

## QUALITY MANAGEMENT IN THE ROMANIAN UPPER SECONDARY EDUCATION: A DIFFERENT INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PERSPECTIVE

*Ioana CĂLINESCU<sup>a</sup>, Georgiana COSTACHE<sup>b\*</sup>, Corina FRĂȘINEANU<sup>c</sup>*

<sup>a</sup> *The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania*

<sup>b</sup> *The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania*

<sup>c</sup> *The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania*

---

### ABSTRACT

*The concept of quality management (QM) has increasingly become a critical one over time no matter the industry or the profession in which it is referred to. Under the current challenges that have a great impact on the economy and the society, new requirements and conditions for how the providers of products, services and solutions in general perform in terms of quality have emerged. Taking into account these realities, we may observe that QM in education follows the same path as in all other fields of activity, developing on fundamental principles that are at a certain extent common to all other areas of the economy and of the society in general. In Romania the QM approach in education is governed both by national legislation formulated in compliance with the objectives presented in the strategy of the European Union (EU). Since its accession to the EU Romania entered a process of continuous improvement and transformation to comply with the recommendations made in the field of education. But why is important to discuss the QM in upper secondary education, what is the most appropriate QM approach and how is quality managed and implemented at the level of the institutions in the upper secondary education in Romania now and what is to be done in the future are some of the questions we tried to provide significant reasoning to. The present article has emerged as a collaboration of two university instructors in Business Process Quality Management and Business Management and one teacher in Business Administration in a high school of Economics in Bucharest incited by the finding that, according to the analysis performed by the university's admission commission, the majority of the candidates in the admission process are graduates from high schools with specializations in Economics.*

**KEYWORDS:** *internal quality management, external quality management, upper secondary education, quality assurance, Romanian education system*

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The quality management (QM) concept has increasingly become a critical one over time no matter the industry or the profession in which it is referred to. Under the current challenges that have a great impact on the economy and the society such as globalization, diversity, the technology burst, the need for flexibility and an easy accessibility of the desired products or services, the trend to customize as a reaction to diversity and uniqueness and to offer almost instantly the most convenient solutions to every emerging problem, just to name a few, new requirements and conditions for how the providers of products, services and solutions in general perform in terms of quality have emerged. Taking into account these realities, we may observe that QM in education follows the same path as in all other fields of activity, developing on fundamental principles that are at a certain extent common to all

---

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: [georgiana.cioana@man.ase.ro](mailto:georgiana.cioana@man.ase.ro)

other areas of the economy and of the society in general, therefore quality planning, quality assurance, quality control and quality improvement may be considered the pillars of enforcing QM in the educational sector as well. Given these circumstances and the fact that change is said to be the new constant of the modern world, the classical definition of QM is still a reference one. As according to Rose (2005, p.41) quality management puts great emphasis on the degree of consistency of the organization, that is of the provider of products or services, suggesting that quality management should focus on four main components: quality planning, quality assurance, quality control and quality improvement. An important clarification to be made here is that in the Romanian education system (and not only since the documents and reports of the EU often mention the term), just like in many entities in the business environment, the concept of QM is mostly referred to as quality assurance (QA), slightly suggesting somehow the idea that a greater emphasis is placed on the enforcement of and compliance with standards and regulations instead of taking the broader and deeper perspective of the entire process.

In the business arena however the situation, although not simple or straightforward at all, seems to be more manageable and trenchant when referring to quality. Discussing the quality issues in education on the other hand is a sensitive subject in general. The most important reason refers to the very nature of education, a complex and long-term process implying great expectations and even greater and, at some extent, unmeasurable and inestimable impact on the individual and the society. The other reasons however not less important may take into account the difficulty of looking at the public system and the education system with the same eyes as we look at an economic entity, drawing a precise border between how the customer and his/her needs are defined and how the provider and his/her challenges are defined. Can we define pupils and students as customers and education institutions as businesses of manufacturing degrees (Parsons, 2015)? Whether we speak about the public or the private systems, the final goal of education is to add value now and in the future for every actor involved and having an interest in the system and we all have and should at some point have such an interest, no matter the side of the equation on which we find ourselves. In fact, it shouldn't be about taking sides at all as cooperation, communication, co-work, coherence and "co-agency" (OECD, 2018) should be the main prerequisites. But this value, does it have a precise quantifiable monetary estimation all the time? And if the result is a non-value, are we able to correct it, erase it, redo it, apologize for it or 'offer a compensation' to change the course of its effects? Does the concept 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it' have the same meaning as in the business field? It is very hard to say but surely the answer inclines very much towards a 'definitely not'.

Being a highly regulated domain, which several economical, social and political bodies have major interests in, the assurance of quality in education needs to be implemented, evaluated and governed upon by structures both inside and outside the system. In Romania the legislation establishing the grounds to manage the quality in the education system is Law no.1/2011 also known as National Education Law (ARACIP, 2017a). Furthermore, additional specific laws and government decisions govern certain other quality aspects in education. Also, since its accession to the EU Romania entered a continuous improvement and transformation process to comply with the recommendations made in the field of education. But how is this transition reporting on the current needs and challenges of the society, is there the possibility to act more and formalize less, to prioritize better and for how long until the so-called 'ideal state'?

The four components of QM emphasized earlier are reflected on both the internal and external approaches of the QM in education. But which area is of greater importance and relevance? Making sure the system functions according to the standards of the governing bodies from the inside? Putting higher pressure and strict control from the outside through the legislation, the regulations and other conditions to enable a certain uniformity and compliance with the expected results? Or both? How are these approaches dealt with in the Romanian upper secondary education system, public and private? We will discuss all of these in the following sections.

This article has emerged as a collaboration of two university instructors in Business Process Quality Management and Business Management at the Faculty of Management from the Bucharest University of Economic Studies (BUES) and one teacher in Business Administration at Virgil Madgearu Economic High School in Bucharest incited by the finding that, according to the analysis performed by the university's admission commission the majority of the candidates in the admission process at the BUES are graduates from high schools with Economics profile (here including also the classes with specialization in Social Sciences, Tourism and Services) in Bucharest. As successors in the forming of minds, characters and professionals in the field we are highly interested in how to manage the quality of the educational act at the level of upper secondary institutions in order to make the transition of students from early education to the labour market as lean and coherent as possible, taking into account most of its implications from the societal, economical, psychological and procedural perspective. A critical aspect to be considered here is the fact that in Romania, the evolution of employment in strong correlation with the level of education highlighted, in part, the incidence of the massification process of higher education (Cretan, 2015), hence the danger to diminish the quality of the forming of graduates of upper-secondary education and furthermore of the graduates from higher education.

## **2. METHODOLOGY**

The findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this article are the result of a qualitative critical analysis performed, on one hand, through a review of the literature in the field of QM in upper secondary education and education in general, of the legislation and regulations in place at national and European level, and on the other hand, through a metaphorical analysis of the concepts used in QM and their adaptation to the field of education to give a meta-significance and reasoning to these underlying concepts in the view of proposing solutions that are more appropriate to the needs of the system and more able to provide sustainable results for the society in the future. At the same time a quantitative analysis of the reports and results presented by the QA bodies and education institutions considered was performed to support the statements and assumptions made and with the aim of defining the current state of QM in education.

## **3. EXTERNAL QM IN THE ROMANIAN UPPER SECONDARY EDUCATION**

### **3.1. Current state**

The idea of making a formal, conceptual distinction between the way quality is perceived and managed inside the system under analysis versus the way the system performs and manages to comply with certain criteria based on needs and specifications, that is internal QM versus external QM, emerges from the principles of national/ international standardization and audit. In order to enable the functioning of the entire cycle of enforcing quality in a process, internal and external approaches and perspectives must be taken into account to create compliance, accuracy, consistency, transparency and sustainability. The concepts of internal and external quality were initially promoted in a formalized way in the certified systems such as the ISO international standards for example, where we find them under the name of external and internal audits (ISO 9001, 2015; ISO 19011, 2002; Hernandez, 2010). Given the need to ensure and supervise the implementation of the legislation and regulations enforced at national and European level but more important, given the critical outcomes that the education system is expected to deliver, like in all other systems subject to standardization, in education the external QM and external quality audits are performed by officially appointed national bodies. Also, according to (Drăgulănescu, 2018) if we are to correlate the findings with evidence from QM implementation in upper secondary education, internal and external quality can be a catalyst since its purpose is to generate, consolidate and develop the confidence/ trust of all stakeholders in the capability of education institutions to satisfy all stakeholders' requirements.

In Romania, according to the legislation, to the national and European procedures, the Ministry of National Education (MNE) is the main coordinating body delegated to evaluate the quality of the education system and of the educational process, through specialized institutions (European Commission, n.d.). According to the European Commission (n.d.) and to the procedures established at the level of MNE, all four phases of QM in education presented earlier in this article are performed at external level by the following bodies:

- the County School Inspectorates - responsible for the evaluation of the educational process in pre-academic (pre-university) education;
- the Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Pre-academic Education (ARACIP) - in charge of the institutional evaluation of pre-academic education institutions;
- the Ministry of National Education - delegated for the evaluation of the entire education system.

ARACIP is, after the MNE, the next main responsible institution, its tasks being the authorization, the accreditation and recurrent evaluation of education institutions in the pre-university system. According to a Eurydice Report of the European Commission (2015), ARACIP carries out evaluations in order to:

- certify that school units meet student needs as well as the required quality standards;
- protect student interests by producing and disseminating information about education quality;
- play a role in the development of a 'culture of quality' in pre-university education institutions;
- recommend policies and strategies to the Ministry of Education to improve the quality of education.

### **3.2. Challenges and opportunities of improvement**

As a consequence of dealing with a complex, broad context, given the need to exchange opinions and approach the issues from several points of view, considering diverse experiences, enforcing the principles of QM and standardization in education has become in time a systemic necessity to involve multiple commissions, agencies and other bodies in the process of quality assurance at national and local level. A process which, because of its complexity, is seen by many actors in the arena and especially by the process owners in the education institutions (schools, high schools, universities) as intensively procedural, bureaucratic, difficult to manage and time consuming. Although there is a disturbing truth in these perceptions, the practical experience has shown that no actual enforcement of any standardization process could be achieved without a procedural background, documentation and forms. However, based on a broad analysis of documents and procedures, we found that these procedures conceived to facilitate the operational aspects of quality implementation in institutions tend to ignore or put less emphasis on the practical aspects of quality assurance and improvement, lacking the recommendation towards the use of some actual tools, methods and techniques to put to work all the criteria and specifications proposed and observed during the evaluation and accreditation process. This initiative may be considered as delegated to the heads of the institutions and to the quality assurance teams in each education institution but some proposals might facilitate and stimulate the interest of the process owners as well as it might lead to more rapid and effective results.

The control aspect of QM is highly important and compulsory in every system, otherwise the initiative has no relevant purpose and no guarantee to succeed. Nevertheless, there is a tendency of the governing bodies but also of the people involved at institutional level in education to focus more on the procedural aspects and on their fulfillment than on the process itself and its underlying goal. That is why teachers, head of schools and inspectors tend to become more taken over by the fulfillment of some indicators and the procedural compliance, that is mainly on the formalities of the accreditation process and less involved in the actual deployment and improvement of quality in the institutions in which they perform. We may state without generalization and exaggeration that these actors manifest a decreasing interest towards discovering creative, practical models and finding and testing adaptable solutions to their particular problems.

Another possible impediment in the simplification of the evaluation and improvement phases is the fact that the procedures promoted and formalities used by the governing agencies do not seem to focus on what is relevant from the point of view of operational effectiveness of the improvement of the quality of education. The quality of education should be slightly differently regarded as compared to the quality of a standard product or service traded on the market. While in the case of a car, mobile device or vacation customers buy from a provider the negative or positive effects of poor or good quality rarely have such a dramatic impact on the users, in the case of quality in education the impact contributes to and influences major changes in behavior, mentality, psychological patterns and many other personality determinants which cannot be very easily controlled, corrected or redone. Therefore, from our perspective but also from a meta-approach of quality in education, the educational process should be more concerned with the quality of the knowledge transmitted, the teaching methods and the correlation of the learning outcomes envisaged with the requirements of the labor market as a long-term guarantee of sustainability to the end users of educational services, pupils and students, parents, teachers, employers and society as a whole. This perspective is not intended to disregard the 'materiality' of quality, that is the importance of the existence of appropriate infrastructure, facilities, technology and all other inputs necessary to perform the educational act in appropriate conditions, as they are emphasized by ARACIP (2017b) in the accreditation criteria presented in the Specific Quality Standards for Upper Secondary Institutions (theoretical/technological high schools). But the existence of these should be an implied prerequisite and should not impede the evolution, the development and the improvement of the system itself, in other words the auditing representatives, inspectors, quality auditors and the decision makers in the education system as well as the audited institutions through their representatives should focus more on the actual 'how to get there' than on the quantification of the excuses of 'incapable to perform in the getting'.

Another interesting finding refers to the formulation of the indicators and the criteria used in the evaluation process. Statements like "the existence of...", "the functioning of...", "the compliance with...", "the achievement of..." in the formulation of the indicators, as found in the accreditation criteria (ARACIP, 2017b), automatically require a formulation of the expected results under the form of "compulsory", "achieved/ not achieved" or expressed as a percentage of the degree of achievement. A method which is not necessarily wrong but that may prove to be not appropriate enough in order to formulate smart objectives, recommendations and corrective actions that become the objectives of the improvement phase. And this may add up negative influence to the already established mentality that quality assurance in education is more of a formality.

### **3. INTERNAL QM IN THE ROMANIAN UPPER SECONDARY EDUCATION**

#### **3.1. Current state**

The three major governing bodies presented in the previous section of this article are mainly responsible for planning, assuring and controlling the implementation of the national and European legislation and recommendations regarding quality assurance in education and, to some extent, for the following of the recommendations and proposals made in the view of the improvement of quality in institutions in the long-term. It's the educational institutions' responsibility, namely high schools, through their representatives, to ensure the actual implementation and compliance with the legislation, the standards enforced, translating procedural directions into actions and enabling the transition to a more compatible, effective and continuously improving education system in terms of quality. In the Romanian upper secondary institutions the internal QM is performed by a Quality Evaluation and Assurance Commission (QEAC) (ARACIP, 2017b) with members appointed from the staff of the institution, the head of school and a number of teachers with high degree of expertise in the field. Nonetheless, quality is everybody's duty, from teacher, to student, to parent and to actors in the business arena, as well as to other trainers and instructors which will add value to the individual's forming

in the later steps in the formation process of the individual, therefore a need for intensive cooperation arises among all these elements.

At European level, starting a decade ago the status of internal school evaluation shifted from recommended or possible to compulsory in 27 education systems among which Romania, as stated in a report of the European Commission (2015). The report also underlines the fact that schools are given a certain autonomy in the carrying out of internal audit and in the decisions to involve a vast range of stakeholders (like students or parents) in the process of evaluation. Eventually, the same report presents a series of support measures and tools at disposal of high schools intended to facilitate the internal evaluation, such as training in how to perform the evaluation, guidelines, an evaluation framework, consultants and online forums to clarify different issues that arise in the evaluation process. As seen in Table 1, Romania uses all of these tools except for one, the financial support.

According to the latest national reports made public by ARACIP (2017c), the overall results of QA efforts in high schools demonstrate an approximately 80% compliance of the institutions in upper secondary education with the evaluation criteria imposed by the body, the degree of fulfillment of the performance indicators being on average around 60%. Although some difference may be observed in the results of quality evaluation at internal level as compared to the evaluation at external level as resulted from the reports, the first being higher and that showing an overestimation of performances from the part of the institutions, results are somehow uniform and optimistic. However, there are both highly performant institutions as well as less performant ones as there are extraordinary students and ordinary ones and making an average and putting all institutions in a pot is not going to lead to relevant conclusions. On the other hand there are aspects of QA at internal level for the evaluation of which it is difficult to design a set of indicators, such as the mentoring and leadership skills of the heads of high schools or of the supervisors of Quality Evaluation and Assurance Commission as promoters of quality improvement, the degree of involvement of school staff in the QA process and in the teaching process in general, the potential contribution of teachers' work and efforts in the teaching process to the solving of the societal and economical problems in the long-run.

In Romania there is a predominance of enrollment preference towards the public education system due to the economic, social and cultural context, the private system being less developed and performant. According to the National Institute of Statistics (Ziarul Financiar, 2018), the pupils and students enrolled in public institutions prevailed (95,4%), only 4,6% of them being enrolled in private institutions.

In Bucharest the percentage of students enrolled in private institutions is higher due to the existence of a larger number of public institutions. If we are to follow the assumption that most first year students enrolled in learning programs at BUES come from high schools with specializations in Economics, it is important to take a brief look at this specialization. As found on the website of the MNE (2015) there are 93 accredited public high schools out of which 23 have specializations in Economics, Services, Tourism and Alimentation. Almost all of the accredited public high schools having those specializations and not only present the results of the process of evaluation of quality conformance and accreditation on their official websites, either as part of their strategy or as a separate dedicated report.

Although a huge progress was made in the past two decades at institutional level in the QA journey, most of which started to accelerate after Romania's accession to the EU, overall perception towards the outcomes but also towards particular aspects of QM in institutions demonstrate a somewhat high degree of discrepancy between the educational process, the management of the capabilities and potential of the educated, the facilitation of learning and the conditions on the labour market. There seems to be a difficulty which overpasses the visible, tangible, procedural side of quality evaluation and is related to the attitude, involvement, continuous preoccupation and concern of all members of the educational community in the school as well as the cooperation of staff members towards the

achievement of this goal. These are subjective, qualitative aspects the impact of which is very difficult to estimate but further research in this area may prove very useful and relevant.

**Table 1. Supporting measures available to internal evaluators in upper secondary education in 2013-2014**

Measure	Training in internal evaluation	External evaluation framework	Indicators enabling school to compare with other schools	Guidelines and manuals specific to internal evaluation	Online forums	External specialists	Financial support
Country							
BE fr			✓				
BE de		✓	✓			✓	
BE nl	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
BG							
CZ	✓	✓		✓	✓		
DK				✓	✓		
DE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
EE	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
IE	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	
EL	✓			✓	✓	✓	
ES	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
FR		✓		✓			
HR	✓			✓		✓	✓
IT	✓	✓	✓	✓			
CY		✓					
LV		✓	✓	✓		✓	
LT	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
LU	✓		✓	✓		✓	
HU	✓		✓				
MT	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	

Measure	Training in internal evaluation	External evaluation framework	Indicators enabling school to compare with other schools	Guidelines and manuals specific to internal evaluation	Online forums	External specialists	Financial support
Country							
NL		✓					
AT	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
PL	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
PT	✓	✓	✓	✓			
RO	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
SI	✓		✓	✓			
SK			✓	✓			
FI	✓		✓	✓			
SE		✓	✓	✓			
UK ENG	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
UK WLS	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
UK NR	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
UK SCT	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
IS		✓	✓	✓		✓	
MK	✓	✓				✓	
NO			✓	✓		✓	
TR			✓	✓			

Source: authors' own processing based on data of the European Commission (2015)

Without overlooking its major contribution, although we referred to it several times throughout the article, we wish to conclude this section with underlining the fact that the teaching, training, the qualitative investment in valuable knowledge and skills and the acquiring of the appropriate prerequisites for a lifelong learning approach following the requirements of the learning outcomes defined and of the occupational standards are critical components. Hence more emphasis and more focus should be placed in the evaluation criteria and in the QM process at both internal and external levels. Thus although procedural formalities and regulating aspects should not be disregarded, after several runnings of the procedures they may be easily internalized and considered as implicit so as not to become a repetitive burden impeding teachers, inspectors and specialists in charge of QA to allocate time to

contribute to other areas of quality improvement in the process, such as personal development activities, conferences and programs, the reformulation and actualization of the lesson plans and learning objectives, the developing of new learning resources (books, guides, case studies), the establishing of partnerships with representatives from higher education institutions, from public and private organizations.

### **3.2 QM METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS TO SUPPORT INTERNAL QA IN UPPER SECONDARY EDUCATION**

As we earlier underlined, staff members and QEAC members may find themselves without a precise purpose, hesitating and eventually feeling frustrated in front of all the documentation on QA without having an actual, tested methodology of putting the criteria in place. In this regard, we propose the use of some quality tools and methods that have been successfully used in the QM of business processes but whose utility was also tested on public systems and on educational systems as well. Most research on the subject provides evidence of the implementation of QM tools in higher education but that does not imply that these tools are only compatible with this environment. Although some researchers questioned the easiness to use such instruments in the process of QA in education (Antony et al., 2012; Balzer, 2015), an initial testing of them in order to see whether they are appropriate or not is to be taken into account, as well as a selection and adapting of the concepts and tools that prove to be most appropriate to the process in which they are to be introduced. Methods like the PDCA cycle and the DMAIC methodology which represent the core concepts of the ISO standards (ISO, n.d.), the SIPOC approach of processes, the cause and effect analysis tools like the '5 whys', the fishbone diagram and the Pareto analysis, Lean Six Sigma tools as for example the mapping tools promoted in Lean management, the kaizen and 5S concepts, the house-of-quality, the circles of quality and statistical process control tools (control charts, scatter diagram, histograms and such) may prove to be supportive and practical both for the purposes of enforcing a QA procedure as well as in the deployment of quality in the teaching and learning processes. Furthermore, we are going to present just an example, for the use of the SIPOC diagram, in order to sustain the utility and the facility to operate with these tools.

The SIPOC approach to QM proposes analyzing all key elements involved in the process that is considered for analysis, namely Inputs, Process Activities (Process Steps), Outputs, Suppliers and Customers, in order to have an exact definition of quality on this process, of what is to be analyzed and who is to be involved and affected by the outcomes. When analyzing an educational process these elements are detailed as follows: the inputs refer to the students' knowledge and abilities, teachers' knowledge, experience and abilities, teaching facilities, study materials, technology and all material tools, forms, methods and instruments involved in the teaching and forming process, at the moment of entering the process that is being analyzed. Process steps refer to all activities and steps involved in the teaching of new knowledge, skills and abilities, namely the initial evaluation of students' knowledge and skills at the time they enroll in the process, continuing with the actual transmission of theoretical and practical knowledge and skills and with the ensuring of the continuous assimilation of information and skills, the evaluation of these prerequisites and the development of new knowledge and abilities. The Outputs refer to the knowledge, skills and abilities both students' and teachers' achieve and internalize through the teaching and forming process they've been part in . But the outcome of teaching also related to a more complex component obtained as a result of the interaction of the teaching environment, the economic, social and psychological conditions in which students and teachers perform, the knowledge development challenges and opportunities accepted or missed by the actors involved with students' and teachers' initial inputs. This metaphorical component may be associated with the experience gained by those involved in the process, the changes in their mentality, the development of a sort of intuition and the formation of a behavior that shapes the future professional. The Suppliers are the providers of the Inputs, in our case being the students, the head of the

school, student's family, the instructors, the society. The Customers are the beneficiaries of the outcomes of the educational act, namely the students, their families, society, the instructors.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the underlying research, on the arguments and findings presented in the article several recommendations may be formulated to accompany the QM process in upper secondary education in the view of ensuring its continuous improvement and sustainability on the long-run. The education system in Romania is in a process of continuous reform but evidence from the reports of the European Commission support the idea that as compared to other European countries, Romania is for sure below its potential (Radu & Gogu, 2018). Among the several issues the system is facing, there are some that should and can be immediately addressed without additional substantial efforts. In this regard we present a set of recommendations and proposals for the two approaches of QM in education.

For the approach of external QM in upper secondary education:

- the periodical reviewing, updating and simplification of the evaluation criteria, standards and indicators in order to place more emphasis on the 'soft' elements involved in the process, that is students, teachers and communities, on the quality of the knowledge and skills acquired and investments in their future professional development, on the quality of the impact the outcomes of the learning process have on society and economy;
- the reformulation of the criteria and indicators presented in the standards in order to follow the principles of quality management, that is to define them in a straightforward, clear and quantifiable form but also in a form that enables a more exact evaluation of the corresponding criteria in order to operationalize easier with them and to be able to observe progress in a more comparable manner;

For the approach of internal QM in upper secondary education:

- the development and use of business simulations to enable practical training on the economic processes in a real company as a method of gaining practical insights in accounting, finance, marketing, human resources, project management, business administration as well as the development and the providing of a software designed to help in the running of the simulations;
- the organization and participation of teachers and experts involved in QA at the level of education institutions in conferences in partnership with representatives from higher education institutions, from the business environment, experts, coaches and consultants to keep up to date with the trends at national and international level as well as with the requirements and necessities of the labor market;
- greater involvement on the side of the education institutions through initiatives that envisage the training and forming of teachers/ instructors, focused on the upgrading of their theoretical knowledge but also on the development of their pedagogical methods and their creativity, their abilities as actors, influencers and coaches in a highly impacting long term mission. A recommendation in this regard refers to the increase in the number of school education mobility projects at the level of education institutions in the Erasmus+ program that may be an effective approach in raising the quality of the teaching skills and of the formal background, contributing to the increase in teachers' desire to develop, to grow as well as a giving a significant sense of belonging;
- the creation of some databases with e-books, articles and projects to be consulted by the students in a library organized at the level of the institution or on the computers in the existing laboratories.

#### REFERENCES

- Antony, J., Krishan, N., Cullen, D. & Kumar, M. (2012). Lean Six Sigma for higher education institutions (HEIs): challenges, barriers, success factors, tools/techniques. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 61(8), pp. 940-948.

- ARACIP (2017a). Cerințe minimale pentru serviciul educațional furnizat de învățământul liceal și postliceal, filiera tehnologică – inclusiv învățământ special integrat. Retrieved September 20, 2018, from <http://beta.aracip.eu/descarca/0/Despre%20ARACIP/Despre%20ARACIP/Legislatie/Cerinte%20minimale%20invatamant%20liceal%20si%20postliceal%20tehnologic.pdf>.
- ARACIP (2017b). *Standarde specifice de calitate pentru nivelul liceal teoretic/ liceal integrat*. Retrieved September 20, 2018, from <http://beta.aracip.eu/descarca/0/Despre%20ARACIP/Despre%20ARACIP/Legislatie/Standarde%20specifice%20de%20calitate%20liceu%20teoretic%20acreditare.pdf>.
- ARACIP (2017c). *RAPORTUL NAȚIONAL PRIVIND STAREA CALITĂȚII în UNITĂȚILE DE ÎNVĂȚĂMÂNT PREUNIVERSITAR PUBLIC DIN MEDIUL RURAL*. Retrieved September 20, 2018, from <http://beta.aracip.eu/descarca/0/Resurse/Starea%20calitatii%20educatiei/raportul%20national%20septembrie%202015.pdf>.
- Balzer, B. (2015). Where is the Evidence-Based Support for Lean Higher Education? The Research, the Challenge, and the Opportunities. Paper presented at the *Lean HE Hub Conference*. Ontario, USA.
- Cretan, G.C. (2015). Higher education and the labour market: evidence from Romania and European Union member states. *Theoretical and Applied Economics. Special Issue, XXII*, pp. 63-74.
- Drăgulănescu, N. (2018). European Quality Assurance in Education and Romania's Position within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). Paper presented at the *15th edition of the international Conference for Quality and Dependability, CCF-2016*. Sinaia, Romania.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (n.d.). *Quality Assurance in Early Childhood and School Education*. Retrieved August 29, 2018, from [https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/quality-assurance-early-childhood-and-school-education-56\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/quality-assurance-early-childhood-and-school-education-56_en).
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice (2015). *Assuring Quality in Education Policies and Approaches to School Evaluation in Europe*. Retrieved September 21, 2018, from <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/4a2443a7-7bac-11e5-9fae-01aa75ed71a1/language-ro>.
- Hernandez, H. (2010). Quality audit as a driver for compliance to ISO 9001:2008 standards. *The TQM Journal*, 22(4), 454-466.
- ISO (n.d.). *The process approach in ISO 9001:2015*. Retrieved October 5, 2018, from [https://www.iso.org/iso/iso9001\\_2015\\_process\\_approach.pdf](https://www.iso.org/iso/iso9001_2015_process_approach.pdf).
- ISO 19011 (2002). *Guidelines on Quality and/or Environmental Management Systems Auditing*. International Organization for Standards, Geneva.
- ISO 9001 (2015). *Quality Management Systems - Requirements*. International Organization for Standards, Geneva.
- Ministry of National Education (2017). *Admiterea 2017. Admiterea in licee 2017*. Retrieved October 5, 2018 from <http://static.admitere.edu.ro/2017/ierarhie/B/>.
- OECD (2018). *The future of education and skills. Education 2030*. Retrieved September 1, 2018, from [https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20\(05.04.2018\).pdf](https://www.oecd.org/education/2030/E2030%20Position%20Paper%20(05.04.2018).pdf)
- Parsons, K. M. (2015, February 10). Students are not customers. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved September 10, 2018, from [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/keith-m-parsons/students-are-not-customer\\_b\\_6310462.html](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/keith-m-parsons/students-are-not-customer_b_6310462.html).
- Radu, C. & Gogu, E. (2018). Issues and Insights Regarding Tertiary Education. A Romanian Perspective. Paper presented at the *11th International Management Conference*. Bucharest, Romania.