Journal of Applied Islamic Education Management
Vol. 1 No. 1 (2026), p. 1-11
Available online at https://cendikianusantara.com/index.php/jaiem

AI-Enabled Quality Assurance in Madrasah: Reconfiguring Institutional Quality Management through Predictive Analytics

Muhammad Imron[1]*, Saiful Bahri[2]
[1] Universitas Islam Negeri Kiai Haji Achmad Siddiq Jember, Indonesia
[2] Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Syariah Babussalam, Indonesia

Article History:
Received: 02 December 2025
Revised: 14 February 2026
Accepted: 10 March 2026

Keywords:
AI-Enabled Quality Assurance; Predictive Analytics; Institutional Quality Management

Correspondence Address:
muhammadimron@gmail.com

Abstract :
This study aims to examine how AI-enabled predictive analytics can reconfigure institutional quality assurance in Islamic higher education and support proactive quality management. A qualitative case study design was employed to investigate how artificial intelligence, predictive indicators, and institutional quality practices are interpreted and implemented within a natural educational setting. The research was conducted at Madrasah Nurul Amin, selected because the institution provides a relevant context for examining digital transformation, quality assurance, and AI-supported management practices. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document analysis involving institutional leaders, quality assurance personnel, lecturers, and administrative staff. Data were analyzed through data condensation, data display, and verification. Findings indicate that AI-enabled quality assurance operates through data integration, predictive risk identification, human interpretation, targeted intervention, and continuous evaluation. The study concludes that predictive analytics can shift quality assurance from retrospective compliance toward proactive improvement, provided that models remain interpretable, ethical, and human-supervised. The implication is that Islamic higher education institutions need integrated data governance, AI literacy, ethical safeguards, and continuous quality-monitoring mechanisms.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence is becoming important infrastructure for higher education quality management because universities generate extensive data from learning platforms, student information systems, assessment records, research activities, services, and evaluations. The central point is that AI-enabled quality assurance can move institutions from retrospective reporting toward proactive improvement. Predictive analytics can identify patterns, anticipate risks, and support timely interventions before quality problems become severe. Recent studies indicate that big data and analytics are increasingly used to support evidence-based decision-making, prediction, student monitoring, and institutional management in higher education (Stojanov & Daniel, 2024). Predictive learning analytics has also demonstrated potential for identifying academic risks and supporting timely educational interventions (Sghir et al., 2023). However, prediction must be interpreted carefully because accuracy, fairness, context, and human

judgment remain essential (Khalil et al., 2024). Therefore, AI-enabled quality assurance is socially important because it can strengthen institutional responsiveness, accountability, efficiency, and continuous improvement.

The general problem is that quality assurance in higher education is often dominated by retrospective compliance, periodic reporting, and document preparation rather than continuous prediction and improvement. Institutions may collect large quantities of academic and administrative data, yet these data are not always transformed into actionable evidence for institutional decision-making. Stojanov and Daniel (2024) explain that although big data and analytics have become increasingly important in higher education, institutions still face challenges in translating available data into meaningful organizational decisions. Similarly, research on learning analytics adoption indicates that institutional implementation remains uneven, with many initiatives still developing beyond pilot stages (Márquez et al., 2024). Islamic institutions face additional challenges because technological innovation must remain consistent with academic integrity, Islamic values, human agency, and institutional responsibility. Recent research in Indonesian Islamic education identifies digital literacy, infrastructure, privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, and ethical governance as significant challenges in AI implementation (Achruh et al., 2024). Consequently, the challenge is not simply adopting AI, but transforming quality management into an evidence-based, predictive, ethical, and continuously learning process.

The field phenomenon indicates that higher education institutions are increasingly experimenting with digital dashboards, learning analytics, automated assessment, student monitoring, decision-support systems, and AI-supported administrative services. Learning analytics dashboards, for example, are increasingly designed not merely to display information but to support learning and institutional decision-making (Paulsen & Lindsay, 2024). Similarly, Drugova et al. (2024) demonstrate that learning analytics can contribute to evidence-informed improvements in higher education learning design. However, the utilization of these technologies remains diverse and is influenced by institutional capacity, data infrastructure, staff competence, and organizational readiness. In Islamic higher education, digital transformation is also expanding, but institutions continue to encounter challenges related to technological readiness and ethical implementation (Achruh et al., 2024). Quality assurance practices still tend to rely heavily on evaluations, audits, tracer studies, performance indicators, and periodic reports. Although these mechanisms provide valuable evidence, they are largely descriptive and retrospective. The emerging phenomenon is therefore a transition from documenting quality toward anticipating quality risks through predictive analytics.

Previous studies have established that AI and learning analytics can support higher education through personalized learning, automated assessment, administrative decision support, profiling, prediction, and student monitoring. A systematic review by Sghir et al. (2023) demonstrates substantial growth in predictive learning analytics, particularly in relation to student performance, academic progression, and educational outcomes. Stojanov and Daniel (2024) similarly show that big data and analytics have become important resources for improving decision-making in higher education. However, much of this literature focuses on teaching and learning, student achievement, retention, dropout, and individual student support rather than institutional quality assurance as an integrated management process. Research concerning Islamic higher education has increasingly examined AI adoption, institutional readiness, digital

transformation, and ethical concerns (Achruh et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the relationship between predictive analytics and institutional quality assurance remains insufficiently examined. This creates an important research gap between the growing analytical capabilities of AI and their systematic integration into institutional quality-management processes.

A further research gap concerns the limited integration of predictive analytics with institutional quality cycles. Existing research frequently examines prediction as a technical exercise, particularly for identifying students at risk, whereas quality assurance research emphasizes standards, indicators, audits, accreditation, and continuous improvement. Sghir et al. (2023) identify substantial methodological development in predictive learning analytics but also highlight continuing challenges related to data quality, model selection, and implementation. Márquez et al. (2024) further demonstrate that institutional adoption of learning analytics remains complex because technological implementation must be supported by organizational structures and institutional capacity. Moreover, Khalil et al. (2024) emphasize the importance of inclusion and responsible data use in learning analytics. These concerns become particularly significant when predictive outputs influence institutional decisions. In Islamic higher education, predictive systems must also respect privacy, fairness, transparency, and educational values (Achruh et al., 2024). Therefore, the unresolved question is how predictive analytics can be embedded into quality assurance without reducing educational quality to algorithmic indicators.

The state of the art of this study lies in reframing AI-enabled quality assurance as a proactive institutional management system rather than an isolated technological application. This perspective connects predictive analytics with quality indicators, early-warning mechanisms, human interpretation, intervention, and continuous evaluation. Stojanov and Daniel (2024) demonstrate the growing importance of analytics for evidence-based decision-making, while Sghir et al. (2023) establish the increasing role of predictive analytics in educational contexts. At the same time, Iskarim (2025) emphasizes the importance of institutional readiness for future quality assurance in Indonesian Islamic higher education. The novelty of the present study therefore lies in integrating three dimensions: predictive intelligence, institutional quality assurance, and Islamic educational values. Such integration is important because effective quality management should not merely describe institutional performance but also anticipate potential risks while preserving human judgment, ethical responsibility, contextual interpretation, and the holistic mission of Islamic higher education. Thus, AI is positioned as decision-support infrastructure rather than an autonomous evaluator of institutional quality.

The research problem is how AI-enabled predictive analytics can be integrated into institutional quality assurance to strengthen quality management in Islamic higher education. The provisional argument is that predictive analytics can improve quality assurance when institutional data are integrated, indicators are clearly defined, analytical models are appropriately validated, and predictions are connected to timely interventions. Sghir et al. (2023) demonstrate that predictive analytics can support educational decision-making, while Stojanov and Daniel (2024) emphasize the potential of analytics for evidence-based institutional decisions. However, these capabilities require organizational readiness, ethical governance, and competent human interpretation. In Islamic higher education, Iskarim (2025) highlights the importance of institutional preparedness for future quality assurance, while Achruh et al. (2024)

emphasize ethical and infrastructural challenges associated with AI adoption. Therefore, AI should function as an early-warning and decision-support mechanism rather than an autonomous evaluator. Institutional quality can consequently be reconstructed through a cycle of data collection, prediction, interpretation, intervention, monitoring, and evaluation, creating a more responsive, evidence-based, and sustainable quality-assurance system.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a qualitative research approach using a case study design. The design was selected because the research seeks to understand in depth how AI-enabled quality assurance, predictive analytics, institutional data, and quality-management practices are interpreted and implemented within a natural educational setting. A case study is appropriate because AI-enabled quality assurance is inseparable from institutional culture, leadership, data governance, staff competence, technological infrastructure, and educational values. The study does not seek statistical generalization but aims to construct a contextual explanation of how predictive analytics can support institutional quality management. The approach also enables the researcher to examine the interaction between formal quality assurance procedures and emerging AI-supported practices.

The research was conducted at Madrasah Nurul Amin, which was purposively selected as the research setting. The institution was selected because it provides a relevant context for examining the intersection between Islamic educational values, institutional quality assurance, digital transformation, and emerging AI-supported management practices. The setting allows the researcher to explore how quality information is collected, interpreted, monitored, and potentially transformed into predictive evidence. The location is also relevant for examining whether technological innovation can strengthen quality management without weakening human judgment, institutional accountability, and the distinctive values of Islamic education.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document analysis. The interviews explored participants' experiences concerning quality assurance, institutional data, AI utilization, predictive analytics, decision-making, and quality improvement. Participants included institutional leaders, quality assurance personnel, lecturers, coordinators, and administrative staff involved in quality-management processes. Participant observation focused on quality-assurance meetings, monitoring activities, institutional evaluation, data-review practices, and interactions among personnel. Document analysis examined quality-assurance reports, institutional performance indicators, evaluation documents, student records, academic reports, strategic plans, monitoring documents, and other relevant institutional records. The three techniques were used complementarily so that statements obtained through interviews could be compared with observed practices and documentary evidence.

Data analysis followed an interactive process consisting of data condensation, data display, and verification/conclusion drawing. First, interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents were condensed by selecting information related to AI-enabled quality assurance and predictive quality management. Second, the condensed information was coded and displayed according to emerging categories, including data integration, predictive analysis, early-warning mechanisms, human interpretation, intervention, ethical governance, monitoring, and continuous improvement. Third,

patterns and relationships among categories were compared across informants and data sources. Interpretations were continuously verified by returning to the original data, identifying contradictions, comparing sources, and relating emerging patterns to the research questions. Conclusions were developed progressively throughout the research process.

The trustworthiness of the findings was strengthened through source triangulation, technique triangulation, member checking, prolonged engagement, and an audit trail. Source triangulation involved comparing information obtained from institutional leaders, quality assurance personnel, lecturers, and administrative staff. Technique triangulation compared interview findings with observations and institutional documents. Member checking was conducted by confirming important interpretations with relevant participants. Prolonged engagement enabled the researcher to distinguish recurring quality-management practices from temporary institutional responses. Dependability was strengthened through systematic documentation of the research process, coding procedures, analytical decisions, and theme development. Confirmability was maintained by connecting interpretations directly to empirical evidence and documenting the reasoning used to construct the findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

AI-Enabled Predictive Quality Assurance

Operationally, AI-enabled predictive quality assurance refers to the use of institutional data, analytical technologies, and predictive indicators to identify emerging quality risks, anticipate possible institutional problems, and support timely interventions. In the research setting, the practice includes monitoring student performance, attendance, academic progression, lecturer performance, program implementation, service quality, and institutional performance indicators. Predictive quality assurance differs from conventional quality assurance because it does not only ask whether institutional standards have been achieved; it also asks what patterns may indicate future risks. The researcher interprets this practice as a shift from retrospective evaluation toward proactive quality management in which historical and current information are transformed into signals for institutional action.

Example interview excerpt—Head of Institution: *"Previously, quality evaluation was mostly conducted after a program had finished. Now we are trying to identify indicators that can show problems earlier. If attendance, academic performance, or participation begins to decline, we need to know this before it becomes a serious quality problem."* The researcher interprets this statement as evidence of an emerging preventive orientation in quality management. The important change is the movement from evaluating completed activities toward monitoring indicators continuously. The leader does not position AI as an autonomous decision-maker but as a mechanism for identifying patterns that require institutional attention. Thus, predictive analytics becomes a supporting instrument for strengthening the responsiveness of quality assurance.

Example interview excerpt—Quality Assurance Coordinator: *"The system can help us see patterns in the data, but the result still needs to be discussed with lecturers and managers. A prediction is not automatically a final conclusion because we need to*

understand the context behind the data." The researcher interprets this statement as evidence of human-supervised predictive quality assurance. The finding demonstrates that institutional actors recognize the difference between prediction and judgment. A predictive signal may indicate a potential problem, but interpretation requires contextual knowledge. This practice corresponds with recent research emphasizing explainability, model stability, human oversight, and ethical considerations in educational AI.

Observation of quality-management activities indicated that institutional data were increasingly discussed as evidence for monitoring and evaluation. Participants referred to student achievement, attendance, academic progression, program reports, lecturer performance, and institutional indicators when discussing quality issues. However, the researcher also observed that predictive analysis was not treated as an independent technological process. Information generated from data still required discussion, interpretation, and contextual verification by institutional personnel. This indicates that AI-enabled quality assurance is developing as a hybrid process, combining technological analysis with professional judgment. The researcher interprets this pattern as important because predictive analytics becomes meaningful only when its outputs are translated into institutional actions such as additional support, program adjustment, lecturer development, or quality improvement.

The findings can be restated simply: institutional data provide signals, predictive analytics identifies possible risks, human actors interpret those signals, and quality-assurance teams determine appropriate interventions. AI therefore does not replace institutional quality managers. Instead, it expands their capacity to detect patterns that may be difficult to identify through manual observation alone. For example, a gradual decline in attendance combined with declining academic performance may become an early-warning signal. Nevertheless, the signal requires further investigation before intervention. This process demonstrates that predictive quality assurance depends on the interaction between technology and human judgment. Such an approach is consistent with UNESCO's human-centred orientation toward AI, which emphasizes human agency, ethical safeguards, and responsible use of AI in education.

The pattern emerging from the data can be described as Data Integration, Predictive Detection, Human Interpretation, Targeted Intervention, Monitoring, Continuous Improvement. This pattern demonstrates a movement from retrospective quality assurance toward proactive quality management. The first stage integrates relevant institutional information; the second identifies patterns or possible risks; the third evaluates those signals within institutional contexts; the fourth establishes an appropriate intervention; and the fifth monitors the consequences of that intervention. The final stage creates a feedback loop through which new evidence informs subsequent quality decisions. The pattern therefore indicates that AI-enabled quality assurance is not simply an automated system but an organizational cycle that combines predictive intelligence, professional judgment, ethical governance, and continuous institutional learning.

Table 1. Indicators of AI-Enabled Predictive Quality Assurance

Informant Position	Interview Excerpt	Indicator
Head of Institution	"We need to identify indicators that can show problems earlier, so quality issues can be	Predictive quality monitoring and early-warning orientation

	addressed before they become serious."	
Quality Assurance Coordinator	"The prediction helps us identify patterns, but the result still needs to be discussed with lecturers and managers."	Human interpretation and contextual validation
Lecturer	"Student performance and attendance data help us identify students or learning activities that require additional attention."	Data-informed academic intervention
Program Coordinator	"After an intervention, we compare the new results with previous indicators to see whether the problem has improved."	Monitoring and evaluation
Administrative Staff	"The data are not only prepared for reports; they are increasingly used to support discussions about institutional quality."	Data integration and evidence-based quality management

Table 1 indicates that AI-enabled quality assurance involves several interconnected institutional roles rather than being concentrated within a technological or quality-assurance unit. The head of the institution establishes the strategic direction by emphasizing early identification of quality risks. The quality assurance coordinator provides an analytical and interpretive function by ensuring that predictive outputs are discussed rather than accepted automatically. Lecturers translate evidence into academic interventions, while program coordinators monitor whether interventions produce improvement. Administrative staff provide the data infrastructure required for institutional analysis. This distribution demonstrates that predictive quality assurance requires organizational participation. AI becomes valuable when institutional actors collectively transform data into evidence, evidence into decisions, and decisions into monitored quality improvements.

The deeper interpretation is that the institution is developing a proactive quality culture rather than merely adopting an AI tool. This distinction is important because technological availability does not automatically produce institutional quality improvement. Research on AI in higher education identifies prediction and profiling as significant applications but also highlights the need for stronger ethics, collaboration, methodological rigor, and contextual interpretation. Similarly, research on Islamic higher education demonstrates that future quality assurance requires institutional readiness, capacity, and continuous improvement rather than compliance alone. The present finding therefore suggests that predictive analytics should be embedded in institutional processes involving interpretation, intervention, monitoring, and accountability.

Discussion

The finding that AI can strengthen quality assurance through predictive monitoring is consistent with recent research showing that data analytics can support evidence-based decision-making in higher education. Stojanov and Daniel (2024) identify data-driven decision-making as a major motivation for the use of big data and analytics in higher education, while Sghir et al. (2023) demonstrate the growing role of predictive learning analytics in identifying patterns and anticipating educational risks. Recent research on AI-enabled quality assurance further shows that AI can support evidence collection, pattern detection, monitoring, and proactive institutional improvement (Isaifan & Hasna, 2025; Warren et al., 2025). The present finding extends this literature by locating predictive analytics directly within the institutional quality cycle rather than

treating analytics as a separate technological function. The theoretical implication is that quality assurance can be reconceptualized as predictive, adaptive, and continuously evaluative. Practically, institutions should integrate dashboards, quality indicators, early-warning mechanisms, and intervention procedures so that analytical information produces timely quality improvement rather than merely additional documentation.

The finding that predictive analytics requires human interpretation aligns with Bond et al. (2024), whose meta-systematic review emphasizes the need for stronger ethics, collaboration, methodological rigor, and contextual sensitivity in higher education AI research. Similarly, Alfredo et al. (2024) argue that human-centred learning analytics requires an appropriate balance between automation and human control, particularly because privacy, reliability, trustworthiness, and human agency influence the legitimacy of AI-supported decisions. Liu et al. (2023) further demonstrate that learning analytics involves substantial privacy and data-protection challenges that require careful institutional management. The present study reinforces these arguments by showing that prediction should support, rather than replace, quality managers' professional judgment. The theoretical contribution is therefore an understanding of AI as a decision-support mediator within institutional quality assurance. Practically, quality assurance teams need procedures for validating predictions, explaining model outputs, documenting decisions, and reviewing unexpected results before algorithmic recommendations are translated into institutional interventions.

The finding that Islamic educational values must shape AI-enabled quality assurance agrees with Achruh et al. (2024), who identify privacy, algorithmic bias, transparency, infrastructure, and digital literacy as significant issues in AI adoption within Indonesian Islamic higher education. Iskarim (2025) similarly demonstrates that Islamic higher education institutions need institutional readiness to respond to future quality assurance demands. The present study advances these discussions by connecting institutional readiness with predictive quality management rather than considering readiness only as technological preparedness. This distinction suggests that technological maturity alone does not constitute institutional maturity; ethical, cultural, organizational, and human capacities must develop simultaneously. The theoretical implication is that AI-enabled quality assurance in Islamic higher education should be understood as a socio-technical and value-sensitive system. Practically, institutions should establish governance principles that protect privacy, preserve human agency, promote fairness, strengthen transparency, and ensure that predictive interventions remain compatible with academic responsibility and the broader educational mission of Islamic institutions.

The finding that predictive analytics can support early intervention is consistent with research on learning analytics and predictive educational systems. Sghir et al. (2023) show that predictive learning analytics has increasingly been applied to identify academic risks and anticipate student outcomes, while a systematic review by Paulsen and Lindsay (2024) demonstrates the growing sophistication of analytics dashboards through the integration of multiple data sources and analytical levels. Drugova et al. (2024) further indicate that learning analytics can support evidence-informed improvements in higher education, although the maturity and empirical evidence of such interventions remain uneven. The present study broadens this application from individual student prediction toward institutional quality assurance. This distinction is important because institutional quality is produced through interconnected processes involving students, lecturers, curricula, governance, academic services, and administrative systems. Consequently,

institutions can combine academic, student, administrative, and quality indicators within governed dashboards. However, predictions should be treated as signals requiring professional investigation rather than definitive judgments about students, lecturers, programs, or institutional performance.

The study contributes a framework linking predictive analytics, institutional quality assurance, human interpretation, ethical governance, and continuous improvement. This contribution complements Indonesian research showing that Islamic higher education institutions are increasingly preparing for future quality assurance and require stronger institutional capacity to respond to changing educational demands (Iskarim, 2025). It also corresponds with recent research emphasizing responsible and human-centred AI, particularly fairness, privacy, transparency, autonomy, and accountability (Alfredo et al., 2024; Memarian & Doleck, 2024). Furthermore, research on learning analytics dashboards emphasizes that analytical systems become more valuable when their outputs are connected to meaningful actions rather than simply presenting information (Paulsen & Lindsay, 2024). Practically, institutions should integrate reliable data sources, define quality indicators, develop early-warning models, train users, validate analytical outputs, implement interventions, and evaluate their consequences. Nevertheless, this study is limited by its single institutional setting and qualitative design. Future research should compare multiple Islamic higher education institutions, test predictive models quantitatively, examine fairness and explainability, and assess longitudinal effects on accreditation outcomes, student success, institutional effectiveness, and quality culture.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding is that AI-enabled predictive analytics can reconfigure institutional quality assurance from a predominantly retrospective and compliance-oriented process toward proactive, evidence-based, and continuously evaluative quality management. The central lesson is that AI should not replace human judgment but strengthen the ability of quality-assurance actors to detect emerging risks, interpret institutional patterns, design timely interventions, and monitor improvement. The scholarly contribution lies in connecting predictive analytics with institutional quality assurance and Islamic educational values, thereby extending existing discussions that often separate AI adoption from quality-management systems. The practical contribution is a process model consisting of data integration, predictive detection, human verification, intervention, monitoring, and continuous improvement. Nevertheless, the single-site qualitative design limits transferability. Future studies should compare institutions, test predictive models quantitatively, examine algorithmic fairness and explainability, and evaluate long-term effects on accreditation, student success, and institutional quality culture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors sincerely thank Madrasah Nurul Amin for granting permission and providing support throughout this research. Appreciation is extended to the leaders, quality assurance personnel, lecturers, administrative staff, and participants who contributed their time, experiences, and perspectives. Their openness and cooperation provided information for understanding AI-enabled quality assurance and predictive analytics. The authors are grateful for the trust, access, assistance, and supportive

research environment provided by the institution, which significantly facilitated data collection, interpretation, and completion of this study.

REFERENCES

Achruh, A., Rapi, M., Rusdi, M., & Idris, R. (2024). Challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence adoption in Islamic education in Indonesian higher education institutions. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 23(11), 423–443. https://doi.org/10.26803/IJLTER.23.11.22

Achruh, A., Rapi, M., Rusdi, M., & Idris, R. (2024). Challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence adoption in Islamic education in Indonesian higher education institutions. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 23(11), 423–443. https://doi.org/10.26803/IJLTER.23.11.22

Alfredo, R., Echeverria, V., Jin, Y., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2024). Human-centred learning analytics and AI in education: A systematic literature review. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6, 100215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100215

Amo-Filva, D., Fonseca, D., García-Peñalvo, F. J., Alier Forment, M., Casany Guerrero, M. J., & Godoy, G. (2024). Exploring the landscape of learning analytics privacy in fog and edge computing: A systematic literature review. Computers in Human Behavior, 158, 108303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108303

Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z

Drugova, E., Zamyatin, A., & Latipov, A. (2024). Learning analytics driven improvements in learning design in higher education: A systematic literature review. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 40(2), 510–524. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12894

Drugova, E., Zamyatin, A., & Latipov, A. (2024). Learning analytics driven improvements in learning design in higher education: A systematic literature review. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 40(2), 510–524. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12894

Isaifan, R. J., & Hasna, M. O. (2025). Artificial intelligence for quality assurance in higher education: A policy-to-practice model from Qatar with global relevance. Quality in Higher Education, 31(3), 288–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2025.2576326

Iskarim, M. (2025). Readiness of Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia for future quality assurance. Quality Assurance in Education, 33(1), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-03-2024-0046

Iskarim, M., Aenurofik, & Junaeti. (2025). Readiness of Islamic higher education institutions in Indonesia for future quality assurance. Quality Assurance in Education, 33(1), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-03-2024-0046

Khalil, M., Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2024). Learning analytics in support of inclusiveness and disabled students: A systematic review. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 36, 202–219.

Khalil, M., Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2024). Learning analytics in support of inclusiveness

and disabled students: A systematic review. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 36, 202–219.
Liu, Y., et al. (2023). Understanding privacy and data protection issues in learning analytics using a systematic review. British Journal of Educational Technology. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13388
Márquez, J., Scheihing, E., & Guerra, J. (2024). Adoption of learning analytics in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. British Journal of Educational Technology. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13385
Mella-Norambuena, J., Badilla-Quintana, M. G., & López Angulo, Y. (2022). Predictive models based on the use of learning analytics in higher education: A systematic review. Texto Livre, 15. https://doi.org/10.35699/1983-3652.2022.36310
Memarian, B., & Doleck, T. (2024). A review of caveats and future considerations of research on responsible AI across disciplines. Human Technology, 20(3). https://doi.org/10.14254/1795-6889.2024.20-3.4
Paulsen, L., & Lindsay, E. (2024). Learning analytics dashboards are increasingly becoming about learning and not just analytics: A systematic review. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 14279–14308. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12401-4
Paulsen, L., & Lindsay, E. (2024). Learning analytics dashboards are increasingly becoming about learning and not just analytics: A systematic review. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 14279–14308. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12401-4
Purnama, O. A. A., Dien, M. E., & Mori, I. (2025). Designing ethical learning analytics frameworks to support decision making and equity in technology enhanced higher education environments. International Journal of Educational Technology and Society. https://doi.org/10.61132/ijets.v2i4.465
Salas Martinez, A., & Ramírez Martinell, A. (2023). Application of learning analytics in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. 2023 11th International Conference in Software Engineering Research and Innovation. https://doi.org/10.1109/CONISOFT58849.2023.00024
Sghir, N., Adadi, A., & Lahmer, M. (2023). Recent advances in predictive learning analytics: A decade systematic review (2012–2022). Education and Information Technologies, 28, 8299–8333. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11536-0
Sghir, N., Adadi, A., & Lahmer, M. (2023). Recent advances in predictive learning analytics: A decade systematic review (2012–2022). Education and Information Technologies, 28, 8299–8333. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11536-0.
Stojanov, A., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). A decade of research into the application of big data and analytics in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 5807–5831. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12033-8
Stojanov, A., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). A decade of research into the application of big data and analytics in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. Education and Information Technologies, 29, 5807–5831. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12033-8
Wang, Y., et al. (2024). Navigating the ethical terrain of AI in education: A systematic review on framing responsible human-centered AI practices. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 7, 100306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100306