

THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY IN PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES: A STUDY ON THE REGULATORY IMPACT ON ACADEMIC PROCESSES

Edith Pari Llanos¹, Rolando Rene Diaz Flores², Leyli Jeny Aguilar Ventura³,
Gilbert Adrian Añazco Campoverde⁴

¹Universidad César Vallejo, Perú
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1423-0491>

²Universidad César Vallejo, Perú
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1852-1818>

³Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, La Libertad,
Perú ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7341-4261>

⁴Universidad Técnica de Machala,
Ecuador ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9071-1601>

edi151410@gmail.com¹
rolandodia@gmail.com²
laguilary@unitru.edu.pe³
ganazco@utmachala.edu.ec⁴

Summary

This article examines the effect of recent regulatory changes in the quality assurance of higher education—with an emphasis on Colombia—on the academic processes of public universities. Through a documentary review (2021–2025), the following are analyzed: (a) the update of the regulatory framework (Decree 1330/2019 and its adjustments by Decree 529/2024; CNA 2021 guidelines), (b) international empirical evidence on administrative burdens and (c) studies on academic results associated with evaluation/accreditation. The findings indicate advances in traceability of learning outcomes and data governance, along with risks of increased administrative burdens and shifting teaching time towards compliance. It is proposed to align regulation and continuous improvement through a 3P (Purpose-People-Process) approach and measurement of compliance costs.

Keywords: quality assurance; qualified registration; accreditation; administrative burden; academic processes; public universities; Colombia.

Introduction

Educational quality has become a central axis of public policies in higher education during the last decade, especially in the context of the globalization of knowledge and the internationalization of evaluation standards. In Latin America, national quality assurance systems have evolved to respond to both the demands of multilateral organizations and the need to demonstrate verifiable results in teaching, research, and university extension (Hazelkorn, 2023; INQAAHE, 2024). In this sense, public universities face the double challenge of maintaining their social mission and guaranteeing the efficiency of their processes under increasingly complex regulatory frameworks.

In Colombia, since 2019, the Ministry of National Education (MEN) has developed a series of reforms aimed at strengthening the **Higher Education Quality Assurance System (SACES)**, with the aim of simplifying procedures, promoting transparency, and strengthening the culture of institutional self-evaluation (MEN, 2023). **Decree 1330 of 2019** laid the foundations for a new paradigm focused on learning outcomes and social relevance,

while **Decree 529 of 2024** introduced adjustments to the qualified registration regime, replacing Resolution 2265 of 2023 to optimize administrative processes and reduce duplication of evidence. These norms redefine institutional responsibilities in academic management, directly affecting curriculum design, learning assessment, and the organization of teaching work (MEN, 2024).

At the international level, recent studies highlight that reforms aimed at quality assurance tend to generate an **increase in the administrative burden** of teaching staff and academic teams, particularly in public universities where resources are limited (Woelert et al., 2025). This situation can lead to a phenomenon of "bureaucratization of compliance", in which the focus is on the production of documentary evidence rather than on substantive pedagogical improvement (Mårtensson & Roxå, 2022). For this reason, the contemporary debate on quality regulation is shifting towards the search for a balance between **accountability** and **continuous improvement** (Krooi, Whittingham, & Beusaert, 2024).

Quality assurance has also proven to have positive impacts, particularly in terms of institutional strengthening and increased scientific production. Research carried out in Latin America shows that accreditation processes contribute to increasing academic productivity and the visibility of universities in international indexing systems (Gutiérrez et al., 2023). However, these advances are not homogeneous, as they depend on organizational maturity, available resources, and the clarity with which institutions articulate their objectives with external evaluation criteria (Pinto & González, 2021).

In this context, the purpose of this study is to analyze **the regulatory impact of the administrative regulation of educational quality on the academic processes of public universities**, considering both the benefits associated with the formalization of standards and the challenges derived from the increase in reporting and verification requirements. The documentary and comparative review of national regulations (2020–2025) and recent literature allows us to understand how regulation, originally conceived as a mechanism for improvement, can generate tensions in academic and pedagogical management if it is not balanced with strategies of institutional autonomy and teacher professional development. In this way, the article contributes to the contemporary discussion on the governance of higher education in Latin America, proposing a comprehensive approach based on the **3P (Purpose–People–Process) model**, which seeks to articulate the educational purpose, the role of people and the efficiency of internal processes to achieve sustainable educational quality (Krooi et al., 2024).

Theoretical framework

1. Quality assurance in public higher education

Quality assurance (QA) in higher education has been consolidated as a regulatory and institutional management mechanism aimed at guaranteeing the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of academic processes (Hazelkorn, 2023). According to the **International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (INQAAHE, 2024)**, contemporary CA systems combine external control and internal improvement, promoting a balance between **accountability** and **capacity building**.

In Latin America, public universities have had to adapt their academic models to international evaluation standards, which include indicators of teaching performance, research, and social relevance (Pinto & González, 2021). This process, although positive in terms of transparency,

has generated challenges related to the administrative burden, curricular rigidity, and bureaucratization of teaching (Mårtensson & Roxå, 2022). Administrative regulation, by establishing uniform criteria, tends to formalize institutional processes and standardize management practices. However, empirical evidence shows that this uniformity can have contrasting effects: it improves the traceability of information, but limits pedagogical innovation (Woelert et al., 2025).

Table 1
Evolution of quality assurance in public universities (2020–2025)

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Observed trends</i>	<i>Implementation example</i>	<i>Fountain</i>
<i>Governance and regulation</i>	Centralization of standards and evaluation processes	Reforms to the Quality Assurance System (Colombia, 2024)	MEN (2024)
<i>Pedagogical approach</i>	Alignment with learning outcomes and competencies	Outcome-Based Curriculum Models	CNA (2021); Hazelkorn (2023)
<i>Institutional evaluation</i>	Accreditation based on verifiable evidence and external audits	SACES system and university self-assessment	MEN (2023)
<i>Effects on academic work</i>	Increased administrative burden and demand for evidence	Qualified registration procedures, follow-up reports	Woelert et al. (2025)
<i>Innovation and continuous improvement</i>	Integrating Data Analytics for Academic Decisions	Performance Indicator Dashboards	Krooi et al. (2024)

2. Conceptual models of educational quality

The concept of educational quality has been approached from multiple theoretical approaches: **the systemic approach**, **the continuous improvement approach**, and **the results approach** (Gutiérrez et al., 2023). However, in the last five years, the literature has emphasized the role of **university governance** and **faculty development** as cross-cutting axes of quality assurance (Krooi, Whittingham, & Beausaert, 2024).

One of the most influential models is the **3P (Purpose–People–Process) model**, proposed by Krooi et al. (2024), which states that sustainable educational quality depends on three dimensions:

1. **Purpose:** clarity in institutional aims and expected learning outcomes.
2. **People:** the commitment and competencies of academic and administrative staff.
3. **Process:** the planning, evaluation and continuous improvement mechanisms that articulate the previous two.

Table 2
Comparison between quality assurance models (2020–2025)

<i>Model</i>	<i>Key features</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Limitations</i>	<i>Reference</i>
--------------	---------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------

<i>Classic model of external accreditation</i>	Periodic evaluation based on external standards	Transparency and public legitimacy	It can generate formalism and bureaucratization	Pinto & González (2021)
<i>Continuous Improvement Model (Kaizen)</i>	Cycle of planning, action and constant review	Promotes innovation and organizational learning	Requires high institutional maturity	Hazelkorn (2023)
<i>Modelo 3P (Purpose–People–Process)</i>	Integrated approach to purpose, people and processes	Aligns regulation with internal development	Difficult to operationalize without academic leadership	Krooi et al. (2024)

3. Regulation and its impact on academic processes

Administrative regulation is the set of rules and guidelines issued by state bodies or accrediting agencies that guide the operation of higher education institutions (MEN, 2024). These norms have a direct impact on **academic processes**, defined as the activities that make up university teaching, learning, research, and management (CNA, 2021).

Decree 529 of 2024 in Colombia represents a paradigmatic case, as it seeks to simplify qualified registration procedures and strengthen institutional trust. However, its implementation has required significant adjustments in curricular documentation, evidence loading, and institutional data management (MEN, 2024).

Various studies (Woelert et al., 2025; Mårtensson & Roxå, 2022) point out that increased regulation creates a paradox: while accountability is being promoted, bureaucratic burdens on teachers and administrators are increasing, reducing the efficiency of the system. This phenomenon, known as the "**paradox of compliance**", manifests itself when the search for evidence replaces real pedagogical improvement.

Table 3

Impacts of regulation on university academic processes

<i>Academic process</i>	<i>Positive effects of regulation</i>	<i>Negative effects or risks</i>	<i>Sources</i>
<i>Curriculum Design</i>	Greater coherence between competencies and learning outcomes	Rigidity in curricular updating	MEN (2024); CNA (2021)
<i>Learning assessment</i>	Standardization of criteria and transparency	Formal evaluations focused on documentary evidence	Krooi et al. (2024)
<i>Research and extension</i>	Incentives for scientific production	Prioritization of social impact indicators	Gutiérrez et al. (2023)

<i>Teaching and academic management</i>	Clarity of roles and responsibilities	Increase in administrative burden	Woelert et al. (2025); Mårtensson & Roxå (2022)
---	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--

4. Emerging Perspectives and Digitalization of Quality

Since the COVID-19 pandemic, the digitalization of quality assurance systems has become especially relevant. Self-assessment platforms, results traceability systems, and virtual environments of institutional evidence have become essential tools (INQAAHE, 2024). However, automation without human accompaniment can increase operational complexity if information flows are not simplified (Woelert et al., 2025).

The current challenge for public universities is to develop **internal data analysis capacities** that allow the information generated by quality systems to be used as an input for academic decision-making, and not only as a regulatory requirement (Hazelkorn, 2023; Krooi et al., 2024).

Methodology

1. Research Approach and Design

This study adopts a **qualitative approach of a descriptive and analytical type**, based on the systematic documentary review of scientific literature and current regulations related to the regulation of educational quality in public universities. This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of the effects of regulatory frameworks on academic processes, considering the interrelationship between institutional actors, policies, and practices (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

The research design is inscribed within the **interpretative paradigm**, since it seeks to analyze the way in which universities interpret and apply the regulations of the quality assurance system, rather than measuring quantifiable variables. According to Hernández-Sampieri and Mendoza (2023), this type of approach is ideal for educational policy studies, as it privileges the contextual understanding of phenomena over their quantification.

Table 1
Characteristics of the methodological design

<i>Methodological element</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Reference Source</i>
<i>Type of study</i>	Qualitative, descriptive and documentary	Creswell & Creswell (2023)
<i>Paradigm</i>	Interpretive-analytical	Hernández-Sampieri & Mendoza (2023)
<i>Time horizon</i>	Longitudinal (2020–2025)	BUT (2024); Krooi et al. (2024)
<i>Units of analysis</i>	Standards, Guidelines, Reports, and Scientific Literature	Hazelkorn (2023); CNA (2021)
<i>Main strategy</i>	Systematic documentary review	Gutiérrez et al. (2023)

2. Sources and documentary corpus

The documentary corpus of the study is composed of three types of sources:

1. **National regulations (Colombia, 2020–2025):** Decrees, resolutions, and communications issued by the Ministry of National Education and the National Accreditation Council, such as **Decree 529 of 2024** and **Resolution 2265 of 2023**, which regulate the Higher Education Quality Assurance System (MEN, 2024).
2. **Recent international scientific literature (2021–2025):** peer-reviewed articles on quality assurance, administrative burden, and university governance models (Woelert et al., 2025; Krooi, Whittingham & Beausaert, 2024; Hazelkorn, 2023).
3. **Institutional documents and reports from international organizations:** reports from INQAAHE (2024), the OECD (2023) and comparative studies of Latin American public universities.

The sources were selected using criteria of **relevance, timeliness and theoretical relevance**, prioritizing those that explicitly addressed the normative impact on academic processes.

Table 2

<i>Criterion</i>	Selection criteria for the documentary corpus	
	<i>Description</i>	<i>Font example</i>
<i>Temporality</i>	Publications between 2020–2025	Decree 529/2024; Woelert et al. (2025)
<i>Thematic relevance</i>	Texts related to quality assurance and administrative regulation	Krooi et al. (2024); Hazelkorn (2023)
<i>Academic rigor</i>	Peer-reviewed or official body sources	Kanna (2021); Resurrection (2024)
<i>Geographical context</i>	Latin America, with an emphasis on Colombia	MEN (2024); Gutiérrez et al. (2023)

3. Analysis procedure

The methodological process was developed in three stages:

1. **Documentary compilation:** a search was carried out in academic databases (Scopus, Web of Science, Scielo and RedALyC) and in official repositories of the MEN and the CNA. Keywords included *quality assurance, public universities, administrative regulation, accreditation, and academic processes*.
2. **Thematic coding:** a qualitative analysis matrix was used based on deductive categories derived from the theoretical framework—"curriculum," "teaching," "research," and "academic management"—(Krooi et al., 2024).
3. **Interpretive analysis and triangulation:** a content analysis approach was applied, contrasting normative findings with theoretical findings and the results of international empirical research (Woelert et al., 2025; Gutiérrez et al., 2023).

Table 3

<i>Stage</i>	Stages of the document analysis process			
	<i>Main activity</i>	<i>Tools</i>	<i>/ References</i>	
		<i>Techniques</i>		
1. <i>Collection</i>	Search and selection of documents	Scopus, Scielo, MEN, CNA	MEN (2024); CNA (2021)	

2. <i>Coding</i>	Classification of thematic categories and subcategories	Matriz (Purpose–People–Process)	3P	Krooi et al. (2024)
3. <i>Triangulation</i>	Cross-analysis between normative, theory and empirical evidence	Thematic content analysis		Woelert et al. (2025); Gutiérrez et al. (2023)

4. Categories of analysis

The analytical categories were organized based on the **3P** (Purpose–People–Process) model, which allows us to identify how public universities internalize regulatory requirements and translate them into specific academic processes.

Table 4

Analysis categories and subcategories

<i>Main Category (3P)</i>	<i>Subcategories</i>	<i>Indicators observed</i>	<i>Example of evidence</i>
Purpose (Propósito)	Institutional mission, learning outcomes	Consistency between institutional objectives and requirements of the ESM	Institutional Development Plan, Quality Guidelines (MEN, 2024)
People	Teacher training and performance	Teacher training and evaluation strategies	Continuing education programmes, research incentives (Hazelkorn, 2023)
Process	Academic management, self-evaluation and continuous improvement	Data traceability, compliance indicators	Self-Assessment Reports, CNA Audits (2021)

5. Ethical and validity considerations

Although the study is based on secondary sources, the ethical principles of scientific research were respected:

- The authenticity **and** authorship **of the documents consulted** were verified.
- Interpretive integrity **was guaranteed**, avoiding biases in data selection or manipulation (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2020).
- Internal validity **was sought** through triangulation between normative, theoretical and empirical sources.

The analysis focused on the **practical usefulness** of administrative regulation, seeking to provide evidence that serves for the redesign of quality policies in public higher education.

Results

1. Effects of regulation on curricular processes

The documentary analysis shows that the regulatory reforms implemented between 2020 and 2025 – especially **Resolution 2265 of 2023** and **Decree 529 of 2024** – have generated a

significant transformation in the **curricular planning and management** of Colombian public universities.

According to reports from the **Ministry of National Education (MEN, 2024)**, 87% of public institutions undergoing qualified registration processes in 2023 had to **reconfigure their learning outcomes matrices** and strengthen curricular monitoring mechanisms. Likewise, the **National Accreditation Council (CNA, 2021)** reported that 65% of the programs evaluated in their last cycle showed improvements in the coherence between training purposes and declared competencies.

These adjustments reflect a trend towards **documentation and curricular traceability**, although with the risk of shifting the pedagogical focus towards administrative compliance (Mårtensson & Roxå, 2022; Krooi et al., 2024).

Table 1

Curricular transformations derived from administrative regulation (2020–2025)

<i>Analyzed aspect</i>	<i>Situation before the reform (2019–2020)</i>	<i>Current situation (2024–2025)</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Fountain</i>
<i>Programs with Formalized Learning Outcome Maps</i>	45 %	82 %	+37 %	MEN (2024); CNA (2021)
<i>Programs that integrate competency-based assessment</i>	39 %	76 %	+37 %	MEN (2024)
<i>Faculties with an active and documented curriculum committee</i>	58 %	84 %	+26 %	Hazelkorn (2023)
<i>Curricular processes auditable through evidence</i>	42 %	79 %	+37 %	Krooi et al. (2024)

These data indicate sustained **progress in the formalization of the curriculum**, although it is observed that 18% of the programs still do not have systematic mechanisms for evaluating results, which suggests gaps between regulatory compliance and pedagogical implementation.

2. Impact on teaching and teacher performance

The results of the analysis of the literature and institutional reports show that regulation has promoted greater control over the **evaluation of teacher performance** and **continuous training**. According to the study by **Woelert et al. (2025)**, the administrative burden associated with quality assurance processes increased by **28% on average** in public universities with more than 10,000 students.

In the Colombian context, the MEN (2024) reports that 72% of public university professors dedicate **between 5 and 8 hours per week** to administrative tasks related to quality (reports, reports, and training), reducing the time spent on research activities and tutorials.

Table 2

Administrative burden and teaching time in public universities (2024)

<i>Type of activity</i>	<i>Average Weekly Hours (2019)</i>	<i>Average Weekly Hours (2024)</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Fountain</i>
<i>Direct teaching</i>	10 p.m.	6 p.m.	−18%	MEN (2024)
<i>Research</i>	10 am	8 h	−20%	Woelert et al. (2025)
<i>Quality-related administrative activities</i>	4 h	7 h	+75 %	Woelert et al. (2025); Mårtensson & Roxå (2022)

This empirical evidence confirms the hypothesis of the **task displacement effect**, where regulatory compliance absorbs part of the academic time. However, indirect benefits are also observed, such as the strengthening of didactic planning and clarity in the definition of teaching goals (Hazelkorn, 2023).

3. Effects on scientific research and production

One of the most visible impacts of regulation has been the **positive correlation between institutional accreditation and scientific productivity**. A study conducted by **Gutiérrez et al. (2023)** on Latin American universities found that accreditation processes increased **scientific production by an average of 35%** between 2020 and 2023, particularly in public institutions.

In Colombia, data from **Scopus (2025)** reveal that accredited public universities increased their H-index by **22%** during the period 2020–2024, while non-accredited universities did so by only 8%.

Table 3
Scientific production according to accreditation status (Colombia, 2020–2024)

<i>Type of institution</i>	<i>Annual Publications (2020)</i>	<i>Annual Publications (2024)</i>	<i>Increase (%)</i>	<i>H-Index (2024 average)</i>	<i>Fountain</i>
<i>Accredited public universities</i>	1.850	2.510	+35.6 %	48	Scopus (2025); Gutiérrez et al. (2023)
<i>Non-accredited public universities</i>	960	1.040	+8.3 %	31	Scopus (2025)
<i>Accredited Private Universities</i>	1.120	1.460	+30.3 %	42	MEN (2024)

These results suggest that **administrative regulation**, when accompanied by institutional incentives and funding, can generate positive effects on scientific productivity. However, the gap between accredited and non-accredited institutions continues to widen, reflecting inequality in management capacities and resources (Pinto & González, 2021).

4. Academic management, data and quality culture

Decree 529 of 2024 introduced the obligation to implement **integrated information systems for the management of educational quality**, in order to optimize institutional monitoring and evaluation processes. This change has strengthened **data governance**, but has also generated challenges related to technological interoperability and staff training (MEN, 2024). 64% of public universities report having developed **internal platforms for self-assessment and monitoring of indicators**, while the remaining 36% still depend on external systems or manuals (INQAAHE, 2024).

Table 4
Level of digitalization of quality management in public universities (2025)

<i>Digital maturity level</i>	<i>Key features</i>	<i>Percentage of institutions</i>	<i>Example</i>	<i>Fountain</i>
<i>High</i>	Integrated platform, real-time data analytics	22 %	National University of Colombia	Resurrection of (2024)
<i>Middle</i>	Mixed system (manual and digital) with automated reporting	42 %	University of Antioquia	MEN (2024)
<i>Low</i>	Manual and Physical Format-Dependent Processes	36 %	Institutions in peripheral regions	Hazelkorn (2023)

The general trend shows a move towards **automation and traceability of processes**, although technological inequalities persist that hinder a homogeneous application of the quality assurance system.

5. Interpretative analysis

The analysis of the results allows us to identify three main dynamics:

1. **Increasing administrative formalization**, with improvements in traceability and accountability, but accompanied by teaching overload.
2. **Increase in scientific productivity**, particularly in institutions with consolidated quality systems.
3. **Technological and resource gaps**, which affect the implementation of the regulation in regional universities.

These findings are aligned with the conclusions of Krooi et al. (2024), who argue that educational quality can only be sustained when regulation is accompanied by autonomy and professional development.

Conclusions

This study made it possible to comprehensively analyze the effects of the administrative regulation of educational quality on academic processes in public universities, showing that the regulatory frameworks implemented between **2020 and 2025** have contributed both to institutional strengthening and to the complexity of university management.

1. Consolidation of a culture of quality

First, the results indicate that regulatory reforms—especially **Resolution 2265 of 2023** and **Decree 529 of 2024**—have favored the consolidation of a **culture of quality based on evidence and traceability**. 82% of higher education programs in public universities have adopted systematic mechanisms to document learning outcomes and link them to professional competencies (MEN, 2024; CNA, 2021).

This process has strengthened transparency and accountability, allowing for greater coherence between curriculum, teaching, and institutional management (Hazelkorn, 2023). However, the findings also reveal that excessive formalization of quality can lead to practices of "**documentary compliance**", in which evidence replaces pedagogical analysis (Mårtensson & Roxå, 2022).

In this sense, educational quality is consolidated not only as a regulatory requirement, but also as a strategic planning tool, as long as assurance systems are integrated into teaching and learning processes (Krooi, Whittingham, & Beausaert, 2024).

2. Transformations in teaching and the role of teachers

Regulation has had a dual impact on academic work. On the one hand, it has promoted **greater clarity in the profiles and functions of teachers**, promoting the professionalization and continuous training of teachers. On the other hand, it has increased administrative burdens, reducing the time available for direct teaching and research activities (Woelert et al., 2025).

The data show that teachers spend between **5 and 8 hours per week** on tasks related to quality assurance, which represents an increase of 75% compared to 2019 (MEN, 2024). This phenomenon, described by Mårtensson and Roxå (2022), is associated with the **bureaucratization of academic work**, where quality is measured in terms of reporting rather than pedagogical reflection.

Therefore, the effectiveness of regulation will depend on the institutional capacity to **balance control with academic autonomy**, strengthening technical support and reducing administrative compliance costs (Woelert et al., 2025; Pinto & González, 2021).

3. Increase in scientific productivity and institutional gaps

The study confirmed that public universities with consolidated insurance systems experienced an **average increase of 35% in their scientific production** during the period 2020–2024, while those without accreditation only grew by 8% (Gutiérrez et al., 2023; Scopus, 2025). This finding suggests that regulation, by establishing performance indicators and accreditation standards, can act as a **catalyst for university research**.

However, **institutional gaps** persist related to financing, technological infrastructure, and management capacities. Regional universities have greater difficulties in complying with regulatory requirements, reflecting a **structural asymmetry** within the higher education system (Hazelkorn, 2023; MEN, 2024).

In this context, it is necessary for quality policies to incorporate principles of **regulatory equity**, guaranteeing technical and financial support differentiated according to the level of institutional maturity.

4. Advances and challenges in the digitalization of quality management

The incorporation of digital technologies in quality assurance processes has generated significant advances in the traceability and analysis of institutional data. 64% of public universities currently have internal self-assessment and monitoring platforms, which improves reporting efficiency (INQAAHE, 2024).

However, universities with less technological development continue to depend on manual processes or hybrid systems, which limits the effectiveness of the model. For Hazelkorn (2023), the **digital transformation of quality assurance** requires a comprehensive strategy of training, investment in infrastructure, and data governance that allows information to be translated into academic decisions and not only into regulatory reports.

5. Theoretical contributions: 3P model and contextualized regulation

The application of the **3P (Purpose–People–Process) model** made it possible to identify that regulation has a positive impact when it manages to align:

- **Clear educational purposes** (Purpose),
- **Committed** and trained people (People), and
- **Efficient** and articulated processes (Process).

When any of these elements is weakened, regulation is perceived as an external imposition and not as an instrument of continuous improvement (Krooi et al., 2024).

This model shows that quality assurance must evolve towards an approach of **accompanied self-regulation**, where institutions assume responsibility for its improvement with technical support from the State, avoiding excessive control and bureaucracy (Pinto & González, 2021).

6. Final recommendations

Based on the findings, the following lines of action are proposed:

1. **Strengthen institutional capacities** in data management and results analysis, promoting the pedagogical use of quality information (INQAAHE, 2024).
2. **Simplify regulatory procedures** to reduce the administrative burden on teachers, through integrated platforms and intelligent audits (Woelert et al., 2025).
3. **Develop regulatory equity policies**, which provide differentiated technical support to regional universities with less technological capacity (Hazelkorn, 2023).
4. **Promote a formative vision of accreditation**, oriented towards innovation and not only accountability (CNA, 2021; Krooi et al., 2024).
5. **Link assurance systems to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**, particularly SDG 4 on quality education, so that regulation contributes to sustainability and inclusion (Gutiérrez et al., 2023).

In short, the administrative regulation of educational quality can become a transformative tool as long as it is based on trust, cooperation and institutional learning. Its effectiveness will depend on the capacity of the State and universities to articulate **regulation, autonomy and continuous improvement** in a more equitable and sustainable higher education ecosystem.

References

- ACEN. (2023). *Standards for program accreditation and educational excellence*. Australian Council on Education in Nursing.
- CNA – National Accreditation Council. (2021). *Guidelines and aspects to be evaluated for programs and institutions* (approved by CESU, March 2021). Bogota, Colombia. <https://www.cna.gov.co>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

- Gutiérrez, G., Yaguarema, M., Ayala, M., Zambrano, J., & Gutiérrez, L. (2023). *Impact of government evaluation and accreditation processes on the research output of universities in developing countries: An X-ray of the young Ecuadorian academia*. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, 1093083. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1093083>
- Hazelkorn, E. (2023). *Trends and issues: Quality and quality assurance in higher education*. European Training Foundation.
- Hernández-Sampieri, R., & Mendoza, C. (2023). *Research Methodology: The Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Routes* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Higher Education. (2024). *Quality assurance struggle in higher education institutions: Moving beyond compliance*. *Higher Education*, 88(5), 765–782. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01022-4>
- INQAAHE – International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education. (2024). *Global trends in quality assurance 2024 report*. INQAAHE. <https://www.inqaahe.org>
- Krooi, M., Whittingham, J., & Beausaert, S. (2024). *Introducing the 3P conceptual model of internal quality assurance in higher education: A systematic literature review*. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 82, 101296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101296>
- Mårtensson, K., & Roxå, T. (2022). *The unintended consequences of quality assurance in higher education: Academic identities and administrative work*. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(4), 742–759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12422>
- MEN – Ministry of National Education of Colombia. (2019). *Decree 1330 of July 25, 2019: Replacement of Chapter 2 of Title 3 of Part 5 of Decree 1075 of 2015*. Bogota, Colombia.
- MEN – Ministry of National Education of Colombia. (2023). *Resolution 2265 of 2023: General provisions for qualified registration procedures*. Bogota, Colombia.
- MEN – Ministry of National Education of Colombia. (2024). *Decree 529 of 2024: Transformation of the Quality Assurance System of Higher Education*. Bogota, Colombia.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). *Education policy outlook 2023: Investing in the future of learning*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/4a709e8f-en>
- Pinto, J., & González, L. (2021). *Quality assurance and academic innovation in Latin American public universities*. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 43(6), 547–562. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2021.1905267>
- Scopus – Elsevier. (2025). *Colombia: Higher Education Research Metrics 2020–2024*. Elsevier Data Portal.
- Woelert, P., Chesters, J., Martinussen, M., & Gannaway, J. (2025). *Administrative burden in Australian universities: Insights into dimensions and drivers from a nationwide survey*. *Science and Public Policy*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scaf029>