

*

*

(74)

(6)

(21)

(%69.5)

(2.08)

(%82)

(%81.3)

(%68.6)

(%73.3)

(%65)

(%47)

:

Abstract

Evaluating the Educational Website RAWAFED of the Ministry of Higher Education in Palestine According to Specific Criteria

This research aims at evaluating the educational website RAWAFED of the Palestinian Ministry of Higher Education according to specific criteria. In order

....

to achieve this, six major criteria were prepared that included seventy-four indicators. These indicators were used as an electronic questionnaire. The questionnaire was applied to RAWAFED by 21 information and instructional technology specialists.

To measure how much the major criteria and the indicators are used in the website, averages, relative weight. and ranks were used by the researchers.

The research revealed the following results: evaluation criteria are available in the website in question by an intermediate degree of (2.08) and with a relative weight of (69.5%). Moreover, the website referential criterion and its information comes in the first rank with a degree of (82%) as relative weight. Secondly, multimedia criterion got a degree of (81.3%). Thirdly, E-contents criterion got an intermediate degree of (73.3%) as a relative weight. Fourthly, graphical user interface criterion got an intermediate degree of (68.6%) as a relative weight Fifthly, the controlling and interaction tools got an intermediate degree of (65%). At last, navigations and educational theory got a low degree of (47%). The research highly recommended that the previous criteria should be taken into consideration when developing the educational websites.

Keywords: Evaluating the educational website, Educational Website RAWAFED, Evaluation criteria.

:

(2013)

2016

(Canada, 2000)

.(King & Leroy, 2014)

(2009 :)

(2014) (Hasan, 2014) (2014)
. (Schwier, 2001) (2012) (2014)

:)

.(2002

(<http://www.rawafed.edu.ps>)

....

(5617) (2014) (170)
. (2014 :)

(AlRoobaea et al, 2013)
Andrews,) .(2001

(AlRoobaea et al, 2013) (Hasan, 2014)
(%69)
(Achour & Ben Abdesslam, 2012)
(%70)
(2009)
. (%40)

(2011)

. (2014)

2016

(AlRoobaea et al, 2013) (Hasan, 2014)
(Andrews, 2001) (2009 :)

-1
-2

(6)

(65)

2015/2014

(Liu, 2007)

Clewley et al,)

(Hadjerrouit, 2010)

(2011)

(McKimm et al, 2003)

()
(2013)

2016

2013

)

:(Nykaenen & Ala-Rant, 1998 2005

2005

)

Static Website

(

.HTML

Database

Dynamic Website

(

)

:

.Active JAVA

- **المواقع ذات التطبيقات البرمجية:**

ASP

MS Visual Basic

Script

.Java Script

:

:(2011 2012)

-

-

....

—
—
—
—

:

(2013)

(2013)

(2011)

(2007)

(McKimm et al., 2003)

:

:Object Learning

—

(Jaakkola & Nurmi, 2004)

(Chittaro et al., 2006)

2016

:Database

:HyperLink

:Paths

:Orientation Devices and Forms

:User Interface

(2008)

....

بانتشيكو (Pachec, 2005)

()

Hadjerrouit, Bhatia, 2011)

:

(Khan, 2005 2010

:Accessibility —

:Globality —

:Interactivity —

:Individuality —

:Autonomy —

:Flexibility —

:Timing —

2016

:Navigation

:Collaboration

:Long Life Learning

:

(Canada, 2000)

Bhatia, 2011 2013

)

2008 2008

Hadjerrouit, 2010 20011

(Liu, 2007 2008

:

—

(Hopkins, 2010)

—

.(King, & Leroy, 2014)

—

.(Riel, 2001)

—

(2014)

....

—

(AlRoobaea et al, 2013)

.(Chickering & Ehrmann, 1997)

—

.(Trujillo, 2008)

:

(Knowlton, 2000)

.(Burgess, 2001)

)

(SCORM)

(

(2012)

:

:

(Bruner)

(2013)

:

2016

(Chickering & Ehrmann, 1997)

:

(Canada, 2000; Logan & Conerly, 2001)

Logan & Conerly,)

(2001)

:

Hasan,)

(2014)

(2014)

:

(2014)

(2014)

(2009)

(2009)

:

(11)

(151)

(2008)

....

(Schwier, 2001)

(59) (Bantjes & Cronje, 2000)

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

:

2016

(2005 :)

(65)

(6)

-1

2016

(12)

(15)

-2

(74)

(6)

Google Drive

(4)

:(2011 :)

2016

(6)

(74)

(13)

(10)

(10) "

(14)

(12)

(15)

" فلسطين

(1)

(1)

1	%82	2.46	:
2	%81.3	2.44	:
3	%73.3	2.20	:
4	%68.6	2.06	:
5	%65	1.95	:
6	%47	1.41	:
	%69.5	2.08	

(1)

(%82)

(5 4 3)

(%81.3)

.....

(%65 - %73.3)

.(%47)

(%69.5) (2.08)

.(%80) (%50)

.....

-:

:(2)

1	%97	2.91	.	1
2	%89	2.68	.	2
2	%89	2.68	.	7
4	%83	2.50	.	5
5	%82	2.45	.	3
6	%80	2.41	.	6
7	%79	2.36	.	8
7	%79	2.36	.	10
9	%73	2.18	.	4
10	%71	2.14	.	9
1	%82	2.46	:	

(2)

(6)

(%97)

(%89)

2016

(4)

(%79)

(%71) (%73)

الرتبة الأولى من بين المعايير الرئيسية

(%82) (2.46)

(%80)

Achour & Ben)

(%70)

(Abdesslam, 2012

(%71)

(2009)

- :

:(3)

1	%89	2.68	.	5
2	%82	2.45	.	4
3	%80	2.41	.	6
4	%77	2.32	.	11
5	%76	2.27	.	12

....

6	%73	2.18	.	1
6	%73	2.18	.	10
8	%71	2.14	.	2
9	%70	2.09	.	7
10	%68	2.09	.	3
11	%68	2.03	.	8
12	%67	2.02	.	9
13	%56	1.68	.	13
3	%73.3	2.20	:	

(3)

(3)

(89%)

(2.68)

(%82)

(10)

(%80)

- تراوحت أوزانهم النسبية ما بين (77 - 4%

(13 - 4)

(%56

(%67)

(%73.3)

(2.20)

(2014)

2016

)

(2010

.(Australian National Training Authority,

2003)

(2009)

(%75)

(Hasan, 2014)

(%79.7)

:(4)

1	%77	2.30	.PPT	Pdf	Word
2	%53	1.59	.	.	.
3	%50	1.50	.	.	.
4	49%	1.47	.	.	.
5	%45	1.36	.	.	.
6	%42	1.26	.	.	.
7	%41	1.23	.	.	.

....

8	%40	1.20	.	4
9	%39	1.17	.	5
10	%34	1.02	.	3
6	%47	1.41		:

(4)

(3)

(77%)

(7) (%53)

(%34 - %49)

(1.02)

(%34)

.(%39)

(1.41)

(%47)

(2012)

(2011)

(2014)

2016

(2014) (2009) (%40)

(Achour & Ben Abdesslam, 2012)

1

:(5)

1	%74	2.23	.	2
2	%73	2.18	.	7
3	%71	2.14	.	3
3	%71	2.14	.	6
3	%71	2.14	.(- - -)	9
6	%70	2.09	.	12
6	%70	2.09	.	14
8	%68	2.05	.	1
8	%68	2.05	.	5
8	%68	2.05	.	8
11	%67	2.00	.	4
11	%67	2.00	.	10
13	%65	1.95	.	11

....

14	%59	1.77	.()	13
4	%68.6	2.06		:	

(5)

- %74) (1.77 - 2.3) (%59

(%74)

(%73)

%71) (%68 -

.(%59) (1.77)

(5)

(%68.6) (2.06)

(Hasan, 2014)

(Kennedy et al., 1998)

(2014)

(%23)

2016

:(6)

1	74%	2.23	.	9
6	%74	2.23	.	8
2	%71	2.14	.	11
3	%69	2.00	.	7
4	%66	1.98	.	2
5	%64	1.92	.	10
7	%63	1.89	.	12
8	%62	1.86	.	3
8	%62	1.86	.	4
8	%61	1.84	.	6
11	%60	1.82	.	1
12	%59	1.77	.	5
5	%65	1.95	:	

(6)

(%59 - %74)

(%71)

(%69)

.....

(%59)
(%60)
(%65) (1.95)

(2012 :)

.(Anderson & Elloumi, 2004)
(%42.8) (2014)
(2009)
.(%19.9)

.....

:(7)

1	%88	2.64	.	1
2	%86	2.59	.	6
3	%85	2.55	.	4
3	%85	2.55	.	2
3	%85	2.55	.	11
6	%84	2.53	.	3
7	%83	2.50	.	9

2016

8	%82	2.47		13
9	%82	2.47		14
10	%81	2.43		5
11	%80	2.41		10
12	%76	2.30		12
13	%75	2.25		8
14	%74	2.22		14
15	%71	2.17		7
2	%81.3	2.44	:	

(7)

(11)

(2.64)

(%86)

(4)

(%85)

(15 -12)

(%81.3)

(2.44)

....

(Miller, 2006)

(Kennedy et al., 1998)

(2014)

(2014)

2016

:2013

.1

.206-163 (1)1

:2011

.2

23- 21

:2009

.3

.251-213 (52)

:2014

.4

.126-87 (8)4

:2012 .5

.236-177 (45)

2009

.6

.191-134 (144)

()

:2013

.7

:2008 .8

.42-14 (76)

.....

:2008 .9

:2007 .10

:2013 .11

7 - 4

:2009 .12

.389-364 (143)4

:2001 .13

.701-726 (72) /

:2005 .14

:2005 .15

:2012 .16

.86-63 (1)16 ()

:2002 .17

.2015/01/17 : **<http://www.alriyadh.com/26698>**

:2014 .18

.188-107 (88)21

: (2005) .19

:2014 .20

2014/05/15

2016

.336-284 .(150)2	:2012	.21
.157-120 (9)5	:2012	.22
.72-11 (45)2	:2014	.23
	:2013	.24
	:	
.739-693 (3)25		
.2014/10/12 :	:2014	.25
	http://www.rawafed.edu.ps	
	:2010	.26
http://www.slideshare.net/nemra1/ss-10224705 :		
	:2011	.27
	:2011	.28

- 1- Achour, H; & Ben Abdesslam, W. 2012: An Evaluation of arabic language learning websites. International Conference on Education and E-Learning Innovations (ICEELI). From: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.0716>
 - 2- AlRoobaea, R., Al-Badi, A., & Mayhew, P . 2013: A Framework for generating domain-specific heuristics for evaluating online educational

....

- websites. *International Journal of Information Technology & Computer Science (IJITCS)*, 8(2), 75-84.
- 3- Anderson, T., & Elloumi, F. 2004: Theory and practice of online learning, Athabasca University. From: http://cde.athabascau.ca/online_book/
 - 4- Andrews, S. 2001: Evaluation of website: www.doe.state.in.us chartered for indiana clearinghouse for citizenship and character education, ERIC Number: ED458637. From: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED458637>
 - 5- Australian National Training Authority . 2003: Developing e-learning content: Australian flexible learning framework quick guides series. from: <http://flexiblelearning.net.au/projects/sharingknowledge.htm#guides>
 - 6- Bantjes, L., & Cronje, J. 2000: An analysis of criteria for the evaluation of educational web sites. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 14(1), 121-129.
 - 7- Bhatia, R. 2011: Features and effectiveness of e-learning tools. *Global Journal of Business Management and Information Technology*, 1(1), 1-7.
 - 8- Burgess, G. 2001: Technology in the classrooms: New designs for learning. paper presented at the international conference on technology and education, tallahassee, FL. From: www.ictc.org/T01_Library/T01_217.pdf
 - 9- Canada, M. 2000: Students as seekers in online courses. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 84, 35-40.
 - 10- Chickering, A., & Erhmann, S. 1997: Implementing the seven principles: technology as lever. *AAHE Bulletin*, 49(2),3-7.
 - 11- Chittaro, L., Ieronutti, L., & Ranon R. 2006: Adaptable visual presentation of 2D and 3D learning materials in web-based cyberworlds. *The Visual Computer*, 22(12), 1002-1014.
 - 12- Clewley, N., Chen, Y., & Liu, X. 2011: Mining learning preferences in web-based instruction: holists vs. serialists. *Educational Technology & Society*, 14 (4), 266-277.
 - 13- Hadjerrouit, S. 2010: Developing web-based learning resources in school education: A user-centered approach . *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects (IJELLO)*, 6(24), 115–135.

2016

- 14- Hasan, L. 2014: Evaluating the usability of educational websites based on students' preferences of design characteristics. *International Arab Journal of e-Technology*, 3(3), 179-193.
- 15- Hopkins, J. 2010: Synchronous vs. asynchronous distance learning activities. Hopkins University School of Education, Center for Technology in Education. From: <https://prezi.com/mkc3n1s2cybq/asynchronous-and-synchronous/>
- 16- Jaakkola, T., & Nurmi, S. 2004: *Academic impact of learning objects: the case of electric circuits*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16-18 September.
- 17- Kennedy, G., Petrovic, T., & Keppell, M. 1998: The Development of multimedia evaluation criteria and a program of evaluation for computer aided learning, Proceedings ASCILITE'98, 407-415. University of Wollongong, Australia. From: <http://www.ascilite.org/conferences/wollo>
- 18- Khan, B. 2005: Learning features in an open, flexible, and distributed environment. *AACE Journal*, 13(2), 137-153.
- 19- King, L., & Leroy, B. 2014: Developing an online learning community in industrial law. critical perspectives on educational technology. From: <http://ascilite2014.otago.ac.nz/files/concisepapers/235-King.pdf>
- 20- Knowlton, D. 2000: A theoretical framework for the online classroom: A defense and delineation of a student-centered pedagogy. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 84, 5-14.
- 21- Liu, L. 2007: An intermediate effect between the quality of web-based learning applications and student learning. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 29-46.
- 22- Logan, E., & Conerly, K. 2001: Students creating community: An investigation of student interactions in a web-based distance learning environment. From: http://www.ictc.org/T01_Library/T01_253.pdf
- 23- McKimm, J., Jollie C., & Cantillon .P 2003: Web based learning, *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 326(7394), 870-873.
- 24- Miller, R. 2006: Web Content Takes the Access Ramp: Designing Sites with Accessibility in Mind. *Econtent*, 29(1),20-24.

....

- 25- Nykaenen, o., & Ala-Rant, M, 1998: A design for a hypermedia-based learning environment. *Education and Information Technologies*, 3(4), 277-290.
- 26- Pachec, Q. 2005: Web based learning (WBL): A challenge for foreign language teachers. *Revista Electronica "Actalidades Investigative en Education"* 5(2).
- 27- Riel, M., & Fulton, K. 2001: The Role of technology in supporting learning communities. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(7), 518-523.
- 28- Schwier, R. 2001: Evaluation of educational websites. EDCMM 802.6. From: <http://etad.usask.ca/802papers/bokcaisse/bokcaisse.pdf>
- 29- Trujillo, H. 2008: Benefits and challenges for the online learner. educational benefits of online learning. Thomas Jefferson University. From: http://www.strayer.edu/online_benefits