Moody, V. (2026). Quality Assurance in Online Graduate Programs: Balancing Institutional Standards, Frameworks, and Models: A Review of Literature. *Journal of Online Graduate Education*, *9*(2), 84–96. https://doi.org/10.65201/001c.172018

LITERATURE REVIEW ARTICLES

Quality Assurance in Online Graduate Programs: Balancing Institutional Standards, Frameworks, and Models: A Review of Literature

Vernice Moody, PhD[1]

[1] National University

Keywords: quality assurance, online graduate education, institutional standards, evidence-based frameworks, centralized and decentralized governance

https://doi.org/10.65201/001c.172018

Journal of Online Graduate Education

Vol. 9, Issue 2, 2026

This article examines how Quality Assurance (QA) in online graduate programs helps institutions sustain academic rigor, consistency, learner support, accessibility, and continuous improvement. As online graduate education expands, institutions face increasing pressure to demonstrate that online programs meet standards comparable to face-to-face instruction while also addressing the distinctive pedagogical, technological, and support needs of online learners. The review synthesizes scholarship on institutional QA standards, evidence-based frameworks, and governance models that shape online program quality. The literature suggests that effective QA systems rely on transparent policies, alignment with institutional mission, faculty preparation, stakeholder engagement, accessibility practices, data-informed evaluation, and regular course and program review. The review also compares centralized and decentralized QA models, noting that centralized approaches promote consistency, accountability, and accreditation readiness. In contrast, decentralized approaches support disciplinary flexibility, faculty ownership, and responsiveness to local program needs. Overall, the findings indicate that online graduate programs benefit most from a balanced QA approach that combines institution-wide standards with adaptable, evidence-based practices that support continuous improvement and meaningful learning outcomes.

Keywords: quality assurance; online graduate education; institutional standards; evidence-based frameworks; centralized and decentralized governance

Quality Assurance (QA) in higher education is a systematic process of continuous evaluation, monitoring, and improvement through which an institution ensures that its academic programs and learning environments meet formally established standards. This process involves structured activities to identify areas of concern, implement controls, and make adjustments that sustain and enhance the quality of the educational experience. QA in online graduate education extends beyond individual course design to institutional policies, leadership, faculty preparation, student services, and data-driven improvement. QA also centers on how institutions ensure rigor, integrity, equity, and measurable learning outcomes in digital environments (Ai Tran et al., 2025). Research in this area is rapidly expanding because online graduate enrollment continues to grow while standards vary widely across institutions.

QA processes enable institutions to demonstrate that online programs meet standards comparable to face-to-face instruction while also accounting for the distinctive pedagogical, technological, and support requirements of online learners (Rockwell, 2025). Allen and Seaman's (2017) previous research noted that the share of higher education students enrolling in distance education has risen steadily over the past several years. This sustained increase highlights the expanding role of online learning and reinforces the importance of rigorous QA frameworks.

The rise of online education and transnational education has posed new challenges and opportunities for QA (Mtitu, 2025). Recent scholars identified several recurring challenges that institutions must address when designing QA systems for online programs. Higher education needs to sustain student engagement and motivation, protect assessment integrity and academic honesty, bridge the digital divide, and ensure online learning contributes to broader institutional goals for educational quality, relevance, and competitiveness. Effective QA systems enhance the quality and relevance of higher education, ultimately contributing to socio-economic development and global competitiveness (Mtitu, 2025; Nagy, 2025). The article offers a literature review demonstrating how QA underpins the credibility and effectiveness of online graduate programs by analyzing institutional standards, comparing evidence-based QA frameworks, and evaluating the strengths and limitations of centralized and decentralized governance models in sustaining academic quality.

Methodology

The literature search followed a structured, iterative process to identify scholarship and practice-based evidence on quality assurance in online graduate education. Searches were conducted in EBSCO Discovery, ProQuest, ERIC, and Google Scholar using combinations of the terms online learning, quality assurance, institutional standards, quality assurance frameworks, quality assurance models, online program evaluation, distance education standards, graduate programs, evidence-based quality frameworks, centralized governance, decentralized governance, and Pedagogical theories. Boolean operators and phrase searching refined the results, including "online learning" AND "quality assurance," "graduate programs" AND "quality assurance," "online graduate programs" AND "quality assurance," "distance education" AND "institutional standards," and "quality assurance frameworks" AND "higher education." Publication dates were limited primarily to 2020–2026, although foundational standards and widely cited earlier frameworks were retained when directly relevant.

Sources considered included peer-reviewed journal articles and literature reviews. Inclusion criteria required sources to be written in English, demonstrate clear relevance to online learning quality assurance and graduate programs, address institutional standards, evidence-based frameworks, and governance models, and provide either a coherent research design or a credible practice-based foundation. Sources were excluded when they lacked direct

relevance to online or distance education, graduate programs that did not address quality assurance, institutional standards, evidence-based frameworks, or governance models not available in full text, or contexts that could not reasonably inform higher education practice. The quality and relevance of sources were evaluated according to publication venue, author credibility, methodological transparency, alignment with the research focus, and contribution to the three thematic domains of the review: Institutional Standards, Evidence-Based Frameworks, and Centralized and Decentralized Governance Models.

Literature Review

The literature regarding online graduate QA begins with the pedagogical theory because effective quality systems must be grounded in intentional teaching and learning design. The pedagogical theory systematically aligns instructional decision-making with broader educational purposes while sustaining a commitment to learners' holistic development (Zogla, 2018). QA constitutes a systematic framework for evaluating quality across higher education systems, institutions, and academic programs (Mostafavi & Ramezani, 2026). Applied to online graduate education, this framework promotes academic rigor, accessibility, learner support, and continuous improvement by aligning learning outcomes, instructional materials, assessments, interaction, technology, and student services. This alignment provides a basis for determining whether online instruction yields outcomes comparable to face-to-face education while addressing persistent challenges related to equitable access, engagement, and assessment (Rockwell, 2025). QA extends beyond regulatory compliance to advance institutional accountability, innovation, growth, and responsiveness to evolving learner and societal needs (Mtitu, 2025; Širec & Rožman, 2025).

This literature review indicates that effective QA in online graduate education depends on integrating three interdependent components: institutional standards, evidence-based frameworks, and centralized and decentralized governance models (Sener, 2006; Zimmerman et al., 2020). Standards articulate normative expectations, and evidence-based frameworks operationalize them through measurable criteria, yet governance models further distinguish how centralized units (e.g., provost-level QA offices) versus decentralized arrangements (e.g., program-level oversight) allocate the authority and accountability required for implementation (Chen et al., 2025; Gorostidi & Rubio-Arostegui, 2026). These strands of research are often examined independently, limiting understanding of how they operate together as a coherent institutional system.

Institutional Standards

Institutional standards define the expectations, responsibilities, and indicators through which online graduate programs demonstrate quality and accountability. Higher education institutions must demonstrate a sustained commitment to educational quality to remain competitive in an increasingly

global academic landscape. By articulating and upholding rigorous standards, institutions strengthen their reputation, build student trust, and position themselves in a crowded, internationally competitive marketplace (Ai Tran et al., 2025).

Across the research, several consistent dimensions of QA in online higher education have emerged. Britto et al. (2013) highlighted the importance of shared standards, targeted professional development, adequate resources, and organization-wide responsibility. These findings illustrate how shared standards and institutional support structures function as stabilizing mechanisms in environments where instructional variability is high. Building on this foundation, Staring et al. (2022) examined the growing recognition among QA agencies and higher education institutions that digital learning environments may require distinct standards and evaluation processes. The analysis showed that institutions acted with urgency to digital modes of instruction and performance indicators. This work highlighted the importance of systematically articulated criteria that ensure technological robustness, instructional alignment, and equitable learning outcomes.

Complementing these perspectives, Rini et al. (2025) provided a systematic review of peer-reviewed studies that identifies four interdependent conditions underpinning effective QA systems in online higher education: alignment with institutional mission, continuous improvement cycles, active stakeholder engagement, and strategic use of data. These conditions operate as mutually reinforcing mechanisms that sustain evaluative rigor and institutional coherence. Gorostidi and Rubio-Arostegui (2026) extended the discussion by examining how QA systems influence institutional culture, governance, and academic practices. Their synthesis demonstrated that formal QA policies contribute to structural convergence across universities, promoting shared norms and values that support a broader culture of quality. This cultural dimension highlights the role of QA in shaping internal expectations, reinforcing collective responsibility, and embedding quality-oriented behaviors within everyday academic work. Their findings suggest QA systems exert influence beyond formal evaluation processes, shaping the institutional ethos that underpins teaching and learning.

The reviewed studies also reveal inconsistencies in how quality is conceptualized, operationalized, and enacted across institutions. These inconsistencies highlight areas where QA remains contested, unevenly implemented, or insufficiently theorized. Allen and Seaman (2017) noted that variability in QA standards across institutions remains a central concern in online graduate education. Although many institutions now offer online graduate programs, they often rely on different criteria, review processes, and accountability structures to define and evaluate quality, resulting in inconsistent expectations and uneven implementation of QA practices. Britto et al.'s (2013) research noted that standards bring greater stability to teaching

quality among instructors with uneven digital preparedness. Staring et al. (2022) argued that digital learning cannot be effectively evaluated using frameworks designed for traditional, face-to-face instruction.

Britto et al. (2013) treated technology primarily as a challenge for faculty, something instructors may lack the time or comfort to adopt. Staring et al. (2022), however, positioned technology as a structural dimension of quality requiring rigorous evaluation, technological robustness, and alignment with pedagogical goals. Rini et al. (2025) emphasized that coherent policies and clearly articulated processes serve as structural anchors for accountability, enabling institutions to demonstrate quality, respond to emerging needs, and maintain public trust. The review positioned QA not as a compliance activity but as an ongoing, evidence-driven process that shapes institutional responsiveness and adaptability. Gorostidi and Rubio-Arostegui (2026) shifted toward examining whether QA is understood primarily as a technical-procedural system or as a cultural-organizational force that reshapes institutional identity.

Zimmerman et al. (2020) introduced a critical inconsistency by demonstrating that the existence of standards does not guarantee their effective application. The findings highlighted substantial variation in how institutions interpret, implement, and assess quality standards in practice. The researchers argued that meaningful QA requires structured training in online pedagogy, adoption of validated design protocols, and systematic quality reviews elements not uniformly emphasized in the other studies.

Evidence-Based Frameworks

While institutional standards establish expectations, evidence-based frameworks are needed to translate those expectations into measurable review and continuous-improvement processes. The dimensions these frameworks measure also determine which aspects of graduate education become visible. Mostafavi and Ramezani (2026) offered insights into operationalizing QA through inclusive, evidence-driven evaluation frameworks tailored to the evolving demands of digital higher education environments. The literature discussed five frameworks: Quality Matters (QM), the Online Learning Consortium (OLC) Quality Scorecard, the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework, the Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (C-RAC) Guidelines, and the Open SUNY Course Quality Review (OSCQR).

Mostafavi and Ramezani (2026) noted that QM includes learning objectives, assessment alignment, instructional materials, learner interaction, accessibility, technology use, and learner support. These features should be systematic, transparent, and grounded in research-based design principles rather than left entirely to individual instructor discretion. OLC focuses on institutional support, technology infrastructure, course development, teaching and learning, student support, faculty support, evaluation, and continuous improvement.

CoI evaluates the quality of online learning experiences through teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence. C-RAC Guidelines emphasize institutional mission alignment, curriculum quality, faculty support, student authentication, academic integrity, student services, learning outcomes, and assessment. OSCQR emphasizes accessibility, learner engagement, assessment, instructional materials, technology, interaction, and course navigation (Mostafavi & Ramezani, 2026).

Didkivska and Vakaliuk (2025) indicated that QA frameworks in digital and distance education exhibit a heightened level of conceptual sophistication, reflecting more nuanced and systematic approaches to defining, evaluating, and evidencing instructional quality. The four frameworks discussed included the Planning, Development, Process, Product (PDPP) evaluation model, the Hierarchy-Based analysis approach, the Planning, Analysis, Designing, Improvement, Confirmation, and Application (PADICA) model, and the Unified quality control model. The PDPP evaluation model includes planning evaluation, which assesses market demand, student demographics, and course objectives, and development evaluation, which covers instructional design, course materials, and website design. The process evaluation monitors technical support, website utilization, and learning interaction. The product evaluation measures student satisfaction, teaching effectiveness, learning outcomes, and program sustainability (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025).

The Hierarchy-based analysis approach evaluates blended learning quality by focusing on student engagement across three dimensions. Behavioral engagement involves participation in learning activities. Emotional engagement involves affective responses to learning experiences. Cognitive engagement includes investment in comprehending complex ideas and mastering skills (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025).

The PADICA model, as described by Didkivska and Vakaliuk (2025), outlines steps for distance learning: strategic preparation for learning experiences, needs assessment and contextual examination, creation of learning experiences and materials, ongoing refinement based on evidence validation of approaches and outcomes, and implementation in authentic contexts. The model also emphasizes the "four Cs": competencies in critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration. This framework revealed improvements in critical thinking and creative skills among students when weekly e-learning activities were structured around industry needs.

Didkivska and Vakaliuk (2025) noted that the Unified quality control model involves total quality management in e-learning systems. The framework includes QA policies formalized through policy-based approaches. The approaches include e-learning platform specifications for teaching and learning activities, and quality control process loops for continuous improvement.

Although institutional standards define expectations for quality, evidence-based frameworks differ in how they translate those expectations into measurable review processes and continuous-improvement practices. Across the literature, the frameworks share a multidimensional conception of quality that integrates pedagogy, technology, assessment integrity, accessibility, learner support, and iterative evaluation. However, they vary in scope and unit of analysis. QM, OLC, CoI, C-RAC, and OSCQR emphasize course design, learning experience, or institutional readiness, whereas PDPP, Hierarchy-based, PADICA, and Unified Quality Control models organize QA around evaluation stages, engagement dimensions, or systemwide management processes (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025; Mostafavi & Ramezani, 2026).

QM and OLC both promote systematic, transparent, and research-informed quality review, but they operate at distinct levels. QM concentrates primarily on course design through criteria such as learning objectives, assessment alignment, instructional materials, learner interaction, accessibility, technology use, and learner support. By contrast, OLC adopts a broader institutional perspective encompassing organizational support, technology infrastructure, course development, teaching and learning, student and faculty support, evaluation, and continuous improvement. Thus, QM offers detailed guidance for aligning components within an individual course, whereas OLC situates course quality within the institutional structures required to sustain online education (Mostafavi & Ramezani, 2026).

CoI, C-RAC, and OSCQR similarly address online learning quality but foreground different dimensions. CoI is primarily experiential, evaluating teaching, social, and cognitive presence as interdependent conditions for meaningful online learning. C-RAC is more regulatory and institutionally oriented, emphasizing mission alignment, curriculum quality, faculty support, student authentication, academic integrity, student services, learning outcomes, and assessment. OSCQR, like QM, is course-focused and emphasizes accessibility, learner engagement, assessment, instructional materials, technology, interaction, and navigation. Consequently, CoI explains the relational processes that support learning, C-RAC establishes institution-level expectations, and OSCQR provides practical criteria for reviewing course design (Mostafavi & Ramezani, 2026).

In contrast to these standards- and criteria-based frameworks, the models examined by Didkivska and Vakaliuk (2025) emphasized how quality is evaluated and improved over time. The PDPP evaluation model, hierarchy-based analysis approach, PADICA model, and Unified Quality Control model reflect greater procedural differentiation: PDPP organizes evaluation across the program life cycle, the hierarchy-based approach concentrates on dimensions of student engagement, PADICA links instructional development to iterative validation and application, and the Unified Quality

Control model embeds QA within total quality management. Although their emphases differ, all four models treat quality as an evidence-driven and continuously developing process rather than a static benchmark.

PDPP and the hierarchy-based analysis approach differ in their units of analysis. PDPP evaluates an online program sequentially: planning addresses market demand, student demographics, and course objectives; development examines instructional design, course materials, and website design; process considers technical support, website use, and learning interaction; and product measures student satisfaction, teaching effectiveness, learning outcomes, and program sustainability (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025).

By comparison, the hierarchy-based approach assesses the quality of blended learning through behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement. PDPP offers a comprehensive life-cycle evaluation of program design and performance. In contrast, the hierarchy-based approach provides a more focused account of how students participate in, respond to, and cognitively invest in learning (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025). PADICA shares PDPP's staged orientation but emphasizes iterative instructional development. Its phases—planning, analysis, designing, improvement, confirmation, and application—move from strategic preparation and needs assessment to the creation, validation, refinement, and authentic implementation of learning experiences. Unlike the hierarchy-based approach, which evaluates engagement as an outcome of the learning environment, PADICA embeds critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration within the design process itself. It reported improvements in critical and creative skills when weekly e-learning activities were aligned with industry needs, illustrating how the model connects iterative course development with competency-based outcomes (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025).

Systemwide orientation distinguishes the Unified Quality Control model. Rather than concentrating on specific course criteria, learner experiences, or discrete evaluation stages, it applies total quality management to e-learning through formal QA policies, specifications for teaching and learning platforms, and closed-loop quality-control processes for continuous improvement (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025). Collectively, the frameworks complement one another: QM and OSCQR provide actionable course-design criteria; CoI and the hierarchy-based approach illuminate learner experience and engagement; C-RAC and OLC connect quality to institutional responsibilities; and PDPP, PADICA, and the Unified Quality Control model structure evaluation and improvement over time. Their differences demonstrate that no single framework addresses every dimension of online education; instead, a comprehensive QA strategy requires the coordinated use of course-level standards, learner-centered evidence, institutional oversight, and iterative improvement processes (Didkivska & Vakaliuk, 2025; Mostafavi & Ramezani, 2026).

Centralized and Decentralized Governance Models

Because frameworks cannot determine their own authority or use, the analysis shifts from what quality systems measure to who controls their implementation. Governance structures authorize, adapt, and enforce standards, with their effectiveness depending on how authority is distributed between central institutions and local academic units (Nagy, 2025).

The education literature often conceptualizes centralization as a governance mechanism designed to enforce uniform policy implementation, uphold nationally defined standards, and maintain consistent QA practices across diverse regional contexts (As-Siddiqi & El-Bukhary, 2025). These systems can support equitable funding, policy coherence, accountability, and accreditation readiness, but they may also become metric-driven and compliance-focused when implementation emphasizes standardization over local adaptation (Chen et al., 2025). These systems can support equitable funding, policy coherence, accountability, and accreditation readiness, but they may also become metric-driven and compliance-focused when implementation emphasizes standardization over local adaptation (Chen et al., 2025).

The literature presents decentralization as a governance approach that shifts authority from national or central bodies to local governments, schools, programs, and community stakeholders, enabling educational decisions to reflect specific social, cultural, disciplinary, and economic contexts (As-Siddiqi & El-Bukhary, 2025). Decentralized systems are often trust-based and formative because they rely on local participation, institutional autonomy, and shared responsibility rather than compliance alone (Chen et al., 2025).

Decentralized systems often emphasize self-evaluation and community accountability, which can strengthen local responsibility while reducing comparability across programs or institutions. Chen et al. (2025) similarly suggested that decentralized approaches promote local quality standards, institutional trust, and professional responsibility rather than mere compliance. Decentralization is also associated with increased flexibility in curriculum design, pedagogical experimentation, and school-level management practices. This autonomy can foster context-responsive approaches that better align with learner needs and local priorities (As-Siddiqi & El-Bukhary, 2025).

In contrast, the literature cautions that centralized models can limit local innovation and responsiveness to community or program-specific needs. Reduced autonomy may slow adaptation to regional challenges, including bilingual education, rural infrastructure needs, or disciplinary differences that require more tailored quality practices (As-Siddiqi & El-Bukhary, 2025). Research by As-Siddiqi and El-Bukhary (2025) also indicated that centralized systems often rely on standardized testing, inspections, and compliance measures to ensure institutions meet shared expectations. Decentralization

may exacerbate resource disparities, particularly between urban and rural areas, and can lead to uneven educational quality when local capacity varies significantly across regions.

The literature also suggests that neither centralized nor decentralized QA models are sufficient on their own. Centralized models strengthen consistency, accreditation readiness, policy coherence, and institutional accountability, while decentralized models support disciplinary flexibility, faculty ownership, innovation, and responsiveness to program-level needs. The most effective approach for online graduate education is a balanced QA model that combines institution-wide standards with adaptable, evidence-based practices. Such a model allows institutions to document quality, respond to learner needs, reduce inconsistency across programs, and sustain continuous improvement in online graduate education (As-Siddiqi & El-Bukhary, 2025; Chen et al., 2025).

The article connects the three concepts by showing that institutional standards establish shared expectations for quality, while evidence-based frameworks translate those expectations into measurable practices and continuous-improvement processes. Governance models determine how those standards and frameworks are implemented: centralized approaches promote consistency and accountability, decentralized approaches support flexibility and local ownership, and a balanced hybrid model integrates the strengths of both.

Limitation

This review was limited by the availability and consistency of information on how online programs monitor course quality and instructor effectiveness. Because QA practices vary across institutions, platforms, and program types, the findings may not fully capture the range of approaches used to maintain and improve online learning experiences. Future studies should examine QA in online education across diverse institutions, disciplines, learner populations, and features of graduate studies to improve the findings' generalizability.

Conclusion

Online learning emerged as a central and enduring feature of contemporary higher education, expanding access to academic opportunities and reshaping traditional pathways to degree completion. In an increasingly competitive online education landscape, higher education institutions must move beyond the mere provision of online programs and engage in rigorous, systematic processes for evaluating, substantiating, and communicating program quality. Such efforts are essential for strengthening institutional accountability, fostering stakeholder confidence, and preserving the legitimacy and long-term credibility of online education as a viable mode of postsecondary learning.

This review's principal scholarly contribution is an integrated, multilevel account of QA in online graduate education. Rather than treating institutional standards, evidence-based frameworks, and governance models as separate lines of inquiry, the review demonstrates how they function as interdependent components of a coherent quality system: standards define expected outcomes, frameworks operationalize those expectations through evaluative criteria and improvement processes, and governance models allocate authority and accountability for implementation. This synthesis also distinguishes course-level design quality from program-level and institution-level quality, showing that established frameworks such as QM, OLC, CoI, C-RAC, OSCQR, PDPP, and PADICA illuminate complementary dimensions of quality but do not, individually, capture the full complexity of graduate education.

Submitted: August 07, 2026 EST. Accepted: September 22, 2026 EST. Published: November 13, 2026 EST.

References

Ai Tran, C., Van, D. H., Thuy Phuong Nguyen, T., Thi Thanh Nguyen, T., & Minh Nguyen, T. (2025). Research in higher education quality assurance worldwide (2003–2023): a bibliometric analysis from the Scopus database. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2479405

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2017). *Digital learning compass: Distance education enrollment report 2017*. Babson Survey Research Group. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED580868.pdf

As-Siddiqi, H., & El-Bukhary, A. (2025). Comparative Studies on Educational Governance: Balancing Centralization and Decentralization in Global Contexts. *Innovative Journal of Educational Research and Insights*, *2*(3), 123–134. https://ojs.bustanilmu.com/index.php/IJERI/article/view/101/56

Britto, M., Ford, C., & Wise, J. M. (2013). Three Institutions, Three Approaches, One Goal: Addressing Quality Assurance in Online Learning. *Online Learning*, *17*(4). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v17i4.402

Chen, L., Zhang, S., & Saharuddin, N. (2025). Crosscultural perspectives on online teaching evaluation practices in higher education: A comparative case study. *International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.4018/IJTEPD.396003

Didkivska, S. O., & Vakaliuk, T. A. (2025). State of the art approaches to the quality of distance education. *Educational Technology Quarterly*, *2025*(1). https://doi.org/10.55056/etq.766

Gorostidi, G., & Rubio-Arostegui, J. (2026). Quality management in higher education from the perspective of institutional isomorphism: a scoping review. *Frontiers in Education*, *10*, 1720224. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1720224

Mostafavi, Z. S., & Ramezani, S. G. (2026). Internal quality assessment from theory to practice: A case study of a fully electronic university. *Educ Inf Technol*, *31*, 2567–2598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-026-13904-6

Mtitu, E. A. (2025). Exploring factors for the introduction and implementation of quality assurance systems in selected higher education institutions in Tanzania. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2455767

Nagy, G. (2025). Performance Measurement and Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Application of DEA, AHP, and Bayesian Models. *Trends in Higher Education*, *4*(3), 54. https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu4030054

Rini, P. P., Sudadio, S., & Muhyidin, A. (2025). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Best Practices, Challenges, and Future Directions. *PPSDP International Journal of Education*, *4*(2), 1553–1574. https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v4i2.869

Rockwell, R. M. (2025). From Correspondence to Code: Tracing the Evolution and Impact of Online Education. *Ubiquitous Learning: An International Journal*, *19*(1), 45–68. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-9795/CGP/v19i01/45-68

Sener, J. (2006). Quality Matters: Inter-institutional quality improvement for online courses. *Online Learning*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v10i1.1772

Širec, K., & Rožman, M. (2025). Collaborative Leadership for Quality Assurance: A Case Study on Developing a Strategic Quality Manual in Higher Education. *Education Sciences*, *15*(12), 1627. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15121627

Staring, F., Brown, M., Bacsich, P., & Ifenthaler, D. (2022). *Digital higher education: Emerging quality standards, practices and supports* (OECD Education Working Papers No. 281). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/f622f257-en

Zimmerman, W., Altman, B., Simunich, B., Shattuck, K., & Burch, B. (2020). Evaluating online course quality: A study on implementation of course quality standards. *Online Learning*, *24*(4), 147–163. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i4.2325

Zogla, I. (2018). Science of pedagogy: Theory of educational discipline and practice. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, *20*(2), 31–43. https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2018-0013