

## **The degree of application of quality standards for special education programs in Palestinian universities from the students' point of view**

Ashraf Abu-Akhayran\*

Sharihan Njoom

\*Al-Quds University

akhayran@staff.alquds.edu

### **Abstract**

The study aimed to identify the degree of application of quality standards for special education programs in Palestinian universities from the students' point of view. As follows: educational program specifications, educational regulations and systems, teaching and learning, student learning assessment, program management, material capabilities and learning resources, human capabilities, community service, program quality assurance and continuous improvement. The validity and reliability of the tool were confirmed by appropriate educational and statistical methods, and the study questions were answered and its hypotheses were examined using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. (SPSS).

The results of the study concluded that the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the students' point of view is that the arithmetic mean of the total degree is (3.91) and a standard deviation is (0.307). The results also indicated that the domain of student learning evaluation obtained the highest arithmetic average of (4.07), followed by the domain of program management with an arithmetic average (4.04), then the material capabilities and learning resources with an arithmetic average (4.02), and then the domain of community service with an arithmetic average (3.98). , followed by the domain of human potential with a mean of (3.91), then the domain of teaching and learning with a mean of (3.88), followed by the domain of educational regulations and systems with a mean of (3.86), followed by the domain of program quality assurance and continuous improvement with a mean of (3.85), followed by the domain of program specifications Education with an arithmetic mean (3.72). The results also indicated that there are differences according to the variable of the academic year, and that the differences in the total degree were between the (second) and (first) year in favor of the (second), and between the (second) and (third) in favor of the (second). And between the (fourth or more) and (first) year is in favor of the (fourth or more), and between the (fourth or more) and (third) year is in favor of the (fourth or more). The study also recommends working on evaluating special education programs continuously to reach better results with regard to the offered curricula, teaching methods, community services and other domains. The scientific material of the courses in line with the recent trends in the specialization.

**Keywords:** quality standards, special education programs, Palestinian universities.

## 1. Introduction:

Special education is one of the disciplines that deal with people with special needs, who differ according to the type of disability they have, so the study of special education needs different standards, conditions and specifications for the study programs and also special education students.

Dealing with people with special needs requires special abilities, qualifications and conditions by new teachers, this means that the teacher is qualified enough to be able to deal with the needs of these children, to train them and enable them to acquire knowledge using different ways including: playing and helping them to comprehend, this leads to the special education teacher's exposure to fatigue and stress, as a result of this work, which needs many hours dealing with students depending on the type of their disability **(Brownell, et al, 2013)**.

The student also needs to obtain information within basic criteria that contribute to clarifying the compatibility between what is being studied and the reality. Al-Omari (2018) sees that quality standards in general are based on a set of principles, they also save time and effort in order to achieve the satisfaction of individuals, and derive their movement from the information that allows talents and skills of students to be employed at various stages of Education.

Special education programs are also new in terms of their adoption as programs taught in Palestinian universities, this is due to the orientation of the Palestinian Ministry of education to focus on integrated education among different groups of students, which is called inclusive education, considering the category of people with special needs, one of the categories that must be taught in general education schools **(Al-Quds Open University, 2015)**.

However, their special circumstances in terms of the severity of the condition and the difficulty of integrating them into public education programs contributed to the creation of special education programs in Palestinian universities to be within the individual disciplines specialized in the education, and teaching of students with special needs in Palestine, because of the importance of this specialization, Palestinian universities have adopted Bachelor's, master's and doctoral programs to teach, qualify and enable staff capable of dealing with the category of people with special needs, to educate, train and assist them in various needs.

The fact that these programs are recent in origin, it was necessary to carry out a study in order to investigate the extent to which the standards of quality of Education agreed upon in university programs and are committed by Palestinian universities are applied in all programs, from the point of view of students studying special education in Palestinian universities.

## 2. Problem statement

Based on the fact that the specialty of special education is recent, and the lack of studies that focused on the evaluation of these programs, in terms of the universities applying the standards of quality education in teaching this specialty, and from the experience of the researchers, it was found that there is a need to study the quality standards applied in these programs and its compliance with the global plans within the standards approved by the Palestinian Ministry of Education, and globally with regard to special education. Therefore, the problem of the study is based in the following question: What is the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students?

## 3. Questions:

The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students?
2. Do the respondents' estimates of the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities differ from the students' point of view according to a variable (gender, academic level, GPA)?

**The second question was converted to a study hypothesis:** There are no significant differences at the level of significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between the calculation averages of the respondents' estimates of the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students depending on the variable level of study.

## 4. Significance:

The significance of the study comes from its theoretical importance, which seeks to complement the theoretical literature regarding the quality standards of education in special education in Palestinian universities, as it is new, the Palestinian library needs more theoretical literature on the Palestinian standards for special education programs.

## 5. Definitions:

Quality standards: evaluative provisions that give performance levels an estimate that reveals the extent to which these levels meet predetermined goals (**Balabel, 2013**).

Special education programs: defined by the researchers procedurally: these are programs offered by Palestinian universities and accredited by the Palestinian quality department, and their courses are taught to students organized in these programs.

## 6. Previous studies:

**Sayed (2020)** conducted a study aimed at raising the issue of quality control in special education support programs and services by building, discussing and evaluating the

indicators of quality control standards for people with speech disorders and the conformity of their outputs on special education institutions and centers. The results of the research found statistically significant differences between the level of effectiveness of support services and quality programs provided to children with speech disorders from the point of view of those involved in them, in the light of the standards and indicators of quality control by calculating the arithmetic averages and standard deviation.

**Al-fahma (2020)** conducted a study aimed at determining the level of availability of quality standards in courses at the College of education from the point of view of the college students and statistical analysis of the results, and to achieve the goal of the research a quality standards of courses was built consisting of (90) standards, the research tools were applied to a sample of (100) students at Faculty of Education-Al-Nadirah- University of Ibb, the results provided the availability of quality standards in the courses (introduction to computer science and psychology) in general at an average level of (3.05), (3.20) respectively.

**Salman, Alloush and Mohammed (2018)** conducted a study aimed at evaluating the quality of the programs of the Faculty of basic education at Al-Mustansiriya University according to the standards of (NCATE), the study sample consisted of (45) members, the researchers used the questionnaire in the study, the study found that the degree of application of the criteria (NCATE) was average, with respect to the six criteria, and the highest percentage came for the programs offered and faculty members and the system of evaluation.

**Al-Salhi (2017)** conducted a study aimed at identifying the degree of availability of quality requirements and academic accreditation in the faculties of Science and arts of Qassim University, the study sample consisted of (488) and the most important results were that the axis of the institutional context got the first ranking, the least influential axis is the infrastructure of supporting services, while the total arithmetic average of the axes of application of quality standards in the faculties of Science and arts of Qassim University was 3.44, which is a relatively high percentage.

**Safran (2014)** conducted a study aimed at evaluating graduate programs at the Faculty of Education at King Khalid University in the light of quality standards and academic accreditation from the point of view of faculty members and graduate students, the study sample consisted of (50) faculty members (male and female), and (279) students of graduate students, and the study found that the axes of quality standards were all achieved from the point of view of faculty members with an average degree.

The study of **(Aajiz, Raza, & Niazi, 2020)** aimed to identify a holistic analysis of quality indicators for teacher training. The study was designed to determine the actual standards of teacher training quality, and to compare national quality standards for teacher training with international standards, to list the advantages and disadvantages of quality standards for teacher training in Pakistan, and to make some suggestions for

improving teacher training. The curriculum of the study was based on critical review and analysis of quality indicators practiced by international teacher training councils and many international universities and the standards of HEC & NACTE for the quality of Education. The results showed a gap in the range of quality indicators, a difference in the number of indicators and unequal treatment of some indicators with reference to their importance.

the **(Alonazy& Kundi,2019)** study aimed to investigate and research satisfaction with the implementation of quality standards in higher education institutions in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the results show that there is satisfaction with the application of quality standards in higher education in the kingdom of Saudi Arabia in big universities, on the other hand, those results also identified the main causes of dissatisfaction with the application of quality standards in some small universities, and the study concluded that the application of quality standards has not yet been done due to the slow pace and so far they have not actually been activated.

The **(Alubaidy,2017)** study aimed at identifying the role of knowledge-based systems in achieving Education Quality Standards, which is a basic requirement for future universities, data was collected using the questionnaire, and 185 questionnaires were distributed and analyzed. It was distributed to a random sample of university professors at Mustansiriya University, the results showed that commitment to the use of knowledge-based systems will strengthen and improve the quality standards of Education.

## **7. Comments on previous studies**

The previous studies focused on the quality of education in general, the quality of education programs, and the quality standards of programs, and the researchers did not find according to their knowledge any study that focused on the quality standards of special education programs, and the researchers also benefited from previous studies in terms of building the study tool, as well as in building the theoretical background of the study. The study agreed with previous studies in the sample size, as well as in the type of curriculum, which is the descriptive approach, and also in some objectives such as program quality standards.

## **8. Study curriculum**

In order to achieve the objectives of the study the descriptive approach was used.

## **9. Population:**

The research population consists of all students enrolled in special education programs at all stages Bachelor's, master's and doctoral, including three universities, namely Al-Quds Open University, Al-Quds University, American University, and the number of special education students in all stages is (350) students, the PhD specialization at the American University includes (50) students, at Al-Quds University (150) students, and at Al-Quds Open University (150) students.

## 10. Sample:

The study sample included (150) students, selected randomly from the members of the study community, from all academic levels.

## 11. Description of variables of respondents:

Table (1.3) shows the distribution of the study sample by gender was: 44% for males and 56% for females. The school year variable shows that the percentage was: 41.3% for the first year, 10.7% for the second, 12.7% for the third, and 35.3% for the fourth and above.

**Table (1): distribution of study sample members according to study variables.**

Variable	Level	Number	Percentage
Academic year	First	62	41.3
	Second	16	10.7
	Third	19	12.7
	Fourth and above	53	35.3

## 12. Instrument:

The study instrument consisted of two sections, the first section is general information, and the second section is the study axes, and the study axes have reached (9) axes.

## 13. Validity and reliability of the instrument:

The validity of the study instrument, which is the questionnaire, was ascertained in two ways:

### First: Validity:

The questionnaire was presented to a group of experienced and competent arbitrators and their number was (7). Some paragraphs were deleted and modified and others were added, so that the number of paragraphs became (55) paragraphs.

### Second: internal consistency

The internal consistency of the questionnaire was calculated by calculating the correlation coefficients between each paragraph of the questionnaire areas and the overall score of the same area, as shown in Table (2.3).

Statistical significance was found in all the questionnaire paragraphs and that indicates internal consistency between the paragraphs. The following table shows this:

**Table (2): Pearson Correlation coefficient results for a correlation matrix of paragraphs of the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students.**

#	R value	Statistical indicator	Number	R value	Statistical indicator	Number	R value	Statistical indicator
1	0.216**	0.008	20	0.496**	0.000	39	0.591**	0.000
2	0.236**	0.004	21	0.442**	0.000	40	0.530**	0.000
3	0.320**	0.000	22	0.434**	0.000	41	0.207*	110.0
4	0.380**	0.000	23	0.451**	0.000	42	0.642**	0.000
5	0.533**	0.000	24	0.485**	0.000	43	0.564**	0.000
6	0.461**	0.000	25	0.495**	0.000	44	0.256**	20.00
7	0.466**	0.000	26	0.521**	0.000	45	0.220**	70.00
8	0.256**	0.002	27	0.452**	0.000	46	0.583**	0.000
9	0.426**	0.000	28	0.452**	0.000	47	0.568**	0.000
10	0.542**	0.000	29	0.427**	0.000	48	0.282**	0.000
11	0.403**	0.000	30	0.428**	0.000	49	0.566**	0.000
12	0.498**	0.000	31	0.442**	0.000	50	0.249**	20.00
13	0.447**	0.000	32	0.415**	0.000	51	0.597**	0.000
14	0.465**	0.000	33	0.561**	0.000	52	0.547**	0.000
15	0.454**	0.000	34	0.448**	0.000	53	0.531**	0.000
16	0.481**	0.000	35	0.463**	0.000	54	0.539**	0.000
17	0.532**	0.000	36	0.435**	0.000	55	0.250**	20.00
18	0.480**	0.000	37	0.529**	0.000			
19	0.268**	10.00	38	0.574**	0.000			

\*\* Statistical indicator at 0.001

\* Statistical indicator at 0.050

### Reliability:

The two researchers verified the reliability of the study questionnaire, using the Cronbach's alpha constancy equation for the study instrument domains and the overall score, and the results were as shown in Table (3.3):

**Table (3): stability coefficient results for Domains and total score**

Domain	# of paragraphs	Stability coefficient
Specifications of the Educational program	9	0.791
Educational regulations and systems	5	0.783
Teaching and learning	7	0.740
Student learning evaluation	7	0.738
Program management	7	0.758
Financial potential and learning resources	4	0.799
Human potential	4	0.770
Community service	5	0.749
Program quality assurance and continuous improvement	7	0.784
Total	55	0.889

This result indicated that the instrument had a reliable domain for the purposes of the study. The following table shows the results of the Cronbach alpha test for the domains.

#### **14. Procedure:**

The instrument was applied to the members of the study sample, where it distributed the study instrument to a sample from the study population, and after the process of collecting the forms from the sample members after answering them correctly, the researcher found that the number of valid recovered forms that were subjected to statistical analysis is 150 questionnaire.

#### **15. Variable:**

##### **Independent variables:**

Academic year: it has four levels: first, second, third, fourth and above.

##### **Dependent variable:**

The respondents' estimates of the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students.

#### **16. Statistical processing**

After collecting the forms and ensuring their validity for analysis, they were coded (giving them certain numbers), in preparation for entering their data into the computer system to perform the appropriate statistical treatments, and analyzing the data according to the study questions. The statistical processing of the data was carried out by extracting the numbers and percentages, and the arithmetic averages and standard

deviations for each paragraph of the questionnaire, the Pearson Correlation coefficient and the Cronbach Alpha equation, using the statistical packages(IBM SPSS 19) (Statistical Package for Social Sciences).

## 17. Results and Discussions:

This part included a presentation of the results of the study, reached by the researchers on the topic of the study, which is **"the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students"** and the demonstration of the impact of each of the variables through the response of the respondents on the study instrument and analyzing the statistical data obtained. In order to determine the average response score of the study sample members, the following scores were adopted:

Degree	Mean range
low	2.33 and less
average	2.34-3.67
high	3.68 and higher

### Questions results:

#### Results of the first question:

**What is the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students?**

To answer this question, the calculation averages and standard deviations of the responses of the study sample members were calculated on the survey areas that reflect the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students.

**Table (4): the mean and standard deviations of the responses of the study sample members to the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students**

#	Domain	Mean	Standard deviation	degree	percentage
4	Student learning evaluation	4.0705	0.47991	High	81.4
5	Program management	4.0410	0.48434	High	80.8
6	Financial potential and learning resources	4.0200	0.53054	High	80.4
8	Community service	3.9827	0.43408	High	79.7
7	Human potential	3.9117	0.41987	High	78.2
3	Teaching and learning	3.8886	0.49979	High	77.8
2	Educational regulations and systems	3.8600	0.58470	High	77.2
9	Program quality assurance and continuous improvement	3.8533	0.36448	High	77.1
1	Specifications of the Educational program	3.7244	0.44848	High	74.5
	Total	3.9170	0.30713	High	78.3

It is noted from the previous table, which reflects the means and standard deviations of the responses of the study sample members on the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students, that the mean of the total score is (3.91) and the standard deviation is (0.307) which indicates that the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students came with a high degree, with a favorable rate (78.3%). The domain of evaluation of student learning received the highest mean of (4.07), followed by the domain of program management with a mean of (4.04), then the material potential and learning resources with a mean of (4.02), then the domain of community service with a mean of (3.98), followed by the domain of human potential with a mean of (3.91), then the domain of teaching and learning with a mean of (3.88), followed by the domain of educational regulations and systems with a mean of (3.86), followed by Program quality assurance and continuous improvement with a mean of (3.85), followed by Specifications of the Educational program with a mean of (3.72), all domains came out with a high score.

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that special education specialization is one of the modern disciplines in Palestine, so the universities are keen to apply all the required standards with regard to the quality of programs and provide them in line with the global development of this program because of the need of the Palestinian society in general to the existence of this specialization, due to the general conditions in

addition to the political conditions, as the presence of the occupation results in cases of trauma during the arrest phase and injuries that lead to disabilities for individuals. Therefore, the Palestinian universities were interested in presenting this specialization in a way that ensures the presence of advanced graduates that deal with special conditions in the Palestinian society, and this result is consistent with the study of **Al-Fahmah (2020)** and the study of **al-Salhi (2017)**, which showed that there is an interest in adopting quality standards in relation to various programs.

Therefore, the researchers conclude that the special education programs in Palestinian universities are distinguished programs, which provide their services jointly between the university students and its faculty, and the surrounding community that works to support people with special needs, and their participation in community life. The level of application of the standards for the programs is also high to distinguish these programs and the preference of students to join them to provide services to people with special needs.

The results also show that special education programs in universities are concerned with the need to apply a balance between theoretical and applied aspects in the courses, and it turns out that there is a need for some important courses.

the results can explained by the fact that students in general want more information in the domain of special education, as it is a wide domain that includes many categories of disabilities, and the need to deal with everyone who suffers from physical problems, which leads to the need for the curriculum to contain everything related to various disabilities, to enable students to easily communicate with all groups and provide appropriate treatment and support, as well as to enable them to provide the appropriate diagnosis.

### **Results of the second question:**

Do the respondents' estimates of the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities differ from the students' point of view according to a variable (Academic year)?

To answer this question, we have converted it to the following null hypothesis:

"There are no statistically significant differences at the level of significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) between the means of the respondents' estimates of the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students according to the variable of the academic level"

The hypothesis was tested by calculating the means to the response of the study sample members on the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students is due to the variable of the academic year.

**Table (5): Means and standard deviations of the response of the study sample members on the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students attributed to the variable of the academic year**

Domain	Academic year	Number	Mean	Standard deviation
Specifications of the Educational program	First	62	3.6846	0.40548
	Second	16	3.9722	0.42841
	Third	19	3.5848	0.40882
	Fourth and above	53	3.7463	0.49421
Educational regulations and systems	First	62	3.7290	0.52616
	Second	16	4.1375	0.77535
	Third	19	3.8737	0.40667
	Fourth and above	53	3.9245	0.61297
Teaching and learning	First	62	3.7719	0.46594
	Second	16	4.1607	0.43605
	Third	19	3.9549	0.54721
	Fourth and above	53	3.9191	0.51088
Student learning evaluation	First	62	3.8733	0.43447
	Second	16	4.4286	0.50305
	Third	19	4.1429	0.37796
	Fourth and above	53	4.1671	0.46775
Program management	First	62	3.8871	0.45847
	Second	16	4.3125	0.55505
	Third	19	3.8571	0.37192
	Fourth and above	53	4.2049	0.44520
Financial potential and learning resources	First	62	3.9395	0.51749
	Second	16	4.4063	0.49896
	Third	19	3.7237	0.28741
	Fourth and above	53	4.1038	0.54692
Human potential	First	62	3.9113	0.43206
	Second	16	3.8906	0.40793
	Third	19	3.6842	0.31004
	Fourth and above	53	4.0000	0.42176
Community service	First	62	3.9935	0.44200
	Second	16	4.0000	0.38644
	Third	19	3.8842	0.37307
	Fourth and above	53	4.0000	0.46410
Program quality assurance and continuous	First	62	3.8180	0.36137
	Second	16	3.7768	0.29029

improvement	Third	19	3.7444	0.40288
	Fourth and above	53	3.9569	0.35833
Total	First	62	3.8296	0.28363
	Second	16	4.1159	0.26078
	Third	19	3.8287	0.25035
	Fourth and above	53	3.9907	0.32395

Table no. (5) notes that there are apparent differences between the average responses of the study sample members on the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students due to the variable of the academic year, to determine the significance of the differences, the analysis of the single variance (one way ANOVA) was used as shown in Table (6):

Table (6): the results of the test to analyze the unilateral variation of the response of the respondents on the averages of the responses of the study sample members on the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities from the point of view of students attributed to the variable of the academic year

Domain	Source of variation	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value of calculated "F"	Level of significance
Specifications of the Educational program	Between groups	1.477	3	0.492	2.522	0.060
	Within groups	28.492	146	0.195		
	Total	29.968	149			
Educational regulations and systems	Between groups	2.520	3	0.840	2.533	0.059
	Within groups	48.420	146	0.332		
	Total	50.940	149			
Teaching and learning	Between groups	2.162	3	0.721	3.002	0.033
	Within groups	35.057	146	0.240		
	Total	37.219	149			
Student learning evaluation	Between groups	5.057	3	1.686	8.412	0.000
	Within groups	29.259	146	0.200		
	Total	34.316	149			
Program management	Between groups	4.713	3	1.571	7.585	0.000
	Within groups	30.239	146	0.207		
	Total	34.953	149			
Financial potential and learning resources	Between groups	4.829	3	1.610	6.332	0.000
	Within groups	37.111	146	0.254		

	Total	41.940	149			
Human potential	Between groups	1.404	3	0.468	2.747	0.045
	Within groups	24.863	146	0.170		
	Total	26.267	149			
Community service	Between groups	0.212	3	0.071	0.371	0.774
	Within groups	27.863	146	0.191		
	Total	28.075	149			
Program quality assurance and continuous improvement	Between groups	0.965	3	0.322	2.494	0.062
	Within groups	18.829	146	0.129		
	Total	19.794	149			
Total	Between groups	1.543	3	0.514	6.000	0.001
	Within groups	12.512	146	0.086		
	Total	14.055	149			

It is noted that the value of F for the total score is (6.000) and the level of significance is (0.001), which is less than the level of significance ( $\alpha \geq 0.05$ ), i.e. there are statistically significant differences between the averages of responses of the study sample members on the degree of application of quality standards in special education programs in Palestinian universities according the academic year variable, as well as for all the domains except the domains of (Specifications of the Educational program, Educational regulations and systems, Community service and Program quality assurance and continuous improvement). The second hypothesis was thus rejected. The results of the (LSD) test were examined to indicate the trend of differences, which are as follows:

**Table (7): test results (LSD) for dimensional comparisons between the computational averages of the responses of the study sample individuals by Academic year variable**

Domain	Variables		Mean differences	Level of significance
Teaching and learning	First	Second	-0.38882 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
		Third	-0.18300	0.157
		Fourth and above	-0.14725	0.110
	Second	First	0.38882 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
		Third	0.20583	0.218
		Fourth and above	0.24158	0.086
	Third	First	0.18300	0.157
		Second	-0.20583	0.218
		Fourth and above	0.03575	0.785
	Fourth and above	First	0.14725	0.110
		Second	-0.24158	0.086
		Third	-0.03575	0.785
Student learning evaluation	First	Second	-0.55530 <sup>*</sup>	0.000
		Third	-0.26959 <sup>*</sup>	0.023
		Fourth and above	-0.29384 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
	Second	First	0.55530 <sup>*</sup>	0.000
		Third	0.28571	0.062

	Third	Fourth and above	0.26146 <sup>*</sup>	0.042
		First	0.26959 <sup>*</sup>	0.023
		Second	-0.28571	0.062
	Fourth and above	Fourth and above	-0.02426	0.840
		First	0.29384 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Second	-0.26146 <sup>*</sup>	0.042
		Third	0.02426	0.840
Program management	First	Second	-0.42540 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Third	0.02995	0.802
		Fourth and above	-0.31775 <sup>*</sup>	0.000
	Second	First	0.42540 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Third	0.45536 <sup>*</sup>	0.004
		Fourth and above	0.10765	0.408
	Third	First	-0.02995	0.802
		Second	-0.45536 <sup>*</sup>	0.004
		Fourth and above	-0.34771 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
	Fourth and above	First	0.31775 <sup>*</sup>	0.000
		Second	-0.10765	0.408
		Third	0.34771 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
Financial potential and learning resources	First	Second	-0.46673 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Third	0.21583	0.105
		Fourth and above	-0.16426	0.084
	Second	First	0.46673 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Third	0.68257 <sup>*</sup>	0.000
		Fourth and above	0.30248 <sup>*</sup>	0.037
	Third	First	-0.21583	0.105
		Second	-0.68257 <sup>*</sup>	0.000
		Fourth and above	-0.38009 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
	Fourth and above	First	0.16426	0.084
		Second	-0.30248 <sup>*</sup>	0.037
		Third	0.38009 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
Human potential	First	Second	0.02067	0.859
		Third	0.22708 <sup>*</sup>	0.038
		Fourth and above	-0.08871	0.252
	Second	First	-0.02067	0.859
		Third	0.20641	0.143
		Fourth and above	-0.10938	0.354
	Third	First	-0.22708 <sup>*</sup>	0.038
		Second	-0.20641	0.143
		Fourth and above	-0.31579 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
	Fourth and above	First	0.08871	0.252
		Second	0.10938	0.354
		Third	0.31579 <sup>*</sup>	0.005
Total	First	Second	-0.28629 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Third	0.00091	0.991
		Fourth and above	-0.16112 <sup>*</sup>	0.004
	Second	First	0.28629 <sup>*</sup>	0.001
		Third	0.28720 <sup>*</sup>	0.004
		Fourth and above	0.12517	0.136
	Third	First	-0.00091	0.991
		Second	-0.28720 <sup>*</sup>	0.004
		Fourth and above	-0.16203 <sup>*</sup>	0.040
	Fourth and above	First	0.16112 <sup>*</sup>	0.004
		Second	-0.12517	0.136
		Third	0.16203 <sup>*</sup>	0.040

It is noted that the differences in the total score were between the (second) year and the (first) year in favor of the (second), and between the (second) and the (third) year in favor of the (second) year. Also between the (fourth and above) year and the (first) year in favor of the (fourth and above), and between the (fourth and above) year and the (third) in favor of the (fourth and above).

The researchers attribute this result to the fact that the more students advanced their academic level and went through the specialization, they felt more need for this education, so they have more knowledge of the programs offered, the level of evaluation and the nature of the program and know the level of specialization and the level of the faculty that manages the program and provide lectures on the specialization through the curriculum, as well as have an advanced level in practical application, the higher the student in the academic level, the more they have experience and knowledge in the level of application of the program.

### **18. Recommendations:**

- Continuously evaluate special education programs to achieve better results in terms of the provided curriculums, teaching methods, community services and other domains.
- The need to adopt special education programs at various stages of Bachelor, Master and doctorate in all Palestinian universities because of the importance of this specialization and the societal need for it.
- Interest in providing the scientific material for the courses in accordance with modern trends in specialization.
- Work on the use of teaching and learning methods and methods that work on the interaction between students and faculty members.
- Raise the level of interest in graduates by communicating with them on a regular basis, and informing them about the developments that occur in it.
- Conducting more studies on special education programs because the researchers did not find any direct study related to the subject of the study.

### **19. References**

Balabel, Magda (2013). A program to develop the skills of designing curriculum maps and characterizing courses for teachers of philosophical subjects in the light of Total Quality Standards, Journal of the Faculty of Education, Benha university, 24(93), 261-319.

Salman, Salman, Mohammed, Hikmat, Alloush, Jalil(2018) evaluation of the quality of programs of the College of basic education in the light of the standards(Ankit), Journal of the College of basic education for educational and Human Sciences, University of Babylon, 38: 1640-1655.

Sayed, Waleed (2020). Building quality control standards and indicators in measuring the effectiveness of support services and quality programs for children with speech and language disorders and the conformity of their outputs to institutions and centers with special needs in the light of the vision of Sustainable Development 2030 in the Arab Republic of Egypt, Journal of research in education and psychology, 35(4): 345-412.

Al-Salhi, Khaled(2017) the availability of total quality requirements and academic accreditation at the faculties of Science and Arts at Qassim University, Journal of the Union of Arab Universities for research in higher education, 37 (3): 173-218.

Umari, Ayman, and Attiyah, Muhammad (2018). Degree of application of TQM standards in secondary schools in Namas governorate. Journal of scientific research in education: Ain Shams University-Girls College of Arts, Science and education, 19(3), 1-44.

Council for Academic Accreditation and quality assurance of Higher Education (2018). Frame of reference for the activities of quality assurance and academic accreditation, Ministry of higher education and scientific research, Palestine.

Aajiz, N. M., Raza, K. K., &Niazi, A. (2020). Meta-analysis of quality standards for teacher education. *THE SPARK A HEC Recognized Journal*, 4, 105-115.

Alonazy, F. M., &Kundi, G. M. (2019). Measures of Satisfaction from the Implementation of Quality Standards in Higher Education Institutions of Saudi Arabia.

Alubaidy, A. H. (2017). The Role of Knowledge Based System in Satisfying Educational Quality Standards and Requirements of Future Universities. *Al-Rafidain University College for Sciences*, (39).

Brownell, M. (2006). *Defining Teacher Quality in Special Education: Understanding the practices, knowledge and beliefs of effective special education teachers*. In CEC Conference.