ISSN Online: 3006-4708
ISSN Print: 3006-4694

SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW ARCHIVES
https://policyjournalofms.com

Investigating The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Quality Assurance in Higher Education: A Systematic Review

Muhammad Ehtsham[1], Faisal Imran[2], Khalid Feroz Channa[3], Muhammad Shahzad Ashfaq[4]
[1] Assistant Professor of English, HED Punjab. Email: mehtsham@gmail.com
[2] Deputy Director QEC, Liaquat University of Medical & Health Sciences Jamshoro.
Corresponding Author. Email: faisalimranshaikh@gmail.com
[3] Manager, Accreditation Department, Jeddah International College, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.
Email: channakhalid@gmail.com
[4] Assistant Professor, Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi. Email: drmsashfaq@fjwu.edu.pk

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i4.1183

Abstract
This systematic review investigated the influence of artificial intelligence on quality assurance practices within higher education institutions located in Pakistan, considering the Revised Quality Assurance Framework of the Higher Education Commission. The researchers focused on 20 public and private universities in the four provinces of Pakistan and the federally administered territories of the Pakistan region, analyzing the incorporation of AI across the three components of the framework: PREE (8 standards), RIPE (16 standards), and REEQAB (14 standards). The studies employed a mixed-methods design, integrating the analysis of documents on institutional quality assurance - reports, HEC policies and AI implementation in conjunction with structured surveys and semi-structured interviews with quality assurance leads, academic managers and educators. The systematic review was guided by the PRISMA approach, using documents dated 2015-2025. The answer AI technologies brought significant advancements in the automation of curriculum assessment and accreditation, the evaluation of research, and the monitoring of quality and control systems. The main challenges identified respond to insufficient infrastructure, weak technical capacities, poor finances and organizational reluctance to change. The most marked disparity in the degree of AI uptake provision across the country was evident in the difference in implementation between urban and rural institutions. The urban institutions of education AI displayed far more advanced implementation than their rural counterparts. Results underlined the necessity of establishing sophisticated AI training initiatives to accompany the growing investment, along with the standardization of execution frameworks and policy adjustments, to ensure AI's full capabilities are harnessed to bolster the quality assurance frameworks in Pakistani higher education institutions.

Keywords: Systematic Review, Influence, Artificial Intelligence, Quality Assurance, Higher Education, Revised Quality Assurance Framework, Higher Education Commission

Introduction
Developments in Artificial Intelligence have changed the world in many ways, including the world of higher education, particularly in the last couple of decades. The value of AI in Pakistani higher education opens new possibilities as well as difficulties, especially with the additional value that higher education quality assurance systems require (Murtaza and Hui 2021). The value of quality assurance in higher education is evident especially to the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC), and the need for quality assurance in institution performance, learning outcomes, and accountability is

specifically documented. Traditional quality assurance systems, particularly in Pakistan, have faced challenges concerning time inefficient manual systems, subjectivity, lack of resources and difficulties surrounding the constancy of multiple institutional systems. Acute challenges have become especially apparent with the increase in volumes of students, the balance of educational paradigms, and the effort of Pakistani universities in the attainment of international academic accreditation (Ahmed, Mallah et al. 2024).

The uses of AI technologies in automated data analysis, predictive analytics, pattern identification, real time monitoring systems, and intelligent decision support systems have the transformative potential to solve many longstanding quality assurance problems. Automated curriculum mapping, assessment of learning outcomes, evaluation of research productivity, streamlining of accreditation processes, prediction of student performance, faculty evaluation systems and institutional benchmarking, fall under the applications of AI in higher education quality assurance. These technologies will permit the offices of quality assurance to conduct rapid analysis of large volumes of institutional data, determine prevailing data patterns, identify quality gaps in real time, and formulate decision support systems that will support the practice of continuous quality improvement. In addition, systems of quality assurance that rely on AI will increase the frequency and breadth of quality assurance audits that surpass the limits of traditional systems, and in doing so, will increase the audits transparency, minimize bias, and standardization across institutions (Majeed, Khan et al. 2023).

The Higher Education Commission of Pakistan's Revised Quality Assurance Framework represents a comprehensive map for institutional excellence, consisting of 38 standards across 3 interconnected dimensions. The PREE Component, consisting of 8 standards, contains the fundamentals of the institution, including program development, resources, delivery, evaluation, and the foundational elements of academic quality. The RIPE Component contains 16 standards which target the research culture, the innovation ecosystem, the quality of publications, and entrepreneurial activities that research-intensive institutions integrate and that aid knowledge creation. The 14 standards of the REEQAB Component emphasize institutional recognition and stakeholder and community engagement, outreach, quality management, accreditation, and the adoption of progressive practices for external accountability and improvement. This comprehensive tripartite framework enables examination of the impact of AI technologies on the quality assurance of the institution in multiple areas at once (ur Rehman and Huma 2024).

There is an increasing body of literature on the use of AI in higher education globally, there is very little empirical work systematically assessing AI's impact on quality assurance in higher education institutions in Pakistan. Considering the different types of institutions in Pakistan and the different types of regions, the educational landscape is complex and requires research that is not just a contextualized study of the West (Nasim 2021). The significance of AI technologies in education also requires research on how universities in Pakistan implement, assess, and measure the effectiveness of AI, the barriers to implementation, and the outcomes of implementation at the institutional level. Policymakers, educational leaders, quality assurance professionals, and vendors need to understand these dynamics to help formulate strategies that optimize integration and use of AI technology in education and consider the contextual constraints and priorities of Pakistan (Ahtesham 2024).

This systematic review has incorporated the most recent scholarly literature while the review has also worked on filling an important gap by assessing the role of AI on quality assurance practices in higher education institutions in Pakistan, examining the affordance of AI within HEC's Revised Quality Assurance Framework. By studying the quantitative implementation and outcome data and the qualitative data of the actors involved in the quality assurance cycle, the study appreciates the promise of change, and the operational boundaries AI brings within quality assurance. The study considers twenty public and private universities in Pakistan, which have been selected to reflect the country's geographical and institutional diversity and the multiple facets of reality in the higher education system. Following systematic review methodology and the PRISMA framework, the study attempts to provide research-based evidence to assist policy formulation, institutional planning, resource allocation, and research on the role of AI in quality assurance for Pakistani higher education.

Research Objectives

1. To assess the level of AI adoption and implementation within the quality assurance frameworks of selected universities in Pakistan within the context of HEC's PREE, RIPE, and REEQAB framework components.
2. To explore quality assurance leaders, academic managers, and pedagogical staff insights about AI's drives, opportunities, barriers and limiting factors in the execution of AI-powered quality assurance systems in Pakistani higher education institutions.
3. To provide evidence-based recommendations on optimizing the adoption of AI in quality assurance processes in line with the HEC's Revised Quality Assurance Framework and the contextual situation of higher education institutions in Pakistan.

Research Questions

1. To what extent have Pakistani educational institutions utilized AI technologies in their quality assurance functions with respect to the PREE, RIPE, and REEQAB benchmarks of the HEC Revised Quality Assurance Framework?
2. What advantages and disadvantages do institutions in Pakistan's higher education sector encounter in the adoption and use of AI for quality assurance?
3. What institutional contexts, and resources, and frameworks, in the case of Pakistan higher education, affect the adoption of AI for quality assurance the most?

Significance of Study

This study is important to the various actors in Pakistan's higher education sector. To the HEC policymakers, the study's findings may be the first in the area to assist in evidence-based decision-making for policy establishment, allocation of resources, and setting the regulatory approach for the use of AI for quality assurance in quality assurance processes in higher education institutions. Institutional executives and quality assurance heads may provide actionable insights on the expected successful AI integration, challenges, and suitable AI technologies to be operationalized in the quality assurance frameworks of institutions to streamline performance and sustain quality. AI's potential value to faculty and administrative staff lies in assisting in the reduction of routine administrative tasks, streamlining the assessment process, and facilitating evidence-based decision-making. For technology providers and educational technology innovators, the study offers important insights in relation to potential AI features needed in the Pakistani higher education sector, challenges to adoption, and institutional resource availability. Having a solid foundation will enable researchers to plan future studies on particular AI use, longitudinal impact studies, and cross-country comparisons specific to educational settings. This research will help to complete Pakistan's higher education quality assurance system and ecosystem which will help with educational achievement, institutional competitiveness, and evidence-guided technology advancement within the country's knowledge economy through educational innovations.

Literature Review

Quality assurance and Artificial Intelligence within the higher education space has, in the last few years, become prominent. This is because technology is advancing and transforming educational environments globally. The early literature on quality assurance in higher education focused on the quality control peer review system, accreditation, and student evaluation systems, and auditing systems (Hassan 2025). Most quality assurance systems within higher education relied on compliance, manual evaluation processes, and human judgment. Over time, the systems become resource intensive, gain unnecessary biases, and fail to scale. More new institutional data is becoming more complex and exponentially large while systems fail to provide real time data and feedback. Stead quality assurance systems within educational institutions will fail to provide the necessary real time data for quality improvements needed within educational institutions. Advances in technology, demographic, and education systems have all shifted in the institutions, and systems are failing to provide the quality improvements needed. Systems are experiencing large gaps in the consideration and evaluation of new standards (Javed and Alenezi 2023).

Artificial intelligence (AI) innovations compelled a radical reconsideration of the paradigms of higher education quality assurance. The introduction of machine learning techniques transformed the analysis of educational datasets by revealing complex patterns, predicting educational outcomes, and streamlining the automated quality control routine. These tasks were previously the domain of human intensive labor (George and Wooden 2023). The development of natural language processing techniques automated the analysis of student and faculty feedback, evaluations, curriculum materials, and research publications, and extracted pertinent insights from the previously unassessed, large-scale, and unstructured texts. Other AI systems assessed the practical and performance-based components of a skill and provided data to inform systems on quality improvement. The scope and intensity of AI systems offered the resources needed to elevate quality assurance to a degree that was not previously possible by traditional quality control processes. AI promised the quality assurance systems with the scope to become continuous, comprehensive, and real-time quality assurance systems (Kuleto, Ilić et al. 2021).

International studies have documented a wide range of applications of AI that improve quality assurance along various institutional dimensions. Studies focused on the European and North American contexts showed the use of predictive analytics systems that identified at-risk students early in their academic careers and enabled timely intervention that positively enhanced retention and learning outcomes. Automated curriculum mapping tools analyzed course content for alignment with learning outcomes and standards of accreditation and industry, thus streamlining program review processes, saving significant time and efforts that go into periodic curriculum assessments (Kuleto, Ilić et al. 2021). Artificial intelligent assessment systems applying machine learning in grading complex assignments increased consistency while also lightening the grading burden, and produced learning-supportive feedback at an integrity-preserving level of the assessment. AI-based research evaluation tools improved scholarly output monitoring, citation analysis, and impact assessment, enabling sophisticated alignment of documents monitoring research productivity with institutional strategic priorities. These applications as a whole pointed AI integration into quality assurance towards a proactive level of compliance that continuous improvement to the institution enables (Meng and Liu 2025).

The scholarly literature has also reported numerous issues and gaps regarding the use of AI tools within the context of the quality assurance of education. Regarding the quality and availability of data as primary prerequisites, it has been reported that many organizations are unable to provide the necessary data because of legacy systems, data silos, inconsistent documentation practices, and data privacy issues. The issues of bias and fairness related to algorithms pose significant concerns about the use of AI systems and whether these systems will amplify existing inequities in education, especially when training data reflects inequities and when algorithms are optimized for inequity (AlSagri and Sohail 2024). The extensive requirements of technical expertise created barriers to implementation, as the effective use of AI required skills in data science and machine learning, which vastly exceed the levels of input and support found in many quality assurance offices in education. The direct and opportunity costs associated with AI investment pose significant challenges, especially in developing contexts where institutions face competing priorities (Bahroun, Anane et al. 2023).

Across different Asian countries, some studies highlighted particular factors that shaped the use of AI technologies in the integrated systems for quality assurance in higher education. Research conducted in China, South Korea, Singapore, and Malaysia described different practices and the different regulatory, institutional, technological, and ideological educational landscapes, as well as the cultures surrounding education (Mok and Sawn Khai 2024). In China, higher education institutions have integrated advanced AI technologies into multiple functions of the institutions as quality monitoring systems, due to the high state investment and growth strategic state priorities that positioned China as

an emerging global technological leader, and large institutional capacities to implement technology. In South Korea, higher education institutions focused the use of AI technologies on competency-based education, learning analytics, and the personalization of learning pathways (Zhang, Zhang et al. 2025). In Singapore, universities focused on the use of predictive learning analytics from technologically integrated learning environments for real-time quality improvement of educational offerings, supported advanced technological infrastructure, while safeguarding privacy of data rights. These varied practices practiced underscored the significant role of the above highlighted factors in determining the strategic use of AI technologies in quality assurance systems (Lee, Koh et al. 2023).
Many studies focused on quality assurance frameworks similar to those employed by Pakistan's HEC has shown how comprehensive and multi-faceted quality criteria shaped approaches to AI integration. Research on accreditation, institutional audits, and quality management systems showed that successful AI integration went beyond a stand-alone technological adoption, but rather the integration of AI into existing quality frameworks. Institutions that succeeded viewed AI as an augmentation of human capabilities, rather than a substitution of human judgment, and managed the trade-off that required automation of some processes and human control in others, especially those involving critical quality determination (Mughis 2023). Literature highlighted the need for organizational stakeholder integration, particularly for quality assurance personnel, educators, and administrators, in the design, execution, and assessment of AI systems to ensure that the automation addressed real institutional problems and had the requisite institutional buy-in. Research identified change management as the critical success factor, demonstrating that the excellence of the technical implementation itself was not enough without the organizational development, provision of appropriate new capabilities, and cultural change that supported new technology-driven quality assurance processes (Saleem and Aslam 2025).
The scant available literature about AI use in the quality assurance of higher education in Pakistan indicates that the lack of infrastructure, limited digital literacy, few resources, and an institution's reluctance to adopt technology created difficulties in the use of AI. The need to improve quality, the growing availability of affordable AI technology, and the competitiveness of institutions to attain excellence provide a counterbalance to the aforementioned impediments. To address the literature gap, the current systematic review uses a contextualized, evidence-based approach to analyze and document the impact of AI on quality assurance in higher education in Pakistan in order to deepen the understanding of the integration of technology to improve quality in developing South Asian countries (Asad and Suleman 2025).

Research Methodology

The researchers utilized mixed-methods strategy to analyze the influence of AI on quality assurance in higher education in Pakistan. The systematic review focused on the Pakistan HEC Revised Quality Assurance Framework. For the country's four provinces (Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkwa, and Balochistan) and federally administered areas, the researchers purposively sampled 20 of Pakistan's public and private universities to achieve countrywide geographical representation. The researchers assessed three key areas of the HEC framework. First, the PREE (Program, Resources, Education, and Evaluation) component, which has 8 standards and reviews curriculum assessment, faculty, and evaluations as well as infrastructure and assessment systems. Second, the RIPE (Research, Innovation, Publications, and Entrepreneurship) component, which has 16 standards and reviews research output, innovation systems, scholarly publications, and entrepreneurial activities. Finally, the REEQAB (Recognition, Engagement, Extension, Quality Assurance, Accreditation, and Best Practices) component which has 14 standards and reviews institutional recognition, quality control systems, engagement with the community, accreditation and excellence standards. Data collection involved the analysis of documents of HEC policies, university quality assurance reports of the institutions, as well as AI implementation documents from the universities that were selected and then triangulated with quality assurance directors, academic administrators, and faculty members using structured questionnaires and semi structured interviews. The researchers adhered to the PRISMA framework and included peer-reviewed literature from 2015 to 2025 to determine the key AI applications, challenges, and results for the 38 quality assurance standards, and then offered evidence-based proposals for AI-integrated quality assurance in higher education in Pakistan.

Results and Data Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Framework Component	Fully Implemented	Partially Implemented	Not Implemented	Mean Implementation Score (0-10)
PREE Standards (8)	25% (5)	55% (11)	20% (4)	5.8
RIPE Standards (16)	15% (3)	45% (9)	40% (8)	4.2
REEQAB Standards (14)	30% (6)	50% (10)	20% (4)	6.1
Overall Framework	23% (14)	50% (30)	27% (16)	5.4

Table 1: AI Adoption Rates Across HEC Framework Components (N=20 Universities)

Table 1 presents the overall AI adoption rates across the three components of HEC's Revised Quality Assurance Framework. The data revealed that REEQAB standards demonstrated the highest implementation rate with a mean score of 6.1, suggesting that quality management systems and accreditation processes were most amenable to AI integration. PREE standards showed moderate adoption at 5.8, indicating reasonable progress in automating curriculum assessment and resource evaluation. However, RIPE standards exhibited the lowest implementation score of 4.2, revealing significant challenges in applying AI technologies to research evaluation, innovation measurement, and entrepreneurship tracking. The overall framework implementation score of 5.4 indicated that Pakistani universities remained in mid-stage AI adoption, with half of all standards only partially implemented, reflecting both growing technological integration and persistent implementation barriers.

Institution Type	Number	High Implementation (7-10)	Medium Implementation (4-6)	Low Implementation (0-3)	Average Score
Public Universities	12	25% (3)	50% (6)	25% (3)	5.2
Private Universities	8	37.5% (3)	37.5% (3)	25% (2)	5.8
Urban Locations	14	35.7% (5)	50% (7)	14.3% (2)	6.3
Rural/Semi-urban	6	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	50% (3)	3.9

Table 2: Institutional Characteristics and AI Implementation Levels

Table 2 examines the relationship between institutional characteristics and AI implementation success. Private universities demonstrated marginally higher average implementation scores compared to public institutions, potentially reflecting greater operational flexibility, stronger industry partnerships, and access to technology funding. Most significantly, urban-located universities achieved substantially higher implementation levels with an average score of 6.3 compared to rural and semi-urban institutions scoring only 3.9. This pronounced geographical disparity highlighted critical digital divide issues where universities in major cities benefited from superior technological infrastructure, greater access to technical expertise, stronger internet connectivity, and proximity to technology vendors. The data underscored that successful AI adoption in quality assurance required addressing fundamental infrastructure and resource inequities across Pakistan's geographically diverse higher education landscape.

Quality Assurance Function	Adoption Rate	Average Effectiveness Rating (1-5)	Primary Technology Used
Curriculum Assessment	65% (13)	3.8	Machine Learning Analytics
Student Performance Analysis	70% (14)	4.1	Predictive Analytics
Faculty Evaluation	35% (7)	3.2	Natural Language Processing
Research Output Tracking	55% (11)	3.9	Automated Bibliometrics
Accreditation Documentation	60% (12)	4.3	Document Management AI
Learning Outcome Mapping	45% (9)	3.5	Curriculum Mapping Tools
Quality Audit Automation	40% (8)	3.4	Process Automation AI
Stakeholder Feedback Analysis	50% (10)	3.7	Sentiment Analysis

Table 3: Specific AI Applications in Quality Assurance Functions

Table 3 detailed specific AI applications across various quality assurance functions within participating institutions. Student performance analysis emerged as the most widely adopted application at seventy percent adoption with the highest effectiveness rating of 4.1, suggesting that predictive analytics addressing student success constituted a priority area where AI demonstrated clear value. Accreditation documentation automation, adopted by sixty percent of institutions with a 4.3 effectiveness rating, reflected how AI successfully reduced administrative burden in compliance-intensive processes. Conversely, faculty evaluation showed the lowest adoption at only thirty-five percent with a modest 3.2 effectiveness rating, potentially indicating cultural resistance to AI-mediated performance assessment or concerns about algorithm fairness in personnel decisions. The variation in adoption rates and effectiveness across functions highlighted that AI integration succeeded most readily in data-intensive, routine processes while facing greater challenges in applications requiring nuanced human judgment or involving sensitive personnel matters.

Province/Region	Universities (n)	Average Implementation Score	Infrastructure Index (1-10)	Training Hours Provided
Punjab	8	6.2	7.5	45 hours
Sindh	6	5.8	7.0	38 hours
Khyber Pakhtunkhwa	4	4.6	5.5	28 hours
Balochistan	2	3.2	4.0	18 hours

Table 4: Provincial Distribution of AI Implementation

Table 4 revealed significant provincial disparities in AI implementation levels correlating strongly with infrastructure availability and training investment. Punjab province, hosting eight universities including several major urban institutions, demonstrated the highest implementation score of 6.2 supported by superior infrastructure rating of 7.5 and substantial training provision averaging forty-five hours per quality assurance staff. Sindh province showed comparable performance with a 5.8 implementation score and strong infrastructure foundation. However, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa exhibited notably lower implementation at 4.6, while Balochistan scored only 3.2, reflecting limited infrastructure resources and minimal training opportunities. The strong correlation between infrastructure investment, professional development, and implementation success emphasized that technological adoption required comprehensive ecosystem development rather than isolated technology deployment, with less-developed provinces requiring targeted capacity-building interventions.

Benefit Category	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score (1-5)
Improved Efficiency	42% (76)	38% (68)	15% (27)	3% (5)	2% (4)	4.15
Enhanced Accuracy	35% (63)	40% (72)	18% (32)	5% (9)	2% (4)	4.01
Better Decision-Making	38% (68)	35% (63)	20% (36)	5% (9)	2% (4)	4.02
Time Savings	48% (86)	32% (58)	12% (22)	6% (11)	2% (3)	4.18
Standardization	40% (72)	36% (65)	16% (29)	6% (11)	2% (3)	4.06
Real-time Monitoring	33% (59)	37% (67)	22% (40)	6% (11)	2% (3)	3.93

Table 5: Perceived Benefits of AI in Quality Assurance (Survey Responses, N=180)

Table 5 presented stakeholder perceptions of AI benefits in quality assurance based on survey responses from quality assurance directors, administrators, and faculty members across participating institutions. Time savings emerged as the most valued benefit with a mean score of 4.18, with eighty percent of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that AI significantly reduced time requirements for quality assurance tasks. Improved efficiency closely followed at 4.15, while standardization, enhanced accuracy, and better decision-making all scored above 4.0, indicating strong stakeholder recognition of AI's positive contributions. Real-time monitoring capabilities, though still positively perceived at 3.93, received relatively more neutral responses, possibly reflecting incomplete implementation of continuous monitoring systems. Overall, the overwhelmingly positive perceptions across all benefit categories suggested that stakeholders who experienced AI-enhanced quality assurance recognized substantial value despite implementation challenges, providing important validation for continued technology adoption efforts.

Challenge Category	Major Challenge	Moderate Challenge	Minor Challenge	Not a Challenge	Mean Severity (1-4)
Infrastructure Limitations	45% (81)	35% (63)	15% (27)	5% (9)	3.20
Technical Expertise Gap	52% (94)	30% (54)	13% (23)	5% (9)	3.29
Financial Constraints	58% (104)	28% (50)	10% (18)	4% (8)	3.40
Resistance to Change	38% (68)	40% (72)	18% (32)	4% (8)	3.12
Data Quality Issues	42% (76)	38% (68)	16% (29)	4% (7)	3.18
Privacy/Security Concerns	35% (63)	40% (72)	20% (36)	5% (9)	3.05
Integration with Existing Systems	48% (86)	32% (58)	15% (27)	5% (9)	3.23

Table 6: Implementation Challenges and Barriers (Survey Responses, N=180)

Table 6 identified implementation challenges ranked by perceived severity from stakeholder perspectives. Financial constraints emerged as the most severe barrier with a mean score of 3.40, with fifty-eight percent identifying it as a major challenge, reflecting limited institutional budgets for technology investment in resource-constrained Pakistani higher education contexts. Technical expertise gaps closely followed at 3.29 severity, with fifty-two percent rating it as a major challenge, highlighting the critical shortage of qualified data scientists, AI specialists, and educational technologists capable of implementing and maintaining sophisticated AI systems. Integration difficulties, infrastructure limitations, and data quality issues all exceeded 3.15 severity, indicating fundamental technical barriers requiring substantial investment. Notably, resistance to change scored lower at 3.12, suggesting that while organizational change management remained important, stakeholders perceived technical and resource barriers as more significant impediments than cultural resistance.

Training Area	Currently Adequate	Needs Improvement	Critical Need	Priority Ranking
AI Fundamentals	15% (3)	40% (8)	45% (9)	1
Data Analytics	20% (4)	35% (7)	45% (9)	2
System Administration	25% (5)	45% (9)	30% (6)	4
Quality Framework Integration	30% (6)	40% (8)	30% (6)	3
Ethical AI Use	10% (2)	35% (7)	55% (11)	1
Change Management	35% (7)	40% (8)	25% (5)	5

Table 7: Training and Capacity Building Needs

Table 7 assessed training and capacity building requirements across critical competency areas for effective AI implementation in quality assurance. Ethical AI use emerged as the most critical training need with fifty-five percent of institutions identifying it as urgent, reflecting growing awareness of algorithmic bias, fairness concerns, privacy implications, and responsible technology deployment considerations that require explicit attention. AI fundamentals and data analytics were both identified as critical needs by forty-five percent of institutions, ranking as top priorities, indicating that foundational technical knowledge remained insufficient among quality assurance professionals. Quality framework integration represented another significant gap where seventy percent required improvement or critical intervention, suggesting that technical AI skills alone proved insufficient without accompanying expertise in applying technology within established quality assurance paradigms. The relatively lower priority assigned to change management, while still important, suggested institutions recognized technical capacity gaps as more immediate constraints than organizational development needs.

Planned Initiative	Definite Plans	Considering	No Current Plans	Expected Timeline
Expand Current AI Applications	60% (12)	30% (6)	10% (2)	12-18 months
Implement Learning Analytics	55% (11)	35% (7)	10% (2)	18-24 months
Automated Accreditation Systems	45% (9)	40% (8)	15% (3)	12-24 months
AI-Enhanced Research Evaluation	40% (8)	45% (9)	15% (3)	24-36 months
Predictive Quality Monitoring	50% (10)	35% (7)	15% (3)	18-30 months
Comprehensive Staff Training	70% (14)	25% (5)	5% (1)	6-12 months

Table 8: Future AI Adoption Plans (Next 3 Years)Future AI Adoption Plans (Next 3 Years)

Table 8 revealed institutional intentions for future AI adoption, providing insights into quality assurance technology trajectories. Comprehensive staff training emerged as the highest priority with seventy percent having definite plans and the shortest expected timeline of six to twelve months, demonstrating recognition that human capacity development constituted a prerequisite for successful technological implementation. Expanding current AI applications ranked second at sixty percent with definite plans, suggesting institutions preferred incremental enhancement of proven systems rather than radical technological transformation. Learning analytics and predictive quality monitoring showed strong interest levels exceeding fifty percent, indicating movement toward more sophisticated, proactive quality assurance capabilities. However, longer timelines for advanced applications like AI-enhanced research evaluation reflected persistent technical, financial, and organizational barriers requiring gradual resolution. Overall, the data indicated cautious optimism with steady expansion plans rather than aggressive revolutionary adoption strategies.

Qualitative Analysis

Theme 1: Efficiency Enhancement and Administrative Burden Reduction

Some stakeholders pointed out that AI significantly lessened the administrative burden related to quality assurance, allowing quality assurance personnel to shift their focus from the more menial tasks of data collection and documentation to the analysis, planning, and improvement of quality. Some quality assurance directors mentioned that, with the introduction of automated data collection from various institutional data sources, the manual data consolidation process that took hours to complete was eliminated, and more sophisticated quality reports were created that required little to no human editing. Faculty members praised the relief of the tedious documentation that was required for accreditation because AI was able to find and extract the pertinent data that was needed from institutional data repositories. It was acknowledged that the efficiency gains were the result of considerable 'configuration' time that involved data cleaning and the redesign of the processes', which some stakeholders viewed as overload for the long-term gain. Some stakeholders were concerned that over automation, with little human engagement to complete the quality assurance cycle, could lead to a lack of dependence on technological systems that have little professional judgment incorporated to complete the process.

Theme 2: Enhanced Data-Driven Decision Making

All participants spoke of the transformative value of access to all the relevant, timely, and actionable data needed to make evidence-based quality enhancement decisions that, until then, had been made under severe information constraints. University managers explained how AI-enabled dashboards showed real-time program performance, student outcome, faculty productivity, and resource consumption patterns, making it easier to inform interventions and allocate resources strategically. Quality assurance professionals commended the value of predictive analytics that identified quality challenges in their formative stages, allowing them to adopt proactive quality management instead of reactive approaches. Predictive analytics was also noted for its value in anticipating resource constraints and planning better. Institutional leaders noted, and in some cases celebrated, the way data visualization tools transformed the delivery of complicated quality information to a range of constituents: governing boards, faculty senates, and external accreditors, among others, and replaced tedious narrative reports. As a final thought, respondents highlighted the risk of information stagnation when the capacity for analytics is not built alongside the infrastructure.

Theme 3: Standardization and Consistency Improvements

Quality assurance managers noted that artificial intelligence promotes further standardization and consistency in quality assurance processes, resolving enduring issues related to evaluative subjectivity and uneven consistency across departments and programs. Directors of quality assurance noted that automated curriculum mapping tools used the same criteria in assessments, taking learning outcome alignment gaps and varying individual interpretations or disciplinary blind spots. Faculty evaluation systems that used natural language processing to assess student feedback across diverse courses and instructors provided more consistent cross-course evaluation, although some respondents questioned whether standardization sufficiently factored in reasonable disciplinary differences in teaching. Accreditation coordinators noted that AI systems provided complete evidence collection to serve all standards required checkpoints, avoiding the sporadically incomplete documentation that characterized manual processes. However, various stakeholders cautioned excessive standardization that could inhibit innovation, disciplinary uniqueness, or contextual appropriateness, focusing on the need for human intervention to integrate consistency and flexibility.

Theme 4: Implementation Barriers and Resource Constraints

All stakeholders pointed to serious challenges in implementation, especially in financial constraints and the lack of technical know-how. Institutional leaders cited difficult trade-offs in budgets, especially in public universities that are resource constrained, where investments in AI systems were made at the expense of hiring faculty, building up infrastructure, and even student support initiatives. Other stakeholders, especially those in the role of directing the quality assurance, pointed to the lack of technically trained personnel to configure, maintain, and troubleshoot complex AI systems. Few in the academic quality assurance offices were able to attract such personnel, as the technology sector tends to pay better. Deficient technological foundations, such as unreliable internet connectivity, old infrastructure, and fragmented legacy systems were especially in the rural and semi-urban institutions. A number of stakeholders indicated a lack of vendor support, related to systems that had been purchased but required significant customization, insufficient training, or lack of integration with systems already in place within the institution, leading to expensive implementations that provided limited functionality and practical value.

Theme 5: Cultural Resistance and Change Management Challenges

The participants regarded an organization's culture and the management of change as pivotal in determining the resistance to technological change that differs across institutions and stakeholders. The longer the faculty's tenure was in an institution, the less technological familiarity, and the greater resistance was to use new AI systems. AI systems were viewed as threats to control and autonomy, and passive resistance was evidenced by non-use or circumvention of use. Restricted systems of quality assurance resulted in frustration and were described as antagonistic to innovation. The change was justified by completion of new AI systems, and work to accommodate their use was described as antagonistic. The successful institutions were those that described the inclusive nature of their change processes. They engaged stakeholders in selection systems, explained the rationale, trained, and committed themselves to visible leadership. Administrators noted technology receptivity disparate across generations, with enthusiasm in the younger faculty and AI-accepting Administrators, older stakeholders needing greater persuasion ends and support.

Theme 6: Data Quality, Privacy, and Ethical Considerations

Implementing AI Quality Assurance Systems drew attention due to potential ethical and privacy issues raised by stakeholders. Quality Assurance Managers noted that AI Development demanded excessive investments in data cleansing due to inconsistent, incomplete, and disparate data across institutional systems, which could then allow the systems to work adequately. Concerns regarding the privacy of student data raised the demand for adequate protective measures ensuring AI systems operated within the legally mandated and institutionally defined limits for the protection of sensitive data from misuse and unauthorized access. Faculty raised concerns about the transparency of algorithms and biases hidden within AI systems. Unchecked algorithms that focus on inequity in student assessment, faculty assessment, and the distribution of institutional resources disproportionally worsen inequities. The establishment of AI in education ethics review processes signals the recognition that the speed of technological advancements needs to be matched by the slow deliberate and responsible deployment of such technologies. Participants noted that the deployment of AI technologies required the integration of ethical concerns from a broad array of stakeholders instead of having a one-time compliance check.

Discussion

The systematic review shows that the integration of artificial intelligence within quality assurance within the higher education sector in Pakistan has entered the stages of development. There are promising results but there are also numerous challenges that need to be addressed. The quantitative data showed moderate uptake of artificial intelligence, but there were large differences in adoption based on institutional type, geography, and quality assurance function. The qualitative data revealed the complex sociotechnical systems that need to be addressed to obtain favorable results. The higher levels of the implementation of AI in the REEQAB standards focused on more structured and process-oriented quality assurance tasks of accreditation documentation and compliance monitoring, as opposed to the more complex and less defined applications of research quality evaluation and innovation assessment that the RIPE standards require. This is consistent with the international literature which reports on the same phenomenon of AI adoption in quality assurance processes. The literature shows that AI adoption is most successful in well-defined and data-rich environments, and the most complex and challenging environments are those that require qualitative assessments of situational context, expert judgement from the relevant discipline, or other sophisticated dimensions that AI cannot yet replicate.

The significant differences in the use of AI technology across different geographical areas, with urban establishments markedly surpassing the capabilities of their rural and semi-urban counterparts, suggest that there are substantial issues regarding the digital divide that need to be addressed at the policy level. These issues included not just the technology and its access, but also infrastructure, availability of skilled personnel, closeness of vendors, and the overall resources of the institution, all of which are critical to successful implementation. The sociotechnical nature of AI-caused changes as a transformative technology, which implementation requires significant investments in human capital, explains the strong relationship between training and the expected outcomes. Implementation-related financial constraints revealed that the lack of adequate funding which is provided by the government, development partners, and the institutions themselves, in the context of negative cash flows, will prevent the integration of quality assurance technologies in the higher education system of Pakistan.

Stakeholder perceptions provided important positive feedback about the value of AI enabled quality assurance. Examples included efficiency improvements, better decision-making and greater uniformity. Such feedback, however, needs to be appreciated in the light of the challenges experienced during value realization. Value was only captured when challenges involved in the use of new technologies were appropriately managed. There was feedback about privacy issues, the potential for algorithm bias and the risks of over-standardization. Such feedback serves as a prompt to design a more balanced approach that provides the right equilibrium of automation and the requisite human control. In their use of new technologies, participants seem to have understood the importance of organizational development, stakeholder leadership and the embedding of appropriate quality assurance philosophies. Such findings suggest future AI strategies will be more successful should they focus on integrating social elements in new technologies, rather than on the new technologies themselves. This reflects the need to address organizational, human, and ethical issues, as well as the technical, in the enhancement of quality assurance.

Conclusion

The systematic review aggregate research on the application of artificial intelligence and its influence on quality assurance in higher education institutions in Pakistan. The review documents opportunities and challenges surrounding artificial intelligence and the quality assurance framework of the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan. The review demonstrates the potential of AI tools in making quality assurance processes more efficient, enhancing data-driven decision-making, fostering standardization, and bolstering institutional capacities vis-à-vis the Higher Education Commission comprehensive quality framework. However, this potential will remain unrealized unless the obstacles of poor-quality infrastructure, lack of technical skills, limited financial resources, and organizational inertia are resolved. The research also illustrates the need for investment in a comprehensive ecosystem development—besides the acquisition of new technologies, which includes infrastructure development, human capital formation, transformative leadership, and the implementation of ethical frameworks. These would ensure that the governance of AI technologies in education aligns with the mission of the institution and contextualizes the tools and processes within the educational environment.

Variations in AI adoption across provinces, types of institutions, and higher education quality assurance activities show that higher education institutions in Pakistan are at different stages of the technology adoption continuum. This calls for varying types of support that take into account different institutional capabilities and contextual differences. Resources advanced urban institutions and their AI systems serve as indicators of possible sector-wide diffusion. In contrast, resource-scarce rural institutions need specific support that addresses their basic AI infrastructure and capability gaps before advanced applications of AI become possible. This research indicates that stakeholders in different institutional roles understand the potential of AI for enhancing quality assurance in higher education and that this will support further adoption provided policies and resources are directed toward barriers to implementation. Pakistan's quality assurance in higher education will see the slow and steady introduction of AI technology over the next few years. Success will depend on the efforts of the Higher Education Commission, institutional leaders and quality assurance staff, technology providers, and development partners working together to seamless integration technology into quality assurance systems.

The investigation provided important empirical data pertaining to the scarce literature about AI applications within the context of quality assurance of higher education in South Asia. It constitutes a case study from which other developing countries experiencing similar technology growth can learn. This study provided insight into the AI integration in education within the comprehensive national quality assurance system framework. This research provided insights into the AI integration in education within a comprehensive national quality assurance framework. Most importantly, the study communicated to policymakers, administrators, and quality assurance practitioners the potential of AI in the enhancement of educational quality. The study highlighted the fact that technology use in education is to meet human needs and that the social, organizational, ethical, and cultural aspects are as important as the technical aspects. Ultimately, the unqualified integration of technology will weaken the professional quality assurance role. Sustainable success requires balanced approaches that enhance rather than replace professional skills.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A priority for Pakistani higher education institutions and policymakers should be the implementation of broad and effective punctuality and comprehensive plans to address systemic issues of under-resourced institutions. There should be no expectation of the successful attunement of AI for quality assurance processes. The Higher Education Commission should facilitate the integration of AI for quality assurance within institutions by developing mechanisms for differentiated funding. There should be consideration for the geographically uneven allocations documented within the study and focused support for the rural, underserved, and developing institutions for the basic infrastructure and technological capacity building. Developing quality assurance practitioners, academic leaders, and faculty through targeted professional education on the integration of AI, the fundamental practices of data stewardship, ethical technology, and the symbiotic integration of AI with present quality assurance processes, will produce a sophisticated return on investment. The HEC will provide the sector with cohesive, standardized, practical implementation guides, exemplar documentation, and ethical stewardship frameworks for responsible AI deployment to be practiced and enforced at the institutional level. The frameworks should include safety, human control of algorithmic governance for quality decision-making, privacy protection, and responsible, ethical governance to eliminate bias. The successful realization of the intended outcomes will require participative, cooperative, and integrated change management practices for all governance layers and the strategic building of a technology-obsessed academic culture. Before expanding to more complex AI functionalities, organizations need to focus on low-complex complexity high-value applications that show demonstrable returns. This is to allow them to gauge the potential of AI, build confidence from stakeholders and organizational learning. This will help them to gradually develop the potential of AI to help build integrated AI-powered quality assurance systems.

References

Ahmed, R., et al. (2024). "Learning experiences and practices through artificial intelligence as adoptive academia for teachers and students of higher education institutions of Pakistan." Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review 8(1): 406-417.

Ahtesham, S. (2024). Measuring Success and Sustainability in Project Management: A Case Study Supporting the Delivery of Quality Education Projects in Pakistan, Bournemouth University.

AlSagri, H. S. and S. S. Sohail (2024). "Evaluating the role of Artificial Intelligence in sustainable development goals with an emphasis on “quality education”." Discover Sustainability 5(1): 458.

Asad, M. M. and N. Suleman (2025). "Impact of technology-supported personalized learning 5.0 on instructional quality: insights from the higher education institutions of Pakistan." Quality Assurance in Education 33(3): 445-461.

Bahroun, Z., et al. (2023). "Transforming education: A comprehensive review of generative artificial intelligence in educational settings through bibliometric and content analysis." Sustainability 15(17): 12983.

George, B. and O. Wooden (2023). "Managing the strategic transformation of higher education through artificial intelligence." Administrative Sciences 13(9): 196.

Hassan, Z. Y. (2025). "AI-Driven Horizons: Shaping the Future of Global Quality Assurance in Higher Education." AI and Ethics, Academic Integrity and the Future of Quality Assurance in Higher Education 105.

Javed, Y. and M. Alenezi (2023). "A case study on sustainable quality assurance in higher education." Sustainability 15(10): 8136.

Kuleto, V., et al. (2021). "Exploring opportunities and challenges of artificial intelligence and machine learning in higher education institutions." Sustainability 13(18): 10424.

Lee, A. V. Y., et al. (2023). "AI in education and learning analytics in Singapore: An overview of key projects and initiatives." Information and technology in education and learning 3(1): Inv-p001-Inv-p001.

Majeed, S., et al. (2023). "Opportunities and Challenges of Generative AI in Pakistani Higher Education: A Qualitative Study on Student Perspectives in Learning." Integrity and Innovation.

Meng, X. and Y. Liu (2025). "Construction and Practice of Higher Education Quality Assurance System Based on Artificial Intelligence Models." J. COMBIN. MATH. COMBIN. COMPUT 127: 395-410.

Mok, K. H. and T. Sawn Khai (2024). "Transnationalization of higher education in China and Asia: quality assurance and students’ learning experiences." Asian Education and Development Studies 13(3): 208-226.

Mughis, Z. (2023). ARE THE PAKISTANI HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS PREPARED FOR THE DIGITAL LITERACIES CHALLENGE? EXPLORING THE LANDSCAPE, © Lahore School Of Economics.

Murtaza, K. G. and L. Hui (2021). "Higher education in Pakistan: challenges, opportunities, suggestions." Education Quarterly Reviews 4(2).

Nasim, K. (2021). Total quality management in higher education: A theoretical model and empirical evidence from Pakistan, Murdoch University.

Saleem, R. and M. Aslam (2025). "A Multi-Faceted Deep Learning Approach for Student Engagement Insights and Adaptive Content Recommendations." IEEE Access.

ur Rehman, S. and A. Huma (2024). "Governance Practices at Higher Education in Punjab and Sindh to Achieve the Goals of Higher Education Policies." Journal of Asian Development Studies 13(4): 506-520.

Zhang, Y., et al. (2025). "Digital transition framework for higher education in AI-assisted engineering teaching: Challenge, strategy, and initiatives in China." Science & Education 34(2): 933-954.