Model L.D.D Elaboration: E-Learning Document Quality Design

Souâd Carpon El Harrassi*
*University of Lille North of France-UVHC

Abstract: Our contribution propose a new model of e-learning document design process according to info-communicational approach. Following our previous work [1] and [2], we have implemented a data collection protocol to identify e-learning document quality criteria according to the views of the “Learner”, the “Designer” and the “Maker”: 1- the “Learner” approach allows us to understand her perception to make recommendations to designers document. 2- "Designer" approach is the subject of a return designer experience on how learners have seen and used the document. 3- 'Crossing' approach is to merge the criteria established in the steps "Learner" and "Designer". 4- the "Maker" approach identifies the needs in decision making. We end this way by our e-learning document model formalization in sport.
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1. Introduction

In this paper, we propose a new model of e-learning document design process by reviewing otherwise the old model and problematic anterior search works [1] and [2] inspired from [3]. So we want to participate in the progress of scientific thought on "a technical system” to common sense, to turn it into" a socio-technical system of Communication and information Science (CIS) viewpoint."

Following this research, we developed the Protocol L.D.D that includes all the approaches "Learner", "Designer" and "Decider". This study [4] was conducted to identify the criteria that contribute to satisfying the user’s needs and expectations. We will limit ourselves to the training sport field. For this, we targeted two learners groups of two training institutions; one in Morocco and one in France.

For what reason our study focuses on Sport as application domain; Morocco and France as a place of experimentation?

We chose the Sport as application domain following an enormous need for training in the matter, explicitly expressed by deciders and pedagogues of the Royal Institute and the National Center for Sports (IRFC-CNS My Rachid) located in Rabat, Morocco.

According to ministerial directives of Youth and Sports, which have proven to be a way to interview with these actors. We organized several meetings to a state of the existing e-learning document design within the institute. We noticed that no documents were designed. This main fact allowed us to formulate our problematic and us driven to extend our analysis to other Moroccan or French universities, there where he infrastructure Sport is more developed.

First, a preliminary interview with the teaching and administrative actors IRFC-CNS My Rachid in Rabat, hasn't found any e-learning document has been designed. Teachers have explicitly expressed their enormous need for training in e-learning. We also recall the hypothesis, that it is relevant to study their needs and expectations, to develop criteria that can contribute to the development of the e-learning document quality in the field of Sport. What prompted us to extend our analysis to other disciplines Moroccan universities. From this observation, a field data collection protocol was implemented. This protocol called -L.D.D- aims to identify quality criteria of e-learning document under the points of view of the "Learner", the "Designer" and "Decider". This protocol has four times.

We start in a first phase, the approach "Learner" which consists of a field study through a questionnaire to the Moroccan learners of the National Sports My Rachid Centre (CNS My Rachid) at the IRFC Institute with the French learners of the Faculty of Science and Sport (FSMS) - section of Sciences
and Techniques of Physical and Sports Activities (STAPS) at the University of Valenciennes and Hainaut Cambrésis (UVHC).

The questionnaire being composed of open and closed questions. The counting of the first allows us to determine the percentage of learners who have access to e-learning, having faced difficulties during the learning phase and requesting follow a tutor. The qualitative analysis content based on answers to open questions, we can identify the needs and expectations of the learner perspective. It is indeed essential to understand their perceptions to make recommendations to the e-learning document designers in Sport.

In a 2nd time, the "Designer" approach is a field study through a semi-structured interview with the designers of the Universities Med V in Morocco and FSMS UVHC in France. The goal is to make the designers experience feedback on how learners have seen and used the e-learning document in Sport.

Thirdly, the crossing of the two results is to identify the criteria of quality e-learning document as two logical "Learner" and "Designer". The results of this cross allow us to identify the levers and constraints of access to distance course and thus offer possible solutions for improvement.

Finally, in a fourth qualitative phase, the "Decider" approach is a study by collecting data using a semi-structured interview with officials of the virtual University in Nord-Pas de Calais region and Information Systems UVHC direction. Our goal is to examine and identify the need for help in decision-making.

To avoid data redundancy with our latest research work [5], we present briefly all the steps of the protocol (Fig.1) we proposed to achieve the criteria that have allowed us to develop an e-learning document quality in Sport, which can be transposed to other contexts.

2. Protocol L.D.D Implementing

The protocol L.D.D was implemented during an experiment conducted in Morocco and France between 2010 and 2013. We leaning on the interviews results with the pedagogues and Deciders CNS My Rachid-IRFC.

The protocol L.D.D was designed specifically to experiment the design and identify e-learning document quality criteria from the "Learners", "Designer" and "Deciders". The steps succeeded depending upon the facts, findings and results of each.

![Fig 1. Protocol L.D.D (Learner, Designer, Decider)](image)

3. Protocol L.D.D Approaches

3.1. Learner Approach

We targeted two learners groups: one side of the CNS My Rachid Centre-IRFC Institute- learners in Rabat-Morocco, on the other side the FSMS-STAPS UVHC learners in Valenciennes -France. These learners are the end users of e-learning document in Sport.

Out of a total of 110 learners at CNS My Rachid only 22 learners (20%) completed the
questionnaire. These learners are distributed over all the promotions from L1 (Licence 1) to L3 (Licence 3) in initial training, BAES and continuing training.

Saw this low response rate, we noted that these results are not satisfied for our study. This is what prompted us to broaden the analysis to other disciplines in Moroccan universities indeed to other learners from a French university. This is the reason our choice of the FSMS STAPS UVHC University.

For STAPS learners, out of a total of 320 learners distributed on all the promotions L1, L2, L3, M1 (Master 1) & M2 (Master 2), all the 206 (64%) responded to the questionnaire whose 16% answered having followed a distance course and were selected. It is indeed indispensable to understand their perception to propose recommendations to designers e-learning document. The verbatim of the analysis of the two learners groups allowed us the identification of criteria that contribute to the satisfaction of their needs.

3.2. Designer Approach

We remember that, following discussions conducted with the pedagogical actors in CNS-My-Rachid Centre in Rabat-Morocco, we noted that no any e-learning document has been designed. What prompted us to extend our analysis to other disciplines of Moroccan or French universities. We also remind that the objective of this approach is to give an experience feedback which is essential for pedagogues to future planning and how learners have seen and used the e-learning document in Sport. Also, the goal is to identify the conceptual approaches of e-learning document designers, and the criteria taken into account in the elaboration of this document.

After the approach "Designer" comes next the “Crossbreeding” third approach. This last step consists of the results junction of the "Designer" with the "Learner" approaches.

3.3. Crossbreeding Approach

From this approach already appeared orientations as to model of the e-learning document design. The crossbreeding of the "Learner" and "Designer" approaches has allowed us to identify two types of "quality" criteria extracts with different of analysis techniques and methods. The crossbreeding results showed that cleared criteria of the "Designer" approach are validated and completed by the "Learner" approach cleared criteria, with some analogies and differences. We highlight here some as well as solutions that have been proposed:

- Unlike the "designer" approach, we have seen a point of view inversion where social stake premium over technical or technological solution. The Designer must consider the learner mode and standard of living, including their budget constraints.
- As to spatiotemporal constraints raised in the "Learner" approach, we have identified the interoperability and reusability criteria proposed by the "Designer". These are standardization stakes that allow make the techniques all interoperable between them to facilitate the use of pedagogicals sequences and resources on all e-learning platforms [6] and [7]. The stakes are considerable for the designer who can reuse courses already designed and available in the catalogs.
- We also note that almost all of the learners and designers point to the mediatization. They claim that is useless to have a distance course if we do not care mediatization which is indispensable to influence the dropout rates.
- We have cleared the differences and similarities between both types of criteria.

3.4. Decider Approach

The primary objective of this approach is to validate -or not- the crossbreeding results of the "Learner" and "Designer" approaches. The "Decider" approach allows us to interview and identify the need for help in decision making.

After a comparative analysis of the tabulation results of both groups of the "Decider" approach; from the deciders voice are extracted key points which are grouped together in order to determine limited expectations or expectations classes.

The analysis is carried out a qualitative analysis of the content type semantic. We extracted some interviews sequences concerning the salient results, particular the e-learning document availability in Sport, their reusability, learners and teachers satisfaction, the role and the position of each actor in the design process, storyboarding, mediatization, services, platforms availability and learners budgetary constraints that limit their access to e-learning document.
We then cruciate the results of this approach with those obtained in the "Crossbreeding" process and we have got the results illustrated in the table 4.

4. Data Collection Method

We have opted for the EBAHIE method (Listening to the needs and expectations and their prioritization) that combines the qualitative and quantitative tools which are absolutely complementary.

This method results from work conducted in the Communication Sciences laboratory at the Valenciennes and Hainaut Cambresis University, in a reflection on the qualification and quality measurability context. It includes a campaign taking field data starting at interviews or questionnaires. At this experience, the protocol L.D.D proves to robust method to combine several sources of information by putting in synergy several approaches and tools to achieve results in pertinent and exhaustive on the problematic posed.

5. Data Taken

5.1. Learner Approach

The table 1 shows the total strength distribution of learners. Only the learners effective who answered the questionnaire is considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garcons</th>
<th>Nombre</th>
<th>Pourcentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filles</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 1. Learners number and percentage who answered the questionnaire |

The table 2 shows the number and percentage of boys and girls who responded to the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Effectif Total Des Apprenants</th>
<th>Nombre De Questionnaires Remplis</th>
<th>Pourcentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNS My Rachid-IRFC-Rabat-MAROC</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPS-FSMS-UVHC-Valenciennes-France</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Deux Institutions</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 2. Number and percentage of boys and girls who responded to the questionnaire |

5.2. Designer Approach

The "Designer" approach is a qualitative field study through a semi-structured interview, with two designers groups. This phase is performed in two steps.

The first group is composed of 20 professors and researchers from the Moroccan University Mohammed V Rabat (National School of Applied Informatics and Systems (ENSIAS), Mohammedia School of Engineers (EMI), School of Sciences of the information (ESI), National School of Applied Statistics (ENSA) and the Institute of Arabization (IA)). The interviews were over seven months, from May 2010 to November 2010.

The second group is composed of 20 research professors and researchers of the French University - UVHC-FSMS-STAPS-Valenciennes. The interviews were over three months, from December 2012 to February 2012.

We have taken into consideration all designers available both to Group I and Group II, which are of the order of 20 [8].
5.3. Decider Approach

The "Decider" approach consists of a qualitative study through an interview free, with two groups of Deciders. This phase is performed in two steps:

- "Group I": the first Moroccan group is represented by the director of IRFC Institute in Rabat.
- "Group II" the second French group is compound the responsible for Virtual University in Nord-Pas-de-Calais region, the Information Systems director at UVHC, and the pedagogic director at FSMS Faculty.

6. Data Collection Techniques

6.1. Learner Approach: Conduct of the Questionnaire

The main data collection technique for this approach has been the survey by the questionnaire. The questionnaire is composed of open and closed questions. This type of questionnaire should ideally include simple and easy questions to reduce the possibility of subjective interpretation and allow for more explicit criteria. The layout of the questionnaire is also very important for learner to ensure a maximum efficiency. The Closed questions are designed to determine the learner’s percentage who have access to distance course, having meet difficulties in the training phase and that solicit monitoring with a tutor. Open questions incite learners to freely express their viewpoints. This questionnaire aims to understand their perception to propose recommendations to e-learning document designers.

6.2. Designer & Decider Approaches: Interview Progress

An appointment was fixed with each designers group. During the interview, we started with a brief description of the interview guide insisting on the goal. This guide was composed of open questions with raises to incite the interviewee to express himself freely. We took notes and simultaneously we recorded the verbatim on a tape recorder to be protected from oblivion. Primary data are afterwards retranscribed on text. The retranscription was performed immediately after each interview before the details memory will not be erased.

7. Data Counting Techniques

7.1. Learner Approach

A qualitative method is used to perform the corresponding counting questionnaires. The analysis tools than, we have chosen the statistical analysis data tools, especially Excel or SPSS for the closed questions and qualitative tools. For the opened questions, we used especially Weft QDA. Our analysis technique is the one concerning the user and which bears respectively on a statistical analysis of the words to define the percentage, and the other one concerning the content analysis. We achieved a comparative study from the both learners groups results.

Combining both of these results allowed us to elaborate a single "Learner" approach quality, with a view to e-learning document design.

7.2. Designer Approach

Having recorded verbatim interviewed, we transcribed them on files (*.doc) and imported as format (*.pdf) in WeftQDA software (only TXT or PDF formats are read by WeftQDA). We looked for passages expressing explicitly or implicitly a need. WeftQDA allows to create some categories and sub-categories as shown in Fig.2. Each category comprises an idea and one that transcribed as faithfully as possible what was really said. We had therefore, at the end of the transcripts of all verbatim, several hundred categories to classify. These categories were grouped by means of affinities diagram.
We have had the designer’s feedback experience on how learners have seen and used the e-learning document in Sport. Some experiences were mentioned as part of various projects [9].

The results junction of the "Designer" approach allowed us to regroup and identify key points. All interviewee expressions were grouped by conceptual and semantic affinity. We will convert them in users expectations and expectations of classes.

### 7.2. Translation into Users Expectations

The voice analysis of each interviewee has led to operate a semantic classification to 18 groups by conceptual affinities. Those rankings correspond to the designers needs key points. These key points are translated to designer’s expectations. In this conversion, the requirements have been expressed in functions positive terms to satisfy rather than in terms of concrete solution, while avoiding the abstractions [4].

For formulate expectations, we chose more the quotes that reflect a nuanced thought, to have more flexibility in searching for designer satisfaction.

### 7.2.2. Defining Expectations Classes (Criteria)

The most meaningful expectations are grouped once again according to their proximity, into four major expectations classes (Table.3). We represent on this table the crossbreeding results of both "Designer" approaches, the identified key points, expectations and their grouping into expectations classes. This will allow us to identify the criteria taken into account during the e-learning document elaboration thus than the designers conceptual approaches of this document.

### 7.3. Decider Approach

From the Deciders Voice are extracted key points, grouped to determine limited expectations or expectations classes. The analysis is carried out a qualitative analysis of the semantic content type. We extracted some conversations sequences of about the salient results, including the e-learning document availability in sports, their reusability, learners and teachers satisfaction, the role and the position of each player in the design process, storyboard, mediatization, e-learning platforms services and availability as well as the learners budgetary constraints that limit their access over distance. We then crossed these results with those obtained in the “Crossbreeding” approach. These results are illustrated in the table.4.
8. The Protocol “L.D.D” Results

In the light of the protocol "L.D.D "Learner" "Designer" "Decider", we noted that one of the first difficulties lies in the vocabulary to obtain a serene and simple comprehension of a new concept. Regarding e-learning, the words abundance, abbreviations, acronyms competitors—and for most practically synonyms—used in recent years by sector actors to designate this new way training, cannot fail to sow confusion and doubt in the minds: e-learning document, online courses, resource, course support … e-learning, e-training, opened and distance learning (ODL), information and communications technology for education (ICTE), teaching computer assisted (EAO), new educational technologies (NET), new information and communications technology (NICT), information and communications technology (ICT): so many expressions variants used today to describe a different method of training or learning of classical training.

E-learning, online courses, resources, training material: four different terms to refer, under various names, supports transmission and acquisition of knowledge and skills. Toward which orient themselves?

Note that in French "course" may be used according to a double meaning: from the professor angle who gives the course and from the learner angle who receives the document. The French language lacks of precision here. Indeed, it means by the same term two separate concepts. A real e-learning document or quality e-learning document, it is use all the content educational aspects and tutoring: courses, Tutorial classes, Practical works, online supervision in real time, videoconference, chat and synchronous or asynchronous forums. We do not find the nowhere in the UVHC and even in France, where only 4% of e-learning document have been developed in some fields but not in Sport field. All that is available is the Learning web page download documents. There is no tutoring. These are only support course that are posted on format (*.ppt) (*.doc) or (*.pdf) which are not real e-learning documents. We note that no distance course is then created, even if the technology infrastructure is very well developed in France! The designers pedagogical have estimated happy to deposit course supports on the Moodle e-learning platform; what does not represent a correspondence course or an online course. The results collected during the qualitative phase confirm and complement those obtained in the quantitative phase. The protocol developed allows us to identify the quality criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points clés</th>
<th>Attentes</th>
<th>Classes d'attentes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shaming of the course</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demanding the course different to a running or at last</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Practical &quot;Learner&quot; makes a decision &quot;Designer&quot; &quot;Decider&quot;</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of a common vocabulary</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Influence of the learner</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Development of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use of a common vocabulary</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Use of a common vocabulary</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Norms and standards</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Influence of the observer</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
<td>Scenarisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Key points translation to expectations and expectations classes
It is obvious that, whatever the equipment, connection speeds and the learning interfaces ergonomics, to certain criteria "quality" e-learning document remain the key values for success. It is not just about transmission of educational supports for the current information technology and communication upsetting all the usual frameworks from the training. No matter the technology forward, producing an e-learning document is first and foremost a matter of satisfying the learners needs and expectations who are the product end users. Produce a course on e-learning being is first and foremost a question of storyboarding content and intellectual rigor face the mediation requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteres</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Identifier les besoins des apprenants et des enseignants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Définir le cadre de la formation, de l’organisation, du public utile, les objectifs pédagogiques de la formation et les ressources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaborer le cahier des charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Séminarisation</td>
<td>Découvrir le contenu en préhension pédagogiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spécifier des objectifs qui doivent être atteints à la fin d’exécution de chaque séquence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Définir les droits d’accès pour chaque séquence pédagogique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Médiation</td>
<td>Spécifier à chaque séquence pédagogique un type et une description des médias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intégrer à chaque séquence pédagogique un type et une description des médias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intégration</td>
<td>Implémenter ou gérer le contenu par un éditeur standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Déployer le contenu sur une plateforme e-learning conformément aux normes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Médiation</td>
<td>Produire le document dans un environnement 'Interface Human Machine' (IHM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Results of the Crossbreeding approaches of protocol L.D.D

9. Model L.D.D Elaboration

In order to model the e-learning document quality and as opposed to deductive approaches of other authors, our approach is based on empirical data which make the originality of this scientific research. Concretely, Unlike the linear model inspired by [3] based on an approach motivated by technical aspects, as we noted in the state of the art, our model is mainly characterized by a closed loop process and an empirical approach and multi-actorial (Learner, Designer and Decider) based on reality. Also, it is from the Learners, Designer and Decider needs and expectations analysis, that we have identified the "quality" criteria that contribute to the model elaboration, in which the learner occupies the central place. Indeed, it is no longer a single process but three processes including mediation, production and standardization (Fig.3).

We highlight the relationship between the mediation process and the production process or the e-learning document standardization process. Therefore, our empirical experiences, the results protocol L.D.D and several theoretical references, we used to lead to the development of our model L.D.D design e-learning document quality.

These results showed that mediation, by its very nature is fundamental, stressing the continuities in the forms of mediation upstream and downstream of the e-learning document design process. Mediation is omnipresent:

1) Mediation,
2) Storyboarding,
3) Mediatization,
4) Integration,
5) Mediation.
10. General Conclusion

The protocol results highlighting often the question is asked of production upside down. Instead of wondering about the learners needs and expectations, the designer strives to provide most recent and most sophisticated technologies that may not be suitable for the end users who are these learners. It follows that our starting hypothesis is validated and that the adoption of a quality approach imposed a viewpoint of inversion where the user need satisfaction premium in any form of technological determinism.

Our experiences and our protocol L.D.D results analyzes converge to prove that the improved e-learning document bears essentially on the document restructuring, the content and tutoring, not redefining and reconstructing of learner activities. It is not a question to promot of such e-learning synchronous or asynchronous mode to maintain a human dimension. It is not a matter either to incorporate this or that type of the media or generate 3D animations, but it is a content restructuring and storyboarding. The combination of the CIS and e-learning has given us new perspectives for arouse a new pedagogy, keeping the learner in the center of the e-learning document quality design process. It's very interesting to take into account the interactions and relations well as the mediation usefulness induced by the content, content structuring, tutoring and by the necessity of grouping physical.

The role is reversed in e-learning, the learner is the main actor. The learner may be lost in the slew of competitors on the market. The question arises for content designers: on what platform to invest? The risk is that designers and learners prefer "common denominators" that are found from one model to another. Since the available Web applications without any downloads and compatible with all platforms. He made his choice based on the e-learning document quality if its profile allows [11]. As a result, learners synchronously promote e-learning to maintain a human dimension, and asynchronously to maintain its pace of learning. Asynchronous mode allows the learner to view the content when he wants and when he can. It is not necessary to be in a particular geographic location to learn.

The role of the teacher makes perfect sense. He must by its function be the guide. A trusted guide for learners to reaper, identify some resources and increase the curiosity. The teacher challenge is to give learners some keys for using the web and its resources.

As to the “Decider” to design an e-learning space in an institution must be seen as a project fully fledged. One is being placed in a project approach, it is easier to understand the support necessity from the “Deciders”, information / training all project stakeholders, risks and costs calculate and also the objectives at the term short medium and long. This strategy allows to succeed a leading change because all of the institution actors are concerned and informed. They are more confident and more involved.

By opposition to others approaches motivated by of the technical, technological or media aspects, especially that of [12] and [13] that have long defended a distinction between mediation of the pedagogical relation and the mediatization content. And unlike to what often hear, "Teach at distance is necessarily resort of the mediatized systems" or "If the distance involves technology”. These last, allow back to articulate the distance and presence. Indeed, it is not more only from posting pedagogical mediatized resources on a network like a mailbox. It's a real work who undertakes therefore rigor, rights and duties.
Our posture thus departs the approaches that reduce the design process only on the mediation and the mediatization. Our empirical approach is based on the reality. We insist that everything is a matter of the content "mediation and storyboarding" [10]. The scenario must be well designed in the light of all issues relating to learner profile, the training objectives and the content nature that we want to teach. Every judicious use of a media whatsoever, is tributary a deeper reflection on what we desires to transmit to the learner. Whether training sequences written on paper or posted online, audiovisual sequences, those operating micro-computing or any other media, the efficiency of a good sequence resides in the fact that it will have been neatly scenarized accordance with the learner expectations.

This is where the great challenge of producing an e-learning document. That's the reason for which it is important to have a solid expertise in the field. The most of designers still working the traditional way, as for the classroom training that means, they mix the content and the form. The e-learning design document requires rigorous processes as indicated below.

Our Study aims to contribute to the university reforms in progress at the profit of a political favoring better responsivenee of education to the learners and society expectations and needs. We therefore hope that this paper content will facilitate the task to anyone and all those who engage in this great challenge of designing an e-learning document. Must than Deciders and designers incorporate a priori, the learners and the teachers in the e-learning document conceptual modeling.
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