DIGITALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION: IMPACTS ON MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPEMENT. A LITERATURE REVIEW

DIGITALIZAÇÃO DO ENSINO SUPERIOR: IMPACTOS NAS PRÁTICAS DE GESTÃO E DESENVOLVIMENTO INSTITUCIONAL. UMA REVISÃO DE LITERATURA

Ben Kasmia Nizar
UniversityofAbdelmalekEssaidi
Morocco
N.benkasmia@uae.ac.ma

Hamiche M'hamed
University of Abdelmalek Essaidi
Morocco
Mhamiche@uae.ac.ma

ABSTRACT

For an extended period, the higher education community has been diligently endeavoring to implement technologically advanced and more efficacious methodologies. The aim is to enhance effectiveness and cultivate a generation of graduates equipped to navigate the evolving labor market dynamics and adapt to the influences of globalization. The outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic significantly catalyzed the adoption of digital education, often referred to as "E-Learning," as a predominant mode of instruction across a majority of countries. This shift was necessitated by the imperative to adhere to social distancing measures and prevent the potential collapse of the educational infrastructure. In the wake of this transformative paradigm, educational institutions were compelled to engineer inventive management approaches to effectively traverse this altered landscape, marking the dawn of a new era. This era is characterized by a profound dependence on advanced technology and unfettered information accessibility as pivotal factors for sustaining and optimizing performance.This paper aims to explain the basic ideas behind managing higher education while exploring the existing research that supports these ideas. By breaking down the various aspects and tools involved, the goal is to shed light on the complex nature of managing higher education. This exploration eventually leads to an examination of how the digitalization of education impacts different functional areas of education management. Through this in-depth analysis, a clear connection emerges between the need for digitalization and the necessity to update management systems. This connection is crucial for not only achieving but also sustaining effective operation in this new era that combines technology and education.

Keywords: Higher education. Digitalization. E-learning. Management. Governance.

RESUMO

Durante um longo período, a comunidade do ensino superior tem-se esforçado diligentemente por implementar metodologias tecnologicamente avançadas e mais eficazes. O objetivo é aumentar a eficácia e cultivar uma geração de licenciados equipados para navegar na dinâmica do mercado de trabalho em evolução e adaptar-se às influências da globalização. O surto da pandemia de Covid-19 catalisou significativamente a adoção da educação digital, muitas vezes referida como "E-Learning", como um modo predominante de ensino na maioria dos países. Esta mudança foi necessária devido ao imperativo de aderir a medidas de distanciamento social e evitar o potencial colapso da infraestrutura educativa. Na sequência deste paradigma transformador, as instituições de ensino foram obrigadas a conceber abordagens de gestão inventivas para atravessar eficazmente esta paisagem alterada, marcando o início de uma nova era. Esta era caracteriza-se por uma profunda dependência da tecnologia avançada e da acessibilidade ilimitada à informação como factores essenciais para sustentar e otimizar o desempenho. Este documento tem por objetivo explicar as ideias básicas subjacentes à gestão do ensino superior, explorando simultaneamente a investigação existente que apoia estas ideias. Ao decompor os vários aspectos e instrumentos envolvidos, o objetivo é esclarecer a natureza complexa da gestão do ensino superior. Esta exploração acaba por conduzir a um exame da forma como a digitalização do ensino afecta as diferentes áreas funcionais da gestão do ensino. Através desta análise aprofundada, surge uma ligação clara entre a necessidade de digitalização e a necessidade de atualizar os sistemas de gestão. Esta ligação é crucial não só para alcançar, mas também para manter um funcionamento eficaz nesta nova era que combina tecnologia e educação.

Palavras-chave: Ensino superior. Digitalização. E-learning. Gestão. Governança.

Introduction

The higher education's sector has always been the backbone of overall society development. While it helps reshaping the community of youth into full functioning members of society, it is also a fertile ground for creativity, innovation and scientific research. Enhancing an educational system necessitates a comprehensive assessment of its operational dynamics encompassing organizational structure, functional processes, instructional methodologies, and educational curricula, inclusive of the integration of cutting-edge technological pedagogical tools aligned with contemporary and refined content, thereby establishing a discernible standard of educational excellence. A multitude of both highly developed and burgeoning nations have embarked upon a concerted endeavor to integrate increasingly sophisticated technological and digital pedagogical modalities within their educational frameworks. This strategic pursuit aims to augment the efficacy and efficiency of educational processes, concurrently fostering adeptness among students in the utilization of contemporary information

and communication technologies. This strategic measure is undertaken with the dual intent of fostering enhanced productivity and equipping the student populace with requisite proficiencies germane to their forthcoming professional trajectories.

With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, a discernible paradigm shift transpired within the realm of global academia, compelling universities and specialized institutions to eschew their conventional face-to-face instructional paradigms in favor of alternative modes to fulfill their pedagogical objectives. This transformation was necessitated by the imperative to uphold social distancing protocols in order to mitigate the propagation of infections. Under such exigent circumstances, academic institutions were compelled to promptly recalibrate their educational approaches to align with the prevailing exigencies. Over the course of numerous decades, the higher education community has diligently sought to elucidate the pivotal role of technology within the realm of education. As attested by authoritative sources (KOZMA, 2003 and 2008; SUNKEL, 2006; CARNEIRO& al, 2009; RODRÍGUEZ, & al, 2012), the integration of information technologies into university settings has been undertaken with the overarching objective of revolutionizing the educational and learning processes, thereby fortifying student success strategies. Additionally, as underscored by the insights of HUSNAYATI HUSSIN (2011), pedagogical technologies have emerged as instrumental agents fostering student motivation and engendering global engagement within the university milieu. At this juncture, it becomes evident that the experimental frameworks encompassing digital learning and educational technologies have evolved from a peripheral consideration to a fundamental imperative, pivotal in ensuring the enduring viability of the educational ecosystem.

In the contemporary landscape, universities are grappling with a fresh array of intricacies and trials within their managerial domain. The infusion of the New Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), exemplified by the proliferation of E-Learning across diverse platforms, has engendered a distinct set of challenges. This challenge is evidenced by an array of innovative and astute measures undertaken by university leaders. These strategic maneuvers are driven by the imperative to harmonize optimal operational efficiency and effectiveness, all

while upholding the pinnacle of educational excellence. The necessity of adapting management practices to the specific context becomes increasingly pronounced under these circumstances.

Within the confines of this manuscript, we present a comprehensive exposition illuminating the intricate interplay between the advancement of higher education, characterized by the assimilation of the new Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) and other educational tools within university environments as paramount vehicles of pedagogical delivery, and the concurrent evolution of management and governance frameworks within these institutions. To this end, a meticulous literature review encompassing a spectrum of diverse concepts and theories germane to the coherent construction of this paper shall be undertaken.

1. Methodology

The methodology section of the article investigating the influence of digitalization on higher education management practices encompasses a systematic approach to comprehensively assess this multifaceted phenomenon. To investigate this intricate interplay, an extensive literature search was conducted using academic databases, employing a range of keywords such as "digitalization," "higher education," and "management practices." Articles from the past decade were scrutinized to ensure relevance and currency. A rigorous selection process was applied to identify primary sources that explicitly explored the integration of digital technologies within higher education institutions and its ramifications for administrative strategies. These sources were then subjected to a qualitative content analysis, wherein key themes and patterns concerning the transformation of management practices in response to digitalization were identified and categorized. The analysis sought to elucidate how technological advancements have redefined decision-making processes, resource allocation, student engagement, and organizational structures within the higher education landscape. The synthesized

findings provide a comprehensive understanding of the evolving management dynamics propelled by the digital revolution in higher education.

2. Literature Synthesis:

A. THE EVOLUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

The conceptual framework underpinning a higher education institution is by no means a new construct. The existence of universities spans for thousands of years, and their evolutionary trajectory culminating in the contemporary configuration. Notwithstanding the numerous iterations that the educational system has undergone across historical epochs, the foundational role of the educator as a wellspring of knowledge remains immutable since its inception. This perpetual essence is underscored by (SURSOCK, 2015), who posits that the teacher is the main source of information, and the learners receive knowledge in a passive manner. This pedagogical paradigm, with its historical resonance, proficiently facilitated the inculcation of specific traits of characters and behavioral standards and to pass on knowledge while ensuring the implementation of a generalized social conduct. this approach to learning sought to transmit to the students the skills, knowledge, realities, and principles of moral and social conduct that the adults considered being essential to ensure the social success of coming generations (DEWEY, 1938).

During the 19th century, the developmental trajectory of higher education underwent a transformative phase marked by the institutionalization movement, rendering it imbued with heightened organizational dimensions. This metamorphosis expanded the purview of learning beyond the confines of the teacher-student dyad, intricately enmeshing it within a more intricate administrative framework that encompassed managerial figures and decision-makers. In retrospect, MINTZBERG (1980) portrays universities of that period as prime instances of pure professional bureaucracies. The resultant interplay between professionals and administrators within this governance paradigm engendered conflicts, spurring the evolution of higher education management. This

evolution entailed relinquishing some degree of autonomy while preserving the overarching role of governmental entities in steering broad societal orientation. This paradigm shift towards enhanced academic involvement in university affairs and governance, as underscored by (MORA, 2000), particularly for educational objectives rather than merely administrative decisions, surfaced as a requisite progression.

Substantial transformations reverberated across the higher education landscape during the late 1980s and 1990s, punctuating the limitations of prevailing managerial paradigms in terms of efficacy and performance. The manifestation of eroding confidence in the autonomy-based university governance galvanized extensive structural alterations, initially spanning to 47 European nations and subsequently extending to encompass Turkey, Russia, and some selected African countries. These modifications engendered comprehensive modernization of university management facets, encompassing accreditation protocols and evaluative mechanisms. A notable reconfiguration emerged, delineating an expanded realm of stakeholders beyond the conventional dichotomy of autonomous academic university governance and government-directed oversight, a transition expounded upon by (CLARK, 1983).

The ascendant prominence accorded to knowledge within the economic landscape prompted governments to channel their focus towards the strategic administration of universities, with the overarching goal of augmenting scientific productivity and elevating overall performance. This concerted endeavor engendered a discernible shift in governance paradigms, giving rise to the emergence of an entrepreneurial mode. The seminal influence of (CLARK, 1998) profoundly permeated the embrace of this novel organizational archetype, advocating for the conceptual alignment of universities with corporate structures to ensure efficacy and quality. Over time, higher education systems have been restructured according to the governmental, socioeconomic, development aspirations and market dynamics (ALEMU, 2018). Consequently, the ramifications have permeated pedagogical methodologies and curricular frameworks. Notably, educators, as expounded by (PICCIANO, 2021), embarked on an adaptive trajectory,

tailoring their instructional strategies to address evolving student needs, prompting a shift toward more interactive teaching methodologies. Education evolved into becoming more focused on the individual student's wants rather than supposing that all students have an equal level of understanding (HÉNARD; ROSEVEARE, 2012).

In the contemporary milieu, higher education has metamorphosed into a domain characterized by information ubiquity and accessibility. The advent of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) has heralded a transformative juncture within higher education, constituting a watershed moment. Since the early 2000's, there has been an ongoing need to engage technology with pedagogy, Technology has intensely and completely changed education process and approaches (PICCIANO, 2021). The catalytic role of advanced technology in expediting and enhancing the learning process, particularly through the medium of the Internet, has been aptly articulated by (KATZ, 2000).

B. THE DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION:

The ascendancy of globalized culture has precipitated a rapid and transformative acceleration across multiple dimensions, with particular emphasis on technological advancements. Central to this technological evolution is the intricate web of interchanges involving commodities, information, and knowledge. Notably, nations worldwide have come to recognize that the trajectory of advancement is intricately linked to the degree of their external orientation and their capacity to embrace the intercontinental exchange of ideas. Temporally, it became evident that the march of technological progress was imminent, catalyzing its far-reaching impact on diverse sectors and arenas, education being one among them. Emanating from this paradigm shift, new tools for both pedagogy and learning were conceived, and the scholastic milieu underwent a metamorphosis wherein student education found itself embedded within an interconnected digital realm. New learning and teaching tools are developed and student learning now takes place in an internet-connected environment (KARSENTI, 2001).

The integration of information and communication technologies stands as a seminal milestone in the annals of educational evolution (ANDERSON, 2010). Operationally defined, ICTE serve as a convergence point for educational and instructional objectives, embodying an intricate ensemble of knowledge, methodologies, and tools meticulously architected and employed for the purpose of generating, storing, categorizing, retrieving, and analyzing textual, auditory, and visual content. Additionally, they facilitate seamless document exchange among interlocutors, transpiring either instantaneously or within a deferred timeframe (ROBERT, 2008, p. 198). Consequently, learners become active agents in the construction of knowledge through dynamic engagements with the corporeal, societal, and virtual landscapes (BASQUE&al, 1998). This framework engenders untrammeled access to information and communication resources, unshackled by spatial-temporal constraints (AOURIK & al, 2020). Remarkably, the assimilation of information and communication technologies precipitates a profound paradigm shift in pedagogical methodologies (MANGENOT, 2000), compelling educators and learners alike to transcend the traditional boundaries of temporal, spatial, and contextual dimensions (HUNG & al, 2015).

The initial years of the 21st century witnessed the inception of an epoch characterized by the digitalization of the higher education landscape. This digital metamorphosis of universities commences with a comprehensive overhaul of infrastructural underpinnings and technological apparatuses, meticulously tailored to harmonize with the imperatives of the burgeoning digital era for each academic institution (CLARDY, 2009; HARASIM, 2000; MASON, 2000; TAYLOR, 2001). Despite the unequivocal prognostications heralding ICTE as the harbingers of learning's future, a concurrent awareness crystallized that their ascendancy could not entirely supplant nor overshadow the intrinsic efficacy of time-honored educational methodologies extant at that historical juncture. Amidst the overarching mission of educational establishments to broaden intellectual horizons and challenge established orthodoxies, it remains salient to acknowledge that the human contingent inhabiting these institutions often exhibits an entrenched resistance to transformative change (ROBBINS & al, 1998). The staunch resistance to change

observed within traditional educational communities has rendered the process of adaptation a formidable undertaking. The incorporation of digital academic practices has ignited a pervasive and normatively imbued discourse within the realm of pedagogical scholarship, engaging the perspectives of scientists, researchers, and instructional method innovators. The landscape is notably characterized by a divergence of opinion, with proponents and opponents engaged in an ongoing dialectic. The discourse encompasses a spectrum of viewpoints that warrant consideration. A comprehensive exploration of the literature reveals multifaceted perspectives on this matter, (BRAHIMI& al, 2015) postulate that, "Although traditional classroom teaching is well known, learning systems outside the classroom, especially those augmented by technology, are still undergoing exploration." Conversely, (COEN, 2011, p.1) contends that, "Technology has always been intricately intertwined with education, and the discourse surrounding its application is not novel." However, (ANDERSON, 2010), (p. 81) assert that the integration of technology into pedagogical frameworks is an inexorable progression: "Technology establishes the tempo and orchestrates the composition, while pedagogy delineates the choreography." The higher education sector has increasingly hinged upon information technology (NEWMAN & al, 2002; PRICE & al, 2007), with information technologies assuming an expanding role in instructional and learning endeavors across the past two decades (DENIZ& al, 2015), swift technological advancements catalyzed by social networks, the internet, and mobile technology have assumed pivotal roles in invigorating and propelling the sphere of higher education (LAZINICA & al, 2009).

The exigency for comprehensive reforms to facilitate the genuine assimilation of informational technologies within university ecosystems as a substantive stride toward the advancement of higher education systems and, ultimately, global societies is evident. KARSENTI & al (2005, p. 6) underscores this, asserting that, "Numerous researchers striving to expound upon the merits of ICT aim to demonstrate that technology offers an enthralling, motivating, and distinct avenue for teaching and learning. ICT is akin to a Trojan horse introducing new pedagogies – notably personalized learning – and perhaps one of the few conduits

for enabling the academia to keep pace with the relentless tempo mandated by educational reforms and other transformative shifts." Consequently, the vanguard of a purported "intelligent" university should entail the provision of quality education predicated on virtual learning environments, wherein instruction and administrative functions are anchored within the realms of the internet and ICT (ALAMI; FAHSSIS, 2019, p. 87).

In the late of 2019, during the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the prevailing uncertainty concerning the management of education was palpable. The primary focus was curbing the virus's propagation, given its initially elusive trajectory. In response, a series of drastic measures were swiftly implemented to safeguard the educational systems of nations worldwide. It was at this juncture that educators and decision-makers recognized their capacity to adopt an interactive online teaching paradigm, one that not only adhered to the imperative of social distancing but also aligned with predefined educational objectives utilizing New Technologies of Information and Communication (NTICs); this was called E-LEARNING. The pandemic precipitated the implementation of "emergency e-Learning" protocols, effectuating a rapid shift from conventional in-person classroom settings to online learning systems (RASHID& al, 2020, p. 2). The collective realization dawned within the higher education community that groundwork for this transition had been laid over the course of many preceding decades. Educational technology transitioned from a privilege or commodity to an indispensable necessity.Academics and professionals alike have asserted that the digitalization of educational services and content will evolve into a norm subsequent to the pandemic (MURPHY, 2020).

The utilization of e-learning methodologies amid the pandemic has prompted numerous higher education establishments to contemplate the integration of augmented online elements and strategies within their pedagogical frameworks (RASHID& al, 2020). E-learning is progressively emerging as the prevailing paradigm in modern education (HALEEM& al, 2020). The landscape of higher education is poised for an irreversible transformation. The dynamics of learning have evolved into an entirely newer paradigm, wherein technology surpasses its conventional role as a mere educational tool and assumes an intrinsic role in the

very process of knowledge generation. The imprint of digitalization reverberates across the entire spectrum of higher education, permeating both pedagogical and administrative domains. Its reach extends beyond the purview of learning to encompass a holistic E-smart approach that orchestrates multifaceted management needs. This comprehensive integration exerts a profound influence on institutional efficacy and propels the advancement of the intricate "knowledge production" cycle, culminating in scientific research outcomes.

C. TRANSITIONING MANAGEMENT PRACTICES:

The digitalization of higher education has triggered a profound transformation in the landscape of management practices across academic institutions. This shift, however, has not unfolded without its share of challenges. Over a span of two years dedicated to online learning, the management academia encountered considerable difficulties in embracing new technologies and emerging learning modes. This period witnessed the introduction of distance education, blended learning, and self-paced learning, posing substantial hurdles to the conventional academic milieu (GARAUS& al, 2016; WHITAKER & al, 2016). These innovative trajectories deviated markedly from established norms, necessitating the recalibration of educational paradigms.

Against this dynamic backdrop, traditional administrative procedures have undergone substantial reformulations, driven by the imperatives of technological harnessing. Tasks such as enrollment management, scheduling coordination, and financial aid allocation, which once relied on labor-intensive manual approaches, have undergone a sweeping recalibration. The infusion of digital tools into these realms has yielded multifaceted advantages, streamlining not only procedural workflows but also mitigating the cumbersome reliance on paper-based processes. Furthermore, the accessibility to data-driven insights has empowered administrators to make informed decisions, optimizing resource allocation and refining strategic frameworks.

This fundamental reconfiguration underscores a dedicated commitment to operational efficiency, with technology emerging as a pivotal agent propelling

streamlined administrative paradigms. As academic institutions navigate this transformative journey, collaborative digital frameworks, astute data analytics integration, and orchestrated automated workflows have evolved as cornerstones within a dynamic, responsive administrative ecosystem. This intricate interplay of factors serves to enrich the holistic educational experience, fostering tangible benefits for both students and top managers. The following paragraph serves as a gateway to a structured analysis delving into the realm of how digitalization has impacted the management of higher education. It lays the foundation for a comprehensive exploration of the multifaceted changes and challenges that have emerged within this domain. This introduction effectively establishes a thematic framework for the subsequent analysis, which will critically dissect the transformative impact of digitalization on higher education management practices.

- **Forms of influence:**

a) **Operational effectiveness in administration:**

The advancement of digital transformation within higher education has ushered in notable enhancements in administrative efficiency. A shift towards digital tools for essential tasks such as enrollment management, financial aid distribution, and scheduling has yielded tangible benefits by reducing paperwork and optimizing processes (ALENEZI;AKOUR.2023). This drive towards administrative efficiency is closely aligned with the empirical insights provided by ALENEZI and AKOUR (2023), who illuminate the significance of identifying pivotal changes, linking them to evolutionary learning, and crafting advantages that harmonize with the dynamic market conditions of the education sector. In the context of universities, the development of a higher education model for digital transformation has emerged as a catalyst for the evolution of strategic management practices. In a similar vein, the research conducted by BECKER & al. (2022) underscores the correlation between the option to work remotely or from an office and elevated work satisfaction and affective commitment among public administration employees. This resonates with the broader theme of adaptability and efficiency in administrative practices. The groundwork laid through prior

endeavors in digitalizing teaching activities within Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) could have paved the way for administrative integration, offering a well-established technical infrastructure (BURKI, 2020; MEI & al, 2019). These interconnected threads highlight the comprehensive impact of digitalization on administrative facets, signifying a fundamental shift towards more efficient and flexible operations within higher education settings.

b) Data-Driven DecisionMaking :

The digital transformation within higher education has elicited a profound paradigm shift in management methodologies, particularly underscored by the ascendance of data-driven decision making (DDDM). This contemporary framework for decision-making, predicated upon empirical data rather than sole reliance on human judgment, has garnered global traction (NAMOUN & al, 2020; LI & al, 2018). The ubiquity of rapid digitization across diverse sectors, including academia, has engendered a fertile milieu for the assimilation of DDDM principles (LI & al, 2018). Eminent among its beneficiaries are Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs), which have progressively embraced this trajectory, instituting diverse DDDM frameworks within the precincts of scholarly endeavors (JONES & al, 2020; NGUYEN & al, 2020). The administrative echelons of these institutions, astutely cognizant of the dividends entailed, have shepherded the infusion of data-anchored paradigms into their decision-making strategies (SAHIBZADA & al, 2020). Notably efficacious in its implementation, the deployment of DDDM has vested HEI governance with a heightened dexterity in navigating complex decision landscapes (TENG & al, 2023).

The doctrinal influence of DDDM within the educational arena transcends administrative orbits and extends, significantly, to the pedagogical continuum. Its pedagogical salience is particularly discernible as educators leverage the troves of student data to imbue curricular decisions, craft strategies, and delineate policies. The confluence of data and pedagogy, thus orchestrated, furnishes the educational milieu with a mechanism to evolve prudently in tandem with empirical insights (ATKINSON, 2015). Concurrently, a corpus of congruent inquiries has underscored the pivotal role of data-driven methodologies in catalyzing educational quality

augmentation and seeding the grounds for inventive strides (KURILOVAS, 2020; BOTVIN& al, 2023). The seminal scholarship engendered by these investigations animates the discernment of transformative imperatives within pedagogical praxis, proffering an incisive compass for navigating the future trajectory of research pursuits into the symbiotic intersections of DDDM and educational efficacy. In the broader purview, the assimilation of DDDM into higher education management augurs an epoch of redefined decision-making efficacy, catalyzed by the empirical potency of data-driven paradigms within the scholastic realm.

c) Online Learning Management:

The integration of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) has brought about significant optimization in educational tools and practices, offering teachers and students swifter and enhanced access to information, mitigating information obsolescence, and maximizing the utilization of online information sources (LARA & al, 2005). This transformation necessitated a concurrent adaptation in management systems to encompass these changes. The reshaping of educational paradigms towards prioritizing communication and information valuation found resonance within the higher education sector. Within higher education, the consistency of information accessibility stands as a pivotal determinant of organizational performance. This shift in management practices galvanized the embracement of Knowledge Management (KM), a burgeoning discipline rooted in the accessibility and continuity of information, emerged in the late 1990s (LAAL, 2011; FIRESTONE, 2001). Knowledge emerged as a fundamental factor of production, as referenced by FIRESTONE (2001) and cited by LAAL (2011), and). KM orchestrates processes through which organizations acknowledge and archive knowledge assets emanating from diverse departments, faculties, or even kindred organizations (LAAL, 2011). Higher education institutions, as KIDWELL & al. (2000) elucidate, possess substantial prospects to employ KM practices to invigorate every facet of their mission, substantiating the concept as a novel iteration of their essence. Remarkably, the implementation of E-LEARNING resonates with the application of KM within higher education, akin to an

extrapolation of its model (KIDWELL & al, 2000). Consequently, KM remolds the architectural framework of higher education systems, ensuring their sustained development over time.

International research corroborates that the efficacy of incorporating ICTs in the educational realm extends beyond mere access; it necessitates real opportunities for meaningful technological engagement, coupled with quality access (SELWYN, 2004). This encapsulates the dilemma associated with assimilating new ICTs into the educational ecosystem, a parallel circumstance evident within higher education. Learning Management Systems (LMSs) have emerged as instrumental instruments in enhancing interaction, amplifying learning capacities, and nurturing higher-order skills such as problem-solving, critical thinking, and collaboration (SMALDINO, 2005; SUWANNATTHACHOTE & al, 2007). Notably, LMSs present a cost-effective avenue for disseminating content consistently to a wide, globally dispersed audience within higher education (MK & al, 2020). As the traditional educational paradigm transitioned towards novel pedagogical approaches facilitated by e-learning tools, LMSs took center stage in orchestrating this evolution (BERSIN& al, 2009). These web-based technologies empower instructors and students alike, offering a conduit for material sharing, assignment submission, and online connectivity and discourse (LONN & al, 2009). The assessment and monitoring of the usability of e-learning systems assume paramount importance in ensuring their efficacious operation (SHEHU & al, 2009; ORFANOU & al, 2015).

d) Redefining Governance and strategic planning:

In today's higher education landscape, the integration of digital technologies has necessitated the formulation of astute strategic planning and effective governance mechanisms. These measures are crucial to harmonize technological advancements with institutional objectives. Such strategies encompass curricular reform and administrative reorganization, aiming to align pedagogical paradigms with technological progress (BATES, 2015; SELWYN, 2016). Nonetheless, the implementation of comprehensive strategies that holistically address digitalization for pedagogical and learning purposes remains a work in progress for many higher

education institutions (BATES, 2015; SELWYN, 2016). While certain institutions have devised policies governing online course offerings, a conspicuous void exists in the formulation of policies that govern essential components like student support, curriculum development, and assessment (SIEMENS, 2015). The conceptualization of strategies for augmenting online pedagogy and educational development represents an evolving sphere, distinct from conventional e-learning activities that predominantly emanate from individual departments or academics (ALVAREZ & al, 2009; GAEBEL& a., 2014). Notably, overarching digitalization initiatives often exhibit top-down trajectories, occasionally neglecting subject-specific nuances (GRAJEK, 2016; TØMTE & al, 2019).

Significantly, technology-driven transformations are frequently spearheaded by administrative entities rather than academic stakeholders (RIENTIES & al, 2013). Initiatives such as the digitalization of examination administration, communication platforms, media services, and learning management systems are frequently championed by administrative bodies (TØMTE & al, 2016). Facilitating pedagogical enhancements within higher education, particularly in virtual settings, demands a systematic approach underscored by the augmentation of extant practices, a facet increasingly intertwined with initiatives rooted in leadership-focused staff development programs (GIBBS& al, 2008). This evolving educational milieu has brought to the fore a conspicuous dearth of robust leadership paradigms within educational management systems. This lacuna has prompted a recalibration, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 era, where the dearth of effective leadership has been laid bare. As elucidated by SATHYE (2004), leadership within higher education constitutes an integral subset of broader leadership principles, serving as a linchpin for steering institutions towards their goals (BUDUR & al, 2019). Leadership, a pivotal determinant of organizational efficacy across sectors (BUDUR & al, 2021; MART, 2013), assumes heightened significance within higher education.

Within this milieu, higher education leadership assumes diverse dimensions encompassing pedagogical stewardship, research facilitation, strategic ideation, collaborative networking, motivational impetus, managerial prowess, equity

considerations, acknowledgment of meritorious endeavors, and the cultivation of interpersonal adeptness (ALI & al, 2020; ALTUN, 2017; DEMIR & al, 2018; HAMID &al, 2021; SATHYE, 2004; SERIN, 2018). As educational paradigms undergo transformative shifts due to technological advancement, robust leadership emerges as a crucial navigational tool for guiding institutions through these profound changes.

3. Discussion:

The intricate interplay between the digitalization of higher education and its profound impact on management practices weaves a complex tapestry that merits careful analysis. This transformative landscape unfurls a spectrum of opportunities and challenges, casting its influence across various facets of the educational sphere. The expansion of accessibility, customization of learning experiences, and fostering of global collaborative networks emerge as promising opportunities poised to redefine the educational paradigm. However, these prospects coexist with challenges such as the digital divide, the imperative for faculty upskilling, and the critical need for data security. Amidst these dynamics, it's imperative to acknowledge that digitalizing higher education transcends the mere integration of technological tools. It necessitates a cohesive strategic blueprint, anchored in a clear vision for its assimilation.

Inherent to this intricate narrative is the inseparable link between digital transformation and management practices. Management, as the orchestrator of institutional dynamics, faces the mandate to recalibrate strategies in alignment with the digitalization wave. From an administrative standpoint, institutions must fortify their technological infrastructure, ensuring operational efficacy while upholding data integrity. Meanwhile, faculty roles undergo a metamorphic shift, evolving from traditional pedagogical functions to nurturing digitally enriched learning ecosystems. The efficacy of management practices hinges on creating an environment that nurtures technological fluency among faculty, fosters innovation, and ensures educational excellence.

Within this transformative milieu, the role of governance emerges as a beacon. Effective governance mechanisms not only guide the integration of technology but also foster an environment of adaptability and innovation. Governance frameworks must encapsulate comprehensive policies that address the digital divide, thereby ensuring inclusivity in the educational journey. Simultaneously, the establishment of stringent data privacy measures within governance frameworks is instrumental in preserving the integrity of the educational process. At the heart of this intricate equation lies strategic planning. A strategic vision deeply attuned to the educational institution's mission guides the assimilation of technology. This integration must be systemic and harmonious, weaving technology into the educational fabric while respecting disciplinary nuances. Such strategic alignment not only navigates challenges but also harnesses opportunities, culminating in an educational environment that is responsive, inclusive, and poised for the future.

Ultimately, the convergence of digital technology and higher education acts as a catalyst for transformative change. However, this transformation is more profound than the superficial application of tools. It necessitates a synergistic partnership between technology, pedagogy, and governance. By embracing this trinity, institutions can reshape the trajectory of education, steering it towards a digitally enriched, intellectually stimulating, and strategically aligned evolution.

Conclusion:

The advent of digitalization in higher education has heralded a transformative epoch in the landscape of academic management practices. The assimilation of digital technologies has not merely engendered efficiency in administrative functions, but has also engendered a paradigm shift in pedagogical methodologies and erudition encounters. The imperative of embracing this paradigmatic transition looms large for both educational institutions and practitioners of management. The efficacious integration of digitalization into the ambit of higher education management mandates an assertive and receptive

approach. The phenomenon of resistance to change stands as a potential impediment, capable of stymieing progress and circumscribing the dividends that accrue from digital innovations. In this regard, the articulation of a coherent vision and the formulation of strategic frameworks are of salient consequence. This encompasses the dispensation of comprehensive training to pedagogues and staff, the cultivation of a milieu conducive to adaptive experimentation, and the iterative evaluation of the utility and potency of implemented strategies. Within a milieu characterized by swift technological evolution, which precipitates recalibrations across industries and recalibrates normative paradigms, higher education confronts an incontrovertible imperative to eschew stasis. The embracement of the digitized transformation has transmuted from a discretionary elective to an ineluctable compulsion. By aligning with this trajectory of change, educational institutions position themselves as vanguards of innovation, catalyzing the optimization of operational efficiencies, and furnishing students with erudition experiences that are both immersive and germane. The ramifications wrought by digitalization upon the precincts of management practices within the ambit of higher education are extensive and profound. The magnitude of the pertinence associated with the embracement of this paradigm shift cannot be overstated. As institutions wholeheartedly assimilate digital technologies into their modus operandi, they not only fortify their stature as pioneers of innovation but also amplify operational efficacy, thereby endowing students with erudition encounters that are captivating and apposite. Although the trajectory may be fraught with challenges, the potential rewards for both institutional entities and individuals alike validate its pursuit as an odyssey replete with substantive promise and worth.

REFERENCES

ALAMI, T. N. ; FAHSSIS, L. Intégration des TIC dans l'enseignement supérieur: CAS DE L'UNIVERSITE HASSAN II. **REMAC**, Morocco. v.*4*, p. 87-104, 2019.

ALEMU, S. The Meaning, Idea And History Of University/Higher Education In Africa *In*: A Brief Literature Review. **Forum for International Research in Education**, Ethiopia, v. 4, n. 3, p. 210-227. 2018.

ALENEZI, M., & AKOUR, M. Digital Transformation blueprint in Higher Education: A case study of PSU. **Sustainability**, Saudi Arabia, v.*15*, n.10, p. 1-14. 2023.

ALI, S. H; YILDIZ, Y. Leadership effects on CSR employee, media, customer, and NGOs. **Manag Econ Res J**, [*s. l.*], v. 6, n. 1, 2020.

ALTUN, M. The effects of teacher commitment on student achievement: A case study in Iraq. **International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences**, [*s. l.*], v. 7, n. 11, p. 417-426, 2017.

ALVAREZ, I; GUASCH, T; ESPASA, A. University teacher roles and competencies in online learning environments: a theoretical analysis of teaching and learning practices. **European Journal of Teacher Education**, Spain, v. 32, n. 3, p. 321-336, 2009.

ANDERSON, T. Learning Technology through Three Generations of Technology Enhanced Distance Education Pedagogy**. European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning**, Canada, v. 2, p. 1-14, 2010.

AOURIK, A; OUZID, A. Le rôle des TIC dans la communication de l'entreprise avec ses parties prenantes. **Revue Internationale des Sciences de Gestion**, [*s. l.*], v. 3, n. 2, p. p 954-976, 2020.

ATKINSON, L. Reading Achievement in a Title I Elementary Public School. *In*: ATKINSON, L. **Teachers' Experiences with the Data-Driven Decision-Making Process in Increasing Students' Reading Achievement in a Title I Elementary Public School**. 2015. ProQuest LLC, Ed.D. Dissertation (Doctoral Dissertations) - Concordia University Chicago, [*S. l.*], 2015. p. 149.

BASQUE, J; ROCHELEAU, J; WINER, L. Une approche pédagogique pour l'école informatisée (Comment informatiser l'école). **RÉPERTOIRE DE PUBLICATIONS DE RECHERCHE EN ACCÈS LIBRE**, Montréal, Canada, 1998.

BATES, T. **Teaching in a Digital Age**. 1. ed. [*S. l.: s. n.*], 2015.

BECKER, C; THÖREL, E; PAULS, N; GÖRITZ, A. S. Homeoffice in Corona-Zeiten – Sind Ausmaß und/oderFlexibilitätwichtig für Arbeitszufriedenheit, sozialeUnterstützung, Commitment und Arbeitsunterbrechungen?". **Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift für AngewandteOrganisationspsychologie (GIO)**, Germany, v. 53, p. 173–187, 2022.

BERSIN, J; HOWARD, C; O'LEONARD, K; MALLON, D. Learning Management Systems2009: Facts. **Practice Analysis, Trends and Provider Profiles**: Bersin & Associates, 2009, [*s. l.*], 2009.

BOTVIN, M; HERSHKOVITZ, A; FORKOSH-BARUCH, A. Data-driven decision-making in emergency remote teaching. **Education and Information Technologies**, [*s. l.*], v. 28, n. 1, p. 489-506, 2023

BRAHIMI, T; SARIRETE, A. Learning outside the classroom through MOOCs. **Computers in Human Behavior**, [*s. l.*], v. 51, p. 604–609, 2015.

BUDUR, T; DEMIR, A. Leadership effects on employee perception about CSR in Kurdistan Region of Iraq. **International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies**, [*s. l.*], v. 5, n. 4, p. 184-192, 2019.

BUDUR, T; POTURAK, M. Transformational leadership and its impact on customer satisfaction: Measuring mediating effects of organisational citizenship behaviours. **Middle East Journal of Management, 8(1**, [*s. l.*], v. 8, n. 1, p. 67-91, 2021.

BURKI, T.K. COVID-19: consequences for higher education. **Lancet Oncology**, [*s. l.*], v. 21, n. 6, p. 758, 2020.

CARNEIRO, R; TOSCANO, J.C; DIAZ, T. **Los desafíos de las tic para el cambio educativo**. SPAIN: Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (OEI), 2009. 183 p. v. 1. ISBN 978-84-7666-197-0.

CLARDY, A. Distant, On-line Education: Effects, Principles and Practices. **ERIC**, [*s. l.*], p. 42, 2009. /https://eric.ed.gov/?id=eD506182.

CLARK, B.R. The contradictions of change in academic systems [1]. **Higher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 12, p. 101–116, 1983.

CLARK, B.R; PERGAMON, B.R; CLARK, B.C. Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation. **Highereducation**, [*s. l.*], v. 12, 1998.

COEN, P.F. Apports des technologies pour l'apprentissage : entre miracle et mirage. **Génération connectée: quels enjeux pour l'école ?** [*s. l.*], v. 1, ed. Actes de la recherche, p. 91-108, 2011.

DEMIR, A; BULUT, I. A new model for respected meetings. **Procedia Computer Science**, [*s. l.*], v. 126, p. 1637-1655, 2018.

DENIZ, M.H; GEYIK, S.K. An empirical research on general internet usage patterns of undergraduate students. **Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences**, [*s. l.*], v. 195, p. 895–904, 2015.

DEWEY, J. Experience and education. **Kappa Delta Pi. International Honor Society in Education**, [*s. l.*], 1938

FIRESTONE, J.M. Key Issues In Knowledge Management. **JOURNAL OF THE KMCI**: KNOWLEDGE AND INNOVATION, [*s. l.*], v. 1, n. 3, 2001.

GAEBEL, M; KUPRIYANOVA, V; MORAIS, R; COLUCCI, E. E-learning in European Higher Education Institutions. Results of a Mapping Survey Conducted in October-December 2013. **EUA**, [*s. l.*], 2014.

GARAUS, C; FURTMÜLLER, G; GÜTTEL, W. H. The hidden power of small rewards: the effects of insufficient external rewards on autonomous motivation to learn. **Academy of Management Learning and Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 15, n. 1, 2016.

GIBBS, G; KNAPPER, C; PICCININ, S. Disciplinary and Contextually Appropriate Approaches to Leadership of Teaching in Research-Intensive Academic Departments in Higher Education. **Higher Education Quarterly**, [*s. l.*], v. 62, n. 4, p. 416 - 436, 2008.

GRAJEK, S. The Digitization Of Higher Education: Charting the course. **Educause,** [*s. l.*], 2016.

HALEEM, A; JAVAID, M; VAISHYA, M. R; DESHMUKH, S.G. Areas of academic research with the impact of COVID-19. **American Journal of Emergency Medicine**, [*s. l.*], v. 38, n. 7, p. 1524-1526, 2020.

HAMID, D; DURMAZ, O. Organizational culture impact on employee innovative behaviors in Kurdistan Black Sea. **Journal of Management and Marketing**, [*s. l.*], v. 2, n. 1, p. 63-72, 2021.

HARASIM, L. Shift happens: online education as a new paradigm in learning. **The Internet and Higher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 3, n. 1-2, p. 41-61, 2000.

HÉNARD, F; ROSEVEARE, D. Fostering Quality Teaching in Higher Education: Policies and Practices. **An IMHE guide for higher education institutions**, [*s. l.*], v. 1, n. 1, p. 7-11, 2012.

HUNG, C. H; LIN, C. Y. Using concept mapping to evaluate knowledge structure in problem-based learning. **BMC Medical Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 15, n. 1, p. 1-9, 2015.

HUSSIN, H. **Information technology and business alignment in Malaysian SMEs**. IIUM Press: [*s. n.*], 2011.

JONES, K. M. L; RUBEL, A; LECLERE, E. A matter of trust: Higher education institutions as information fiduciaries in an age of educational data mining and learning analytics. **JASIST**, [*s. l.*], v. 71, n. 10, p. 1227-1241, 2020.

KARSENTI, T. L'Alphabétisation et les technologies de l'information à l'aube du nouveau millénaire: nouvelle conception, nouvelles perspectives. **Canadian journal for the study of adult education**, CANADA, v. 15, n. 2, p. 37-60, 2001.

KARSENTI, T; LAROSE, F. L'intégration pédagogique des TIC dans le travail enseignant : recherches et pratiques. **Revue des sciences de l'éducation**: L'élève à risque dans l'école d'aujourd'hui : apprentissage, adaptation sociale, intervention et réussite, [*s. l.*], v. 33, n. 3, p. 765–766, 2005.

KATZ, Y. J. The Comparative Suitability Of Three ICT Distance Learning Methodologies For College Level Instruction. **Educational Media International**, [*s. l.*], v. 37, n. 1, p. 25-30, 2000.

KIDWELL, J.J; VANDER LINDE, K.M; JOHNSON, S.L. Applying corporate knowledge management practices in higher education. **Educause quarterly**, [*s. l.*], v. 23, n. 4, p. 28-33, 2000.

KOZMA, R.B. International Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education. *In*: KOZMA, R.B. **Comparative analysis of policies for ict in education**. USA: Springer International Handbook of Information Technology in Primary and Secondary Education book series, 2008. v. 20, cap. Comparative Analysis of Policies for ICT in Education, p. 1083–1096. ISBN 978-0-387-73314-2.

KOZMA, R.B. Technology, innovation, and educational change: a global perspective: a report of the Second Information Technology in Education Study, Module 2. **International Society for Technology in Education**, [*s. l.*], 2003.

KURILOVAS, E. On data-driven decision-making for quality education. **Computers in Human Behavior**, [*s. l.*], v. 107, 2020.

LAAL, M. Knowledge management in higher education. **Procedia Computer Science**, [*s. l.*], v. 3, p. 544-549, 2011.

LARA, P; DUART, J. M. Josep Maria. Gestión de contenidos en el e-learning: acceso y uso de objetos de información como recurso estratégico. **Rev. U. Soc. Conocimiento**, [*s. l.*], v. 2, p. 6, 2005.

LAZINICA, A; CALAFATE, C. T. **Technology: Education and Development**. [*S. l.*]: Books on demand, 2009. 529 p. ISBN 978-953-307-007-0.

LI, Y; ZHAI, X. Review and Prospect of Modern Education using Big Data. **Procedia Computer Science**, [*s. l.*], v. 129, p. 341-347, 2018.

LONN, S; TEASLEY, S. D. Saving time or innovating practice: Investigating perceptions and uses of Learning Management Systems. **Computers & Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 53, n. 3, p. 686-694, 2009.

MANGENOT, F. L'intégration des TIC dans une perspective systémique. **Revue des langues modernes**: Les nouveaux dispositifs d'apprentissage des langues vivantes, [*s. l.*], p. 38-44, 2000.

MART, C. T. A passionate teacher: Teacher commitment and dedication to student learning. **Nternational Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development**, [*s. l.*], v. 2, n. 1, p. 437-44, 2013.

MASON, M. From distance education to online education. **The Internet and Higher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 3, n. 1-2, p. 63-74, 2000.

MEI, X. Y; AAS, E; MEDGARD, M. Eachers' use of digital learning tool for teaching in higher education: Exploring teaching practice and sharing culture. **Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 11, n. 3, p. 522-537, 2019.

MINTZBERG, H. Structure in 5's: A Synthesis of the Research on Organization Design. **Management Science** , [*s. l.*], v. 26, n. 3, p. 229-344, 1980.

MK, J; BANANDUR, P; GARADY, L. TEACHING & LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (LMS) AMONG HIGHEREDUCATION TEACHERS. **NTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS, MANAGEMENTAND ALLIED SCIENCES**, [*s. l.*], v. 7, n. 4, p. p 112-119, 2020.

MORA, J; VIDAL, J. Adequate policies and unintended effects in Spanish higher education. **Tertiary Education and Management**, [*s. l.*], v. 6, n. 4, p. 247-258, 2000.

MURPHY, M. P. A. COVID-19 and emergency eLearning: Consequences of the securitization of higher education for post-pandemic pedagogy. **Contemporary Security Policy**, [*s. l.*], v. 41, n. 3, p. 492-505, 2020.

NAMOUN, A; ALSHANQITI, A. Predicting Student Performance Using Data Mining and Learning Analytics Techniques: A Systematic Literature Review. **Applied Sciences,** [*s. l.*], v. 11, n. 1, p. 237, 2020.

NEWMAN, F; SCURRY, J.E. Higher Education and the Digital Rapids. **International Higher Education**, USA, n. 26, p. 13-14, 2002.

NGUYEN, A; GARDNER, L; SHERIDAN, D. Data analytics in higher education: An integrated view. **Journal of Information Systems Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 31, n. 1, p. 61, 2020.

ORFANOU, K; TSELIOS, N; KATSANOS, C. Perceived usability evaluation of learning management systems: Empirical evaluation of the System Usability Scale. **The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning**, [*s. l.*], v. 16, n. 2, p. 227-246, 2015.

PICCIANO, A. G. Theories and frameworks for online education: Seeking an integrated model. *In*: IN A guide to administering distance learning. [*S. l.*]: BRILL.com, 2021. cap. 5, p. 79–103.

PRICE, L; RICHARDSON, J. T; JELFS, A. Face-to-face versus online tutoring support in distance education. **Studies in higher education**, [*s. l.*], v. 32, n. 1, p. 1-20, 2007.

RASHID, S; SUNISHTHA, S.Y. Impact of Covid-19 Pandemic onHigher Education and Research. **Indian Journal of Human Development**, india, v. 14, n. 7, p. 1-4, 2020.

RIENTIES, B; BROUWER, N; LYGO-BAKER, S. The effects of online professional development on higher education teachers' beliefs and intentions towards learning facilitation and technology. **Teaching and teacher education**, [*s. l.*], v. 29, p. 122-131, 2013.

ROBBINS, S; BARNWELL, N. **Organisation Theory: Concepts and Cases**. 3. ed. [*S. l.*: *s. n.*], 1998. 517 p. ISBN 0724810323, 9780724810321.

ROBERT, J. P. **Dictionnaire pratique de didactique du FLE**. Éditions Ophrys: [*s. n.*], 2008.

RODRÍGUEZ, P; NUSSBAUM, M; DOMBROVSKAIA, L. ICT for education: a conceptual framework for the sustainable adoption of technology-enhanced learning environments in schools. **Technology, Pedagogy and Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 21, n. 3, p. 291-315, 2012.

SAHIBZADA, U. F; JIANFENG, C; LATIF, K. F; SHAFAIT, Z; SAHIBZADA, H. F. Interpreting the impact of knowledge management processes on organizational performance in Chinese higher education: mediating role of knowledge worker productivity. **Studies in Higher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 47, n. 4, p. 713-730, 2020.

SATHYE, M. Leadership in higher education: A qualitative study. **Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research**, [*s. l.*], v. 5, n. 3, 2004.

SELWYN, N. Reconsidering political and popular understandings of the digital divide. **New media & society**, [*s. l.*], v. 6, n. 3, p. 341-362, 2004.

SELWYN, N. **Education and technology:** Key issues and debates. [*S. l.*]: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016.

SERIN, H. The use of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations to enhance student achievement in educational settings. **International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies**, [*s. l.*], v. 5, n. 1, p. 191-194, 2018.

SHEHU, V; BESIMI, A; ABAZI, L; SHAQIRI, M. Usability issues while building a new LMS. *In*: SHEHU, V; BESIMI, A; ABAZI, L; SHAQIRI, M. **The ITI 2009 31st International Conference on Information Technology Interfaces**. 2009. Conference paper (Phd) - IEEE, Cavtat, Croatia, 2009. p. 5.

SIEMENS, G. Preparing for the digital university: A review of the history and current state of distance. **Blended, and online learning**, [*s. l.*], 2015.

SMALDINO, S. E. **Instructional Technology and Media for Learning. (Includes Clips from the Classroom)**. [*S. l.*]: Prentice Hall Ptr, 2005.

SUNKEL, G. Las tecnologías de la información y la comunicación (TIC) en educación en América Latina. **Una exploración de indicadores**, Cepal, 2006.

SURSOCK, A. Trends 2015: Learning and Teaching in European Universities. **Europeanuniversity association**, [*s. l.*], 2015.

SUWANNATTHACHOTE, P; MONSAKUL, J. Blended Instruction with Blackboard LMS: A case study of Educational Technology Undergraduate Courses at Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University"*In*: **Proceedings of the Conference on Opportunity and Prospect of Thai Educational Development**. 2007. Conference paper (PHD) - Faculty of Education, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, [*S. l.*], 2007. p. 6.

TAYLOR, J. C. Fifth generation distance education. **Instructional Science and Technology**, [*s. l.*], v. 4, n. 1, p. 1-14, 2001.

TENG, Y; ZHANG, J; SUN, T. Data-driven decision-making model based on artificial intelligence in higher education system of colleges and universities. **Expert Systems**, [*s. l.*], v. 40, n. 4, 31 ago. 2023.

TØMTE, C. E; FOSSLAND, T; AAMODT, P. O; DEGN, L. Digitalisation in higher education: mapping institutional approaches for teaching and learning. **Quality in Higher Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 25, n. 1, p. 98-114, 2019.

TØMTE, C; AANSTAD, S; LØVER, N. Evaluering av eCampus-programmet. **Norwegian Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education**, OSLO, 2016.

WHITAKER, J; NEW, J. R; IRELAND, R. D. MOOCs and the Online Delivery of Business Education What's new? What's not? What now?. **Academy of Management Learning & Education**, [*s. l.*], v. 15, n. 2, p. 345-365, 2016.