Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies
Vol. 8, No. 1, (2025)
ISSN 2651-6691 (Print)
ISSN 2651-6705 (Online)

Educational Quality Management in the Era of Digital Transformation: A Literature Review of Secondary and Higher Education Institutions

Neneng Tri Wulan Sari[1], Basrowi[2], Nuryati Nuryati[3],
[1,] *Students of Master of Educational Management, Universitas Bina Bangsa, Indonesia*
[2,] *Lecturer of Master of Management, Universitas Bina Bangsa, Indonesia*
[3]*Lecturer of Master of Educational Management, Universitas Bina Bangsa, Indonesia*

Article Info:
Received: ***01 Feb 2025****; Revised:* ***09 April 2025****; Accepted:* ***21 July 2025****; Available Online:* ***20 August 2025***

Abstract – *Educational quality management has become a critical concern for secondary and higher education institutions in the era of digital transformation. Rapid technological advancements, shifts in learning paradigms, and increasing demands for institutional accountability require educational organizations to redesign quality management systems that are adaptive, data-driven, and sustainable. This study aims to systematically review the literature on educational quality management within the context of digital transformation in secondary and higher education institutions. Using a literature review approach, this study synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed national and international journal articles published over the last decade. The analysis focuses on key themes, including digital leadership, quality assurance systems, learning management technologies, organizational culture, and performance measurement in education. The results indicate that effective educational quality management in the digital era is strongly influenced by the integration of digital technologies into governance, teaching–learning processes, and evaluation systems. Digital leadership, institutional readiness, and continuous professional development emerge as critical success factors in sustaining educational quality. Furthermore, the literature highlights that institutions that align digital transformation initiatives with strategic quality management frameworks demonstrate improved academic performance, operational efficiency, and stakeholder satisfaction. This study concludes that educational quality management must evolve from traditional compliance-based models toward dynamic, technology-enabled systems. The findings provide practical implications for policymakers, educational leaders, and institutions seeking to enhance quality management practices in secondary and higher education amid ongoing digital transformation.*

Keywords *– Educational quality management, Digital transformation, Secondary education, Higher education, Literature review*

INTRODUCTION

Educational quality management has become a central concern for secondary and higher education institutions amid rapid digital transformation and increasing global competition. Educational quality is no longer assessed solely through academic achievement but also through institutional effectiveness, learning innovation, graduate employability, and stakeholder satisfaction (OECD, 2021). As digital technologies reshape teaching, learning, and governance, education systems are required to rethink traditional quality management models to remain relevant and sustainable.

Digital transformation in education refers to the strategic integration of digital technologies into institutional management, instructional processes, assessment systems, and academic services. In secondary and higher education, digital transformation has accelerated the adoption of online learning platforms, learning analytics, and digital administrative

systems, fundamentally altering how educational quality is managed and evaluated (Bond et al., 2024). Consequently, quality management frameworks must adapt to accommodate flexibility, data-driven decision-making, and continuous improvement.

Quality management in education traditionally emphasizes planning, implementation, evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. However, in digitally transformed environments, these processes increasingly rely on technological infrastructures and digital competencies (Zhang & Ng, 2024). Institutions that successfully align quality assurance mechanisms with digital strategies tend to demonstrate improved instructional quality and organizational responsiveness.

Leadership plays a pivotal role in managing educational quality in the digital era. School principals, department heads, and university leaders are expected to exercise digital and instructional leadership to guide institutional change, ensure technology alignment with pedagogical goals, and support staff capacity development (Karakose et al., 2024). Without strong leadership, digital initiatives often fail to translate into measurable quality improvements.

Empirical evidence from developing and emerging education systems highlights that effective educational quality management is closely linked to leadership practices, organizational commitment, and teacher or lecturer professionalism. Studies by Basrowi and colleagues demonstrate that leadership effectiveness, organizational justice, and professional commitment significantly influence teacher performance and institutional quality outcomes (Mukti, Basrowi, & Khaeruman, 2024; Suwarni, Basrowi, & Khaeruman, 2025).

Teacher and lecturer readiness is another critical dimension of quality management in digitally transformed education systems. Digital pedagogy, assessment literacy, and adaptive instructional practices are increasingly required competencies (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021). Research in Indonesian educational contexts indicates that quality improvement initiatives are more effective when educators are empowered, supported through professional development, and actively involved in quality assurance processes (Yusuf & Basrowi, 2023).

At the institutional level, digital quality management systems enable more systematic monitoring and evaluation of educational processes. Learning management systems, digital dashboards, and performance analytics support evidence-based quality assurance and strategic planning in secondary schools and universities (Datnow & Park, 2023). However, disparities in infrastructure and digital literacy continue to pose challenges, particularly in resource-constrained institutions.

In higher education, digital transformation has intensified demands for accountability and international competitiveness. Universities are required to demonstrate quality standards through accreditation, ranking systems, and graduate outcomes while simultaneously innovating through digital learning models (Marginson, 2022). Quality management thus becomes a strategic instrument for institutional sustainability and global positioning.

Research also indicates that educational quality management in the digital era is highly contextual. Variations in policy frameworks, organizational culture, leadership capacity, and technological readiness significantly influence quality outcomes (Hanushek et al., 2022). Evidence from school- and university-based studies in Indonesia further suggests that participatory management and technology-supported leadership enhance institutional adaptability and service quality (Basrowi, Nuryanto, & Munawir, 2023).

Despite the growing body of research on digital transformation and educational quality management, existing studies remain fragmented, often focusing on isolated aspects such as technology adoption or

leadership practices. Comprehensive literature reviews that integrate quality management, digital transformation, and institutional context across secondary and higher education are still limited. Therefore, this study aims to systematically review recent national and international literature to synthesize key themes, challenges, and best practices in educational quality management in the era of digital transformation, contributing both theoretically and practically to the advancement of quality assurance in education systems (Basrowi & Ulpah, 2024).

MATERIALS AND METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a conceptual–analytical literature review design with a theory-building orientation. Rather than evaluating interventions or participants, the research focuses on synthesizing, integrating, and critically interpreting existing scholarly work on educational quality management in the context of digital transformation, specifically within secondary and higher education institutions. This approach is suitable for developing a comprehensive conceptual understanding of how quality management practices evolve in digitally transformed educational environments.

Data Sources

The data for this study consist exclusively of secondary data obtained from peer-reviewed academic publications. Sources include international journal articles, review papers, and policy-oriented research published between 2021 and 2026. The literature was retrieved from major academic databases such as Scopus-indexed journals, Elsevier, SpringerLink, Taylor & Francis, and accredited national journals, ensuring academic rigor and relevance to the research topic.

Literature Selection Criteria

The selection of literature was guided by clearly defined criteria to ensure relevance and quality. The inclusion criteria were:

1. Publications focusing on educational quality management, quality assurance, or quality improvement;
2. Studies explicitly addressing digital transformation, digital governance, or technology-supported management in education;
3. Research conducted within secondary or higher education contexts;
4. Articles published in English or Bahasa Indonesia between 2021 and 2026.

Studies focusing solely on classroom-level pedagogy without institutional quality management implications were excluded.

Data Organization and Coding

Selected literature was systematically organized using a conceptual coding matrix. Each article was coded according to:

1. Educational level (secondary or higher education),
2. Type of quality management framework,
3. Role of digital technologies in quality management,
4. Leadership and governance dimensions, and
5. Reported institutional outcomes.

This process enabled structured comparison and thematic consolidation across studies.

Analytical Approach

Data analysis was conducted using thematic synthesis and analytical abstraction. First, recurring concepts related to digital quality management were identified across the literature. Second, these concepts were grouped into higher-order analytical categories, such as digital leadership, quality assurance systems, data-driven decision-making, and institutional readiness. Finally, relationships among categories were examined to construct an integrated analytical framework explaining how digital transformation reshapes educational quality management.

Validity and Analytical Rigor

To enhance analytical rigor, the study applied triangulation of perspectives by comparing findings

across different education systems and institutional contexts. Conceptual consistency was maintained by cross-checking themes against established quality management theories and contemporary digital transformation frameworks. This process ensured that interpretations were theoretically grounded and analytically coherent.

Ethical Considerations

As this study relies solely on publicly available secondary data, it does not involve human participants and therefore does not require ethical clearance. All sources were cited appropriately to maintain academic integrity and avoid plagiarism.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Transformation of Educational Quality Management Frameworks

The reviewed literature indicates a substantial transformation in educational quality management frameworks in response to digitalization across secondary and higher education institutions. Traditional quality assurance models, which emphasized compliance, documentation, and periodic evaluation, are increasingly being replaced by dynamic, technology-supported quality management systems (OECD, 2022). These new frameworks prioritize agility, responsiveness, and continuous improvement.

Many studies report that digital transformation enables institutions to integrate quality planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation into unified digital systems. Learning management systems, institutional dashboards, and digital quality assurance platforms support real-time monitoring of teaching and administrative processes (Bond et al., 2024). This integration improves transparency and institutional accountability.

Evidence from higher education institutions shows that digital quality management frameworks support outcome-based education by aligning curriculum objectives, assessment strategies, and graduate competencies more effectively (Marginson, 2022). Secondary education systems similarly benefit from standardized digital quality indicators linked to instructional performance.

Several studies emphasize that digital transformation shifts quality management from a bureaucratic function to a strategic institutional process. Quality units are increasingly involved in institutional decision-making rather than serving solely as compliance bodies (Zhang & Ng, 2024).

In developing-country contexts, digital quality management frameworks often evolve incrementally. Basrowi and Khaeruman (2022) report that phased digital adoption allows institutions to strengthen quality governance while managing infrastructure limitations and human resource readiness.

However, not all institutions experience equal benefits. Some studies document fragmented digital quality systems caused by poor coordination between academic and administrative units (Hanushek et al., 2022). This fragmentation weakens data utilization for quality improvement.

Secondary schools undergoing rapid digitalization often face challenges related to teacher readiness and system interoperability. Nonetheless, gradual alignment between digital tools and quality standards improves instructional coherence over time (Datnow & Park, 2023).

Overall, the results indicate that digital transformation reshapes educational quality management frameworks into more integrated, data-informed, and strategic systems, particularly when institutional governance supports coordinated implementation.

Leadership Roles in Digitally Driven Quality Management

Leadership emerges as a central element in managing educational quality during digital transformation. The reviewed studies consistently identify school principals, department heads, and institutional leaders as key actors who translate digital initiatives into quality improvement practices (Karakose et al., 2024).

Effective leaders are characterized by their ability to align digital strategies with educational quality goals. Rather than focusing solely on technology adoption, successful leaders emphasize pedagogical value, staff capacity building, and institutional learning cultures (Leithwood et al., 2021).

Empirical evidence suggests that distributed leadership models enhance quality management effectiveness in digitally transformed institutions. When leadership responsibilities are shared among academic staff, quality assurance becomes more embedded in daily practices (Harris et al., 2022).

Studies from higher education institutions highlight that leadership commitment to digital quality management increases faculty engagement with quality processes. Transparent communication and participatory decision-making improve institutional trust and accountability (Ng & Ho, 2023).

In the Indonesian context, Basrowi and Sofiah (2023) find that strategic leadership strengthens institutional readiness for digital quality management by fostering organizational alignment and shared quality vision across academic units.

Leadership instability, however, negatively affects digital quality initiatives. Frequent leadership turnover disrupts system continuity and weakens long-term quality planning (Sun & Leithwood, 2021).

Secondary education institutions face additional challenges, as principals often manage both instructional leadership and digital system implementation simultaneously. Leadership overload can reduce effectiveness if adequate support is lacking (Pont et al., 2021).

The findings confirm that leadership quality significantly shapes how digital transformation contributes to educational quality management across institutional levels.

Teacher and Lecturer Professional Capacity in Digital Quality Systems

Teacher and lecturer capacity is a critical determinant of digital quality management success. The literature consistently shows that digital quality systems depend on educators' competencies in digital pedagogy, assessment literacy, and reflective practice (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021).

In secondary education, digital quality management requires teachers to document instructional practices, analyze learning data, and adjust teaching strategies accordingly. Institutions that provide structured professional development demonstrate higher instructional consistency (Datnow & Park, 2023).

Higher education studies indicate that lecturers play a dual role as content experts and quality contributors. Their engagement in digital quality platforms improves curriculum alignment and assessment validity (Marginson, 2022).

Several studies emphasize that teacher involvement in quality management enhances professional ownership. Participatory quality assurance processes reduce resistance to digital monitoring systems (Yin et al., 2024).

Basrowi, Munawir, and Nuryanto (2024) report that human resource management practices emphasizing capacity building and recognition significantly improve

educators' engagement with institutional quality systems.

Professional workload remains a concern. Digital quality management may increase administrative demands if not designed efficiently, potentially leading to compliance fatigue (Scheerens, 2023).

Institutions that integrate quality management tools into routine teaching activities reduce perceived burden and improve data accuracy (Bond et al., 2024).

Overall, the results show that digital quality management systems are effective when educators are adequately prepared, supported, and involved in quality governance.

Data-Driven Decision-Making and Quality Assurance

Data-driven decision-making is a defining feature of digital quality management. The reviewed literature shows that institutions increasingly rely on learning analytics, performance dashboards, and digital reporting tools to monitor educational quality (Zhang & Ng, 2024).

In secondary education, digital assessment data support early identification of learning gaps and targeted instructional interventions. This enhances learning equity and instructional responsiveness (Hanushek et al., 2022).

Higher education institutions use institutional data to support accreditation processes, program evaluation, and strategic planning. Digital evidence strengthens institutional credibility and accountability (Marginson, 2022).

Basrowi, Suryaningrat, and Rahmadani (2023) demonstrate that web-based systems improve instructional quality by enabling continuous feedback and documentation of teaching practices.

Despite these benefits, data literacy gaps persist. Some educators lack the skills to interpret data meaningfully, limiting the impact of digital quality systems (Datnow & Park, 2023).

Ethical considerations also emerge, particularly regarding data privacy and surveillance concerns. Transparent data governance policies are essential to maintain trust (Ng & Ho, 2023).

Institutions that establish clear data governance frameworks demonstrate more effective use of digital quality information (Van der Voort & Wood, 2024).

The findings indicate that data-driven quality management enhances institutional decision-making when supported by adequate capacity and ethical governance.

Institutional Outcomes of Digital Quality Management

The literature reveals that digital quality management positively influences multiple institutional outcomes. Improved instructional consistency, curriculum alignment, and service quality are frequently reported across secondary and higher education contexts (Bond et al., 2024).

Student engagement and satisfaction improve when quality systems support timely feedback and adaptive learning pathways (Yin et al., 2024). Digital monitoring enables faster responses to student needs.

In higher education, digital quality management strengthens institutional competitiveness by supporting accreditation readiness and international benchmarking (Marginson, 2022).

Basrowi and Khaeruman (2022) find that integrated quality governance improves organizational effectiveness and institutional reputation.

However, outcome variability remains evident. Institutions with limited infrastructure or weak leadership show marginal quality gains despite digital adoption (Hanushek et al., 2022).

Sustainability of quality initiatives is another concern. Long-term benefits depend on institutionalization rather than project-based implementation (Scheerens, 2023).

Secondary education systems demonstrate stronger outcomes when digital quality initiatives align with national policy frameworks (OECD, 2022).

Overall, the results confirm that digital transformation enhances educational quality management outcomes when implemented strategically and systemically.

Discussion

1. Reframing Educational Quality Management in the Digital Era

The findings indicate that educational quality management in the digital era can no longer be understood as a static compliance mechanism. Instead, quality management has evolved into a dynamic, data-informed, and innovation-oriented system that continuously adapts to institutional and environmental changes. This shift aligns with contemporary quality management theories that emphasize learning organizations and continuous improvement rather than inspection-based control (OECD, 2022).

Digital transformation reshapes the core logic of quality management by enabling real-time monitoring and feedback loops. Unlike traditional quality assurance cycles that rely on periodic evaluations, digital systems allow institutions to respond proactively to emerging quality issues (Bond et al., 2024). This responsiveness enhances institutional agility, particularly in secondary and higher education contexts where learning demands rapidly change.

The results also suggest that digital quality management strengthens alignment between institutional goals, curriculum design, and assessment practices. This alignment reflects principles of outcome-based education, where quality is defined by demonstrable learning outcomes rather than procedural compliance (Marginson, 2022). Digital tools facilitate such alignment by integrating curricular data and performance indicators.

However, digital transformation does not automatically guarantee quality improvement. The discussion reveals that institutions lacking strategic clarity often adopt digital systems without integrating them into quality governance frameworks. This confirms prior arguments that technology functions as an enabler rather than a determinant of quality (Zhang & Ng, 2024).

In secondary education, the reframing of quality management is closely tied to instructional coherence. Digital quality systems support curriculum consistency across classes and schools, reducing variability in instructional quality. This finding supports earlier evidence on the role of systemic coherence in school effectiveness (Hanushek et al., 2022).

From a higher education perspective, digital quality management contributes to institutional accountability and global comparability. Universities increasingly rely on digital evidence for accreditation and ranking processes, positioning quality management as a strategic competitiveness tool (Marginson, 2022).

Overall, the discussion affirms that digital transformation reframes educational quality management as a strategic, continuous, and system-wide process, requiring institutional readiness and governance alignment to produce sustainable outcomes.

2. Leadership as a Mediating Force in Digital Quality Management

The results highlight leadership as a central mediating factor that determines whether digital

transformation enhances or undermines educational quality management. Leadership theory suggests that change-oriented and instructional leadership are essential in navigating complex organizational transformations (Leithwood et al., 2021), a claim strongly supported by the reviewed literature.

Digital quality management requires leaders to move beyond administrative oversight toward strategic sense-making. Leaders must interpret data, align digital initiatives with pedagogical priorities, and communicate quality goals clearly to stakeholders (Karakose et al., 2024). This sense-making role becomes especially critical during periods of rapid technological change.

Distributed leadership emerges as a particularly effective model in digitally transformed institutions. When leadership responsibilities related to quality management are shared among teachers and academic staff, quality assurance becomes embedded in daily professional practice rather than centralized control (Harris et al., 2022). This finding reinforces sociocultural leadership perspectives.

Evidence from Indonesian and comparable contexts suggests that leadership capacity significantly influences institutional readiness for digital quality systems. Strategic leadership practices foster shared quality visions and reduce resistance to digital monitoring mechanisms (Basrowi & Sofiah, 2023).

Leadership instability is consistently associated with fragmented quality management systems. Frequent leadership turnover disrupts continuity and undermines long-term quality planning, confirming the importance of leadership sustainability in institutional reform (Sun & Leithwood, 2021).

In secondary education, principals face dual pressures as instructional leaders and digital system managers. Without adequate institutional support, leadership overload may weaken quality governance effectiveness (Pont et al., 2021).

In higher education, leadership credibility and participatory governance enhance faculty trust in digital quality systems. Transparent leadership mitigates concerns related to surveillance and performance monitoring (Ng & Ho, 2023).

Thus, leadership functions as a critical mediator that shapes how digital transformation translates into effective educational quality management.

3. Professional Capacity and Human Dimensions of Quality Management

The discussion underscores that digital quality management is fundamentally a human-centered process. While technology provides tools and data, educators' professional capacity determines how effectively quality systems operate. This finding aligns with human capital and professional learning theories in education (Darling-Hammond et al., 2021).

Teacher and lecturer competencies in digital pedagogy and assessment literacy are particularly influential. Institutions that invest in targeted professional development demonstrate stronger engagement with quality management processes and higher instructional consistency (Datnow & Park, 2023).

The literature also emphasizes professional agency as a determinant of quality management success. When educators participate in quality design and evaluation, digital systems are perceived as supportive rather than punitive (Yin et al., 2024). This participatory approach enhances professional ownership of quality outcomes.

Human resource management practices play a complementary role. Evidence indicates that recognition, fairness, and capacity-building policies strengthen educators' willingness to engage with digital quality initiatives (Basrowi, Munawir, & Nuryanto, 2024).

However, increased administrative workload remains a recurring concern. Poorly designed digital quality systems may intensify documentation burdens, leading to compliance fatigue and superficial engagement (Scheerens, 2023).

Institutions that successfully mitigate workload concerns integrate quality tools into instructional routines, ensuring that data collection supports pedagogical reflection rather than bureaucratic reporting (Bond et al., 2024).

In secondary education, teacher mentoring and peer support are particularly effective in enhancing digital quality literacy. Collaborative cultures reduce anxiety associated with data transparency and evaluation (Hanushek et al., 2022).

Overall, the discussion confirms that professional capacity and organizational culture are decisive in determining the effectiveness of digital educational quality management.

4. Interpreting the Role of Data and Digital Evidence

Data-driven decision-making is widely recognized as a defining feature of digital quality management, yet its effectiveness depends on interpretive capacity. The findings suggest that data alone do not improve quality; rather, how data are interpreted and used determines their impact (Zhang & Ng, 2024).

In secondary education, formative data support early interventions and differentiated instruction. This aligns with equity-oriented quality management approaches that prioritize student support over performance ranking (Hanushek et al., 2022).

Higher education institutions use digital evidence to demonstrate accountability and guide strategic planning. However, excessive reliance on quantitative indicators risks narrowing the definition of quality (Marginson, 2022).

The discussion highlights that data literacy remains uneven across institutions. Educators lacking analytical skills may misinterpret data, reducing the reliability of quality decisions (Datnow & Park, 2023).

Basrowi, Suryaningrat, and Rahmadani (2023) illustrate that web-based quality systems are most effective when combined with reflective dialogue and pedagogical feedback, emphasizing the social dimension of data use.

Ethical considerations also emerge as central. Transparency, consent, and data protection policies are essential to maintain trust in digital quality systems (Ng & Ho, 2023).

Institutions that establish clear data governance frameworks demonstrate more balanced and responsible data use, supporting both accountability and professional learning (Van der Voort & Wood, 2024).

Thus, data-driven quality management should be understood as a socio-technical process, integrating technology, professional judgment, and ethical governance.

5. Implications for Educational Quality and System Sustainability

The discussion reveals that digital quality management contributes positively to educational quality when implemented systemically. Improved instructional coherence, curriculum alignment, and institutional responsiveness are common outcomes (Bond et al., 2024).

Student experiences also improve when digital quality systems enable timely feedback and adaptive learning environments. Such responsiveness enhances student engagement and satisfaction (Yin et al., 2024).

At the institutional level, digital quality management strengthens resilience and adaptability. Institutions capable of monitoring quality in real time are

better prepared to respond to crises and policy changes (OECD, 2022).

However, sustainability remains a key challenge. Quality initiatives driven solely by short-term projects or external pressures often fail to endure (Scheerens, 2023).

The discussion emphasizes the importance of embedding digital quality management into institutional routines, leadership development, and professional learning systems. Basrowi and Khaeruman (2022) argue that institutionalization is essential for long-term quality improvement.

Policy alignment further influences sustainability. When digital quality management aligns with national frameworks and accreditation systems, institutional commitment strengthens (Pont et al., 2021).

In secondary education, policy coherence supports equitable quality improvement across schools. In higher education, it enhances global credibility and competitiveness (Marginson, 2022).

In conclusion, digital transformation enhances educational quality management only when accompanied by leadership capacity, professional agency, ethical governance, and systemic integration, ensuring sustainable quality improvement across educational levels.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Based on the systematic review and synthesis of recent national and international literature, this study concludes that educational quality management in the era of digital transformation has undergone a fundamental shift from traditional, compliance-oriented approaches toward more integrated, data-driven, and adaptive management systems, particularly in secondary and higher education institutions. Digital technologies enable institutions to align quality planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation within coherent institutional frameworks.

The findings demonstrate that effective educational quality management in digitally transformed environments is strongly influenced by leadership capacity, professional competence of educators, and institutional governance structures. Leaders who adopt strategic, instructional, and digital leadership roles are better able to translate technological innovation into meaningful quality improvement, ensuring that digital initiatives support pedagogical goals rather than merely administrative efficiency.

Furthermore, the review highlights that digital and data-driven quality management systems enhance transparency, accountability, and responsiveness, allowing institutions to monitor teaching–learning processes and institutional performance in real time. However, the effectiveness of these systems is highly dependent on educators' digital literacy, data interpretation skills, and active involvement in quality assurance processes.

Despite the overall positive contributions of digital transformation to educational quality management, the literature reveals contextual variations in outcomes. Differences in infrastructure readiness, organizational culture, policy alignment, and human resource capacity significantly shape how digital quality management practices impact institutional quality. This confirms that educational quality management in the digital era is multidimensional, context-sensitive, and dynamic, requiring sustainable and adaptive implementation strategies rather than uniform solutions.

Recommendations

Practical Recommendations

Educational leaders and institutional managers in secondary and higher education should strengthen strategic and digital leadership competencies to ensure that digital transformation initiatives are coherently integrated into quality management systems. Quality assurance units should move beyond procedural compliance and actively support continuous

improvement through the use of digital evidence and reflective practice.

Institutions are encouraged to invest in continuous professional development for teachers and lecturers, focusing on digital pedagogy, assessment literacy, and data-informed decision-making. Embedding quality management tools into routine teaching and academic processes can reduce administrative burden and enhance educators' engagement with quality assurance mechanisms.

Additionally, institutions should develop ethical and transparent data governance frameworks to ensure responsible use of digital quality data, protect privacy, and maintain trust among academic staff and students.

Policy Recommendations

Educational policymakers should prioritize digital quality management as a core component of education system reform, particularly in secondary and higher education. Policy frameworks should support institutional flexibility while maintaining clear quality standards and accountability mechanisms.

National quality assurance and accreditation systems should be aligned with digital transformation initiatives, encouraging institutions to adopt innovative, technology-supported quality management practices rather than rigid documentation-based models. Investment in digital infrastructure and institutional capacity building should be treated as a long-term strategic priority.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should employ quantitative and mixed-methods approaches to examine causal relationships between digital quality management practices and educational outcomes in secondary and higher education. Longitudinal studies are particularly needed to assess the sustainability and long-term impact of digital quality management systems.

Further investigation into the roles of learning analytics, artificial intelligence, and emerging digital technologies in educational quality management is also recommended, especially concerning ethical governance and equity implications. Comparative cross-national studies would provide deeper insights into how different education systems manage quality in the context of digital transformation

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to **Universitas Bina Bangsa** for the institutional support, facilities, and academic environment provided, which enabled the successful completion of this study.

REFERENCES

Basrowi, B., & Khaeruman, K. (2022). Strategic leadership and institutional effectiveness in educational organizations. *Journal of Educational Management Studies, 6*(2), 145–159. https://doi.org/10.21009/jems.062.06

Basrowi, B., & Sofiah, L. (2023). Strategic leadership and digital readiness in educational institutions. *Journal of Educational Administration and Leadership, 5*(1), 33–47. https://doi.org/10.30870/jeal.v5i1.18721

Basrowi, B., Munawir, A., & Nuryanto, U. W. (2024). Human resource capacity building and organizational quality improvement in education. *International Journal of Educational Management and Policy, 8*(1), 22–35. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijemp.2023.11.004

Basrowi, B., Nuryanto, U. W., & Munawir, A. (2023). Digital governance and leadership adaptability in Indonesian education systems. *International Journal of Data and Network Science, 7*, 1341–1352. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2023.7.009

Basrowi, B., Suryaningrat, R. R., & Rahmadani, K. (2023). Web-based instructional quality systems and continuous feedback in education. *International Journal of Information and*

Education Technology, 13(5), 812–820. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2023.13.5.1883

Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2024). Digital transformation in education: Evidence-informed perspectives and future directions. *Computers & Education, 200*, 104781. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104781

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2021). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 25*(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Datnow, A., & Park, V. (2023). Data-driven leadership and continuous improvement in education. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 59*(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X221114742

Hanushek, E. A., Woessmann, L., & Zhang, L. (2022). General education, vocational education, and labor-market outcomes over the life-cycle. *Journal of Human Resources, 57*(3), 984–1039. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.57.3.0219-10011R1

Harris, A., Jones, M., & Baba, S. (2022). Distributed leadership and digital transformation: A systematic review. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50*(4), 562–582. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432211043882

Karakose, T., Polat, H., & Papadakis, S. (2024). Digital leadership in education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432231201934

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2021). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership revisited. *School Leadership & Management, 41*(1–2), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2019.1596077

Marginson, S. (2022). The changing dynamics of higher education global competition. *Higher Education, 84*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00733-1

Ng, P. T., & Ho, D. C. W. (2023). Leadership, trust, and data use in educational quality assurance. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 51*(3), 402–421. https://doi.org/10.1177/17411432221090212

OECD. (2021). *Education at a glance 2021: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/b35a14e5-en

OECD. (2022). *Education at a glance 2022: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en

Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2021). Improving school leadership: Policy and practice. *Educational Research Review, 34*, 100403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100403

Scheerens, J. (2023). Educational effectiveness and quality management revisited. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 34*(3), 385–401. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2173654

Sun, J., & Leithwood, K. (2021). Leadership stability and school improvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 57*(2), 193–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X20969892

Van der Voort, H., & Wood, M. (2024). Data governance and ethics in digital public organizations. *Government Information Quarterly, 41*(1), 101835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2023.101835

Yin, H., Huang, S., & Chen, G. (2024). Teacher participation and quality assurance in digital education systems. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 129*, 104109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104109

Zhang, Y., & Ng, S. W. (2024). Digital quality assurance and institutional effectiveness in education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 32*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-07-2023-0124