotation> [access.April.10.2021. [Accessed April, 2021].
- [6]. Hsu, C., & Cheng, I. "The development and design of teaching platform: Taking Blackboard and NSCU Cyber University as examples". Journal of Educational Research and Development, 2005. Vol 1. Pp. 177–206.
- [7]. King Khalid University. "E-course quality standards, Saudi Arabia". [Online], available LC: //http kku.edu. Sa/eLQAAR . [Accessed Jan, 2021].
- [8]. Lorenzo, G., & Moore, C. "Five pillars of quality online education: The Sloan Consortium" 2002.[online], available [http://www.rainier.umdj.edu/megs/technology\\_corner/tech\\_online\\_qa\\_general.cfm](http://www.rainier.umdj.edu/megs/technology_corner/tech_online_qa_general.cfm). [Accessed Jan, 2021].
- [9]. Shields, P., & Rangarajan, N. "A playbook for research methods: Integrating conceptual frameworks and project management " 2013.[E-book] Available: New Forums Press.

- [10]. Swansea University. "Guidelines for the development of E-learning materials" .Version 1.1.2007. [Online],available. [www.swan.ac.uk](http://www.swan.ac.uk). [accessed Feb , 2021] .
- [11]. Pawlowski, J. M. " Structuring quality approaches for e-learning". Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Advances Learning Technologies (ICALT'03).European quality observatory (EQO), 2003. Pp.412-423
- [12]. Hirata, K. "Informed model for quality management methods in e- learning". Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT'06) 2006. [Online], available.. <http://csdl2.computer.org/comp/proceedings/icalt/2006/2632/00/263201147.pdf>. Accessed Feb, 2021].