



Co-funded by
the European Union



ERASMUS+ CBHE Project # 101177299-eCAMPUS-EDU-2024-CBHE

**“Fostering Socially Distanced and Inclusive on
Campus Education in Armenian HEIs”**

INTERNAL QA REGULATION & CRITERIA FOR DIGITAL TLA

For Armenian Higher Education Institutions

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

YEREVAN 2025

Copyright © 2025 - eCAMPUS. All rights reserved
Any use of this document requires proper citation of the source and acknowledgment of the ERASMUS+ eCAMPUS project

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1. Preamble and Legal Basis	3
2. Definitions.....	3
3. Scope and Application	4
4. Guiding Principles.....	5
5. IQA Criteria for Digital TLA	6
6. Evidence Requirements and Documentation.....	14
7. Roles and Responsibilities	15
8. Monitoring, Review and Reporting Cycle	16
9. Expected Impact	16



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

1. Preamble and Legal Basis

This Regulation establishes the internal quality assurance (IQA) framework for Digital Teaching, Learning and Assessment (TLA) in Armenian higher education institutions (HEIs). It is developed within the Erasmus+ CBHE project eCAMPUS (#101177299) and draws upon nationally agreed policy directions as formulated in the Policy Paper on IQA of Online/Digital TLA (eCAMPUS, 2026).

The framework is grounded in the following Armenian national legislative and regulatory acts:

- RA Law on Higher Education and Science;
- RA Government Decree on the State Accreditation of Educational Institutions and Educational Programmes;
- ANQA (National Centre for Professional Education Quality Assurance Foundation) accreditation standards and procedures.

The framework is also aligned with the following international standards and frameworks:

- The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015);
- The OECD's Eight Emerging Principles for Digital Higher Education;
- The European Digital Competence Framework for Educators (DigCompEdu) as adapted for Armenia through the DigiComArm framework, developed within the eCAMPUS project;
- The UNESCO Recommendation on Open Educational Resources.

This Regulation is applicable to all Armenian HEIs offering digital or technology-enhanced learning in any mode: fully online, blended/hybrid, or digitally-supported face-to-face delivery. Armenian HEIs are at varying stages of digital education development and quality culture maturity. This Regulation adopts a developmental approach: requirements are framed as directions for continuous improvement, and institutions are supported to build capacity progressively rather than expected to achieve full compliance from day one.

2. Definitions

For the purposes of this Regulation, the following definitions apply:

Term	Definition
Digital TLA	Teaching, learning and assessment activities delivered fully online, in blended/hybrid format, or with significant use of digital technologies in a face-to-face environment.

IQA (Internal Quality Assurance)	The policies, procedures, practices and systems by which an institution monitors, evaluates and enhances the quality of its provision from within.
LMS (Learning Management System)	A software platform used to design, deliver, track and manage digital learning activities and content. Moodle is the most widely used LMS in Armenian HEIs; other platforms (e.g., Canvas, Blackboard) may also apply.
Blended/Hybrid Learning	A mode of delivery that combines face-to-face and online instruction in a planned, pedagogically integrated manner.
Academic Integrity	The commitment to ethical principles including honesty, fairness, trust, respect and responsibility in all academic activities, including online assessment.
Learning Analytics	Measurement, collection, analysis and reporting of data about learners and their contexts, with the purpose of understanding and optimising learning.
Digital Accessibility	The inclusive design of digital content and tools ensure they are usable by all students, including persons with disabilities.
PDCA Cycle	A continuous improvement cycle (Plan–Do–Check–Act) applied to institutional quality management processes.
Equivalence	The principle that students studying online should achieve the same quality of learning outcomes as students in face-to-face settings, though through different pedagogical means.
DigiComArm	Armenia's national digital competence framework for educators, developed within the eCAMPUS Erasmus+ project as a direct adaptation of DigCompEdu to the Armenian higher education context.

3. Scope and Application

3.1 This Regulation applies to all programmes, modules, courses or units in which digital TLA constitutes a significant component of delivery, regardless of the proportion of online content.

3.2 It applies to all faculties, departments and administrative units involved in planning, designing, delivering, supporting or evaluating digital teaching, learning and assessment.

3.3 It encompasses the following delivery modalities:

- Fully online learning (all content, interaction and assessment delivered digitally);
- Blended/hybrid learning (a structured combination of online and face-to-face components);
- Digitally supported face-to-face learning (classroom-based courses with significant digital tool integration);
- Technology-enhanced assessment (digital submission, e-proctoring, adaptive testing, portfolio platforms).

3.4 In applying these criteria, institutions are not required to treat digital and face-to-face instruction identically. Rather, the principle of equivalence applies: institutions must demonstrate that digital learners achieve equivalent quality of learning outcomes, though through pedagogically appropriate digital means.

4. Guiding Principles

The IQA framework for Digital TLA is founded on the following eight principles, consistent with ESG and international best practice:

#	Principle	Meaning
1	Student-Centered Digital Learning	Engagement, active learning, interaction and learner autonomy guide all digital course design and pedagogy.
2	Equivalence of Quality	Digital education achieves the same or better quality and learning outcomes as face-to-face instruction.
3	Transparency and Academic Integrity	Online assessment is fair, valid, secure and trustworthy; assessment design accounts for AI and digital tool availability.
4	Accessibility and Inclusion	Digital learning is universally accessible, including for students with disabilities, rural learners, and users with limited bandwidth.
5	Evidence-Based Decision-Making	Analytics, feedback and performance data are systematically collected and used to inform improvement.
6	Staff Competence and Support	High-quality digital education depends on well-prepared, continuously developed and institutionally supported staff.

7	Ethical and Responsible Technology Use	Data protection, privacy, AI governance, and equity are ensured in all digital environments.
8	Continuous Enhancement	Institutions embed PDCA cycles and ongoing review mechanisms across all aspects of digital TLA.

5. IQA Criteria for Digital TLA

The following ten criteria constitute the official IQA framework for digital TLA. Each criterion includes a policy intent, mandatory institutional requirements and measurable indicators. Institutions must demonstrate compliance through documented evidence.

#	Criterion	Focus
1	GOVERNANCE AND QA STRATEGY	Ensure institutional commitment, leadership and accountability for digital education
2	CURRICULUM AND DIGITAL COURSE DESIGN	Ensure consistent, pedagogically sound and accessible course design across all digital programmes
3	DIGITAL TEACHING, LEARNING AND INTERACTION	Promote high-quality digital pedagogy supporting active learning, instructor presence and meaningful student interaction
4	FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	Build institutional capacity for high-quality digital teaching through structured professional development
5	STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY	Ensure fairness, validity, reliability and integrity in digital assessments, including in AI-rich environments
6	STUDENT SUPPORT AND DIGITAL SERVICES	Ensure effective academic, technical and wellbeing support for all digital learners
7	TECHNOLOGY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND RELIABILITY	Ensure that digital learning is supported by reliable, secure and fit-for-purpose technological systems
8	DATA PRIVACY, PROTECTION AND SECURITY	Protect student and staff data and ensure responsible, legal and transparent data use in digital environments
9	ETHICS AND DIGITAL EQUITY	Promote ethical technology use, inclusive digital access and non-discriminatory practice in digital education

10	MONITORING, EVALUATION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	Ensure that digital education is continuously monitored, evaluated and improved through evidence-based PDCA cycles
----	---	--

Detailed Criteria

Each criterion is presented below with its institutional requirements and corresponding measurable indicators. The indicators are intended to guide self-assessment and monitoring; institutions may supplement them with context-specific measures.

CRITERION 1: GOVERNANCE AND QA STRATEGY		
Policy Intent: <i>Ensure institutional commitment, leadership and accountability for digital education.</i>		
#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
1.1	A formally approved institutional digital/online education strategy or policy is in place and publicly accessible.	Strategy document published on institutional website; date of most recent approval on record.
1.2	Clear roles and responsibilities for digital TLA quality are assigned and documented (e.g., Deans, QA Office/Unit, IT Department, Methodological Department or Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs, programme committees).	Organisational chart/responsibility matrix in force; annual review confirmed.
1.3	A dedicated body or committee oversees the implementation and periodic review of digital TLA quality.	Committee ToR approved; meeting minutes available for at least 2 sessions per year.
1.4	Students are represented in institutional bodies responsible for overseeing the quality of digital TLA.	Student representatives participate in ≥1 relevant governance body; attendance recorded.

CRITERION 2: CURRICULUM AND DIGITAL COURSE DESIGN		
Policy Intent: <i>Ensure consistent, pedagogically sound and accessible course design across all digital programmes.</i>		
#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
2.1	Institutional standards or templates for digital course structure and LMS organisation are defined and applied consistently across programmes.	≥90% of digital courses use approved LMS template; compliance audit conducted annually.

2.2	Digital courses integrate multimedia, interactive and collaborative elements to support active student engagement.	Course design checklist confirms ≥ 3 active/interactive elements per course unit.
2.3	Digital course content is reviewed annually for accuracy, relevance and pedagogical quality.	Annual content review log maintained per course; last review date recorded in LMS.
2.4	All new digital courses undergo formal approval, including instructional design review or peer review, prior to delivery.	100% of new digital courses pass pre-delivery approval gate; approval records archived.
2.5	Blended and online programmes are subject to the same programme approval and review procedures as face-to-face programmes.	Programme approval documentation confirms equivalent process applied; no exemptions granted.

CRITERION 3: DIGITAL TEACHING, LEARNING AND INTERACTION

Policy Intent: Promote high-quality digital pedagogy supporting active learning, instructor presence and meaningful student interaction.

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
3.1	Institutional guidelines define expectations for effective digital teaching, including synchronous/asynchronous balance and active learning strategies.	Guidelines document approved and disseminated to all teaching staff; annual update confirmed.
3.2	Instructor presence standards are established (minimum response times, frequency of announcements, facilitation of discussions).	Maximum instructor response time ≤ 48 hours; compliance monitored via LMS analytics each semester.
3.3	Structured opportunities for student-to-student and student-to-instructor collaboration are embedded in all digital courses.	≥ 2 collaborative activities per course module evidenced in course design records.
3.4	Mechanisms are in place to prevent and address student isolation, including online communities, group activities and peer learning.	Student engagement rate tracked; early warning triggered if individual engagement falls below institutional threshold.
3.5	Digital teaching effectiveness is regularly evaluated through student feedback, peer observation or teaching portfolio review.	100% of digital courses evaluated each semester; results shared with faculty within 4 weeks of survey close.
3.6	Continuous professional guidance and peer communities of practice support digital teaching innovation.	Community of practice active with ≥ 2 documented sessions per academic year; participation rate recorded.

CRITERION 4: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT

Policy Intent: Build institutional capacity for high-quality digital teaching through structured professional development.

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
4.1	Mandatory foundational training in digital pedagogy is required before faculty teach in a digital or blended mode for the first time.	100% of first-time digital instructors complete foundational training before course commencement; completion records archived.
4.2	A structured programme of continuous professional development in digital teaching, instructional design and educational technology is offered and regularly updated.	Annual CPD programme published; ≥80% of teaching staff complete ≥1 CPD activity per academic year.
4.3	Dedicated instructional design, media production and technical support services are available to faculty.	Support request log maintained; average resolution time ≤3 working days; annual satisfaction rating ≥3.5/5.
4.4	Faculty digital competence is assessed and mapped against the DigiComArm framework (or equivalent), and individual development plans are established.	DigiComArm self-assessment completed by ≥80% of teaching staff; development plans reviewed annually.
4.5	Peer mentorship, communities of practice and recognition mechanisms incentivize engagement with digital TLA development.	≥1 recognition scheme (award, certification, or equivalent) active; number of recipients reported annually.
4.6	Faculty participation in digital CPD is monitored and evaluated for effectiveness.	CPD participation report produced annually; post-training evaluation shows ≥70% positive impact rating.

CRITERION 5: STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Policy Intent: Ensure fairness, validity, reliability and integrity in digital assessments, including in AI-rich environments.

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
5.1	Institutional assessment policies explicitly include standards and procedures for digital and online assessment.	Assessment policy reviewed within last 2 years; digital assessment section confirmed present.
5.2	Online assessments are valid, reliable and demonstrably aligned with intended learning outcomes.	Assessment blueprint completed for all online assessments; alignment confirmed in course approval records.

5.3	Academic integrity mechanisms are implemented, including student authentication, appropriate use of proctoring tools and plagiarism detection software.	<i>Plagiarism detection software active on ≥95% of written digital submissions; annual integrity incident report produced.</i>
5.4	Diverse assessment formats are promoted, including formative, summative and authentic tasks designed to remain valid where AI tools are accessible.	<i>Assessment format diversity audit conducted annually; ≥30% of digital courses use authentic/portfolio-based assessment.</i>
5.5	Clear institutional policies govern the acceptable use of Artificial Intelligence by students in digital assessments.	<i>AI use policy published and updated at least annually; communicated to all students at programme induction.</i>
5.6	Feedback quality, content and turnaround times for digital assessments comply with institutional standards and are monitored.	<i>≥90% of digital assessment feedback returned within institutional deadline; annual compliance report produced.</i>
5.7	Assessment strategies are reviewed regularly to ensure they remain appropriate for digital delivery contexts.	<i>Programme-level assessment review conducted at least every 2 years; review report archived.</i>

CRITERION 6: STUDENT SUPPORT AND DIGITAL SERVICES

Policy Intent: *Ensure effective academic, technical and wellbeing support for all digital learners.*

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
6.1	Mandatory orientation and digital skills training is provided to all students enrolled in digital or blended programmes prior to commencement.	<i>100% of new digital learners complete orientation before first course activity; completion rates tracked per cohort.</i>
6.2	Accessible academic advising, tutoring, library services and technical support are adapted and available to digital learners.	<i>Digital learner support usage data collected each semester; services rated ≥3.5/5 in annual student survey.</i>
6.3	Digital materials and platforms comply with accessibility requirements, ensuring usability for students with disabilities.	<i>Annual accessibility audit completed; all critical barriers remediated within agreed timeframe.</i>
6.4	Measures are in place to promote digital well-being, including reasonable workload expectations and prevention of digital fatigue.	<i>Digital well-being guidelines published; workload monitoring integrated into course design approval process.</i>

6.5	Early identification and support mechanisms exist for students at risk of disengagement or failure in digital learning environments.	<i>LMS-based early warning system active; intervention triggered for students with ≥ 2 weeks inactivity.</i>
6.6	Student satisfaction with digital services and support is regularly surveyed and findings are acted upon.	<i>Survey conducted ≥ 1 per semester; improvement actions published within 6 weeks of results; tracked to completion.</i>

CRITERION 7: TECHNOLOGY, INFRASTRUCTURE AND RELIABILITY

Policy Intent: *Ensure that digital learning is supported by reliable, secure and fit-for-purpose technological systems.*

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
7.1	Formal processes are in place for the institutional evaluation, selection and approval of digital educational technologies.	<i>Technology approval procedure documented; all newly adopted platforms pass institutional review before deployment.</i>
7.2	LMS reliability, performance and usability are systematically monitored, with regular reporting to institutional governance bodies.	<i>LMS uptime target set and published by institution (recommended $\geq 98\%$ per semester for most Armenian HEIs; $\geq 99.5\%$ as a long-term benchmark); monthly performance report submitted to relevant governance body.</i>
7.3	Adequate technical assistance is available to students and staff, with defined service standards (response times, availability).	<i>Helpdesk SLA published (e.g., first response ≤ 4 hours); SLA compliance reported quarterly.</i>
7.4	A documented contingency plan exists to maintain continuity of digital learning in the event of technical failure or disruption.	<i>Business continuity/contingency plan reviewed annually; drill or test conducted at least once every 2 years.</i>
7.5	Technology platforms are reviewed for fitness-for-purpose, accessibility compliance and sustainability on a regular cycle.	<i>Platform review conducted every 3 years at minimum; review report and decision documented.</i>
7.6	Student and staff feedback on technology usability and adequacy is systematically collected and used for improvement.	<i>Annual technology satisfaction survey conducted; improvement actions linked to findings and tracked.</i>

CRITERION 8: DATA PRIVACY, PROTECTION AND SECURITY

Policy Intent: Protect student and staff data and ensure responsible, legal and transparent data use in digital environments.

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
8.1	A formal institutional data protection policy, consistent with the RA Law on Personal Data Protection (2015) and, where applicable, GDPR principles for international data transfers, is in place and actively implemented.	Data protection policy published; aligned with RA Law on Personal Data Protection; last review within 2 years; responsible officer designated.
8.2	Clear and informed consent procedures are established for the collection and use of student and staff data in digital learning contexts, in line with RA personal data legislation.	Consent procedures documented and in use; records of consent maintained in accordance with RA legal requirements.
8.3	Mechanisms ensure the secure storage, handling and transmission of data, including appropriate encryption and access control standards.	Encryption and access control standards documented; annual compliance check against institutional IT security policy.
8.4	Regular cybersecurity audits are conducted and documented, with incident response plans in place.	Cybersecurity audit conducted ≥annually; incident response plan reviewed ≥annually; drill conducted every 2 years.
8.5	Third-party educational technology providers are assessed for data protection compliance with RA legislation prior to institutional adoption.	Data protection compliance assessment completed for all newly adopted third-party platforms before deployment.
8.6	Students and staff receive clear information about their data rights under RA law and the institution's data governance practices.	Data rights information published on institutional website and included in student/staff induction materials.

CRITERION 9: ETHICS AND DIGITAL EQUITY

Policy Intent: Promote ethical technology use, inclusive digital access and non-discriminatory practice in digital education.

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
9.1	An ethical framework governing the use of learning analytics, student monitoring tools and AI in teaching and assessment is documented and communicated.	Ethics framework approved; communicated to all staff; reviewed within last 2 years.
9.2	Transparent and ethical AI use policies for both educators and students are established, regularly reviewed and aligned with national and international guidance.	AI use policy published and updated at least annually; staff and student training on policy offered each academic year.

9.3	Institution-wide strategies promote academic integrity in digital contexts, including student education on ethical AI use.	Academic integrity module/orientation session completed by ≥90% of new students each year.
9.4	Measures address digital inequity specific to the Armenian context, including: device access for students without personal computers or tablets; internet connectivity gaps, particularly for students in Yerevan's peripheral districts, regional cities and rural/marz communities; digital literacy development for all students and staff; accessibility and inclusive design for persons with disabilities; and alignment with gender equality principles.	Annual digital equity audit conducted; institutional data on student device and connectivity access collected; targeted support scheme operational where gaps are identified.
9.5	Content and learning activities are available in low-bandwidth-compatible formats for students in rural areas, remote marz communities or locations with limited internet infrastructure.	≥80% of course content available in low-bandwidth or offline-compatible format; uptake and effectiveness reviewed annually; student connectivity issues flagged and addressed within the semester.
9.6	Digital equity initiatives are monitored, reported and continuously improved.	Annual digital equity progress report produced; improvement actions assigned with responsible parties and timelines.

CRITERION 10: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Policy Intent: Ensure that digital education is continuously monitored, evaluated and improved through evidence-based PDCA cycles.

#	Institutional Requirement	Measurable Indicator
10.1	Student feedback on digital learning experiences is collected systematically at course and programme level, at least once per academic term.	Course evaluation response rate ≥60% per term; results analysed and shared with programme teams within 4 weeks.
10.2	Faculty feedback on digital teaching conditions, support needs and emerging challenges is gathered regularly and used in institutional planning.	Annual faculty survey conducted; findings incorporated into institutional planning cycle; response report published.
10.3	Learning analytics and performance data (including enrolment, engagement, completion and grade data disaggregated by delivery mode) are analysed to identify patterns.	Analytics dashboard active and reviewed each semester; comparative report on face-to-face vs digital outcomes produced annually.

10.4	Quality review findings related to digital TLA are documented, shared across the institution and formally responded to by programme teams and the QA Office.	<i>100% of review findings receive documented institutional response within defined timelines; responses archived.</i>
10.5	Digital tools, platforms and course content are updated on a documented periodic cycle with evidence of improvement actions.	<i>Update cycle documented per tool/platform/course; improvement action log maintained and reviewed annually.</i>
10.6	An annual institutional digital TLA quality report is produced, consolidating evidence across all ten criteria and used as the basis for strategic planning.	<i>Annual report published by end of each academic year; formally received by senior governance body; publicly accessible.</i>

6. Evidence Requirements and Documentation

6.1 Institutions shall maintain a documented evidence base demonstrating compliance with each criterion. Evidence may include, but is not limited to:

Criterion	Examples of Evidence
1. Governance	Approved strategy; committee minutes; governance structure documents; risk registers.
2. Course Design	Course templates; design approval records; peer review reports; content audit logs.
3. Teaching & Interaction	Teaching guidelines; faculty delivery plans; engagement tracking reports; observation records.
4. Faculty Development	CPD records; participation logs; competence mapping; training evaluations; DigiComArm assessments.
5. Assessment & Integrity	Assessment policies; assessment blueprints; academic integrity reports; plagiarism detection logs; AI policy documents.
6. Student Support	Orientation records; support service usage statistics; student satisfaction surveys; accessibility audit reports.
7. Infrastructure	Technology approval records; LMS performance reports; helpdesk statistics; contingency plans.
8. Data & Privacy	Data protection policy; consent forms; cybersecurity audit reports; DPIA records.

9. Ethics & Equity	AI ethics policy; equity action plan; digital inclusion audit; non-discrimination reports.
10. Monitoring	Annual digital TLA quality report; course evaluation summaries; analytics dashboards; improvement action logs.

6.2 Evidence must be kept for a minimum of five years and must be available for review by the institutional QA Office, programme committees and, where applicable, external QA reviewers or accreditation bodies.

7. Roles and Responsibilities

Effective implementation of this Regulation requires the engagement of all institutional stakeholders. The following table defines key roles:

Stakeholder	Responsibilities
Rector / Senior Leadership	Approve and resource the institutional digital TLA strategy; ensure governance structures are in place; champion quality culture across the institution.
Academic Council	Receive and approve the annual digital TLA quality report; endorse major policy documents and strategic decisions related to digital education.
QA Office / QA Unit	Coordinate implementation of IQA criteria; manage evidence collection; produce annual digital TLA quality reports; liaise with ANQA and external QA bodies.
Vice-Rector for Academic Affairs	Provide strategic oversight of digital education quality; ensure alignment between digital TLA development and institutional academic strategy.
Deans / Faculty Management	Ensure compliance within faculties; resource programme-level implementation; support programme committee reviews; escalate non-compliance issues to the QA Office.
Methodological Department / Educational Technology Unit	Provide instructional design and methodological support; coordinate faculty CPD; maintain LMS (Moodle) standards and templates; advise on accessibility and pedagogical quality.
IT Department	Ensure Moodle and other platform reliability and security; manage technology approval processes; conduct cybersecurity audits; operate helpdesk services.

Academic Staff / Faculty	Design and deliver high-quality digital courses; comply with institutional guidelines; engage in CPD and DigiComArm development; participate in peer review.
Students / Student Representatives	Participate in feedback mechanisms; serve on governance bodies including the Academic Council where provided for by institutional statute; contribute to review processes.
Programme Committees	Review programme-level digital TLA quality; analyse student feedback and learning analytics data; propose and implement improvements within the PDCA cycle.

8. Monitoring, Review and Reporting Cycle

8.1 Annual Review: Programme committees shall conduct an annual review of digital TLA quality at programme level, producing a brief summary report addressing compliance with criteria 1–10.

8.2 Periodic Review: A comprehensive institutional review of compliance with this Regulation shall be conducted every three years, involving external peer input where available.

8.3 Reporting: An annual institutional digital TLA quality report shall be produced by the QA Office, consolidating evidence across all ten criteria and formally submitted to senior governance. The report should be publicly accessible.

8.4 External QA Alignment: Findings from internal reviews shall be used to prepare the institution for external quality reviews or accreditation processes conducted by ANQA (National Centre for Professional Education Quality Assurance Foundation).

8.5 Improvement Actions: All reviews shall result in documented improvement actions, assigned to responsible parties with timelines, and tracked to completion.

9. Expected Impact

Full implementation of this Regulation is expected to produce the following outcomes across Armenian HEIs:

- Consistent and demonstrable quality of digital TLA across all institutions and programmes;
- Enhanced student learning experiences, engagement and achievement in digital environments;
- Strengthened academic integrity and reliability of online assessments;

- Higher digital competence levels among academic and support staff, aligned with DigiComArm;
- Improved equity, digital accessibility and learner inclusion;
- Data-informed institutional decision-making and quality culture;
- Increased institutional readiness for external QA processes related to digital learning;
- Contribution to the development of a national digital QA ecosystem aligned with European standards.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.