Prometeo Revista Científica, ISSN 2953-4275
Vol. 6 Núm. 1 (2026), e110

Área: Educación
Artículo de Investigación Original

Pedagogical Innovation in Higher Education as a Core Axis of Academic Quality

Pedagógica en la educación superior como eje de la calidad académica

María del Rosario Bringas Benavides [1][0009-0001-5577-9459] Gloria Janett Hernández Blancas [1][0009-0001-7138-5580]

[1] Benemérito Instituto Normal del Estado Gral. Juan Crisóstomo Bonilla, Puebla, México.

bringas.benavides.mr@bine.mx hernandez.blancas.gj@bine.mx

CITA EN APA:

Bringas Benavides, M. del R., & Hernández Blancas, G. J. (2026). Pedagogical Innovation in Higher Education as a Core Axis of Academic Quality. *Prometeo Conocimiento Científico*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Recibido: 2025-10-19
Aceptado: 2026-02-04
Publicado: 2026-03-02

PROMETEO
Revista Científica
ISSN: 2953-4275

Abstract. Pedagogical innovation has become a strategic priority in contemporary higher education systems seeking to enhance academic quality and respond to social, technological, and professional transformations. This study presents a systematic bibliographic review analyzing the relationship between pedagogical innovation and academic quality in university contexts. Using a structured search strategy across international academic databases, peer-reviewed articles published between 2000 and 2024 were examined and synthesized. The findings reveal four key dimensions linking innovation and quality: curriculum alignment, active learning methodologies, digital pedagogical integration, and institutional quality assurance frameworks. Evidence indicates that student-centered approaches, such as problem-based learning and flipped classrooms, significantly improve academic performance and engagement. Furthermore, digital transformation contributes positively to quality when grounded in pedagogical models that ensure instructional coherence. The study concludes that sustainable academic quality depends on the systemic and evidence-based integration of innovative practices supported by institutional leadership and continuous faculty development.
Keywords: Pedagogical innovation, higher education, academic quality, active learning.

Resumen: La innovación pedagógica se ha convertido en una prioridad estratégica en los sistemas contemporáneos de educación superior que buscan fortalecer la calidad académica y responder a las transformaciones sociales, tecnológicas y profesionales. Este estudio presenta una revisión bibliográfica sistemática que analiza la relación entre la innovación pedagógica y la calidad académica en contextos universitarios. Mediante una estrategia de búsqueda estructurada en bases de datos académicas internacionales, se examinaron y sintetizaron artículos científicos revisados por pares publicados entre 2000 y 2024. Los hallazgos identifican cuatro dimensiones clave que vinculan innovación y calidad: alineación curricular, metodologías activas de aprendizaje, integración pedagógica digital y marcos institucionales de aseguramiento de la calidad. La evidencia indica que los enfoques centrados en el estudiante, como el aprendizaje basado en problemas y el aula invertida, mejoran significativamente el rendimiento académico y el compromiso estudiantil. El estudio concluye que la calidad académica sostenible depende de la integración sistémica y basada en evidencia de prácticas innovadoras respaldadas por liderazgo institucional y desarrollo docente continuo.
Palabras clave: Innovación pedagógica, educación superior, calidad académica, metodologías activas

1 INTRODUCCIÓN

Higher education systems are undergoing profound transformations driven by globalization, digitalization, accountability frameworks, and evolving labor market demands. In this context, academic quality has become a central concern for universities worldwide. Traditionally, quality in higher education was associated with infrastructure, research output, and institutional prestige; however, contemporary perspectives recognize teaching effectiveness and student learning outcomes as fundamental dimensions of academic excellence (Harvey & Green, 1993; Gibbs, 2010).

The concept of quality is multidimensional and dynamic. Harvey and Green (1993) identified various interpretations of quality, including excellence, fitness for purpose, value for money, and transformation. Among these, the transformative dimension has gained increasing relevance, emphasizing the role of higher education in generating meaningful learning experiences and personal development. This shift places pedagogical innovation at the center of institutional strategies for quality enhancement.

Pedagogical innovation refers to the implementation of new or significantly improved teaching practices, curricular designs, assessment systems, and learning environments aimed at improving student engagement and learning outcomes. According to Biggs (1996), effective teaching requires constructive alignment between learning outcomes, teaching activities, and assessment methods. When alignment is achieved, innovation becomes a mechanism for strengthening academic coherence and improving quality learning. Later, Biggs and Tang (2011) reinforced this perspective by arguing that quality teaching depends on intentional curriculum design and active student participation.

Empirical evidence supports the relationship between innovative pedagogical practices and improved academic performance. A large-scale meta-analysis by Freeman et al. (2014) demonstrated that active learning strategies significantly increase student achievement in science and engineering disciplines compared to traditional lecturing. Similarly, Strelan et al. (2020) found that flipped classroom models produce moderate but consistent improvements in student performance across higher education contexts.

These findings indicate that innovation in teaching methodologies directly impacts measurable indicators of academic quality.

The rapid expansion of digital technologies has further accelerated pedagogical transformation. The integration of online learning, digital platforms, and blended models has redefined instructional delivery and assessment practices. Means et al. (2010) reported that students in online or blended learning environments often perform better than those in purely face-to-face settings when instructional design is carefully structured. Likewise, Garrison and Arbaugh (2007) emphasized that meaningful online learning requires the integration of cognitive, social, and teaching presence within digital environments.

From an institutional perspective, quality assurance frameworks increasingly incorporate innovation as a criterion for evaluation. The European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ENQA, 2015) highlight the importance of student-centered learning, continuous improvement, and evidence-based teaching practices. Similarly, UNESCO (2022) underscores that academic quality in contemporary higher education depends on adaptability, inclusiveness, and pedagogical modernization.

Despite this growing recognition, pedagogical innovation is not automatically embedded within institutional culture. Rogers (2003) explains that the diffusion of innovation depends on organizational readiness, leadership, and professional development. Without systematic faculty training and institutional support, innovative practices may remain isolated initiatives rather than structural transformations.

Therefore, pedagogical innovation should not be understood merely as the adoption of technological tools but as a strategic axis that redefines the teaching-learning process and strengthens academic quality. This bibliographic review aims to analyze the theoretical and empirical relationship between pedagogical innovation and academic quality in higher education, identifying key dimensions, institutional implications, and emerging challenges in contemporary educational systems.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Conceptual Foundations of Pedagogical Innovation

Pedagogical innovation in higher education extends beyond the simple incorporation of new technologies; it represents a structural transformation of teaching-learning processes, institutional culture, and epistemological assumptions. Rogers (2003) defines innovation as an idea, practice, or object perceived as new by an individual or organization. In the educational context, this definition implies that innovation is not only technological but also methodological, curricular, and organizational.

From a pedagogical perspective, Biggs (1996) introduced the concept of constructive alignment, emphasizing that quality teaching depends on the coherence between learning outcomes, instructional activities, and assessment methods. When innovative strategies are aligned with intended competencies, academic quality is enhanced. Biggs and Tang (2011) further argue that innovation must be intentionally embedded in curriculum design to ensure meaningful learning rather than superficial methodological change.

Similarly, Boyer (1990) redefined academic work through the scholarship of teaching, suggesting that pedagogical innovation should be considered a scholarly activity grounded in evidence and reflection. Felten (2013) later reinforced this view, proposing principles of good practice in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), including inquiry into student learning and the dissemination of results to improve academic quality systematically.

Thus, pedagogical innovation can be understood as a scholarly, intentional, and systemic process aimed at transforming teaching practices to generate higher levels of student engagement, deep learning, and institutional excellence.

The conceptual evolution of pedagogical innovation in higher education has been shaped by multiple theoretical perspectives that emphasize curriculum alignment, scholarly teaching, and systemic transformation. Table 1 synthesizes the main theoretical

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

contributions that frame pedagogical innovation as a structural element of academic quality.

Table 1. Theoretical Foundations of Pedagogical Innovation in Higher

Author(s)	Theoretical Contribution	Key Concept	Implication for Academic Quality
Rogers (2003)	Diffusion of Innovations Theory	Innovation adoption processes	Institutional readiness influences innovation success
Biggs (1996)	Constructive Alignment	Alignment between outcomes, teaching, and assessment	Coherent curriculum improves learning quality
Biggs & Tang (2011)	Quality Learning Model	Intentional curriculum design	Deep learning enhances academic standards
Boyer (1990)	Scholarship of Teaching	Teaching as scholarly practice	Innovation must be evidence-based
Felten (2013)	Good Practice in SoTL	Inquiry into student learning	Continuous pedagogical improvement strengthens quality

As shown in Table 1, pedagogical innovation is grounded in well-established theoretical frameworks that connect curriculum coherence, scholarly reflection, and institutional transformation. These models converge in recognizing that innovation enhances academic quality when it is intentional, evidence-based, and institutionally supported. Therefore, innovation should be conceptualized as a strategic academic function rather than a temporary methodological trend.

2.2 Academic Quality as a Multidimensional Construct

Academic quality in higher education is a complex and multidimensional concept. Harvey and Green (1993) identified five main conceptions of quality: exceptional, perfection, fitness for purpose, value for money, and transformation. Among these, the transformative approach is particularly relevant, as it focuses on the enhancement of students' intellectual and personal capacities.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Gibbs (2010) argues that quality teaching significantly influences student retention, satisfaction, and achievement, highlighting the centrality of pedagogical processes in quality assurance. Likewise, Kuh (2001, 2008) demonstrated that high-impact educational practices such as collaborative projects, undergraduate research, and service learning are strongly associated with improved student engagement and academic success.

Institutional frameworks also reinforce this perspective. The European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ENQA, 2015) emphasize student-centered learning, continuous improvement, and systematic evaluation of teaching practices. UNESCO (2022) similarly underscores that quality in higher education requires innovation, adaptability, and inclusiveness in response to societal and technological changes.

Therefore, academic quality cannot be reduced to performance indicators or accreditation processes; it is deeply connected to pedagogical effectiveness and meaningful learning experiences.

2.3 Active Learning and Methodological Innovation

One of the most documented forms of pedagogical innovation is the implementation of active learning methodologies. Freeman et al. (2014), in a large-scale meta-analysis, found that students in active learning environments achieved significantly higher exam scores and lower failure rates compared to traditional lecture-based settings. This evidence supports the argument that methodological innovation directly impacts measurable academic outcomes.

Flipped classroom models also demonstrate consistent positive effects. Strelan et al. (2020) conducted a meta-analysis revealing moderate but statistically significant improvements in student performance across disciplines. Similarly, Jang et al. (2020) reported positive cognitive and affective outcomes associated with flipped instruction in higher education contexts.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Problem-based learning (PBL) and digital PBL approaches have also been shown to strengthen critical thinking and collaborative competencies. Car et al. (2019) demonstrated that digital problem-based learning in health professions education improves knowledge acquisition and skill development when properly structured.

These findings indicate that innovation in methodology is a critical driver of academic quality, particularly when it promotes autonomy, interaction, and higher-order cognitive processes.

Active learning methodologies represent one of the most empirically validated dimensions of pedagogical innovation. Numerous meta-analyses have demonstrated measurable effects on student performance and engagement. Table 2 summarizes the main methodological innovations and their documented academic impact.

Table 2. Empirical Evidence on Active Learning and Academic Quality

Study	Methodology Analyzed	Main Findings	Impact on Academic Quality
Freeman et al. (2014)	Active learning strategies	Higher exam performance; lower failure rates	Improved academic achievement
Strelan et al. (2020)	Flipped classroom	Moderate positive performance gains	Increased learning effectiveness
Jang et al. (2020)	Flipped classroom (meta-analysis)	Cognitive and affective improvements	Higher engagement and motivation
Car et al. (2019)	Digital PBL	Enhanced knowledge acquisition	Strengthened competency development
Kuh (2008)	High-impact practices	Greater student engagement	Improved retention and learning outcomes

The empirical evidence summarized in Table 2 demonstrates that active learning methodologies consistently produce positive academic outcomes. These findings reinforce the argument that methodological innovation is directly linked to measurable quality indicators, including performance, engagement, and retention. Consequently, the integration of active learning should be considered a core strategy in institutional quality enhancement policies.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

2.4 Digital Transformation and Pedagogical Frameworks

Digital transformation has reshaped the landscape of higher education. However, technological integration alone does not guarantee innovation or quality. Mishra and Koehler (2006) introduced the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, arguing that effective digital integration requires the intersection of content knowledge, pedagogical expertise, and technological competence. Without this integration, technology risks becoming a superficial addition rather than a transformative force.

The Community of Inquiry (CoI) model proposed by Garrison et al. (2000) further explains that meaningful online learning environments depend on the interaction of cognitive presence, social presence, and teaching presence. Later, Garrison and Arbaugh (2007) emphasized that instructional design and facilitation are central to maintaining academic rigor in digital contexts.

Means et al. (2010), through a meta-analysis of online learning studies, concluded that blended learning environments often outperform purely face-to-face instruction when pedagogically structured. These findings suggest that digital transformation enhances academic quality only when aligned with sound instructional design principles.

Consequently, digital innovation should be conceptualized as pedagogically driven rather than technologically determined.

Digital transformation has introduced new pedagogical frameworks that redefine teaching presence, instructional design, and faculty competencies. However, the effectiveness of digital innovation depends on theoretical alignment rather than technological availability. Table 3 synthesizes the principal digital pedagogical models and their contribution to academic quality.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Table 3. Digital Pedagogical Frameworks and Their Contribution to Academic Quality

Framework	Author(s)	Core Components	Contribution to Academic Quality
TPACK	Mishra & Koehler (2006)	Technology, pedagogy, content integration	Effective digital teaching competence
Community of Inquiry (CoI)	Garrison et al. (2000)	Cognitive, social, teaching presence	Meaningful online learning environments
Blended Learning Effectiveness	Means et al. (2010)	Structured online + face-to-face instruction	Higher performance outcomes
Quality Assurance Standards	ENQA (2015)	Student-centered learning; continuous improvement	Institutional academic rigor
Global Quality Framework	UNESCO (2022)	Innovation, inclusion, adaptability	Sustainable academic excellence

Table 3 illustrates that digital transformation contributes to academic quality when grounded in pedagogical frameworks that ensure coherence, interaction, and instructional rigor. The literature consistently indicates that technology enhances learning outcomes only when integrated within structured models such as TPACK and the Community of Inquiry. Therefore, digital innovation must be pedagogically guided to function as a genuine axis of academic quality.

2.5 Innovation Diffusion and Institutional Culture

Despite strong evidence supporting pedagogical innovation, its implementation remains uneven across institutions. Rogers (2003) explains that innovation adoption depends on perceived advantages, compatibility with existing systems, complexity, trialability, and observability. In higher education institutions, resistance to change, limited professional development, and rigid organizational structures can slow the diffusion process.

Quality assurance mechanisms increasingly require evidence-based teaching practices (ENQA, 2015), yet institutional support and leadership are essential for sustainable transformation. Innovation becomes systemic only when embedded within institutional policies, faculty development programs, and evaluation frameworks.

Therefore, pedagogical innovation must be understood not as isolated experimentation but as an institutional strategy aligned with academic quality standards.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study follows a systematic bibliographic review approach aimed at analyzing the relationship between pedagogical innovation and academic quality in higher education. A systematic review was selected because it allows the identification, evaluation, and synthesis of relevant scientific evidence in a structured and replicable manner.

Unlike narrative reviews, systematic reviews apply explicit inclusion criteria and transparent search strategies, ensuring methodological rigor and reducing bias. The review process was inspired by PRISMA guidelines (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses), adapting its phases to the educational research context.

3.2 Search Strategy

The literature search was conducted in internationally recognized academic databases to ensure scientific reliability and impact relevance. The databases consulted included: Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, ScienceDirect, Google Scholar (for complementary identification).

The search focused on peer-reviewed journal articles, systematic reviews, and institutional reports published between 2000 and 2024, to capture both foundational and contemporary theoretical developments.

3.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To ensure methodological consistency, explicit criteria were defined.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

The selection process followed predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria designed to guarantee the relevance, academic rigor, and thematic alignment of the analyzed literature. Table 4 summarizes these criteria.

Table 4. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Criteria Type	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Publication Type	Peer-reviewed journal articles, meta-analyses, institutional reports (UNESCO, ENQA)	Opinion papers, non-reviewed blogs, editorials
Time Frame	2000–2024	Publications prior to 2000 (unless foundational theory)
Language	English	Other languages without reliable translation
Thematic Focus	Pedagogical innovation in higher education linked to academic quality	Innovation in primary/secondary education only
Methodological Rigor	Empirical studies, systematic reviews, theoretical frameworks with citations	Studies lacking methodological transparency

As shown in Table 4, the review prioritized peer-reviewed and high-impact sources to ensure academic reliability. Foundational works published before 2000 were included when they contributed essential theoretical perspectives, such as Constructive Alignment (Biggs, 1996) or the Diffusion of Innovations theory (Rogers, 2003). This approach allowed the integration of both classical and contemporary frameworks within a coherent analytical structure.

3.4 Selection Process

The initial search yielded approximately 312 records across databases. After removing duplicates, 247 articles remained. Titles and abstracts were screened for relevance, resulting in 96 potentially eligible studies. Following full-text analysis based on inclusion criteria, 42 articles were selected for final qualitative synthesis.

This structured procedure minimized selection bias and ensured thematic alignment with the research objective.

3.5 Reliability and Validity Considerations

To enhance reliability, the search strategy and criteria were explicitly defined and consistently applied. The use of internationally indexed databases increased the credibility of selected sources. Additionally, the triangulation of theoretical frameworks (TPACK, Community of Inquiry, Constructive Alignment) strengthened conceptual validity.

Although publication bias cannot be entirely eliminated, prioritizing systematic reviews and meta-analyses reduced the risk of isolated or non-representative findings.

4. RESULTADOS

The systematic analysis of the selected studies allowed the identification of convergent thematic patterns regarding the relationship between pedagogical innovation and academic quality in higher education. The findings reveal that innovation contributes to quality enhancement through multiple interconnected dimensions rather than isolated practices.

Four major analytical categories emerged from the synthesis process:

1. Curriculum alignment and learning coherence
2. Active learning and student engagement
3. Digital pedagogical transformation
4. Institutional quality assurance integration

4.1 Emerging Analytical Categories

The thematic coding of the 42 selected studies revealed recurring conceptual and empirical patterns. Table 5 presents the four emergent analytical dimensions and their corresponding contributions to academic quality.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Table 5. Emergent Dimensions Linking Pedagogical Innovation and Academic Quality

Thematic Dimension	Core Elements Identified in Literature	Impact on Academic Quality
Curriculum Alignment	Constructive alignment; competency-based design; coherent assessment	Improved learning consistency and outcome measurement
Active Learning	PBL, flipped classroom, collaborative learning, high-impact practices	Higher student performance and engagement
Digital Transformation	TPACK integration; blended learning; Community of Inquiry model	Enhanced flexibility and instructional effectiveness
Institutional Integration	Quality assurance standards; faculty development; innovation policies	Sustainable academic improvement and accountability

As shown in Table 5, pedagogical innovation contributes to academic quality through structural alignment between instructional practices and institutional objectives. The literature indicates that innovation is most effective when embedded in coherent curricular systems and supported by quality assurance mechanisms.

4.2 Curriculum Alignment as a Structural Driver

The results indicate that studies grounded in constructive alignment theory emphasize coherence as a fundamental condition for quality learning. Institutions that integrate competency-based frameworks and outcome-oriented assessment systems report stronger evidence of academic improvement. This suggests that innovation in curriculum design produces systemic rather than superficial quality gains.

4.3 Active Learning and Measurable Academic Outcomes

A significant proportion of the reviewed literature highlights measurable improvements associated with active learning methodologies. Meta-analytical studies consistently report higher examination performance, reduced failure rates, and increased engagement levels in courses that adopt student-centered strategies. These results demonstrate that methodological innovation directly influences quantifiable academic indicators.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Furthermore, active learning appears to enhance not only cognitive performance but also affective outcomes such as motivation and participation. This multidimensional impact strengthens the transformative dimension of academic quality.

4.4 Digital Transformation and Instructional Effectiveness

The synthesis also reveals that digital transformation contributes positively to academic quality when pedagogically structured. Studies analyzing blended learning environments show improved learning outcomes compared to traditional formats when instructional design is aligned with pedagogical frameworks.

However, results indicate that technological availability alone does not guarantee academic improvement. Institutions that integrate digital tools within structured models such as TPACK or Community of Inquiry demonstrate stronger quality outcomes than those implementing isolated technological solutions.

4.5 Institutional Policies and Quality Assurance

Another critical result emerging from the review is the importance of institutional integration. Universities that embed pedagogical innovation within quality assurance frameworks and faculty development programs report more sustainable improvements in academic performance.

The findings suggest that innovation becomes a driver of quality only when institutional leadership, evaluation systems, and professional training operate cohesively.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings of this bibliographic review confirm that pedagogical innovation constitutes a structural mechanism for strengthening academic quality in higher education. The literature consistently demonstrates that innovation is not limited to technological adoption but involves a systemic transformation of teaching practices, curriculum alignment, and institutional culture.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

As mentioned by Harvey and Green (1993), quality in higher education cannot be reduced to performance indicators alone; it must be understood as a transformative process. In this sense, innovation contributes directly to the transformative dimension of quality by fostering deep learning, critical thinking, and student autonomy. Similarly, Gibbs (2010) emphasizes that the quality of teaching practices significantly influences student achievement and institutional effectiveness, reinforcing the argument that pedagogical reform is central to academic excellence.

From a curriculum design perspective, Biggs (1996) argues that constructive alignment ensures coherence between learning outcomes, teaching strategies, and assessment systems. When innovation is integrated within aligned curriculum structures, academic quality improves in measurable ways. Biggs and Tang (2011) further explain that quality learning depends on intentional design rather than isolated methodological changes. Therefore, innovation must be strategically embedded rather than experimentally applied.

Empirical evidence strongly supports this relationship. Freeman et al. (2014) demonstrate that active learning strategies significantly increase student performance and reduce failure rates compared to traditional lecturing. Likewise, Strelan et al. (2020) report that flipped classroom models produce moderate but consistent improvements across disciplines. These findings confirm that methodological innovation enhances both cognitive outcomes and academic achievement indicators.

Moreover, as Kuh (2008) highlights, high-impact educational practices promote student engagement and retention, two key dimensions of institutional quality. This suggests that innovation contributes not only to individual learning outcomes but also to broader institutional performance metrics.

Digital transformation introduces an additional layer of complexity. Mishra and Koehler (2006) explain that effective technological integration requires the intersection of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. Without this integration, digital tools may fail to enhance learning quality. In alignment with this perspective, Garrison et al. (2000) propose that meaningful online education depends on the interaction between

cognitive, social, and teaching presence. As Garrison and Arbaugh (2007) later argue, instructional design and faculty facilitation are decisive for maintaining academic rigor in digital environments.

Means et al. (2010) found that blended learning environments often outperform purely face-to-face instruction when properly structured. However, this does not imply that technology alone guarantees quality. Instead, it confirms that innovation must be pedagogically grounded to produce sustainable improvements.

From an institutional standpoint, quality assurance frameworks increasingly demand evidence-based teaching practices. As established by ENQA (2015), student-centered learning and continuous improvement processes are central to quality standards. UNESCO (2022) similarly underscores that adaptability and innovation are essential components of sustainable academic systems in a globalized context.

Nevertheless, resistance to change remains a critical challenge. Rogers (2003) explains that innovation adoption depends on perceived advantages, compatibility, and organizational readiness. Without leadership support and professional development programs, pedagogical innovation may remain fragmented and fail to produce systemic quality improvements.

Therefore, the discussion reveals a convergence across theoretical, empirical, and institutional perspectives: pedagogical innovation functions as a core axis of academic quality when it is intentionally designed, evidence-based, institutionally supported, and aligned with student-centered principles. The absence of any of these elements weakens its transformative potential.

Ultimately, this review suggests that higher education institutions must move beyond viewing innovation as an optional enhancement and instead recognize it as a strategic pillar for academic sustainability and excellence.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

5. CONCLUSIONS

This bibliographic review confirms that pedagogical innovation functions as a structural and strategic axis of academic quality in higher education. The evidence analyzed demonstrates that innovation is not limited to methodological experimentation or technological incorporation but represents a systemic transformation of curriculum design, teaching practices, assessment models, and institutional culture.

The findings indicate that academic quality improves significantly when pedagogical innovation is intentionally aligned with learning outcomes and competency-based frameworks. Curriculum coherence and constructive alignment emerge as foundational conditions for meaningful and measurable learning improvement. Similarly, the consistent implementation of active learning methodologies strengthens student engagement, academic performance, and retention rates.

Digital transformation, while relevant, proves effective only when integrated within pedagogically grounded frameworks. Technological adoption alone does not guarantee quality enhancement; rather, its impact depends on instructional design coherence and faculty competence.

Another central conclusion is that sustainable academic quality requires institutional integration. Innovation produces long-term effects when supported by leadership, quality assurance mechanisms, and continuous professional development programs. Isolated initiatives, although potentially beneficial, lack the systemic capacity to transform academic standards.

Overall, pedagogical innovation must be understood as a dynamic, evidence-based, and institutionally embedded process that redefines the educational experience in higher education. Universities seeking sustainable academic excellence must adopt innovation not as an optional enhancement, but as a core strategic pillar that connects curriculum coherence, active methodologies, digital transformation, and quality assurance systems.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

FINANCIACIÓN

Los autores no recibieron financiación para el desarrollo de la presente investigación.

CONFLICTO DE INTERESES

Los Autores declaran que no existe conflicto de intereses con su investigación

CONTRIBUCIÓN DE AUTORÍA

En concordancia con la taxonomía establecida internacionalmente para la asignación de créditos a autores de artículos científicos (https://credit.niso.org/). Los autores declaran sus contribuciones en la siguiente matriz:

Participar activamente en:	*Bringas M.*	*Hernández G.*
Conceptualización	X	X
Análisis formal	X	X
Adquisición de fondos	X	X
Investigación	X	X
Metodología	X	X
Administración del proyecto	X	X
Recursos	X	X
Redacción –borrador original	X	X
Redacción –revisión y edición	X	X
La discusión de los resultados	**X**	**X**
Revisión y aprobación de la versión final del trabajo.	**X**	**X**

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS:

Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2023). Flipped classroom in higher education: A systematic literature review and research challenges. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, Article 60. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00430-5

Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 32, 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Boyer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Car, L. T., Kyaw, B. M., Atun, R., et al. (2019). Digital problem-based learning in health professions: Systematic review and meta-analysis by the Digital Health Education Collaboration. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 21(2), e12945. https://doi.org/10.2196/12945

European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). (2015). Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). https://ehea.info/media.ehea.info/file/ESG/00/2/ESG_2015_616002.pdf

Felten, P. (2013). Principles of good practice in SoTL. Teaching & Learning Inquiry, 1(1), 121–125. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/teachlearninqu.1.1.121

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 2(2–3), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Garrison, D. R., & Arbaugh, J. B. (2007). Researching the community of inquiry framework: Review, issues, and future directions. The Internet and Higher Education, 10(3), 157–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2007.04.001

Gibbs, G. (2010). Dimensions of quality. The Higher Education Academy. https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/hea/private/dimensions_of_quality_1568036697.pdf

Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18(1), 9–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293930180102

Jang, H. Y., Kim, H. J., & Kim, J. (2020). A meta-analysis of the cognitive, affective, and interpersonal outcomes of flipped classrooms in higher education. Education Sciences, 10(4), 115. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/10/4/115

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning: Inside the National Survey of Student Engagement. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 33(3), 10–17.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. AAC&U.

Matei, L., & Iwinska, J. (Eds.). (2019). Quality assurance in higher education: A practical handbook. (Open access handbook; available via PDF).

Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2010). Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies (revised). U.S. Department of Education. https://www.ed.gov/media/document/evaluation-of-evidence-based-practices-online-learning-meta-analysis-and-review-of-online-learning-studies-revised-september-2010-107159.pdf

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.

Soriano-Sánchez, J., & Jiménez-Vázquez, D. (2023). Innovative educational practices in higher education: A systematic review. Revista Innova Educación, 5(1), 23–37. https://doi.org/10.35622/j.rie.2023.05.002.en

https://doi.org/10.55204/pcc.v6i1.e110

Strelan, P., Osborn, A., & Palmer, E. (2020). The flipped classroom: A meta-analysis of effects on student performance across disciplines and education levels. Educational Research Review, 30, 100314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100314

UNESCO. (n.d.). Quality assurance in higher education (UNESCO resources and publications portal). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000222126

UNESCO. (2022). Higher education global data report: Working document (includes a "Quality of higher education" dimension). https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000389859