



## REIMAGINING HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DIGITAL ERA: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE 4A FRAMEWORK (ACCESSIBILITY, ADAPTABILITY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND ALIGNMENT)

Vanthoch Soth 

### RESEARCH ARTICLE



**Author Details:** Assistant Professor,  
Academic & Research Division,  
University of Management and  
Economics, Cambodia

**Corresponding Author:**  
Vanthoch Soth

**DOI:**  
<https://doi.org/10.70096/tssr.250302020>

### Abstract

With digital transformation, global disruptions, and societal change accelerating, higher education institutions (HEIs) need to rethink their strategic orientations. This critical review presents the 4A Framework—Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, and Alignment—as a holistic model for reimagining higher education for the 21st century. The review examines new research that demonstrates how higher education institutions can adopt the 4As to respond to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), workforce needs, technological advances, and the need for inclusion. We provide a conceptual synthesis and thematic analysis as a pathway for HEIs to implement the 4A dimensions into their governance, teaching, curriculum, and alignment with stakeholders. However, the 4A devolves in the trivium of structural limitations, digital divides and the dissonance of international standards and local realities. In a summary, the paper argues for local adaptation, collaborative regional research projects, and the need for new technologies such as AI and blockchain to implement the 4A strategy and for transforming higher education into a new modus operandi that is effective, equitable and fit for the future.

**Keywords:** *Higher Education; 4A Framework; Accessibility; Adaptability; Accountability; Alignment; Sustainability; Digital Transformation; SDGs; Educational Policy; Institutional Strategy.*

### Introduction

#### 1.1 Background

The global challenges, technology, and sustainability demand in confluence are transforming the higher educational institutions (HEIs) in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Access to quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all has been identified among the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that will address such issues, and higher education has been considered a key vehicle to achieving these goals (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2020). This digital distraction makes it even more important for higher education institutions to adapt to the new learning environment, which is marked by the need for blended and new learning solutions that are becoming necessary to equip people with 21st-century skills (Ramalingam et al., 2021). This has left a big demand for new frameworks, such as the 4A model (accessibility, adaptability, accountability, and alignment), that provide structured ways of dealing with complex problems.

Global trends indicate an unparalleled need for higher education institutions (HEIs) to not only focus on knowledge transmission, but also actively participate in society-making, particularly through research that contributes to societal well-being and sustainability. Aver et al. (2021) argue that multidisciplinary in higher education is crucial in responding to this epoch, where complex problems like economic instability and ecological crises define the time. Moyer and Hedden (2020) strengthen the case for HEIs to take on the SDGs by judging the current pathways as acceptable for achieving these global goals. By providing a rich conceptualization of the intersections and relationships between higher education and sustainable development, frameworks such as the 4A can help describe the pathways that higher education institutions may be supporting, resulting in the iterative development of more relevant educational practices, which themselves become instruments for sustainable development.

One of the most recent learning models is blended learning, which combines traditional instructions with web-provided learning and reflects the shift of educational learning paradigms toward more flexible forms (Ramalingam et al., 2021). This framework, while hinting at the broader implications of this pedagogical approach for learning environments across educational contexts,

also enhances accessibility for diverse learners. Educators play a crucial role here. As Scharenberg et al. (2021) pointed out, a major determinant of the efficiency of sustainability education is teachers' competencies and their expected capability to educate a culture of sustainability among their students. The need to hold the institutions accountable for the quality of their educational outcomes and processes is worth acknowledging here; it further emphasizes the significance of the A in the 4A framework: Still, they are expected to promote a planetary literacy and sensitivity among their students.

Moreover, Cebrián et al. (2020) proclaimed that the principles of education for sustainable development (ESD) ought to be transversally enwrapped throughout all levels of education so as to build the spaces for learning sustainability competencies. This supportive higher education environment, created in synergy with SDG-focused themes related to the institution's mission and new approaches to education, serves to ensure that students of interest become future leaders of society with the skills, knowledge, and attitudes necessary to address real-world solutions to contemporary challenges. Such alignment becomes critical not only to meet current needs but also to equip tomorrow's leaders with the tools to negotiate an increasingly complex world. Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are not only offering academia but also play an important role in public engagement and knowledge transfer sustainably. In the world, Ruíz-Mallén and Heras (2020) show how diverse institutions conceptualize and exercise sustainability. HEIs can use frameworks like 4A to build coherence across their responses so that sustainability initiatives are cohesive, holistic, and well communicated.

Benchmarking and continuous checking are all important elements in keeping up accountability, one of the big themes in the 4A framework. Caeiro et al. (2020) suggest that practices such as sustainability assessment and benchmarks enable an institution to continuously improve and demonstrate commitment to the principles of ESD. Doing so is in alignment with institutional accountability and gives all relevant actors inside (and outside) the HEI the opportunity to be aware of its sustainability initiatives while engaging stakeholders (students and faculty) throughout meaningful pathways. Moreover, the link between enterprises and universities plays a crucial role in sustaining the demand for adaptability in universities. The digital shift and upskilling must be appropriate for actual economies and industries. Create a multidisciplinary team of experts with hired graduates who will be placed on a review committee and get included in industry-related real-time challenges in the university's curriculum and programs to prepare HEIs to be firmly grounded for the future forces of change.

With the challenges of 21<sup>st</sup>-century education, HEI's global frameworks and paradigms are also continually evolving. This program serves as a work stream that focuses on the 4A framework, adopts a safety net based on geographic location to foster a learning ecosystem, keeps up with global trends, and maintains accessibility, adaptability, and accountability. This move is crucial in preparing teachers and learners to address the pressing issues of our future, specifically climate change, economic inequality, and social justice. It provides results for distance learning, college partnerships, hiring, the utilization of expertise, online learning, and the efforts of academic developmental organizations in building Higher Education Institutions (HEIs.) The 4A model can act as a blueprint to support higher education in meeting the needs faced globally and will subserve the pivotal role that universities have as engines of sustainable development. Focusing on accessibility, adaptability, accountability, and alignment will better prepare HEIs, and their students, to realize their role in an increasingly connected world.

## **1.2 Research questions**

- What are academic conversations doing with the 4A Framework?
- What are practical outcomes of putting 4As in action in HEIs?
- What are the challenges and gaps in current implementation?

## **2. Methodology**

The thematic literature review therefore set out to systematically reviews relevant academic and institutional literature on results such as access opportunities in higher education, learning environment adaptivity, universities' accountability, as well as universities' calibration in the SDGs above. A handful of keywords were used in the search strategy, thus forcing interdisciplinary connections to be explored in-depth between such diverse fields of research. This type of articulation allowed for a nuanced mapping of the higher education ecosystem and its actors and also offered a platform to tackle the major challenges in these bodies. Specific criteria determined the inclusion or exclusion of articles and reports. Literature published for the years 2020 to 2024 is included; that is, peer-reviewed journal articles and reports from well-known organizations like UNESCO, OECD, or the World Bank. This chosen time frame captured only the most recent developments and discussions in the literature to ensure that the findings were timely and relevant. Through the use of peer-reviewed sources, this review argues how important academic rigor and reliability are when it comes to educational research (Kwasi-Agyeman, 2021).

For literature collection, data sources could be top-level academic databases like Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar. They were chosen for their breadth of research in education, permitting the analysis of such studies and reports from various disciplines represented in higher education. With regards to accountability in higher education, Sijde Liu & Sijde (2021) observe that universities have faced numerous management demands over the years with various educational outcomes and institutional effectiveness, implying as an interesting perspective that can help policymakers evaluate symbolic practices and align policies in higher education. This review will also feature thematic analysis that highlights some themes and threads that emerge in the literature chosen for the review. Using a theme-based approach allows insights to be distilled from qualitative data about curriculum, program adaptability, and accountability systems. An example of a framework was that Omar and Arif (2020) described access to higher education through a new framework focusing on the quality of pedagogy, which was fitting

in with frameworks on curriculum flexibility and accessibility for students which were addressed throughout the review. The ultimate finding was that students' pedagogical access was a key component to consider to increase the chances of succeeding in higher education studies. Especially by a foundation grounded in literature on the various issues, this showed some of the emerging issues with regards to responsibility and gave direct implications on university governance and quality assurance mechanisms. Research by Ahdiyana et al. (2022) might improve transparency and performance in higher education in Indonesia through written reforms on accountability. Marques (2023) also emphasizes how the approach to the issue of transparency and accountability (which also has implications for the universities' social mission and accountability in relation to the promotion of ethical governance and informed public debate) has been neglected in Portugal (in Portuguese).

Integrative analysis was employed to qualitatively aggregate findings of the studies on the influence of socioeconomic factors on access to education for students in the studies reviewed. This can be seen, for instance, in the findings from Russia, where disparate access to higher education depends on region, and geography and economic capacity are determinants of how much educational inequity can be fought (Prakhov & Bugakova, 2023). This review collates these varying perspectives to reflect on the current landscape of themes associated with accessibility, adaptability, and accountability and how these align with wider sustainability goals within the higher education sector; This form of mapping is successful in synthesizing reliance between published work in education and cognate disciplines; the methodology provides an insight into how the body of higher education work is composed and where there are spaces for more interests in both investigation and approach advancement. Guided by the five themes developed here, this synthesis of literature offers crucial insights to engaged stakeholders looking to create more equitable and responsive educational systems.

### **3. Theoretical Foundation of the 4A Framework**

The 4A Framework for higher education institutions (HEIs) is based on a strong theoretical framework. It is made up of Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, and Alignment. We derived the four facets from competing educational landscapes, societal expectations, and policy infrastructures that characterize contemporary higher education. The Capability Approach, the Tuning Framework, and the Adaptive Systems Theory are all educational theories that can be directly linked to the start and growth of each of the 4As. Together, they paint a clear picture of how these theories work together and how they apply to higher education institutions.

#### **3.1. History and Evolution of the 4As**

Accessibility describes the aim of expanding the opportunity in pursuing higher education to diverse populations, such as those of an underrepresented and disadvantaged background. The concept of accessibility in education has been shaped, over time, by various waves of social justice advocacy to ensure that all people have fair access to education that is enriching, meaningful, and liberating. It aligns itself with the Capability Approach, which emphasizes providing individuals with opportunities to achieve valuable differences (attainments) that will be instrumental in increasing both their capability and the freedom to pursue education (Butler et al., 2018). It is easy to see how universities which are adaptive or responsive to their environment with regards to educational needs, technology, or socio-economic factors. The reasoning behind Adaptive systems theory is that in order to survive systems must be able to change and try out new paths of development, becoming more resilient and sustainable in the process. According to Ekasari et al. (2020), higher education needs to implement adaptability to its curriculum offerings and pedagogy practices in the context of the rapid changes in the society of the 21st century.

One of the ways to ensure accountability in HEIs is through the quality of parallel management output. Several years ago, we contended that the accountability movement in higher education merely mirrors the developments in K-12 education, with heightened scrutiny in K-12 paving the way for these practices to extend into the non-K-12 sector. Such a debate on accountability reflects the equilibrium of institutional autonomy and outer governance (Schmidt et al., 2023; McLendon et al., 2006). For instance, the literature suggests a shifting paradigm in which the HEIs are being pressured to justify themselves so that they will be held accountable in a way that facilitates quality assurance and the trust of stakeholders (Woodard et al., 2011).

Alignment refers to the necessity of coherence between educational goals, teaching strategies, and evaluation methods. This is in line with one of the frameworks that is the Tuning Framework to bring convergence of education systems across different contextual variations and contexts to guarantee that graduating individuals hold the capacities needed for future work and constructive investment in society. (Sangster, 2022; Kamovich & Foss, 2017). In today's globalized educational context, it is more important than ever to align educational programs according to professional standards and the needs of societies.

#### **3.2. Frameworks It Builds Upon**

The 4A Framework is closely associated with several bodies of educational theory, augmenting its credibility and utility in higher education settings. The capability approach advocates that the goal of development and social justice is to enable individuals to lead lives they have reason to value (Sen 1999; Nussbaum 2011). This approach in turn speaks substantively to the practice of accessibility, as it falls in line with the aim of decreasing access barriers to education (Butler et al., 2018). The Tuning Framework, which originated from the Bologna Process in Europe, focuses on alignment between curricula to ensure educational outcomes are meeting society's and professionals needs. This framework helps to make education more open and flexible, and it fits the system into a larger context for similar systems to make sure they can be used in education settings (Huisman & Currie, 2004).

Comparatively, in case that complemented by Adaptive Systems Theory, it provides further justification for placing adaptability at the centre of education systems, and thereby providing resilience and flexibility during times of unforeseen disruption. This hypothesis suggests that educational institutions must be inherently adaptive to survive and flourish in a drastically complex, quickly-changing society (Onumah & Owusu, 2023). The concept of accountability in the 4A Framework hinges on a similar underlying principle to the traditional perspective of governance and management theory. Organizational oversight, assessment, and performance measurement have also been investigated, particularly in the public sector (Macheridis & Paulsson, 2021) Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) must balance with their educational mandates and accountability to the society that financed them, which incite to soft response to accountability instruments.

### **3.3. A Conceptual Model of 4A in the Context of HEIs**

The 4A Framework is a synergistic model, which means that its different parts work together to create a complete educational framework for higher education institutions. As it relates to higher education institutions, accessibility is more than simply access to the physical space; it includes the elimination of economic, sociocultural, and institutional barriers to enrollment and participation. Sociological studies have confirmed the importance of accessibility efforts in improving educational outcomes for marginalized populations, which need to inform universities in their efforts to create inclusive policies and practices (Pounder, 2020). Institutions that can adapt in the increasingly globalized marketplace will find urgency in this process. Research has also shown that these adjustments positively impact student engagement and retention rates (Woodard et al., 2011).

The accountability of HEIs goes beyond the fulfillment of regulatory requirements. Accreditation signifies a pledge to improvement, a process for institutions to periodically demonstrate educational quality and stakeholder trust. The evidence suggests that well-structured accountability systems can produce major gains in institutional performance and student satisfaction and highlights the importance of incorporating accountability mechanisms into the educational mission (Dougherty et al., 2013).

Last but not least, alignment guarantees the HEIs' work under a common vision that establishes coherence among the strategic goals, curricular development, and assessment modes. Such consistency enables the broader objective of shaping highly educated graduates with the competencies needed to meet the demands of the job market. At the same time, alignment encourages higher education entities, both small and large, to collaborate with the outside world, including industry players, for higher education relevance through adaptively responsive programming. This 4A Framework outlines an emerging model that captures how the attributes of Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, and Alignment reflect higher education's interplay of change. The framework is grounded in well-acknowledged theories and modernistic educational needs and adds justly to the discourse on improving institutional effectiveness in a rapidly changing scholarly field.

### **4. Accessibility in Higher Education**

Higher education accessibility is a multi-faceted issue encompassing the many different types of barriers students face in pursuing and completing their education. Digital divide, geographical barrier, cost, and disability access are some of them. Each of these barriers can significantly narrow the range of opportunities accessible to would-be students while also having a correspondingly negative impact on the picture of educational equity and inclusion.

Digital access refers to the availability and accessibility of the online resources and platforms that make online learning possible. The pandemic further fueled momentum toward digital platforms with solutions that promised to democratize access to education around the world (Zhao, 2024). Although online education has promise, it faces challenges; students in low-resourced areas often do not have the level of internet connectivity or the technology they need to prosper as students and beyond (Sitnikova, 2023). Furthermore, geographic barriers matter for the students from rural and remote areas – those students often cannot attend physical institutions because there are no universities or campuses in their locality and traveling costs more, but public transport here is insufficient (Prakhov & Bugakova, 2023). Accessibility challenges are further heightened by financial constraints with tuition and living expenses increasing (Asire, 2023), which are more pronounced in low-income families and marginalized groups.

Likewise, it is imperative to incorporate disability inclusion into higher education institutions to ensure their capacity to accommodate students with disabilities. These entail the removal of architectural barriers on campus and making curricula flexible to meet different learning needs (Amin et al., 2021; Batanero et al., 2022). Policies that aim to broaden access and provide support structures are necessary to pave the way for futures where all students have the opportunity to thrive. Several best practices and initiatives have been developed globally to build accessibility in higher education. Examples include the UK's Open University, which has gained international recognition for its innovative online learning pathways. Inclusive pedagogical approaches at the institution nurture diverse student learning and thus are conducive to greater access to higher education (Jena & Das, 2024). Unlike previous times, this so-called balance between access and quality in higher education could be done thanks to Open Courseware (OCW), MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), and many other new types of Coursera/Nano degree-type courses. This model has been notably helpful in areas where higher education resources are scarce (Liu et al., 2020).

Some of digital universities have been established in Asia, but not the least in Bangladesh, where technology integration in learning environments is providing options and growth opportunities for students (Hossain et al., 2023). This trend recognizes the importance of digital platforms in improving access and quality in education, fulfilling a long-awaited promise to reduce

disparities between urban and rural students. Partnerships between institutions and governmental agencies, such as collaborative initiatives between nations, assume the role of effective promoters of financial aid and scholarships for disadvantaged communities (Sitnikova, 2023).

But all the while, the challenges of tertiary education accessibility firmly remained. However, three main infrastructural gaps currently obstruct the effective implementation of accessibility policies. First, the over 11% of students with disabilities not being physically or socially accommodated for could be attributed to lack of resources necessary towards accommodating for them; second, lack of positive training of teachers to teach students with disabilities further inhibits them (Amin et al., 2021). Just like, still the digital gap acts as a significant detours to Online Education, which are most prevalent in developing countries where despite there have some affordable and nominal networks (Utami et al., 2024), that is an empty ground for millions, i.e. still deprived off to having opportunity for optimizing the web ecosystem. Inadequate investment in educational infrastructure, common in many parts of India and Indonesia, for instance, magnifies these imbalances in such a manner that ensures great inequities across socioeconomic strata remain intact (Ilie et al., 2021).

A further challenge lies within the financial constraints that institutions often face, which can significantly limit their capacity to launch accessibility projects. Many higher education institutions operate with low funding, which causes them to prioritize achieving their short-term operational needs over their long-term physical accessibility goals, contributing to a cycle of inequity in accessing higher education (Asire, 2023; Jena & Das, 2024). This is where budget allocation will be crucial to overcoming challenges, as institutions will need to rally around funding policies that create wider access for all students while coming up with new strategies to facilitate it. Where countries have invested heavily in expanding access to higher education, challenges related to quality and sustainability have often emerged. The step of growth in higher education in China resulted in high enrollment ratios in higher education, which raised questions related to educational quality and employability in the labor market (WANG, 2023). This trend emphasizes that increasing access is important, but it must not come at the cost of ensuring that education is relevant, rigorous, and meaningful to serve all students.

And upon examining the overlap of accessibility and educational outcomes, we find that low aspirations of pupils and socio-economic conditions can be a barrier to accessing higher education. This “soft barrier,” as it has been described in recent research, is rooted in systemic problems that can lead young people who grow up in under-resourced communities to feel hopeless (Mseleku, 2022). Tackling these sanctions must be holistic: policy that is institutionalized through the student affairs interface but also activated through community support and systems that create confidence that college is attainable and successful for them. In the higher education inclusivity domain, the importance of educational management remains indisputable. Management practices among institutions directly influence their responsiveness toward the distinct needs of different student populations and the extent to which these institutions facilitate or pose barriers to broadening access (Karim et al., 2024). Educational management as it applies to education and focuses on the development of strategic planning along with strategic processes designed to facilitate a safe, effective, and learning-promoting environment reflecting the faculties of diversity and inclusivity through strategic staffing, resource allocation, student support, and curriculum.

The aggregation of accessibility issues we see regarding higher education must be addressed in a collaborative effort from multiple stakeholders, including government, educational programs, community organizations, and other entities. By establishing best practices, creating innovative solutions, and ensuring diverse student needs are acknowledged and met, the landscape of higher education can continue to progress toward equity and inclusion. By overcoming these particular challenges in the realms of digital access, the geography of opportunity, financial limitations and disability inclusion, stakeholders can work together towards a solution that promotes a more inclusive learning experience and thriving pocket of opportunity for all students, on a global scale.

### **5. Adaptability in Higher Education**

In the aftermath of the seismic societal shifts brought by artificial intelligence (AI), automation, and the embrace of lifelong learning models, the adaptability of higher education has become paramount. With increasing demand for agility in educational structures, schools now face the challenge of building environments that rapidly and dynamically respond to the fluid nature of student needs and the evolving demands of the workforce. Adaptability can no longer be viewed solely as a reactive measure but rather as a prerequisite for educational institutions that wish to continue to be relevant in a world characterized by technological disruption and a new set of demands from employers and learners. First, the emergence of AI and automation has wrought havoc on age-old structures of employment, and this necessitates re-establishing how education prepares students to enter the workforce.

Today's unprecedented technological advancements have made lifelong learning a necessity to stay employable, given the rapid changes in the labor market landscape. Educational institutions of higher learning have to improve their curriculum, making them broad and versatile so they can accommodate the emerging skills and knowledge areas faster. This flexibility will take the form of adaptable learning pathways, where programs are shaped by the evolving demands of the industry and individual student interests. In this regard, modular curricula can help institutions to adapt quickly to technological changes, and skill sets can be endowed to students in a timely manner (Narayanawamy et al., 2024). As well, interdisciplinary education that is necessary to create a workforce is more adaptable. Providing students with the tools to draw ideas from different fields is essential for making education enlightening and ensuring graduates have a diverse skill set as industries become more interconnected. Many institutes

worldwide (e.g., a few institutions in Finland) have launched new interdisciplinary programs with links across disciplines. Such initiatives broaden students' perspectives and facilitate the development of a more versatile workforce that is able to respond to diverse challenges (Desmarchelier & Cary, 2022; Pirkkalainen et al., 2022).

However, within this rapidly changing educational landscape, educational technology (EdTech) emerges as an enabler for adaptive behavior. But the rise of e-learning platforms and adaptive learning environments is transforming the higher education system into a more dynamic ecosystem, in which learners can pursue individualized learning sessions. They also offer real-time inputs and evaluations that encourage education on demand, customized according to the needs of the learners (Reed, 2023). Such adaptive learning capability propels student agency and self-directedness – critical attributes for success in a time of upheaval. We trust that expanding micro-credentials is undoubtedly changing the way we consider about college degrees and professional reputations. Micro-credentials are knowledge certificates in particular skill sets or competencies that are most appropriate for micro-learning and can be given for brief classes or specific education that does not lead to diplomatic degrees (Maina et al., 2022; Ha et al., 2024). This has particularly been the case in Australia, where micro-credentials are proving to be an essential means for rapid upskilling in response to changing job markets, as demonstrated in case studies. Employers are increasingly viewing such credentials as meaningful proof of an applicant's functional competencies and enhancing the employability of graduates (Lang, 2023; Tamoliūnė et al., 2023).

Nonetheless, there are various limitations that hinder the general flexibility of education, especially at the higher education level. According to a study conducted by Ali et al. (2024), bureaucratic inertia, also referred to as institutional inertia, is one of the primary challenges that lead to a gap between the policy and procedural framework and the ongoing trends and practices in education. The study was conducted by Ali et al. (2024), Ahmat et al. (2021), and others. There was often resistance from faculty and administrative staff accustomed to traditional educational methods, who might feel defensive about changes to educational models and curricula (Sharma et al., 2024). The second giant barrier is that faculty and administration have not been trained and resourced properly to make that flexibility possible, and there has also been no investment to enable it. Such a situation suggests that teachers would not be well prepared to use or integrate new technologies or methodologies (ROQUE, 2023). Furthermore, it would mean that institutions would need to scaffold professional development programs around new pedagogical methods, which, in turn, would also provide access to relevant technologies (Raj et al., 2024). These investments will provide faculty with the opportunity to adopt modular, interdisciplinary teaching and learning methods, offering stakeholders flexibility in the learning process.

While there is unlimited potential for new educational models, especially those in conjunction with modern technologies, a systemic shift is needed for higher education to be responsive. Citizens need to create a culture of flexibility in schools like in the space age. This way, students, teachers, administrators, and employers can work together in creative ways to shape curriculums and delivery methods, which in turn are shaped by market forces. Such adaptability depends heavily on feedback cycles embedded in the program and consultations with stakeholders as well as ongoing evaluation of program effects (Ha et al., 2022). Prior to COVID-19, there were calls to action describing the pressing need for a more agile higher education landscape and emphasizing adaptable learning environments. In addition, during COVID-19, many institutions faced the unprecedented challenge of needing to pivot quickly to online and modular delivery methods. This giant adaptation ensured the continuity of educational systems, which also provided us with a wide range of insights into potential future learning structures that are resilient and adaptable in nature (Tria, 2020; Brown et al., 2023). We need to evolve higher education in this age of innovation and shifting workforces. Focus on greater curriculum flexibility, new interdisciplinary programming, creative use of educational technology, and micro-credentialing initiatives are all actionable steps to consider. But we must overcome challenges, bureaucratic rigidity, resistance to change, and an aversion to the required upskilling, to build a real culture of agility that prepares future generations to navigate an uncertain world and start changing the system.

Flexibility in higher education is crucial for the time of the era of rapid technological advancement and demanding labor sectors. The flexibly enhanced curriculum focused on interdisciplinary programming, effective use of educational technology, and adoption of micro-credentialing are just some of the linchpins in that initiative. We must go beyond these issues and address challenges like bureaucratic inflexibility, insufficient willingness to change, and the need for extensive training to establish a genuine culture of adaptability and prepare future generations to thrive in an uncertain world.

## **6. Accountability in Higher Education**

Accountability is one of the main but complex pillars of higher education, making sure that in the world of academic institutions are educational standards and ethical, financial, and operational standards. Key ideas in this discussion include openness, accountability, and judging performance. These help create an educational system that is driven by constant improvement and trust among all stakeholders (Chaudhary, 2024; Adeusi et al., 2024; Macheridis & Paulsson, 2021). Transparency in higher education is crucial. It is a critical prerequisite for the act of accountability— incentivizing institutions to provide public insight into their operations, finances, and academic performance. Sulila, 2022). This approach helps to avoid the habitual reading of academic reports as monitors, or big data, to better engage stakeholders (including students, lecturers, and the public) in substantive dialogue, inform decision-making processes, and ensure that institutions are held accountable for their educational offerings and outcomes. The progressions in accountability have constructed the proliferation of data collection and management systems in higher education (Brown & Klein, 2020). The increased reliance on metrics has put performance measurement at the heart of academic governance, and the governance landscape has changed significantly as a consequence.

Traditionally, trends in accountability have driven a parallel evolution in governance in higher education. To comply with the standards set governance frameworks include mechanisms like accreditation or key performance indicators (KPIs) or student feedback systems. Accreditation organizations are pivotal in ensuring educational quality, appraising institutions based on prescribed standards, and simultaneously encouraging sustained self-improvement (Hossain, 2023; Macheridis & Paulsson, 2021). Reaffirmation of institutional accreditation serves a dual purpose: one to assure quality and the second to assure stakeholders of institutional education quality and ethical stewardship (Adeusi et al., 2024). Lastly, the paper saliently calls for KPI use in higher education institutions to enable institutions to measure and talk about their performance presence. Essentially, KPIs provide a methodological pathway in measuring various aspects such as student persistence rates, student completion rates, financial solvency (Chaudhary, 2024; Chang et al., 2021). Most institutions have developed robust mechanisms for collecting student feedback that yield qualitative data that inform superior teaching practice, curricular development and administrative decision-making. This is a feedback loop that is essential in enabling a venerable context for academic improvement as well as ensuring that the provisions of an institution are pulling in the same direction as the stakeholders involved (Chaudhary, 2024).

This shift toward data-driven governance is evident in the new trends in accountability. Administrators now have access to real-time analytics that inform institutional strategy through data dashboards (Harris, 2022). When combined with outcome-based funding structures used by some government agencies, these trends make a system where resources are distributed based on proven educational successes (Chaudhary, 2024; Sulila, 2022). State accountability systems encourage universities to meet performance targets that are consistent with state educational goals and social values in ways that foster more effective instructional practices and pedagogy. This can consequently impact stakeholders who interact with institutions; however, with the obvious benefits to these accountability mechanisms, the danger they hold and the need for being top of the line should be considered. One worry about too much standardization is that data will force universities to fit their teaching methods into narrowly defined groups, limiting even risk to threaten academic diversity and new ideas that can help the world (Brown & Klein, 2020). This is because the steps that lead to learning outcomes will be reduced to numbers in the entity, which could create a culture of compliance (Adeusi et al., 2024). Moreover, when accountability and practices are only done on paper or through protocol but the university does not adopt genuine changes, it can also lead to tokenism where rationalization is the "kudos" but not changes (Brown and Klein, 2020; Chang et al., 2021).

Misaligned incentives make accountability frameworks highly dubious as well. Instead of an holistic approach to quality assessment and improvement in the institution, the attention is given to metrics that might have a positive effect on real world rankings or funding (Yüner, 2023). Such a scenario leads to organizations perpetuating a culture that favors performance over process, numbers over the real learning and growth which is supposed to be swarming around. The onus lies upon institutions to avoid these traps by embedding an integrated view of accountability that seeks both qualitative and quantitative indicators (Hossain, 2023; 2023) (Macheridis & Paulsson, 2021). As a case in point, U.S. accreditation bodies illustrate the dynamic between establishing common standards and allowing room for flexibility. This is achieved by aligning the various assessments to promote and reward improvement, rather than solely adhering to a set arbitrary bar (Chaudhary, 2024; Hossain, 2023). World rankings like the QS and Times Higher Education Impact Rankings also emphasize accountability as an approach to demonstrating how institutions contribute towards the society in which they operate while incentivizing competitive development between institutions (Yüner, 2023; Pepugal, 2022). These rankings combine multiple dimensions of performance, thereby offering more holistic views on institutional effectiveness beyond the limits of traditional metrics.

And we also must not discount the role of innovative governance structures and frameworks. To avoid such, we reviewed emerging participatory models, which enables stakeholders to enter governance processes (Harris, 2022). It democratizes governance and adds texture to the accountability narrative because it gives voice to everyday people, creating the space for a wide range of stakeholders to raise their concerns and share their hopes. Realizing the potential of digitalization in higher education is likely to have significant implications for the governance landscape (Komljenović, 2020). Last but not least, innovative functionalities offered by technologies such as blockchain can help restructure accountability frameworks through improved record-keeping trails, data management security, and accreditation processes (Salem & Magdi, 2024). If used appropriately, technology can help institutions cultivate a culture based on responsible governance between people, where educational practices match the development of the society in the future.

Overall, in higher education, accountability measures are multivariate, emerging as accounting dilemmas among transparency practices, governance institutions, and performance evaluation metrics. Notice this creates trust, ensures ethical standards, and hence enhances the quality of teaching in democracies. But institutions also need to guard against over-automation and badly aligned incentives that can distract from real educational aims. These are the real challenges for higher ed ecosystems, and they will solve them and persist in excellence through positive transfigurations of governance/fiduciary strategies and accountability mechanisms to inspire and trust communities.

## **7. Alignment with Societal and Economic Goals**

In today's fast-paced world, it is crucial to link higher education institutions (HEIs) to sustainable development goals (SDGs) and the requirements of the labor market. The emerging global challenges, such as climate change, social inequality, or economic crises, must at the same time be reflected in the educational priorities of HEIs towards a new educational paradigm that meets stated societal and economic priorities. The incorporation of SDGs within higher education not only integrates environmental sustainability. Instead, it initiates a dialogue with a much broader view that must be considered for addressing multiple and

different socioeconomic issues (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2020; Omotosho et al., 2023). The process to align HEIs with the SDGs or the national labor market is working on Industry-University-Government (UIG) collaboration models. It's these partnerships, that allow knowledge transfer and the creation of student pathways based on market need. Such type of partnerships can be helpful to try to avoid the curricularate for the industries needs within a couple of years looking for a link between theory and practice (McCowan, 2023). Including the views of industry stakeholders and governmental authorities within the bounds of academia can ultimately lead to more relevant and responsive academic course offerings (Wright et al., 2022).

Curriculum mapping is an integral part of this alignment process. It involves mapping how different facets of education intersect with SDG indicators, as well as the skills that the job market will be demanding in the future (Masina, 2024; Finnveden & Schneider, 2023). Hence, universities need to be able to measure what they teach today with these standards and evolve them, so that students acquires competencies of great importance, such as critical thinking, problem-solving, teamwork and communication skills that empower them to construct a fair and sustainable society (Popelo et al., 2023; Cebrián et al., 2020). This will improve the employability of graduates and make them able to cope with diverse needs of a complex society (Tùng et al., 2023).

The most famous examples are Germany's dual education model or Singapore's SkillsFuture initiative that provides some best practices for integration between vocational training and higher education. For example, Germany's dual system involves on-the-job learning that occurs through cooperation between educational institutions and workplaces. This approach addresses both economic demands and individual personal development needs (Hoidn & Šťastný, 2021). This model provides a framework for other countries seeking to attain similar integration, research indicates that graduates from blended educational paths generally enjoy higher employability and job security than those who follow more traditional educational routes (Hoidn & Šťastný, 2021; Gu, 2024). Great examples are, Singapore has the SkillsFuture initiative, encouraging learning for life and the competency-based education; which is the continuous honing of skills learned from a variety of learning modes. From this vein, the SDGs are especially compliant with this, as they cultivate a culture of learning continuously on personal and professional bases, thus, enabling individuals to equip themselves with the necessary dynamics needed to navigate the endeavors of the global job market (Armas & Jugo, 2024; Omotosho et al., 2023).

The alignment of HEIs with these societal objectives is not without risk, however. A marketization bias may result in a disregard for critical thinking and creativity in the educational architecture (Crawford & Cifuentes-Faura, 2022). With courses increasingly tailored to respond to immediate needs from industry, there is a risk that well-rounded education that encourages analytical and independent thinking is being sacrificed. This imbalance may limit the student's possibility of innovating and adjusting to different cases, which may impact the sustainable development targets (Abdalla et al., 2024). Such pressures to do so can, however, do away with academic freedom and discourage faculty from participating in wider critical discourses that are crucial to tackling complex global problems (Omotosho et al., 2023; Berchin et al., 2021). For this reason, achieving balance in alignment strategies becomes essential for HEIs to espouse a holistic educational paradigm that exists not simply for market readiness but also for critical engagement.

While this is critical for teaching methods to change in response to short-term or immediate needs of the market, it's also important to create a long-lasting culture of intellectual criticism where students learn how to question, critique, and figure out what they can contribute to society (Molina et al., 2023; Finnveden & Schneider, 2023). Consequently, this approach will not only produce employable graduates but also cultivate graduates who are citizens and champions of change in their respective communities. A synthesis of success stories from different countries reveals that HEIS can contribute to building sustainability literacy by both interdisciplinary teaching and integrating sustainability principles into existing academic programs. There is evidence that engaging students in the development of sustainability competencies helps engage them more deeply and honors their capacities to enact change in the future (Masina, 2024; Cebrián et al., 2020). Creating such frameworks will not only ensure a better education for all but will also contribute to meeting the commitments made in global sustainability agendas.

When we think of the future, the ongoing role of HEIs as change-makers is becoming obvious. The growing need to place sustainability into all operational practices of education is indicative of a shift in which organizations start to be considered proponents of the SDGs (Armas & Jugo, 2024; Abdalla et al., 2024). Building an inclusive model is necessary to involve all impacted stakeholders, including students, educators, and industry partners, in collaboratively designing and iteratively developing relevant educational outcomes. To achieve success, all stakeholders must play their roles and contribute to the common good of sustainable development; collaboration is key. Whenever, universities explore these intricacies, their potential to accelerate progress toward the SDGs and effectively address the dynamic demands of the labor market will be determined by their capacity to nurture a culture of collaboration, adaptability, and critical inquiry. Future generations can only be prepared to confront tomorrow's complex challenges through educational ecosystems founded on sustainable development, connectivity, and innovative thinking. The sustainable development agenda is intricately linked with curriculum development through the creation of an enabling framework for capacity development, recruitment and collaboration with industries in need. By creating opportunities to build on best practices from existing models, establish critical partnerships and navigate marketization risks, HEIs can support students, in their successes beyond college and in how they craft their contributions to a sustainable future.

## **8. Integrated 4A (Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, Alignment) Strategy for HEIs**

The climate of global crises, like that brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, has triggered the continuing evolution of Universities (also called Higher Education Institutions HEIs) requiring a reevaluation of institutional strategies that focusing on the 4A principals of Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, and Alignment (Hassan et al., 2024). Using this dynamic framework, HEIs are to shape learning opportunities to be accessible and adaptable to social issues, needs and diversity of the course participants. These three dimensions, when put into practice, form the basis of a resilient institution that ensures the presence of a relevant, high-quality education for students, staff, faculty and the communities and stakeholders they serve.

### **8.1. Four Dimensional Synthesis**

HEI access is about making educational resources and the infrastructure for students, regardless of their heritage and capability. During the pandemic, this problem became more acute as the transition toward online and hybrid learning environments accelerated. This is a timely evaluation of the necessary tasks that HEIs are currently grappling with in their quest to deliver digital technologies and online curricula to the most impoverished and disadvantaged individuals, those with poor access to basic resources and limited competence with technology (Mishra et al., 2020; Ramírez-Hurtado et al., 2021). Encouraging more people from underrepresented groups to consider, pursue, and feel included in higher education presents a significant opportunity for outreach work (Hassan et al., 2024). Adaptability refers to the ability of HEIs to respond quickly to changes in the educational landscape and the needs of society. The COVID-19 pandemic reminded us that flexibility is essential, as schools rushed to switch to online education. And this adaptability shouldn't apply just to technological breakthroughs; it also is reflected in curricular responsiveness that would allow programs to adapt to new skill requirements in today's labor market and matters of global importance such as sustainability and economic transition (Baraero-Era, 2024). It is for this reason that the institutions that adhere to this model are better positioned to prepare the next generation for employability and the 21<sup>st</sup>-century workforce (Akande & Atiku, 2021).

This dimension involves a commitment of HEIs to transparent governance practices, responsible resource management, and the evaluation of outcomes. Accountability builds trust among the stakeholders, namely students, faculty, and funding agencies, about the institution's commitment to its declared missions and its standards of educational quality (Channuwong et al., 2024; Shukla, 2023). Onumash & Owusu (2023) found that, from their research, these frameworks for accountability must incorporate mechanisms for assessing program effectiveness, student satisfaction, and the efficacy of resource allocation. By emphasizing accountability, HEIs are responding to the pressures of globalization and competition for funding and enrollment. Finally, alignment emphasizes the significance of overall strategic goals that tend to reflect the mission and vision of the institution. Connecting academic programs, initiatives, and offerings to the world is important for staying relevant in today's rapidly changing global setting (Holovko-Havrysheva et al., 2023). For example, when it comes to ethical standards, sustainability, and inclusion. HEIs will need to focus on their distinctive strengths in supporting global issues and ensure that the educational provision throughout their institutions reflects their mission.

### **8.2. Emerging Strategic Roadmap: Phased Integration at Institutional Scale**

The adoption of 4A occurs in phases. First is assessment and understanding. This stage requires universities to assess their current policies, programs, and infrastructural capabilities with respect to the 4As dimensions. Students, faculty, local communities, and administrative leaders who are part of the process will have a better understanding of institutions' strengths and weaknesses because they will have asked stakeholders for their input (Hassan et al., 2024; Baraero-Era, 2024). During phase two, Design and Development, HEIs should produce interventions based on the assessment results. Creating online resources to improve accessibility and offering workshops for faculty to help instructors adapt their teaching practices may be included in this period (Mishra et al., 2020; Cicha et al., 2021). The time frame also includes appointing accountability standards such as quality assurance mechanisms and engaging stakeholders feedback mechanisms (Onumah & Owusu, 2023).

Plans will become actionable in Phase 3 – implementation and engagement. The successful implementation of a new approach will require broad consent from all levels of the university and some staff training on policies and new digital tools. It's also important to keep working with outside groups like community groups and industry partners to make sure that the educational programs keep up with the demand-side and supply-side forces that drive the need for qualifications (Baraero-Era, 2024; Hearne, 2022). The final stage will be evaluation and iteration; again, these efforts will be aligned to help assess the effect of the changes on student achievement and the effectiveness of the institution. At this stage, we gather both quantitative and qualitative data to assess the extent to which we have achieved the desired objectives. Therefore, we should design these phases to be more dynamic and adaptable, allowing for real-time updates. This evaluation of institutions is to be able to modify and improve their activities in case new feedback and change need to be adapted (Ramírez-Hurtado et al., 2021; Shukla, 2023).

### **8.3. Policy Framework and Implementation Toolkit**

To do this, we can make a broad policy framework that spells out the specific goals. The roles and actions that need to be taken in each area of the 4A strategy should include ethical and sustainable issues to make sure that the policies are in line with the global problems we are facing right now. Each institution can make their own implementation toolkit with useful materials, templates for engaging stakeholders, training programs, and tools for measuring progress toward higher values in areas like alignment, accessibility, adaptability, and accountability (Hassan et al., 2024; Baraero-Era, 2024). And if those standards address accessibility, they should also recommend digital tools that might help make resources more interoperable – universal design

principles and online course quality specifications come to mind. Facilitative responsive curricula development according to local needs/resources for reporting accountability. The accountability section, on the other hand, can provide templates and metrics to standardization for reporting while allowing flexibility in reporting annually for transparency and necessary evaluation process reporting to be shared with its stakeholders (Channuwong et al., 2024; Shukla, 2023).

#### **8.4. Alignment with Institutional Mission, Vision, Strategic Goals**

The 4A strategy must be in line with an institution's values, mission, and vision to create a cohesive learning experience that matters to its members in all situations. Its strategic goals must be attainable and measurable, not just aspirational. Higher education institutions can make a culture of openness and responsiveness a part of their policies and procedures by including principles of accessibility, adaptability, accountability, and alignment in their mission statements (Bazhenkov et al., 2023). When the 4A framework is anchored to the institutional mission, faculty, students, and administrative staff can coalesce around a shared sense of purpose around what is fundamentally necessary to create cohesion across the institutional landscape. Moreover, alignment with strategic objectives keeps institutions focused on providing socially relevant and impactful education and research. Taking the lead in engagement, HEIs can position themselves ahead of the curve in the higher education sector, exemplifying best practices in teaching and learning and community engagement (Baraero-Era, 2023; Holovko-Havrysheva et al., 2024). By operationalizing the quadrants of the 4A strategy and by embedding a structured framework to institutionalize them, HEIs can address and serve the contemporary challenges to galvanize as sustainable, adaptive and accountable institutions in a ever complex global ecosystem.

#### **9. Challenges and Gaps in 4A (Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, Alignment) Implementation**

The 4A (Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, Alignment) can be implemented within existing educational frameworks. This is not without its challenges arising from structural, infrastructural, and framework versus reality misalignment. All these have emphasized the importance of context-sensitive strategies for the implementation of education in order to find the best musically, and of course this must be done on a local level.

##### **9.1. Structural Challenges**

Structural challenges in the 4A implementation framework include issues of governance, funding deficits, and cultural hindrances. In many parts of the world, especially in those with decentralized education systems, governance structures do not provide sufficient support or coordination for effective implementation. To develop regional knowledge hubs that are sustainable economically, socially, and environmentally (global civics), embrace educational diversity, and coordinate popular, public, and private educational systems to meet local and global demands, it is crucial to develop a unified educational strategy based on research (Liu & Coates, 2024; Liu et al., 2023). Funding is another significant obstacle, as many institutions do not have sufficient funds available to make essential changes or improvements to educational programs, especially in less-financed areas or under-resourced communities (Bahattab et al., 2024). Additionally, cultural factors deeply influence how education takes place. A clear example comes from findings related to educators expanding binary thought patterns in the curriculum practices, where global and local epistemologies blur (Nganga et al., 2023). This cultural perspective inevitably results in resistance to the internationalization of education and hence creates the gulf between what is espoused globally and what exists on the ground (Choo & Sarpong, 2024).

##### **9.2. Technological Constraints and Digital Divide**

The latter arguably precedes it, but that is not only a matter of provocation – an equally serious issue is the limitations posed by technology and the inequities of digitization, especially as brought into sharper focus by the COVID-19 pandemic. The transition to online learning modalities has made stark the deep inequalities of access to technology resources for students. Even though, many institutions were immediately able to shift to online platforms, studies indicate that students who struggled to adapt to these modalities blamed a lack of support by educators (Flores et al., 2021). In addition, the inequities in access to technology have negatively affected educational outcomes, highlighting the need for solutions that provide all students with access to digital learning (Bahattab et al., 2021). To protect these 4A principles, education implementation frameworks must make technology access a must. This is especially important in the Global South, where resources are harder to get to.

##### **9.3. Mismatch between Global Paradigms and Local Realities**

A further major challenge to the successful implementation of the 4A framework is the misalignment between global education frameworks put forward by organizations such as UNESCO and the OECD and local educational contexts (Liu & Coates, 2024; Andrews, 2021). Trimble et al. (2016) suggest that current global trends of generalized educational standards proposed by organizations simply ignore or neglect the peculiar socio-economic conditions and socio-cultural circumstances of locales/regions. For example, this is what happens when the OECD's global competence frameworks are put into place: the focus on certain views on competence might not take into account the experiences and goals of teachers and students in a local setting, which leads to doubt and opposition (Andrews, 2021). That's why local input and adaptation of the global frameworks that have been proposed will be an important, responsible way to close this gap (Chen, 2023). Local educational practices may be very different from a global perspective.

#### **9.4. Importance of Contextualized Adaptation**

In the midst of these challenges, the need for contextualized adaptation in education is ever so high. Educational policies are relevant only if they consider local cultural identities and community socio-economic context (Lei & Mou, 2022). We are not in a position to tell the world how to shape education; rather, we need to contextualize educational interventions toward the dynamic capabilities at scale, something that can address the underlying needs of a diverse population of learners (Ramsgaard et al., 2021; Lei & Mou, 2021). For example, a return to curricula grounded in indigenous ways of knowing has been shown to foster better engagement and affirm the cultural identities of learners, leading to better outcomes within fairer learning environments (Liu & Coates, 2024; Nganga et al., 2023).

Trying to avoid the distractions of fixed educational strategies of the past also serves to remind us that policies only work when they fit the dynamics of the burgeoning educational environment in which they are actualized. This situation highlights even more the urgency of moving beyond rigid, fixed frames and enabling policies to work vertically through the dynamic localization of education (Al-Krenawi et al., 2024). When expectations are both high and low, commenters frequently seize upon the problems and fallibility of the 4As theory. These constitute structural barriers to accessing technology, as well as issues with how global educational systems function in varied social spaces. So educational leaders can strive towards better meeting their populations' needs using such a contextualized adaptation lens and consideration of these four variables in sequence for close to equitable outcomes for all.

#### **10. Future Directions and Research Gaps**

We need to examine future directions and research gaps regarding the 4A framework (Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, and Alignment) in a systematic, multi-angled fashion. The field needs to conduct more studies on the outcomes of the 4A framework. Yet there remains a marked absence of systematic scrutiny of how these principles play out in practice, especially in different educational settings within both Global South and Global North contexts. Additionally, regarding educational systems, empirical evidence is required to now highlight how these results are achieved, particularly given the disproportionalities seen within higher education contexts during the COVID-19 pandemic (Devkota, 2021; Huang et al., 2022). There are very few empirical studies to date, making it difficult to interpret the 4A framework's effectiveness more completely and also to present policy-based recommendations for improving the learning process.

Furthermore, examining the 4A framework across the Global South and the Global North is key to understanding the features that influence the effectiveness and implementation of the framework in specific socio-economic and cultural contexts. It is more likely that institutions from the Global North are better equipped or have more resources to use educational innovations than institutions from the Global South (Han & Kumwenda, 2024). Above all, the contribution of a comparative study provides information about what works and what doesn't in different contexts, which is valuable knowledge in global education policy. These local-level connections demonstrate the extent to which localized action plans can mainstream educational fairness considerations, despite alarming barriers to online education in these areas and wider breaches during pandemics (Devkota, 2021; Huang et al., 2022; Schwarz et al., 2024).

Lastly, it is a less-explored domain that aims to investigate 4A processes in the context of integrated technologies, e.g., artificial intelligence (AI) and big data. Blockchain and AI buyers will play a role in education. They reduce the process of education, increase transparency, and enable individualized learning contexts. However, no cross-sectional studies on their execution and efficiency with respect to the 4As are available yet. We need to investigate how we can repurpose and harness these developments for equitable educational provision that caters to the needs of all learners. It may be especially important to look into how these new technologies can help close the education gap between the Global North and South, since access to these technologies is often unequal (Ajayi et al., 2022).

Further developing the 4A framework as an organizing framework for the virology quality assurance and policy audits is another area of promising future research. As calls for greater accountability in higher education continue to rise, the necessity for strong mechanisms to ensure quality and responsiveness becomes more pronounced. Taking into consideration of using the 4A framework as the basis for quality assurance will put educational institutions in a position to drive the accessibility and adaptability of their offerings, holding them accountable and making sure that they align with the needs of the learner and society (Maluleke et al., 2022). However, the development of these mechanisms has received little research effort. A possible area of further investigation is whether or not your frameworks that use the 4As as a basis to understand premises or processes for systematic policy evaluations and systematic implementations can shed light on how the educational institutions can be directed towards improving outcomes, especially within the resource-strained contexts.

Databases on the 4A framework need to emphasize the inclusion of different voices in their research and development. Therefore, studies highlight the underrepresentation of Global South perspectives in global education policy discourses and their lack of focus on policies that may not be viable or honest for the challenges the Global South faces (Zuccotti, 2024; Wilder et al., 2024). Future research should focus on building platforms of collaboration and dialogue among scholars from the Global South and North, and emphasize co-produced research to explore the nuances of implementing the 4A framework across various contexts. Thus, integrative approaches like these can make the research findings more meaningful and useful for education practices and policies anywhere. Future research directions for the 4A framework need in-depth studies of outcomes,

comparisons of regions, the use of new technologies, and the involvement of all stakeholders in the management of quality control systems. Closing these gaps would lead to a more appropriate and theoretical student reflection in global education.

## 11. Conclusion

The 4A Framework – Accessibility, Adaptability, Accountability, and Alignment – is a potent and future-oriented model for rethinking higher education institutions (HEIs) in the digital era. In an era characterized by the challenges of technological disruption, socio-economic inequity, sustainability mandates, and a changing labor market, the framework is a blueprint for an effective, inclusive, and responsive approach for global education systems. By making education completely inclusive, learning becomes equitable, as access to learning does not become a barrier. Adaptability helps higher education institutions be quick to respond to changes in technology, industry needs, and student needs. It also helps to base learning on modular approaches, cross-disciplinary programs, and the use of EdTech to create academic and micro-credentialed pathway systems. Specifically, accountability emphasizes how the principles of openness in governance and positive measurement of performance and quality can help build trust between stakeholders and ultimately promote positive institutional developments over time. Alignment is the rationale between institutional missions, academic programs, and societal and economic goals, and it opens common space for universities, industries, and governments to collaborate on achieving Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

As long as, the 4A Framework provides a cohesive route to reform, implementation presents both challenges and opportunities. These challenges include structural and funding constraints, resistance to change, digital divides, and the risk of imposing a uniform approach to diverse local realities. Context-sensitive strategies, inclusive policy-making, and stakeholder engagement will create new dynamics of success while some elements of failure will emerge from institutional transformation and technological innovations. The 4A Framework is not an abstract idea but rather the basis for a true paradigm shift to create robust, inclusive, and future-focused higher education systems. It urges HEIs to transcend established practices and adopt a vibrant, integrated paradigm as a means to ready both learners and institutions to excel in an increasingly intricate and globalized environment.

**Acknowledgment:** No

**Author's Contribution:** *Vanthoch Soth*: Data Collection, Literature Review, Methodology, Analysis, Drafting, Referencing

**Funding:** No

**Declaration:** Not Applicable

**Competing Interest:** No

## References:

1. Abdalla, S., Ramadan, E., Al-Belushi, M., & Al-Hooti, N. (2024). Unveiling the role of arab universities in advancing sustainable development goals: a multi-dimensional analysis. *Sustainability*, 16(14), 5829. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16145829>
2. Adeusi, K., Jejenywa, T., & Jejenywa, T. (2024). Advancing financial transparency and ethical governance: innovative cost management and accountability in higher education and industry. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(5), 1533-1546. <https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i5.1099>
3. Ahdiyana, M., Pambudi, A., & Widiyanto, H. (2022). Exploration study on accountability provisions at indonesian universities., 97-107. [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-17-6\\_12](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-17-6_12)
4. Ahmat, N., Bashir, M., Razali, A., & Kasolang, S. (2021). Micro-credentials in higher education institutions: challenges and opportunities. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 17(3), 281. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14505>
5. Ajayi, O., Bagula, A., Maluleke, H., Gaffoor, Z., Jovanovic, N., & Pietersen, K. (2022). Waternet: a network for monitoring and assessing water quality for drinking and irrigation purposes. *Ieee Access*, 10, 48318-48337. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2022.3172274>
6. Akande, J. and Atiku, S. (2021). Developing industry 4.0 accountants: implications for higher education institutions in namibia. *Development in Learning Organizations an International Journal*, 36(5), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/dlo-09-2021-0177>
7. Al-Krenawi, A., Hashmi, J., & Patel, D. (2024). Globalization, colonization, islamization, and social work practice. *International Journal of Social Work*, 11(2), 44. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijsw.v11i2.22291>
8. Ali, M., Raza, S., Puah, C., & Qazi, W. (2024). Editorial: micro-credential as a digital enabler for higher education ecosystems. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(4), 893-896. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-05-2024-655>
9. Amin, A., Saron, N., Akhir, N., Zakaria, S., & Badri, R. (2021). Main challenges of students with visual impairment at higher education institutions. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v10-i1/9682>
10. Andrews, T. (2021). Bourdieu's theory of practice and the oecd pisa global competence framework. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 20(2), 154-170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14752409211032525>
11. Armas, K. and Jugo, R. (2024). Education for a sustainable future: analysis of universities vision and mission statements in line with global sustainable development goals. *ijlsgdr*, 4(1), e01790. <https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730x.sdgsreview.v4.n00.pe01790>
12. Asire, L. (2023). Stakeholders' interventions in addressing financial constraints restricting women refugees access to higher education: the case of bidibidi refugee settlement, uganda. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 6(3), 335-350. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.6.3.1606>

13. Bahattab, A., Linty, M., Trentin, M., Truppa, C., Hubloue, I., Corte, F., ... & Ragazzoni, L. (2021). Availability and characteristics of humanitarian health education and training programs: a web-based review. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 37(1), 132-138. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049023x21001333>
14. Bahattab, A., Trentin, M., Hubloue, I., Corte, F., & Ragazzoni, L. (2024). Humanitarian health education and training state-of-the-art: a scoping review. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1343867>
15. Baraero-Era, J. (2024). Examining the participation in sustainability assessments among higher education institutions in the philippines. *Iop Conference Series Earth and Environmental Science*, 1366(1), 012004. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1366/1/012004>
16. Batanero, J., Rueda, M., & Cerero, J. (2022). Access and participation of students with disabilities: the challenge for higher education. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(19), 11918. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191911918>
17. Bazhenkov, C., Safonov, Y., Goncharenko, M., Zavalko, K., & Любченко, H. (2023). Rating of higher education institutions — the basis of competitiveness. *Review of Economics and Finance*, 21, 278-285. <https://doi.org/10.55365/1923.x2023.21.26>
18. Berchin, I., Dutra, A., & Guerra, J. (2021). How do higher education institutions promote sustainable development? a literature review. *Sustainable Development*, 29(6), 1204-1222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2219>
19. Brown, M. and Klein, C. (2020). Whose data? which rights? whose power? a policy discourse analysis of student privacy policy documents. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 91(7), 1149-1178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2020.1770045>
20. Brown, M., McGreal, R., & Peters, M. (2023). A strategic institutional response to micro-credentials: key questions for educational leaders. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2023(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.801>
21. Butler, D., Leahy, M., Twining, P., Akoh, B., Chtouki, Y., Farshadnia, S., ... & Valtonen, T. (2018). Education systems in the digital age: the need for alignment. *Technology Knowledge and Learning*, 23(3), 473-494. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-018-9388-6>
22. Caeiro, S., Hamón, L., Martins, R., & Aldaz, C. (2020). Sustainability assessment and benchmarking in higher education institutions— a critical reflection. *Sustainability*, 12(2), 543. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020543>
23. Cebrián, G., Pubill, M., & Mulà, I. (2020). Competencies in education for sustainable development: emerging teaching and research developments. *Sustainability*, 12(2), 579. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020579>
24. Chang, Z., Rusu, V., & Köhler, J. (2021). The global fund: why anti-corruption, transparency and accountability matter. *Globalization and Health*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-021-00753-w>
25. Chankseliani, M. and McCowan, T. (2020). Higher education and the sustainable development goals. *Higher Education*, 81(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00652-w>
26. Channuwong, S., Ruksat, S., Bangbon, P., & Naudé, A. (2024). Organizational factors influencing good governance application of thai higher education institutions. *International Journal of Religion*, 5(11), 1858-1870. <https://doi.org/10.61707/5gxa7g36>
27. Chaudhary, N. (2024). Searching for performance accountability in higher education: a case study. *KMC Journal*, 6(1), 260-279. <https://doi.org/10.3126/kmcj.v6i1.62346>
28. Chen, J. (2023). Neoliberalism and neocolonialism in the mix: evidence of glocalization in the globalization–localization dynamics of early childhood practices in hong kong. *Policy Futures in Education*, 22(6), 1053-1081. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103231171977>
29. Choo, L. and Sarpong, J. (2024). Guest editorial: considering the global-local relationships in education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 22(6), 1020-1031. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103241278163>
30. Cicha, K., Rizun, M., Rutecka, P., & Strzelecki, A. (2021). Covid-19 and higher education: first-year students' expectations toward distance learning. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1889. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041889>
31. Crawford, J. and Cifuentes-Faura, J. (2022). Sustainability in higher education during the covid-19 pandemic: a systematic review. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1879. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031879>
32. Desmarchelier, R. and Cary, L. (2022). Toward just and equitable micro-credentials: an australian perspective. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-022-00332-y>
33. Devkota, K. (2021). Inequalities reinforced through online and distance education in the age of covid-19: the case of higher education in nepal. *International Review of Education*, 67(1-2), 145-165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-021-09886-x>
34. Dougherty, K., Natow, R., Bork, R., Jones, S., & Vega, B. (2013). Accounting for higher education accountability: political origins of state performance funding for higher education. *Teachers College Record*, 115(1), 1-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811311500101>
35. Ekasari, K., Eltivia, N., & Wahyuni, H. (2020). Blending learning: self reflection of accounting education in the indonesian vocational higher education.. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200415.031>
36. Finnveden, G. and Schneider, A. (2023). Sustainable development in higher education—what sustainability skills do industry need?. *Sustainability*, 15(5), 4044. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054044>
37. Flores, M., Barros, A., Simão, A., Pereira, D., Flores, P., Fernandes, E., ... & Ferreira, P. (2021). Portuguese higher education students' adaptation to online teaching and learning in times of the covid-19 pandemic: personal and contextual factors. *Higher Education*, 83(6), 1389-1408. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00748-x>
38. Gu, S. (2024). The impact of higher education on economic growth: a comparative analysis of china, germany, and the united states. *Advances in Economics Management and Political Sciences*, 99(1), 105-113. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/99/2024ox0191>
39. Ha, N., Dyke, N., Spittle, M., Watt, A., & Smallridge, A. (2024). Micro-credentials through the eyes of employers: benefits, challenges and enablers of effectiveness. *Education + Training*, 66(7), 948-963. <https://doi.org/10.1108/et-08-2023-0340>
40. Ha, N., Spittle, M., Watt, A., & Dyke, N. (2022). A systematic literature review of micro-credentials in higher education: a non-zero-sum game. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(6), 1527-1548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2146061>
41. Han, S. and Kumwenda, B. (2024). Bridging the digital divide: promoting equal access to online learning for health professions in an unequal world. *Medical Education*, 59(1), 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.15455>
42. Harris, N. (2022). Strengthening internal accountability by avoiding fantasy documents in responsibility center budgeting. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2022(198), 63-74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20442>
43. Hassan, M., Murtaza, A., & Rashid, K. (2024). Redefining higher education institutions (heis) in the era of globalisation and global crises: a proposal for future sustainability. *European Journal of Education*, 60(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12822>
44. Hoidn, S. and Šťastný, V. (2021). Labour market success of initial vocational education and training graduates: a comparative study of three education systems in central europe. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 75(4), 629-653. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2021.1931946>

45. Holovko-Havrysheva, O., Krayevska, O., & Sas, S. (2023). Third mission of universities: regulatory frameworks in a comparative perspective. *Geopolitical Social Security and Freedom Journal*, 6(1-2), 149-173. <https://doi.org/10.2478/gssfj-2023-0011>
46. Hossain, M., Tabash, M., Siow, M., Ong, T., & Anagreh, S. (2023). Entrepreneurial intentions of gen z university students and entrepreneurial constraints in bangladesh. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-023-00279-y>
47. Hossain, S. (2023). Study on quality assurance of higher education and outcome-based education in bangladesh. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(12), 72-80. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.1112007>
48. Huang, F., Crăciun, D., & Wit, H. (2022). Internationalization of higher education in a post-pandemic world: challenges and responses. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 76(2), 203-212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12392>
49. Huisman, J. and Currie, J. (2004). Accountability in higher education: bridge over troubled water?. *Higher Education*, 48(4), 529-551. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:high.0000046725.16936.4c>
50. Ilie, S., Rose, P., & Vignoles, A. (2021). Understanding higher education access: inequalities and early learning in low and lower-middle-income countries. *British Educational Research Journal*, 47(5), 1237-1258. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3723>
51. Jena, A. and Das, R. (2024). Enhancing access, equity, and quality in higher education in india through technology and its challenges. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i02.14623>
52. Kamovich, U. and Foss, L. (2017). In search of alignment: a review of impact studies in entrepreneurship education. *Education Research International*, 2017(1). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/1450102>
53. Karim, A., Chowdhury, T., Karim, A., & Ahmed, A. (2024). The impact of educational management on the higher education: international perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v14-i1/20462>
54. Komljenović, J. (2020). The future of value in digitalised higher education: why data privacy should not be our biggest concern. *Higher Education*, 83(1), 119-135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00639-7>
55. Kwasi-Agyeman, F. (2021). Public funding of higher education and student access. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 12(6S1). <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v12i6s1.2666>
56. Lang, J. (2023). Workforce upskilling: can universities meet the challenges of lifelong learning?. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 40(5), 388-400. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijilt-01-2023-0001>
57. Lei, X. and Mou, W. (2021). Updating self-location by self-motion and visual cues in familiar multiscale spaces.. *Journal of Experimental Psychology Learning Memory and Cognition*, 47(9), 1439-1452. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000992>
58. Lei, X. and Mou, W. (2022). Developing global spatial memories by one-shot across-boundary navigation.. *Journal of Experimental Psychology Learning Memory and Cognition*, 48(6), 798-812. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0001083>
59. Liu, L. and Coates, H. (2024). International education hubs: a comparative study of china's greater bay area and established hubs. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 78(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12556>
60. Liu, S. and Sijde, P. (2021). Towards the entrepreneurial university 2.0: reaffirming the responsibility of universities in the era of accountability. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3073. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063073>
61. Liu, Z., Lomovtseva, N., & Korobeynikova, E. (2020). Online learning platforms: reconstructing modern higher education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Ijet)*, 15(13), 4. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i13.14645>
62. Macheridis, N. and Paulsson, A. (2021). Tracing accountability in higher education. *Research in Education*, 110(1), 78-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034523721993143>
63. Maina, M., Ortiz, L., Mancini, F., & Melo, M. (2022). A micro-credentialing methodology for improved recognition of he employability skills. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00315-5>
64. Maluleke, H., Bagula, A., Ajayi, O., & Chiaraviglio, L. (2022). An economic feasibility model for sustainable 5g networks in rural dwellings of south africa. *Sustainability*, 14(19), 12153. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912153>
65. Marques, M. (2023). Transparency and accountability in portuguese public universities. *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.55267/djfm/13433>
66. Masina, R. (2024). Integration of sustainable development goals in the textile science, apparel design, and technology programs in zimbabwean universities. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 31(1), 265-284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14779714241264972>
67. McCowan, T. (2023). The crosscutting impact of higher education on the sustainable development goals. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 103, 102945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102945>
68. McLendon, M., Hearn, J., & Deaton, R. (2006). Called to account: analyzing the origins and spread of state performance-accountability policies for higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737028001001>
69. Mishra, L., Gupta, T., & Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 1, 100012. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100012>
70. Molina, Á., Helldén, D., Alfvén, T., Niemi, M., Leander, K., Nordenstedt, H., ... & Biermann, O. (2023). Integrating the united nations sustainable development goals into higher education globally: a scoping review. *Global Health Action*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2023.2190649>
71. Moyer, J. and Hedden, S. (2020). Are we on the right path to achieve the sustainable development goals?. *World Development*, 127, 104749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104749>
72. Mseleku, Z. (2022). Beyond hard barriers: lack of aspiration as a soft barrier to access higher education amongst youth living in low-income housing estate. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.20853/36-6-4516>
73. Narayanaswamy, R., Albers, C., Knotts, T., & Albers-Miller, N. (2024). Sustaining and reinforcing the perceived value of higher education: e-learning with micro-credentials. *Sustainability*, 16(20), 8860. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16208860>
74. Nganga, L., Akpovo, S., Kambutu, J., Thapa, S., & Mwangi, A. (2023). Educational policies in early childhood education programs in kenya and nepal: challenging unjust binary mindset around curricula practices. *Policy Futures in Education*, 22(6), 1150-1168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103231176587>
75. Omar, M. and Arif, S. (2020). From epistemological pedagogical access to student success: new framework for studying access to higher education. *Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review (Rjsser)*, 1(3), 45-55. [https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol1-iss3-2020\(45-55\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol1-iss3-2020(45-55))

76. Omotosho, A., Akintolu, M., Kimanzi, M., & Modise, A. (2023). Assessing the enactus global sustainability initiative's alignment with united nations sustainable development goals: lessons for higher education institutions. *Education Sciences*, 13(9), 935. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13090935>
77. Onumah, R. and Owusu, G. (2023). What drives the attainment of goals of ethical education in higher institutions? the perception of professional accountants and accounting educators. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 16(5), 1548-1563. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jarhe-02-2023-0080>
78. Pepugal, E. (2022). Levels of perception on school-based management implementation in san luis national high school, philippines. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(4), 26-34. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i4.516>
79. Pirkkalainen, H., Sood, I., Napoles, C., Kukkonen, A., & Camilleri, A. (2022). How might micro-credentials influence institutions and empower learners in higher education?. *Educational Research*, 65(1), 40-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2022.2157302>
80. Popelo, O., Холявко, Н., Нрыhorkiv, М., Kosmii, O., Олексиенко, O., & Жаворонок, А. (2023). Eu higher education institution toward the sustainable development. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 46(2), 124-132. <https://doi.org/10.15544/mts.2023.13>
81. Pounder, J. (2002). Public accountability in hong kong higher education. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 15(6), 458-474. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550210439616>
82. Prakhov, I. and Bugakova, P. (2023). Regional accessibility of higher education in russia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 44(3), 558-583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2023.2167700>
83. Raj, R., Singh, A., Kumar, V., & Verma, P. (2024). Achieving professional qualifications using micro-credentials: a case of small packages and big challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(4), 916-947. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-01-2023-0028>
84. Ramalingam, S., Yunus, M., & Hashim, H. (2021). Exploring esl learners' blended learning experiences and its' effectiveness through web-based technologies. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (Ijere)*, 10(4), 1436. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i4.21465>
85. Ramírez-Hurtado, J., Hernández-Díaz, A., López-Sánchez, A., & León, V. (2021). Measuring online teaching service quality in higher education in the covid-19 environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2403. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052403>
86. Ramsgaard, M., Thomassen, M., Middleton, K., & Neergaard, H. (2021). Mapping and navigating context for opportunity development: the context hive – a research-based framework. *Industry and Higher Education*, 35(4), 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222211021311>
87. Reed, A. (2023). Micro-credentials and the role of evidence: increasing the potential for learner-centeredness, inclusivity and an expansive model of assessment and credentialing. *International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 40(5), 401-412. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijilt-12-2022-0228>
88. ROQUE, J. (2023). Modular distance learning in the area of education during the new normal: a systematic review. *Aide Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 3, 253-268. <https://doi.org/10.56648/aide-irj.v3i1.67>
89. Ruiz-Mallén, I. and Heras, M. (2020). What sustainability? higher education institutions' pathways to reach the agenda 2030 goals. *Sustainability*, 12(4), 1290. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041290>
90. Salem, D. and Magdi, D. (2024). A model for using blockchain technology in educational systems. *A Model for using Blockchain Technology in Educational Systems*
  - a. 34(91-102). <https://doi.org/10.21608/jstc.2024.338407>
91. Sangster, A. (2022). Revolutionising the accounting curriculum in higher education: a vision of the future. *Accounting and Management Review | Revista De Contabilidade E Gestão*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.55486/amrrcg.v26i.3a>
92. Scharenberg, K., Waltner, E., Mischo, C., & Rieß, W. (2021). Development of students' sustainability competencies: do teachers make a difference?. *Sustainability*, 13(22), 12594. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212594>
93. Schmidt, M., Newbutt, N., Lee, M., Lu, J., Francois, M., Antonenko, P., ... & Glaser, N. (2023). Toward a strengths-based model for designing virtual reality learning experiences for autistic users. *Autism*, 28(7), 1809-1827. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13623613231208579>
94. Schwarz, A., Sellnow, D., Sellnow, T., & Taylor, L. (2024). Instructional risk and crisis communication at higher education institutions during covid-19: insights from practitioners in the global south and north. *Journal of International Crisis and Risk Communication Research*, 7(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.56801/ijrcrc.v7.i1.1>
95. Sharma, H., Jain, V., Mogaji, E., & Babbilid, A. (2024). Blended learning and augmented employability: a multi-stakeholder perspective of the micro-credentialing ecosystem in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 38(4), 1021-1044. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-12-2022-0497>
96. Shukla, M. (2023). Quality enhancement in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 06(02). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v6-i2-39>
97. Sitnikova, V. (2023). Scholarships for international students as a way to ensure the right to education (including case studies). *Verejná Správa a Spoločnosť*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.33542/vss2023-1-8>
98. Sulila, I. (2022). The effect transparency, accountability, responsibility, independency and fairness on the governance performance of state universities in indonesia. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 12(1), 142. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v12i1.19493>
99. Tamoliūnė, G., Greenspon, R., Teresevičienė, M., Volungevičienė, A., Trepulė, E., & Daukšienė, E. (2023). Exploring the potential of micro-credentials: a systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1006811>
100. Tria, J. (2020). The covid-19 pandemic through the lens of education in the philippines: the new normal. *International Journal of Pedagogical Development and Lifelong Learning*, 1(1), ep2001. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdll/8311>
101. Tùng, T., Lan, D., Lân, T., Thi, K., Cuc, V., & Oanh, P. (2023). Significance of higher education in transmitting knowledge of sustainable developments: insights from vietnam. *ISVS*, 10(11), 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.61275/isvsej-2023-10-11-01>
102. Utami, P., Suprpto, N., Hidaayatullaah, H., & Cheng, T. (2024). The comparison of chat gpt, perplexity ai, and scopus database to capture indonesian higher education quality in achieving sdgs 2030. *E3s Web of Conferences*, 513, 04001. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202451304001>

103. WANG, Z. (2024). Achieving universal higher education in china: characteristics, challenges, and future directions. *Pacific International Journal*, 6(4), 125-129. <https://doi.org/10.55014/pij.v6i4.490>
104. Wilder, P., Cohen, J., Deogracias, M., & Trudeau, A. (2024). Cultivating nonviolent relationships within global literacy education partnerships. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 68(2), 197-203. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1371>
105. Woodard, H., Shepherd, S., Crain-Dorough, M., & Richardson, M. (2011). The globalization of higher education through the lens of technology and accountability. *I-Manager's Journal of Educational Technology*, 8(2), 16-24. <https://doi.org/10.26634/jet.8.2.1629>
106. Wright, C., Ritter, L., & Gonzales, C. (2022). Cultivating a collaborative culture for ensuring sustainable development goals in higher education: an integrative case study. *Sustainability*, 14(3), 1273. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031273>
107. Yüner, B. (2023). Examination of the variables explaining school effectiveness by chaid analysis. *Kuramsal Eğitimilim*, 16(4), 808-820. <https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.1294397>
108. Zhao, H. (2024). Digital platforms in higher education: opportunities, challenges, and strategies. *Advances in Economics Management and Political Sciences*, 116(1), 118-122. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2754-1169/116/20242447>
109. Zuccotti, C. (2024). Migration and education in the global south: a study of south american origin children in the argentinean educational system. *International Migration Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183241268294>

#### **Publisher's Note**

*The Social Science Review A Multidisciplinary Journal* remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published data, map and institutional affiliations.

#### **©The Author(s) 2025. Open Access.**

This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>