

**A Review of Research on Institutional Quality Needed to Implement - E -Learning in
Higher Education**

Amir Iqbal

Ms Scholar Department of Management Science Kohat University of Science and Technology
Kohat

Muhammad Usman

Ms Scholar Department of Management Science Kohat University of Science and Technology
Kohat

Asif Iqbal Khattak

Ms Scholar Department of Management Science Kohat University of Science and Technology
Kohat

Abstract

To ascertain the organizational requirements for e-learning implementation in a university, the purpose of this research is to present a collection of classifications and characteristics obtained from a review of the literature pertaining to e-learning implementation in higher education. Prior research has examined the implementation and outcomes of learning platforms, in addition to the challenges, concerns, and critical success factors that impact e-learning acceptance. Nevertheless, the number of articles delineating the stipulations for implementing an e-learning solution and the methods for evaluating it is quite limited. As a result, the subsequent research inquiry was formulated: Which institutional characteristics are considered during the global implementation of e-learning? We identified the characteristics of research on the application of e-learning through the use of benchmarking techniques and documentary analysis, which were developed after a comprehensive review of the relevant literature. Three stages were required to complete this work: In the initial phase, papers were selected according to criteria such as title, abstract, and keywords. The articles were required to be completely accessible and pertinent to the subject matter of institutional attributes and evaluation in the context of e-learning implementation. In the second stage, attributes were extracted from the selected papers by selecting the most significant features of each investigation. Benchmarking and categorizing the extracted features comprised the final stage. This was accomplished by benchmarking the derived features prior to categorizing them as emerging categories. Financial resources, management, planning, communication, evaluation, functional and structural factors, quality, technical assistance, and training are the primary emerging categories, according to the findings. The literature review identified the subsequent characteristics: e-learning project planning, design, production, presentation, availability, standards and procedures, politics, leadership,

organizational culture, organizational change, quality assurance, technological platform selection, platform quality evaluation, and e-learning project financial and economic resources. In conclusion, our research outcomes encapsulated the fundamental institutional characteristics identified in numerous scholarly articles and provided a practical, user-friendly framework for the integration of e-learning in higher education.

Keywords: Institutional Quality, Implement - E -Learning , Higher Education

Introduction

According to the Royal Spanish Academy, implementation refers to the act of initiating, employing various methodologies, executing measurements, installing, or carrying out a design, specification, standard, or policy. The commissioning of online programs in this activity is contingent upon the execution of a planning document formulated by a university or Higher Education Institution (HEI). In order for any conventional institution to begin an online teaching program, it is imperative to address a series of concerns, foremost among them being: What are the necessary conditions for commencing an online program? What organizational changes are deemed necessary? Addressing these problems can be particularly problematic due to the inherent differences across systems [1], the rapid advancement of technology, and the unique conditions and architectural designs of higher education institutions (HEIs). In a similar vein, the integration of virtual learning into the traditional course setting presents a formidable challenge for educational institutions [2]. In addition, it is imperative for them to provide substantial resources towards education and training in order to effectively address the difficulties at hand and successfully execute the requisite modifications [1]. Furthermore, the establishment of a robust management system is essential to provide administrators with the required assistance in their decision-making processes [3].

Educational institutions are often acknowledged as facilities that are committed to the instruction and development of individuals. There are notable distinctions between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and corporate or commercial organizations in several aspects, including directional considerations, organizational structure, operations, values, and methods of activity assessment. Moreover, higher education institutions (HEIs) may be perceived as social establishments that possess the ability to be adaptable and responsive to their environment. This adaptability enables the formation of many types of institutions that share the fundamental responsibilities of generating, disseminating, acquiring, and preserving knowledge [4],[7].

Prior research has investigated the use and outcomes of establishing a learning platform [8], [13], along with the barriers, challenges, and key determinants of success that impact the adoption of e-learning [14],[18].

However, as stated by the author in reference [19], there is a limited body of research dedicated to exploring the strategic management aspects of e-learning. This includes a lack of studies focused on strategy creation and analysis, strategy implementation, strategy assessment, and comprehensive descriptions of the necessary components for establishing an online teaching program.

Hence, the primary inquiry that this study endeavors to explore is: What are the institutional factors that are considered in the worldwide implementation of e-learning? Furthermore, the objective is to present a collection of institutional characteristics and classifications that are essential for the implementation of e-learning in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), as identified by an analysis of published case studies in scientific databases.

The successful adoption of e-learning at higher education institutions necessitates the establishment of a well-defined organizational management plan. This strategy should encompass several crucial elements, including task operation, administrative and financial issues, e-learning management, ongoing development of e-learning, fostering a positive organizational culture, and ensuring continual quality improvement. References [3], [20], and [21] are cited in the text. Organizational management is a systematic procedure that establishes connections between different acts in order to achieve the goals and objectives of an institution. It effectively oversees the human element to generate desired outcomes and coordinates efforts and resources to fulfill both tactical and strategic goals [21].

This study outlines the methodology employed, the findings of the documentary analysis of research paper content benchmarking, and the key characteristics categorized into ten groups. The last phase of our work encompasses our final reflections and expressions of gratitude.

Methodology

The research topic was addressed using a descriptive research technique in this study. The objective of this essay is to ascertain the fundamental institutional characteristics necessary for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to effectively adopt and execute e-learning methodologies. As stated by the source referenced as [22], this particular approach is employed to delineate a research object by documenting its inherent traits and attributes.

A comprehensive review of the literature was conducted, including benchmarking approaches and documentary analysis, to identify institutional components from significant articles pertaining to the implementation of e-learning.

Benchmarking is a systematic and thorough evaluation of many aspects of organizations, goods, services, and processes, with a specific focus on online education [23], [24]. As stated in citation [25], benchmarking has gained popularity as a strategic approach for not only detecting and addressing gaps, but also effectively implementing new standards and policies. The present undertaking comprises a tripartite process, consisting of three sequential stages.

The process of selecting appropriate documents for analysis. At the commencement of this phase, a search algorithm was employed to retrieve information from a diverse range of scientific databases by utilizing phrases associated with the implementation, evaluation, and assessment of e-learning and online education within the context of higher education, along with their respective modifications. Upon careful examination of the title, abstract, keywords, full-text accessibility, and their correlation with intriguing issues such as institutional features, e-learning deployment, and evaluation in the realm of online education, a total of 78 papers were selected.

Identifying key attributes in the chosen research

At this juncture, a summary encompassing the fundamental aspects of each selected work was finalized. This paper examines the attributes associated with a certain institutional element necessary for the implementation of e-learning.

In this section, we will discuss the process of comparison and attribute categorization. In order to complete this stage, the extracted features obtained from the analyzed articles were subjected to benchmarking. The aforementioned traits were subsequently categorized into emergent clusters. As a result, comparison tables were generated whereby qualities and authors were organized based on the frequency of their recurrence.

Results

This section provides a summary of scholarly publications that compile research on the adoption and integration of e-learning in various educational institutions. Upon thorough examination and analysis of the articles, the distinctive attributes linked to the practice of institutional administration were identified. Subsequently, a total of eleven distinct categories were formed to encompass and classify these aforementioned features.

Paper Selection

The databases employed in this study were EBSCO-ERIE, JSTOR, IEEE Xplore, Emerald, Springer, Science Direct, and Taylor & Francis. These databases provide access to full-text articles from academic journals and conference sessions.

The search equation encompassed a total of seventeen phrases that pertained to the domains of implementation or implantation, e-learning or online education, higher education, and their respective variants. After applying a filtration process to the initial set of 5.044 records obtained from the search, specifically based on availability of full-text, a reduced set of 4.231 records was identified. Following this, a thorough evaluation was carried out on the title, abstract, and keywords, considering their alignment with the intellectually stimulating subjects, namely online education assessment, institutional features, higher education, and e-learning implementation. Following the completion of the evaluation, a total of 132 records were acquired. Ultimately, duplicate items were eliminated from a total of 78 specifically chosen articles.

Upon examination of the 78 relevant publications, it was found that 51 of them were journal articles, accounting for 65% of the total, while the remaining 27 were conference proceedings papers, representing 35% of the total.

Comparing and classifying traits within the categories

The present study involves the comparison and classification of features within several groups. In the last phase, the process involved comparing each characteristic to other characteristics in order to facilitate the integration and consolidation of features into many groupings.

Examining the characteristics

After conducting a thorough analysis of the 191 qualities, a process of comparison was undertaken to identify any semantic similarities. As a result, these qualities were subsequently consolidated and categorized into a total of 105 different traits. The results encompassed characteristics derived from the frequency of one author compared to that of 10 writers. The present study has identified several supplementary characteristics through an in-depth examination of literature and analysis of relevant documentaries. These traits encompass leadership, organizational culture, faculty beliefs, quality assurance, technological platform selection and evaluation, planning, design, production, presentation, availability, and assessment of e-learning projects.

A total of 105 homologated qualities were analyzed in relation to the development of categories for the classification of institutional aspects, with the aim of identifying any emergent concerns within these categories. The aforementioned classification categories were established as a

consequence of this undertaking: fiscal assets, administration, strategic development, information dissemination, assessment, operational and organizational components, excellence, technical support, and instruction.

When doing a comparative analysis between two entities, the findings of this study have demonstrated that the necessary characteristics for implementing e-learning in higher education institutions are multifaceted, comprising several dimensions ranging from the organizational structure of the institution to operational features such as strategic planning, effective communication, and efficient management.

Moreover, out of the 68 articles selected for the study, the functional category exhibited the highest number of associated references, accounting for 51.5% (35). This was followed by the structural category, which comprised 39.7% (27) of the chosen articles. The financial resources category had 35.3% (24 references), while the planning category accounted for 32.4% (22 references). There are a total of 21 items in each of the management and communication categories, which collectively account for 30.9% of the whole dataset. The evaluation category was referenced in 22.1% (15) of the articles, technical support was noted in 23.5% (16) of the references, and training was cited in 13, or 19.1%, of the publications. The further organization of characteristics inside categories.

Conclusion

This study illustrates that the application of e-learning extends beyond the instructional procedures carried out within the technology platform. Instead, the proper operation of the online educational system necessitates certain organizational and activity changes.

This study contributes to the advancement of knowledge on the fundamental institutional characteristics necessary for the effective implementation of an e-learning system. In order to achieve this objective, a set of 10 institutional categories were formed, namely: communication, evaluation, financial resources, administration, strategizing, quality, technical assistance, and training. Therefore, this study consolidates the essential institutional attributes found in several academic papers and presents a pragmatic framework that can be easily consulted when incorporating e-learning in higher education.

Based on the results, it was seen that the functional category had the highest number of linked traits. This suggests that a more thorough examination of the considerations that higher education institutions should take into account while developing online programs in the future

may be achieved by breaking this category into smaller subcategories. There is evidence to show that the functional and structural categories hold significance.

However, the findings also indicated a lack of scholarly literature on the subject of e-learning awareness and training inside the institution. This might possibly impact the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of implementing an online academic program.

Furthermore, it can be noted that the assessment process plays a pivotal role in establishing the criteria used to evaluate e-learning initiatives within an organization. This includes the formulation of strategies for measuring the effectiveness of e-learning, as well as determining the perceived value of technology, skills, and student behavior in the e-learning environment. Additionally, assessment is instrumental in evaluating self-efficacy and ensuring the active participation of all stakeholders within the organization. Nevertheless, the assessment of the organizational characteristics identified in this study is inconclusive. While the articles outline the necessary expertise that higher education institutions should possess, they do not provide any guidance on the suitable approaches for quantifying or evaluating these characteristics. The emergence of a specialized field of research has been driven by the advancement of measuring concepts, aiming to enhance the acquisition of knowledge.

References

- [1] K. Sharma, "Financial implications of implementing an e-learning project," *J. Eur. Ind. Train.*, vol. 35, no. 7, pp. 658–686, 2011.
- [2] D. Schneckenberg, "El e-learning transforma la educación superior," *Educar*, vol. 23, pp. 143–156, 2004.
- [3] J. Sae-Khow, "Developing of Indicators of an E-Learning Benchmarking Model for Higher Education Institutions," *Turkish Online J. Educ. Technol. - TOJET*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 35–43, Mar. 2014.
- [4] G. C. Winston, "Why can't a college be more like a firm?," J. W. Meyerson (Ed.), *New Think. High. Educ. Creat. a Context Chang.* Bolton, MA Anker Publ. Company. Cited Shoham Perry, pp. 32–39, 1998.
- [5] S. Shoham and M. Perry, "Knowledge management as a mechanism for technological and organizational change management in Israeli universities," *High. Educ.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 227–246, 2009.
- [6] M. A. Gamboa, "Universidad nodo: modelo inteligente para la sociedad red," *Reencuentro*, vol. 35, no. Special, 2002.

- [7] M. E. Ortiz, M. A. Campos, M. G. Mitre, S. I. Herrera, M. M. Clusella, and P. A. Luna, "Organización ' universidad ' como objeto de estudio transdisciplinario : complejidad bajo las perspectivas sistémica y," *unifacef*, vol. 33, no. 1, 2007.
- [8] N. Tselios, N. Avouris, and A. Dimitracopoulou, "Evaluation of Distance-learning Environments: Impact of Usability on Student Performance," *Int. J. Educ. Telecommun.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 355– 378, 2001.
- [9] M. Jurian, L. Chiotoroiu, and M. Buibas, "Work in progress: E-Learning Impact on Romanian Maritime Education," *Proceedings. Front. Educ. 36th Annu. Conf.*, pp. 27–28, 2006.
- [10] B. M. Olds, "Effective Strategies to Assess the Impact of e-Learning," in *ECI Conference on eTechnologies in Engineering Education: Learning Outcomes Providing Future Possibilities*, 2004, p. 5.
- [11] S. Ozkan and R. Koseler, "Multi-dimensional evaluation of E-learning systems in the higher education context: An empirical investigation of a computer literacy course," in *Proceedings - Frontiers in Education Conference, FIE*, 2009, pp. 1–6.
- [12] A. Hassanzadeh, F. Kanaani, and S. Elahi, "A model for measuring e-learning systems success in universities," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 10959–10966, 2012.
- [13] B. Fetaji and M. Fetaji, "E-learning Indicators Approach to Developing E-learning Software Solutions," in *EUROCON 2007 - The International Conference on "Computer as a Tool," 2007*, pp. 2687–2694.
- [14] C. Keller, J. Lindh, S. Hrastinski, I. Casanovas, and G. Fernandez, "The impact of national culture on e-learning implementation: a comparative study of an Argentinean and a Swedish university," *EMI. Educ. Media Int.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 67–80, Mar. 2009.
- [15] C. Gang, "Analysis of impact of teacher's personality characteristics on E-learning," *2009 4th Int. Conf. Comput. Sci. Educ.*, pp. 1744–1747, Jul. 2009.
- [16] M. McPherson and M. B. Nunes, "Organizational issues for e-learning: Critical success factors as identified by HE practitioners," *Int. J. Educ. Manag.*, vol. 20, pp. 542–558, 2006.
- [17] G. J. Ramon, "Barriers to a wider Implementation of LMS in Higher Education: a Swedish case study, 2006-2011," pp. 2006–2011, 2012.
- [18] P. Gannon-leary and F. Elsa, "Communities of Practice and virtual learning communities: benefits, barriers and success factors," no. September, pp. 1–14, 2007.
- [19] H. Md. Basir, A. Ahmad, and N. L. Mohd Noor, "Strategic management of E-learning implementation programme in Malaysian public universities issues on policy and key

initiatives,” in *CSSR 2010 - 2010 International Conference on Science and Social Research*, 2010, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1143–1148.

[20] Comisión Europea, “Documento de trabajo de los servicios de la Comisión e-learning: concebir la educación del futuro,” Bruselas, 2002.

[21] Á. Sánchez Cabrera, “Análisis crítico de la estructura organizacional en las OFCC. Gestión económica, gestión financiera y enfoques de administración en las organizaciones de carácter social: Un estudio a la luz de la teoría de la organización (1980-2000),” Universität Berlin, 2006.

[22] J. W. Creswell, *Research design Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*, Second. 2003.

[23] J.-L. Maire and G. Büyüközkan, “Methods and Tools for First Five Steps of Benchmarking Process,” in *PICMET*, 1997, p. 6.

[24] J.-L. Maire, V. Bronet, and M. Pillet, “Benchmarking: methods and tools for SME,” *Benchmarking An Int. J.*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 765–781, 2008.

[25] E. Ossiannilsson, “Findings from European Benchmarking Exercises on E-Learning: Value and Impact,” *Creat. Educ.*, vol. 02, no. 03, pp. 208–219, Aug. 2011.

[26] R. Altunisik, “The Role of Leadership in the Success of e-Learning Programs: The Case of Sakarya University e-MBA Program,” in *3rd International Conference on New Horizons in Education - Inte 2012*, 2012, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 539–546.

[27] I. Doherty, “Agile Project Management for e-Learning Developments,” *J. Distance Educ.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 91–106, 2010.

[28] R. A. Ellis, N. Jarkey, M. J. Mahony, M. Peat, and S. Sheely, “Managing quality improvement of eLearning in a large, campus-based university,” *Qual. Assur. Educ.*, vol. 15, pp. 9–23, 2007.

[29] S. Kucina Softic and Z. Bekic, “Organizational aspects of supporting e-learning at university level,” in *ITI 2008 - 30th International Conference on Information Technology Interfaces*, 2008, pp. 153–158.

[30] K. Mahmud and K. Gope, “Challenges of Implementing E-learning for Higher Education in Least Developed Countries: A Case Study on Bangladesh,” in *2009 International Conference on Information and Multimedia Technology*, 2009, pp. 155–159.

[31] G. Mihhailova, “E-learning as internationalization strategy in higher education: Lecturer’s and student’s perspective,” *Balt. J. Manag.*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 270–284, 2006.

- [32] M. Mosakhani and M. Jamporzmay, "Introduce Critical Success Factors (CSFs) of elearning for Evaluating E-learning Implementation Success," in International Conference on Educational and Information Technology, 2010, no. Iceit, pp. 224–228.
- [33] K. Sharma, P. Pandit, and P. Pandit, "Critical success factors in crafting strategic architecture for e-learning at HP University," *Int. J. Educ. Manag.*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 423–452, 2011.
- [34] S. Siritongthaworn, D. Krairit, N. J. Dimmitt, and H. Paul, "The study of e-learning technology implementation: A preliminary investigation of universities in Thailand," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 11, pp. 137–160, 2006.
- [35] M. Stansfield, T. Connolly, A. Cartelli, A. Jimoyiannis, H. Magalhaes, and K. Maillet, "The Identification of Key Issues in the Development of Sustainable e-Learning and Virtual Campus Initiatives," *Electron. J. e-Learning*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 155–164, 2009.
- [36] J. Stoltenkamp and O. A. Kasuto, "E-Learning change management and communication strategies within a HEI in a developing country : Institutional organisational cultural change," *Res. Reflections Innov. Integr. ICT Educ.*, pp. 720–727, 2007. [37] M. M. Thompson, "Evaluating online courses and programs," *J. Comput. High. Educ.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 63–84, 2004.
- [38] J. P. Tucker and G. R. Gentry, "Developing an e-learning strategy in higher education," *Foresight*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 43–49, 2009.
- [39] B. Wakim and I. Hodali, "The Implementation of E-Learning in The Lebanese University Lebanon And In the Al-Quds Open University-Palestine," 2006.
- [40] Woga, "E-learning and Web 2.0: transforming higher education in Africa: Recommendations for successful implementation," *Dev. Learn. Organ.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 28–31, 2012.
- [41] İ. Yengin, D. Karahoca, A. Karahoca, and H. Uzunboylu, "Re-thinking virtual universities," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 5769–5774, Jan. 2010.
- [42] M. Žuvić-Butorac and Z. Nebić, "Institutional support for e-learning implementation in higher education practice: A case report of university of rijeka, Croatia," in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Technology Interfaces, ITI*, 2009, pp. 479–484.
- [43] U. Bayramova, M. Laanpere, and P. Normak, "Strategic planning of e-learning innovation: interplay between national and institutional levels," in *8th International Conference on Application of Information and Communication Technologies (AICT)*, IEEE, 2014, p. 5.

- [44] J. Buchan, "Putting Ourselves in the Big Picture: A Sustainable Approach to Project Management for e-Learning," *Distance Educ.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 55–75, 2010.
- [45] J. W. Chen, D. B. Wu, and H. L. Ma, "A Strategic Alignment of e-learning Implementation Process in a University Setting," in *Proceedings - 2010 International Conference on Web Information Systems and Mining, WISM 2010, 2010*, vol. 1, pp. 109–112.
- [46] R. Sharpe, G. Benfield, and R. Francis, "Implementing a university e-learning strategy: levers for change within academic schools," *Res. Learn. Technol.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 135–151, Jun. 2006.
- [47] H. Uzunboylu, "A Review of Two Mainline e-Learning Projects in the European Union," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 201–209, 2006.
- [48] M. Ward, S. West, M. Peat, and S. Atkinson, "Making it Real: Project Managing Strategic eLearning Development Processes in a Large, Campus-Based University," *J. Distance Educ.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 21–42, 2010.
- [49] S. Wills, "Strategic planning for blended eLearning," *7th Int. Conf. Inf. Technol. Based High. Educ. Training, ITHET*, no. March 2002, pp. 670–676, 2006.
- [50] I. a. Zualkernan, L. Blank, J. Abdalla, A.-R. Al-Ali, H. Al-Nashash, H. El Kadi, R. Ahmed, and G. Qadah, "Using Future Search Conference for e-Learning Strategy Formulation in Higher Education," in *Sixth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT'06)*, 2006, p. 5.
- [51] S. Loomis and J. Rodriguez, "Institutional change and higher education," *High. Educ.*, vol. 58, no. February, pp. 475–489, 2009.
- [52] A. Nasiri and G. Deng, "Organizational coordination for competition in the E-learning centers," in *2008 International Conference on Wireless Communications, Networking and Mobile Computing, WiCOM 2008, 2008*, no. 70671016, pp. 1–5.
- [53] G. Netteland, B. Wasson, and A. I. Mørch, "E-learning in a large organization: A study of the critical role of information sharing," *J. Work. Learn.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 392–411, 2007.
- [54] K. Sharma, D. Sood, A. Singh, and P. Pandit, "Strategic architecture for e-learning at H.P. University," *Int. J. Educ. Manag.*, vol. 24, no. 7, pp. 575–596, 2010.
- [55] J. N. Eastmond, T. Nickel, J. Plessis, and L. D. Smith, "An incremental approach to implementing a web course," *TechTrends*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 40–45, 2000.

- [56] P. a Kirschner, "Design, Development, and Implementation of Electronic Learning Environments for Collaborative Learning," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 39–46, 2004.
- [57] R.-A. Montague and M. Pluzhenskaia, "Web-based Information Science Education (WISE): Collaboration to Explore and Expand Quality in LIS Online Education," *J. Educ. Libr. Inf. Sci.*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 36–51, 2007.
- [58] H. M. Selim, "Critical success factors for e-learning acceptance: Confirmatory factor models," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 396–413, 2007.
- [59] I. Jung, "The dimensions of e-learning quality: from the learner's perspective," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 445–464, 2011.
- [60] K. Nelson, J. Clarke, I. Stoodley, and T. Creagh, "Using a Capability Maturity Model to build on the generational approach to student engagement practices," *High. Educ. Res. Dev.*, vol. 34, no. March 2015, pp. 37–41, 2014.
- [61] R. Hogan, "eLearning: A Survival Strategy For Developing Countries," *Soc. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 127–150, 2011.
- [62] J. Becker, R. Knackstedt, and J. Pöppelbuß, "Developing Maturity Models for IT Management," *Bus. Inf. Syst. Eng.*, vol. 1, pp. 213–222, 2009.
- [63] A. Assiri, J. Berri, and A. Chikh, "Classification and tendencies of evaluations in e-learning," in *2012 International Conference on Education and e-Learning Innovations, ICEELI 2012*, 2012, p. 6.
- [64] J. N. Hudson, E. a Farmer, K. M. Weston, and J. a Bushnell, "Using a framework to implement large-scale innovation in medical education with the intent of achieving sustainability," *BMC Med. Educ.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1–9, 2015.
- [65] J. Sinay, D. Kocur, P. Kosc, and S. Benco, "Experiences with e-learning implementation at the Technical University of Kosice," in *Information Technology Based Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Higher Education and Training, 2004. ITHET 2004.*, 2004, pp. 582–586.
- [66] S. Pal, S. Mukherjee, P. Choudhury, S. Nandi, and N. C. Debnath, "M-learning in university campus scenario - Design and implementation issues," in *International Conference on Industrial Technology (ICIT) IEEE*, 2013, pp. 1851–1856.

- [67] A. B. Urbina-Nájera, R. Rodríguez-Huesca, L. C. Escamilla-Rodríguez, and B. N. PérezCamacho, "Evaluation of specialization program in competency-based education in e-learning," in 7th Colombian Computing Congress, CCC 2012, 2012, p. 6.
- [68] N. Van, "The Solution for Building a Strategic Plan for e-learning at Universities in Vietnam," in International Conference on Education and e-Learning Innovations, 2012, vol. 7, p.
- [69] J. Stoltenkamp and O. A. Kasuto, "E-Learning change management and communication strategies within a HEI in a developing country: Institutional organisational cultural change at the University of the Western Cape," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 41–54, Nov. 2009.
- [70] O. Debande, "ICTs and the Development of eLearning in Europe: the role of the public and private sectors," *Eur. J. Educ.*, vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 191–208, 2004.
- [71] P. Rao, "E-learning in India: the role of national culture and strategic implications," *Multicult. Educ. Technol. J.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 129–150, 2011.
- [72] N. Kerimbayev, A. Akramova, and J. Suleimenova, "E-learning for ungraded schools of Kazakhstan: Experience, implementation, and innovation," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. May, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2014.
- [73] D. Akaslan, E. L. Law, and S. Taskin, "Analysis of issues for implementing e-learning: The student perspective," in Proceedings of the 2012 IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference (EDUCON), 2012, pp. 1–9.
- [74] M. Abbad, "A Conceptual Model of Factors Affecting eLearning Adoption," *Eng. Educ.*, vol. 2, no. 1989, pp. 1108–1119, 2011.
- [75] M. Abbad, "Proposed model of e-learning acceptance," in 2012 International Conference on Education and e-Learning Innovations, ICEELI 2012, 2012, no. 1, p. 9.
- [76] W. Premchaiswadi, P. Porouhan, and N. Premchaiswadi, "An Empirical Study of the Key Success Factors to Adopt E-Learning in Thailand," in International Conference on Information Society (i-Society 2012), 2012, pp. 333–338.
- [77] K. Bartimote-Aufflick, A. Bridgeman, R. Walker, M. Sharma, and L. Smith, "The study, evaluation, and improvement of university student self-efficacy," *Stud. High. Educ.*, no. March, pp. 37–41, 2015.
- [78] N. Munkhtsetseg, D. Garmaa, and S. Uyanga, "Multi-criteria Comparative Evaluation of the ELearning Systems: A Case Study," in 7th International Conference on Ubi-Media Computing and Workshops, 2014, pp. 190–195.

- [79] S. W. Van Rooij, "Higher education and foss for e-learning: The role of organizational subcultures in enterprise-wide adoption," *Int. J. Open Source Softw. Process.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 15–31, 2010.
- [80] M. A. Khan and S. Mahmood, "Implementing Blended Learning through Studio Courses," in 2013 Fourth International Conference on e-Learning "Best Practices in Management, Design and Development of e-Courses: Standards of Excellence and Creativity," 2013, pp. 241–244.
- [81] U. Tudevdagva, W. Hardt, T. Evgeny, and M. Grif, "New approach for e-learning evaluation," in *Proceedings - 2012 7th International Forum on Strategic Technology, IFOST 2012*, 2012, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–4.
- [82] M. Yaman and D. Graf, "Evaluation of an international blended learning cooperation project in biology teacher education," *Turkish Online J. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 87–96, 2010.
- [83] J. Hardman and A. Paucar-Caceres, "A Soft Systems Methodology (SSM) Based Framework for Evaluating Managed Learning Environments," *Syst. Pract. Action Res.*, vol. 24, pp. 165–185, 2011.
- [84] H. El-Ghalayini and N. El-Khalili, "An approach to designing and evaluating blended courses," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 417–430, 2012.
- [85] S. Clegg and S. Bradley, "Models of personal development planning: practice and processes," *Br. Educ. Res. J.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 57–76, 2006.
- [86] S. Ozkan and R. Koseler, "Multi-dimensional students' evaluation of e-learning systems in the higher education context: An empirical investigation," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 1285–1296, Dec. 2009.
- [87] T. Ramayah, N. H. Ahmad, and M. C. Lo, "The role of quality factors in intention to continue using an e-learning system in Malaysia," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 5422–5426, 2010.
- [88] W. Erik, D. Beck, K. Dawson, S. Jinks, and M. DiPietro, "The other side of the LMS : Considering implementation and use in the adoption of an LMS in online and blended learning environments," *TechTrends*, vol. 51, no. 2 (April), pp. 35–40, 2007.
- [89] J. E. Stefaniak, "The implementation of service-learning in graduate instructional design coursework," *J. Comput. High. Educ.*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 2–9, 2015.
- [90] S. W. Van Rooij, "Instructional design and project management: Complementary or divergent?," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 139–158, 2011.

- [91] G. Grigoraş, D. Dănciulescu, and C. Sitnikov, "Assessment Criteria of E-learning Environments Quality," *Procedia Econ. Financ.*, vol. 16, no. May, pp. 40–46, 2014.
- [92] R. Pruengkarn, P. Praneetpolgrang, and A. Srivihok, "An evaluation model for e-learning Websites in Thailand University," in *Fifth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT'05)*, 2005, pp. 161–162.
- [93] L. Qiang and M. Ming, "An Evaluation Model of Web-Based Distance Education for the Deaf Undergraduate," in *2009 International Symposium on Intelligent Ubiquitous Computing and Education*, 2009, pp. 254–257.