Open Access

Contemporary Research Analysis Journal

e-ISSN: 3050-5909
p-ISSN: 3050-5895

Volume 03 Issue 02 February 2026
CrossRef DOI: 10.55677/CRAJ/06-2026-Vol03I02

Page no: 122-127

How Do National Education Policies and Quality Assurance Frameworks Influence the Adoption, Governance, and Pedagogical Innovation of Online Teaching, Particularly in Relation to Assessment Practices, Accreditation Processes, and Academic Integrity?

Dr. Robert Liston Omari Otieno[1], Dr. Tabitha Otieno[2], Dr. Benjamin C. Ngwudike[3]
[1]Kisii University, Kenya.
[2,3]Jackson State University, Jackson, Mississippi, USA

ABSTRACT: The rapid institutionalization of online teaching has intensified debates about the role of national education policies and quality assurance (QA) frameworks in shaping educational quality, legitimacy, and innovation. While online teaching offers expanded access and pedagogical flexibility, its effectiveness is profoundly influenced by regulatory environments governing adoption, assessment, accreditation, and academic integrity. This study examines how national education policies and quality assurance frameworks influence the adoption, governance, and pedagogical innovation of online teaching, with particular attention to assessment practices, accreditation processes, and academic integrity. Drawing on a critical review of policy and quality assurance literature, the study analyzed how regulatory frameworks both enable and constrain institutional practices in digitally mediated learning environments. The analysis reveals persistent tensions between standardization and innovation, especially where quality assurance systems remain anchored in face-to-face teaching assumptions. Findings indicate that policy clarity and alignment with institutional capacity are essential for sustainable online teaching, while enhancement-oriented QA frameworks are more effective than compliance-driven models in supporting pedagogical innovation. The study further showed that surveillance-heavy approaches to assessment and academic integrity raise ethical concerns and may undermine trust and learning quality. The paper argues for adaptive, context-sensitive governance models that balance accountability with pedagogical flexibility. By foregrounding the interaction between policy intentions, quality assurance mechanisms, and institutional enactment, the study contributes to ongoing debates on the governance of online teaching and offers policy-relevant insights for strengthening quality, credibility, and innovation in digital higher education.

KEYWORDS: online teaching, education policy, quality assurance, accreditation, assessment, academic integrity, National Education Policies, Quality Assurance Frameworks, and the Governance of Online Teaching

Cite the Article: *Omari Otieno, R. L., Otieno, T., Ngwudike, B.C. (2026). How Do National Education Policies and Quality Assurance Frameworks Influence the Adoption, Governance, and Pedagogical Innovation of Online Teaching, Particularly in Relation to Assessment Practices, Accreditation Processes, and Academic Integrity?. Contemporary Research Analysis Journal, 3(2), 122–127.* https://doi.org/10.55677/CRAJ/06-2026-Vol03I02

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Publication Date: February 27, 2026

**Corresponding Author: Dr. Benjamin C. Ngwudike*

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of online teaching has transformed higher education systems worldwide, shifting digital learning from a peripheral innovation to a core mode of delivery. While this transition has expanded access and flexibility, it has also exposed significant tensions between pedagogical innovation and regulatory control. National education policies and quality assurance frameworks increasingly shape how institutions adopt, govern, and legitimize online teaching, particularly in relation to assessment practices, accreditation processes, and academic integrity. As online education moves beyond emergency adoption toward long-term institutionalization, questions of policy alignment, governance capacity, and quality assurance have become central to debates about credibility and educational standards.

Existing scholarship demonstrates that quality assurance systems were largely developed within face-to-face teaching paradigms and often struggle to accommodate the pedagogical and technological realities of online learning (Jung & Latchem, 2012; Robinson, 2003). At the same time, governments and accreditation bodies face growing pressure to regulate online education in ways that ensure accountability without stifling innovation (Hénard & Roseveare, 2012; Mello Silva & Vargas, 2022). This study examined

how national education policies and quality assurance frameworks influence the adoption, governance, and pedagogical innovation of online teaching, with particular attention to assessment, accreditation, and academic integrity.

2. CONCEPTUAL ORIENTATION: POLICY, QUALITY ASSURANCE, AND ONLINE TEACHING

Education policy functions not merely as a collection of formal directives but as a powerful governing mechanism that shapes how institutions interpret legitimacy, organize teaching practices, and define acceptable forms of knowledge delivery. Within higher education systems, policy frameworks establish the conditions under which online teaching is authorized, recognized, and evaluated. Robinson (2003) underscores that governance, accreditation, and quality assurance structures are central to determining what is considered a valid practice in open and distance education. Through these mechanisms, policy does not simply regulate activity from a distance; it actively constructs the norms, expectations, and boundaries within which institutions and instructors operate.

Quality assurance systems occupy a particularly influential position within this policy landscape. Traditionally, QA has been justified as a means of safeguarding academic standards, protecting students, and ensuring public accountability (Dill, 2007). From this perspective, QA frameworks are intended to support continuous improvement in teaching and learning rather than act as punitive or bureaucratic instruments. Makhoul (2019) reinforces this view by arguing that accreditation and quality assurance can enhance teaching and learning when they emphasize reflective practice, curriculum coherence, and evidence-based improvement.

However, the migration of teaching into online and digitally mediated environments has exposed important limitations within existing QA paradigms. Many quality assurance models were developed in the context of face-to-face education and remain anchored in assumptions about physical infrastructure, contact hours, and standardized assessment formats (Jung & Latchem, 2012; Robinson, 2003). When applied uncritically to online teaching, these frameworks often prioritize procedural compliance over pedagogical effectiveness. As a result, institutions may focus on demonstrating conformity to prescribed standards rather than exploring innovative teaching and assessment practices that are better suited to online learning environments.

This misalignment has generated growing tensions between regulation and innovation. Mello Silva and Vargas (2022) describe quality assurance systems as simultaneously enabling and constraining innovation in higher education. On the one hand, QA frameworks provide legitimacy, structure, and shared expectations that can support institutional confidence in online teaching. On the other hand, overly rigid standards may discourage experimentation, limit pedagogical flexibility, and incentivize risk-averse behavior. In online contexts, this tension is particularly visible in areas such as assessment design, learning analytics, and student engagement strategies, where innovation often challenges conventional regulatory assumptions.

Recent scholarship suggests that the impact of policy and QA frameworks on online teaching is not uniform but depends on how these frameworks are interpreted and enacted at the institutional level. Jung and Latchem (2012) note that quality assurance in distance and e-learning varies significantly across contexts, reflecting differences in policy priorities, institutional capacity, and educational cultures. Similarly, Asiyai (2022) emphasizes that effective QA practices require alignment between policy expectations and institutional realities, including staff expertise, technological infrastructure, and student support systems. Where such alignment is lacking, QA risks becoming a symbolic exercise that prioritizes documentation over meaningful quality enhancement.

This study adopted a conceptual orientation that views pedagogical innovation in online teaching as the outcome of interaction among three interrelated forces: national education policies, quality assurance frameworks, and institutional enactment. Policies articulate official intentions and regulatory priorities; QA frameworks translate these intentions into standards and evaluative criteria; and institutions interpret, negotiate, and implement these requirements within specific pedagogical and organizational contexts. Drawing on Dill (2007) and Makhoul (2019), the study treats quality assurance not as inherently restrictive but as potentially developmental, depending on how it is designed and applied. At the same time, following Mello Silva and Vargas (2022), it recognizes that misaligned or inflexible QA systems can constrain innovation and undermine the pedagogical potential of online teaching.

By foregrounding the dynamic relationship between policy, quality assurance, and practice, this conceptual orientation provides a lens for examining how online teaching is governed, legitimized, and transformed. It allows the study to move beyond simplistic accounts of policy impact and instead explore how regulatory frameworks shape, and are shaped by, the evolving realities of digitally mediated education.

3. NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICIES AND THE ADOPTION OF ONLINE TEACHING

National education policies play a foundational role in legitimizing online teaching as a credible and acceptable mode of instruction within higher education systems. By formally recognizing online and distance education, policy frameworks signal institutional permission to invest in digital infrastructure, redesign curricula, and expand access beyond conventional campus-based models. Jung and Latchem (2012) observed that policies which explicitly acknowledge e-learning and distance education tend to accelerate institutional adoption by reducing uncertainty around accreditation, quality standards, and recognition. In such contexts, online teaching is framed not as an exceptional or temporary solution, but as an integral component of the national education system.

In contrast, ambiguous, outdated, or restrictive policy environments often produce cautious and uneven adoption. Where policy frameworks fail to clearly articulate the status of online teaching, institutions tend to prioritize compliance over innovation, adopting

digital delivery in limited or conservative ways to avoid regulatory risk. Kahsay (2012) notes that in such settings, institutions may hesitate to fully redesign curricula or assessment practices, opting instead for minimal digital adaptations that preserve traditional structures. This cautious approach reflects concerns about accreditation, recognition, and long-term legitimacy rather than pedagogical resistance per se.

Empirical studies across diverse national and institutional contexts consistently demonstrate that policy clarity is a critical condition for sustainable adoption of online teaching. In the Kenyan context, Wangai (2022) shows that quality assurance practices significantly influence both program quality and institutional confidence in delivering online education. Institutions operating within clear and supportive policy frameworks are more likely to invest in staff development, learner support systems, and pedagogically sound online course design. Conversely, weak or inconsistent policy guidance often results in fragmented implementation and uneven quality.

Asiyai (2022) further emphasizes that policy effectiveness depends on alignment between regulatory expectations and institutional capacity. Policies that mandate online teaching without corresponding investment in infrastructure, training, and support risk producing superficial adoption. In such cases, institutions may engage in what can be described as symbolic compliance, adopting the outward forms of online teaching—such as learning management systems or digital course shells—without substantive pedagogical transformation. This disconnect between policy intent and institutional enactment undermines the potential of online teaching to enhance access and learning quality.

Taken together, these studies suggest that national education policies shape not only whether institutions adopt online teaching, but how they do so. Policy clarity, coherence, and capacity alignment emerge as decisive factors in determining whether adoption leads to meaningful pedagogical innovation or remains a procedural response to regulatory pressure.

4. QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORKS AND THE GOVERNANCE OF ONLINE TEACHING

Quality assurance frameworks constitute the primary mechanisms through which online teaching is governed, evaluated, and legitimized within higher education systems. Traditionally, QA models have been designed around face-to-face teaching assumptions, emphasizing contact hours, physical facilities, staff–student ratios, and standardized assessment formats (Robinson, 2003; Jung & Latchem, 2012). While these criteria have long served as proxies for quality in conventional education, their applicability to online teaching has increasingly been called into question.

When applied to digitally mediated learning environments, traditional QA standards often struggle to capture the pedagogical realities of online teaching. Institutions delivering online programmes frequently face difficulties demonstrating equivalence with face-to-face provision, particularly when quality is measured through indicators that privilege physical presence over learning design and student engagement. Robinson (2003) argues that such misalignment creates regulatory tension, as institutions are required to fit innovative practices into frameworks that were not designed to accommodate them. The result is often an emphasis on documentation and procedural compliance rather than pedagogical effectiveness.

In response to these challenges, recent scholarship highlights growing efforts to reconceptualize quality assurance for online and e-learning contexts. Ramezani and Mostafavi (2025) proposed a comprehensive accreditation framework specifically tailored to e-learning institutions, emphasizing learner support services, instructional design quality, staff competence, and digital assessment integrity. This approach reflects a shift away from surface indicators of quality toward criteria that are more closely aligned with how learning actually occurs in online environments.

Similarly, Shattuck (2023) advocates for multi-level quality assurance processes that operate at the levels of teaching practice, learning resources, and program design. Rather than relying on single metrics or compliance checklists, this approach recognizes quality as an ongoing, distributed process that involves instructors, administrators, and institutional systems. Such models position QA not merely as an external audit function but as an internal culture of continuous improvement.

Despite these advances, the implementation of context-sensitive QA frameworks remains uneven. Many institutions continue to operate under hybrid systems in which innovative online practices coexist with regulatory standards that remain largely unchanged. This unevenness reflects broader systemic tensions between accountability and flexibility, as well as disparities in institutional capacity and regulatory readiness. As Jung and Latchem (2012) cautioned, without deliberate reform, quality assurance risks becoming a barrier rather than a facilitator of effective online teaching.

Overall, quality assurance frameworks play a decisive role in shaping the governance of online teaching. When aligned with digital pedagogical realities, they can support innovation, credibility, and quality enhancement. When misaligned, they reinforce conservative practices and constrain the transformative potential of online education. Understanding this dual role is essential for evaluating how governance structures influence the future of online teaching.

5. ASSESSMENT PRACTICES UNDER POLICY AND QUALITY ASSURANCE CONSTRAINTS

Assessment constitutes one of the most tightly regulated dimensions of online teaching, reflecting longstanding concerns about validity, reliability, and academic integrity. National education policies and quality assurance frameworks often treat assessment as the primary indicator of academic standards, leading to heightened regulatory attention in digitally mediated contexts. As a result,

institutions offering online programs frequently encounter restrictions on permissible assessment formats, with particular skepticism directed toward approaches perceived as less controllable, such as open-book examinations, project-based assessment, and continuous or formative evaluation (Butler-Henderson & Crawford, 2020).

While such restrictions are intended to safeguard academic credibility, they may inadvertently constrain pedagogical effectiveness. Online teaching environments afford opportunities for assessment designs that emphasize higher-order thinking, authentic tasks, and sustained engagement over time. However, policy frameworks that privilege traditional, time-bound examinations often limit instructors' ability to exploit these affordances. Butler-Henderson and Crawford (2020) argued that the persistence of conventional assessment models in online contexts reflects an overreliance on control-based assumptions rather than evidence of pedagogical effectiveness.

Emerging research demonstrates that innovative assessment practices, when supported by appropriate regulatory frameworks, can enhance learning while maintaining academic standards. Butler-Henderson and Crawford (2020) show that online examinations can be both scalable and credible when grounded in pedagogical redesign rather than surveillance alone. This includes aligning assessment tasks with learning outcomes, emphasizing application and analysis, and integrating continuous feedback mechanisms. Such approaches shift the focus from detecting misconduct to designing assessments that reduce opportunities for academic dishonesty by their very nature.

However, when policy and QA frameworks equate rigor with heightened surveillance, institutions may be driven toward intrusive proctoring technologies and control-oriented practices. Gbadago et al. (2025) caution that surveillance-heavy assessment regimes raise significant ethical concerns, including issues of privacy, equity, and student wellbeing. These practices risk eroding trust between institutions and learners, potentially undermining the educational relationship that assessment is meant to support. In this sense, regulatory emphasis on control may paradoxically weaken both academic integrity and learning quality.

Taken together, these dynamics highlight a fundamental tension in the governance of online assessment. While regulation is necessary to ensure credibility, overly prescriptive policies may inhibit pedagogical innovation and ethical practice. Effective governance of online assessment therefore requires a shift from control-centric models toward frameworks that recognize pedagogical design as a central mechanism for ensuring quality and integrity.

6. ACCREDITATION PROCESSES AND THE LEGITIMACY OF ONLINE TEACHING

Accreditation plays a central role in establishing the institutional legitimacy of online teaching, functioning as a key mechanism through which educational quality is recognized, regulated, and trusted. Accreditation bodies act as gatekeepers, determining whether online programs are eligible for public recognition, funding, and student enrolment (Dill, 2007). In this capacity, accreditation processes exert significant influence over institutional decisions related to program design, delivery modes, and assessment practices.

When accreditation frameworks adopt an enhancement-oriented approach, they can contribute positively to teaching and learning. Makhoul (2019) argued that accreditation systems are most effective when they prioritize continuous improvement, reflective practice, and evidence-based enhancement rather than punitive compliance. In such cases, accreditation can encourage institutions to invest in pedagogical innovation, staff development, and learner support, thereby strengthening the quality of online teaching.

However, accreditation standards that are poorly aligned with the realities of online pedagogy may produce the opposite effect. Requirements that privilege physical infrastructure, face-to-face contact, or rigid curricular structures can discourage experimentation and responsiveness in online program design. Institutions may respond by replicating traditional models in digital formats, prioritizing conformity over pedagogical effectiveness. This tendency reinforces conservative practices and limits the transformative potential of online education.

Case-based evidence suggests that institutions operating within international or reform-oriented accreditation frameworks may adopt more holistic approaches to quality assurance. Mattar (2022), examining the experience of Qatar University, illustrates how international accreditation standards can be leveraged to integrate academic integrity, transparency, and innovation into institutional quality cultures. In this model, accreditation serves not merely as an external audit but as a catalyst for internal reform, encouraging alignment between policy, practice, and ethical standards.

These examples demonstrate that accreditation need not function solely as a constraint on online teaching. When standards are adaptable, context-aware, and pedagogically informed, accreditation can enhance institutional legitimacy while supporting innovation. Conversely, rigid or misaligned accreditation processes risk undermining both quality and credibility by forcing online teaching into frameworks designed for fundamentally different educational modalities.

7. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ETHICAL GOVERNANCE IN ONLINE TEACHING

Academic integrity has emerged as one of the most pressing regulatory concerns in online education, largely because digitally mediated learning environments disrupt traditional mechanisms of assessment control. In response, policy and quality assurance frameworks have often prioritized detection and punishment, relying heavily on surveillance-oriented solutions such as online proctoring technologies, identity verification systems, and algorithmic monitoring tools (Thacker & McKenzie, 2022). These

approaches are frequently justified on the grounds of preserving public trust and institutional credibility, particularly in contexts where online teaching is still subject to skepticism.

However, an overreliance on surveillance-based integrity measures raises significant ethical and pedagogical concerns. Gbadago et al. (2025) highlighted that such practices generate ethical dilemmas related to student privacy, unequal impact on marginalized learners, and the erosion of trust between institutions and students. Surveillance-heavy integrity regimes may disproportionately disadvantage students with limited access to private study spaces, stable internet connectivity, or appropriate technology, thereby compounding existing inequalities. Moreover, the framing of integrity primarily as a compliance issue risks positioning students as potential offenders rather than as ethical learners.

Emerging scholarship advocates for a shift toward more holistic and educative models of academic integrity governance. Thacker and McKenzie (2022) argue that institutional cultures of integrity are more sustainable when integrity is embedded as a shared pedagogical value rather than imposed solely through enforcement mechanisms. This perspective emphasizes integrity education, transparent expectations, and assessment designs that encourage authentic engagement and reduce opportunities for misconduct by design.

Within this framework, quality assurance systems play a critical role. QA mechanisms that conceptualize academic integrity as an integral dimension of teaching quality—rather than as an external compliance requirement—are better positioned to support ethical online teaching practices. Such systems encourage institutions to align assessment strategies, staff development, and student support with integrity principles, thereby maintaining academic standards without undermining innovation. Ethical governance of online teaching, therefore, depends not on intensifying control but on cultivating trust, responsibility, and pedagogical coherence across policy and practice.

8. DISCUSSION

The reviewed literature demonstrates that national education policies and quality assurance frameworks exert a substantial influence on how online teaching is adopted, governed, and pedagogically enacted. Across contexts, policies that provide clarity, flexibility, and explicit recognition of online teaching tend to enable institutions to invest confidently in digital infrastructure, curriculum redesign, and staff development. In contrast, rigid or ambiguous policy environments often constrain institutional action, encouraging conservative implementation strategies aimed at regulatory compliance rather than pedagogical effectiveness.

Quality assurance systems remain central to maintaining accountability and public trust in online education. However, their impact is contingent on the extent to which they are aligned with the realities of digital pedagogy. When QA frameworks are grounded in face-to-face assumptions, they risk prioritizing documentation, control, and standardization over learning design, student engagement, and innovation. Conversely, context-sensitive QA models—such as those emphasizing instructional design quality, learner support, and ethical assessment—demonstrate greater potential to enhance online teaching.

A persistent tension emerges between standardization and innovation. Regulation is necessary to safeguard academic standards, ensure comparability, and protect institutional credibility. Yet overly prescriptive frameworks may reduce online teaching to procedural compliance, discouraging experimentation and responsiveness. This tension is particularly evident in assessment regulation, accreditation requirements, and academic integrity governance, where control-oriented approaches may undermine pedagogical and ethical goals.

The challenge for policymakers and quality assurance bodies lies in developing adaptive governance models that balance accountability with trust, regulation with flexibility, and standardization with pedagogical creativity. Addressing this challenge is essential for moving online teaching beyond emergency adoption toward sustainable, high-quality educational practice.

9. IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study carry significant implications for policy, quality assurance, institutional governance, and pedagogical practice. For policymakers, there is a clear need to develop responsive and forward-looking policy frameworks that explicitly address the distinctive characteristics of online teaching. Policies should move beyond equivalence-based regulation toward models that recognize the pedagogical affordances and constraints of digitally mediated learning environments.

Quality assurance agencies are encouraged to revise standards to accommodate diverse assessment models, flexible delivery modes, and digitally mediated forms of student engagement. QA frameworks that emphasize enhancement, reflection, and continuous improvement are more likely to support innovation while maintaining credibility.

At the institutional level, universities and colleges must invest in internal quality assurance cultures that prioritize pedagogical quality over minimal compliance. This includes staff development, instructional design support, and integrity education initiatives that align institutional practice with regulatory expectations.

Pedagogically, instructors require regulatory space to design assessments and learning activities that leverage online affordances while upholding academic integrity. Without such space, innovation risks being constrained by governance structures that were not designed for digital education.

10. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that national education policies and quality assurance frameworks play a decisive role in shaping the adoption, governance, and pedagogical innovation of online teaching. Their influence is particularly pronounced in the regulation of assessment practices, accreditation processes, and academic integrity. When policy and QA frameworks are aligned with pedagogical realities, they can enhance educational quality, institutional credibility, and ethical practice. When misaligned, they risk constraining innovation, encouraging superficial compliance, and undermining learning.

Sustainable online education depends on governance systems capable of balancing accountability with trust, regulation with flexibility, and standards with pedagogical creativity. As online teaching continues to evolve, the effectiveness of higher education systems will increasingly depend on their ability to rethink policy and quality assurance not as barriers to innovation, but as enabling frameworks for meaningful and ethical digital learning.

REFERENCES

1. Asiyai, R. I. (2022). Best practices for quality assurance in higher education: Implications for educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 25*(5), 843–854. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2020.1774684
2. Butler-Henderson, K., & Crawford, J. (2020). A systematic review of online examinations: A pedagogical innovation for scalable authentication and integrity. *Computers & Education, 159*, 104024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104024
3. Dill, D. D. (2007). Quality assurance in higher education: Practices and issues. In *The international encyclopedia of education* (3rd ed.). Elsevier.
4. Gbadago, F. Y., Masud, I., Iddris, F., Koomson, S., Poku, P. K., & Zoiku, S. (2025). Ethical dilemmas in teaching and assessment in higher education: A literature synthesis towards an integrative model for policy, practice and academic integrity. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-2024-0031
5. Hénard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices*. OECD Publishing.
6. Jung, I., & Latchem, C. (2012). *Quality assurance and accreditation in distance education and e-learning: Models, policies and research*. Routledge.
7. Kahsay, M. N. (2012). *Quality and quality assurance in Ethiopian higher education: Critical issues and practical implications*. Addis Ababa University Press.
8. Makhoul, S. A. (2019). Higher education accreditation, quality assurance and their impact on teaching and learning enhancement. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences, 35*(4), 235–250. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-03-2018-0030
9. Mattar, M. Y. (2022). Combating academic corruption and enhancing academic integrity through international accreditation standards: The model of Qatar University. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 20*(2), 119–146. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09414-8
10. Mello Silva, M. F. D., & Vargas, E. R. D. (2022). Quality assurance systems: Enemies or allies of innovation in higher education institutions? *Quality Assurance in Education, 30*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-04-2021-0060
11. Ramezani, S. G., & Mostafavi, Z. S. (2025). Developing and validating a comprehensive scale for accreditation standards and quality assurance in e-learning institutions. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1–49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12655-9
12. Robinson, B. (2003). Governance, accreditation and quality assurance in open and distance education. In *Policy for open and distance learning* (pp. 197–222). Routledge.
13. Shattuck, K. (Ed.). (2023). *Assuring quality in online education: Practices and processes at the teaching, resource, and program levels*. Routledge.
14. Thacker, E. J., & McKenzie, A. (2022). Using quality assurance frameworks to support an institutional culture of academic integrity at Canadian universities. In *Academic integrity in Canada: An enduring and essential challenge* (pp. 519–534). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83255-3_28
15. Vettriselvan, R., Velmurugan, P. R., Deepan, A., Jaiswani, G., & Durgarani, M. (2025). Transforming virtual education: Advanced strategies for quality assurance in online and distance learning. In *Navigating quality assurance and accreditation in global higher education* (pp. 563–580). IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-9472-7.ch030
16. Wangai, M. M. (2022). *The influence of quality assurance practices on quality of academic programmes in higher education institutions in Kenya: A case of the Faculty of Education, University of Nairobi* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).