



Journal of Intercultural Management and Ethics

JIME

ISSN 2601 - 5749, ISSN-L 2601 - 5749

published by

Center for Socio-Economic Studies and Multiculturalism
Iasi, Romania
www.csesm.warter.ro

Special Editor

Liviu Warter, Ph.D.

Center for Socio-Economic Studies and Multiculturalism, Iasi, Romania

E-mail: liviu@warter.ro

TABLE OF CONTENT

| | |
|---|-----|
| Editorial | 5 |
| Liviu Warter | |
| A Treatise on the Jackass in Academe: How Arrogance and Self-Centeredness Destroy the Credibility of Higher Education | 9 |
| Hershey H. Friedman, Linda Weiser Friedman | |
| Necessary New Competencies for the Future Generations at Work | 29 |
| Fons Trompenaars | |
| Plagiarism in Scientific Articles. A Brief Review | 47 |
| Oana Isailă, Hostiuc Sorin | |
| From Knowledge Enrichment to Career Development: The Case of Higher Education in Israel..... | 53 |
| Tamar Almor, Avi Shnider | |
| Insights Into Plagiarism | 65 |
| Bianca Hanganu, Beatrice Gabriela Ioan | |
| Empowering Changemakers for a Better Society: The Case of Iéseg School of Management, France | 73 |
| Grant Douglas | |
| The Role of Medical Higher Education in Promoting Nondiscrimination - The Sibiu Experience | 81 |
| Silviu Morar | |
| Building a Culture of Integrity..... | 95 |
| Thomas D. Zweifel | |
| A Brief Conversation on Quality and Ethics in Higher Education | 105 |
| Ioan Chirila, Iulian Warter | |
| The Nexus Between Ethics and Quality in Higher Education. Case Study | 113 |
| Iulian Warter | |
| Cold War Ain't Over Yet (Political Correctness and the Academic Caste)..... | 143 |
| Slawomir Magala | |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Authorship Criteria for Scientific Articles | 153 |
| Hostiuc Sorin, Oana Isailă, Maria Aluaş | |
| How Perceive the Students on Political Sciences the Academic Performance and Integrity? Exploratory Case Study | 159 |
| Silviu-Petru Grecu | |
| The Impact of Organizational Culture in Higher Education. Case Study..... | 173 |
| Liviu Warter | |
| Letter to the Editor..... | 201 |
| Cristian G. Curcă | |
| Letter to the Editor..... | 205 |
| Hershey H. Friedman, Frimette Kass-Shraibman | |
| Book Review | 209 |
| Aurelian Virgil Băluţă | |

THE NEXUS BETWEEN ETHICS AND QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION. CASE STUDY

Iulian Warter, Ph.D.

Center for Socio-Economic Studies and Multiculturalism, Iasi, Romania

E-mail: iulian@warter.ro

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discover the main issues regarding the quality and ethics in higher education, including the nexus between them. It is based on a case study on The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration (FEAA) within the “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University (UAIC) in Iasi, Romania. The results indicate that it is essential to promote ethical values. Organizations in higher education implement clear quality and ethical standards, transparent procedures and openness in communication to increase accountability, promote mutual trust and support among members of the organization, along with transparent analysis of ethical issues and dilemmas that mark the existence of organizations. Due to the competitive and turbulent nature of higher education, even the best organizations will start experiencing performance problems if they are not willing or able to innovate and introduce change. Future research should focus on the concept of performance in higher education and the relationship between ethical and quality aspects.

Key words: quality management, ethics, higher education, culture

Abbreviations

UAIC - “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University in Iasi, Romania

FEAA - Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

ARACIS - Romanian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education

1. Introduction

In the academic world, research in the fields of quality and ethics is often separate. One reason for this is that the origins are very different; ethics derives from philosophy, while quality management has developed from management studies. Given current developments in both areas, there are important justifications for linking the two disciplines. In both the quality management and the ethics of the organization, it is a common practice to discuss the issues of responsibility.

Warter & Warter (2018a) show that ethics is closely linked to quality. An organization that does not meet ethical rules and standards is not able to provide high quality services and / or products. Furthermore, non-compliance with the minimum quality standards established within the organization raises ethical issues. It is obvious that ethics and maintaining quality standards are two issues that can not be addressed separately.

It is important for all stakeholders in the organization to understand that to some extent all organizations are constantly confronted with change. The basic aspects of ethics and quality may undergo minor or more extensive changes. Some components disappear, new ones are accepted, and existing ones can change in an observable way. Paradoxically, although the pace of change varies from one organization to another, when we look over time, there is nothing as constant as change.

Building and consolidating a strong organizational culture is not being achieved in a short time. Those responsible with ethics and quality who intend to create a culture of respect face great challenges, but they can and should create it. Culture begins with the tone given by

the leaders of the organization, a code of conduct and quality, but they do not build a culture of ethics and respect alone. Culture is organic, manifested by the way employees work and interact with others, and how they support the organization's purpose, mission and values.

Warter & Warter (2017b) emphasize that ethics is not a recent discovery. Throughout the centuries, philosophers in their struggle with human behavior have developed different approaches to ethics, each leading to a different conclusion. The word "ethics" comes from the Greek word "Ethikos", which refers to character.

The behavior of organizations and their leaders is largely influenced by the characteristics / dimensions of the culture to which they belong, and there are a number of ways in which organizations can create a culture that promotes ethics (Warter & Warter, 2017c).

Ethical profiles can affect the behavior of individuals in a number of ways. Thus, the ethical profile that an individual brings into an interaction directly affects the behavior of that individual. In addition, individual perception of the individual's ethical profile in an interaction can influence the behavior (Warter & Warter, 2017a).

Warter & Warter (2018b) draw attention to the fact that professional ethics is a component of professional culture, with two correlations and mutual influences between them. Professional ethics is a system of norms and values that regulate human behavior in the field of work, being of great importance to the organization.

People have found many ways to describe quality. Some of the most popular definitions for quality are: A degree of excellence; Conformance to requirements; Totality of characteristics which act to satisfy a need; Fitness for use; Fitness for purpose; Freedom from defects; Delighting customers.

All of the above gauges of quality are useful, as they each contain elements of what quality means to users of products and services. However, for quality to be embedded in a product or service there must be a set of measurable performance standards, which when achieved will guarantee the desired level of quality ("What is Quality", n.d.).

Popoola, et al. (2017) reveal that: "Ethics institutionalization, or the degree to which an organization explicitly and implicitly incorporates ethics into its decision-making process, is operationalized along two dimensions: implicit (i.e., IEI) and explicit (i.e., EEI) ethics institutionalization".

Bendermacher, Egbrink, Wolfhagen, & Dolmans (2017) reveal that "Quality culture in HEI results from an interplay between contributing organisational context elements, working mechanisms and quality related outcomes. HEI attempts to address the structural/managerial dimension of quality culture are reflected in their attention to improvement strategies, evaluation systems, staff and student involvement, student centeredness and attention to policies, procedures and responsibilities."

According to Orsingher (2006): "Attention is increasingly being focused on quality management in higher education institutions throughout Europe. A large number of education institutions all over Europe have seen a progressive withdrawal of the State as the main financing body of the university system. After granting higher education institutional autonomy, the State has required more transparency and accountability. A series of external factors, such as the labour market, the European higher education arena and the increasing social relevance of research and higher education led universities to the implementation of quality assurance procedures".

2. Literature review

2.1. Ethics in higher education

Education stands at that boundary between the internal, subjective, unique personal history of each individual, and the social, collective and objective (or at least inter-subjective) generation of publicly available knowledge. (Turner, 2011).

Orkodashvili (2010) emphasizes that another significant issue that policymakers should consider is the effect that corruption in higher education can have on the Bologna Process. Many countries in the Europe and Central Asian region are participating in the Bologna Process with members of the European Union.

Paulson (2016) states that institutions of higher learning face the decision to make changes due to multiple factors impacting academe. Changes to policy, changes in governance and leadership, as well as changes in curriculum, programs, and instructional methods are common as colleges and universities. While such changes may be necessary, they can often be difficult or stressful for faculty.

Although there are consultations when major decisions are made, opinions do not influence decisions taken at the executive level. University top management continue to pressure faculties to take in more students so that they can generate income to retain the university's competitiveness and viability (Kamarudin, 2017).

Olaskoaga-Larrauri, Barrenetxea-Ayesta, Cardona-Rodríguez, Campo, & Barandiaran-Galdós (2016) too reflect upon this phenomenon and claim that the deans do not seem concerned about the level of skills currently held by teaching staff, but they do express concern that low levels of motivation and a lack of commitment to their universities on the part of lecturers (two variables which are clearly interconnected) may jeopardise the quality of education provided.

There is a need for increased creative engagement on the part of the teaching staff, commitment to good communication with the students, introduction of new teaching approaches that will facilitate learning. Teachers should provide for building up students' confidence by enabling collaboration and encouraging students' creative and critical attitude toward academic contents, scientific theories and social phenomena (Denkova, Stojanovski, & Dzamtovska Zdravkovska, 2016).

According to Goos and Salomons (2017), course evaluations often suffer from low response rates, and more so if the evaluation is online. This is a first-order problem not yet sufficiently considered in the literature, despite student evaluations of teaching (SET) scores commonly being used by departments for the purposes of awarding faculty teaching prizes and making promotion decisions, by students in course selection decisions, and for institutional rankings and accountability.

The increasing formalization, codification and centralization of the systems for managing student appeals and complaints mean that there are inevitably legacy issues around managing the previously local systems, roles, cultures and remedies. While centralization (of policy if not quite of management) of complaints and appeals in principle will improve consistency, transparency and monitoring, there is the danger of losing the supportive and solution-focused pragmatism which probably characterizes much of the work of senior tutors and academic advisors around the sector as McGhee (2011) points out.

The results presented herein showed the institutional evaluation as opportune and necessary towards a model of university management. It is believed that the greatest obstacle to the development of institutional evaluation is the treatment of the results of the evaluation processes, which should support better decisions that promote the improvement of institutional activities; there is also some concern in the dissemination of evaluation results as unsatisfactory (Silva, Borges, Borges, & Elias, 2017).

Most of universities have some form of faculty governance in which professors participate with the administration in crafting academic policy. Without constant attention and encouragement, however, such systems can quickly fall into disrepair. Many governing

bodies that include members of the faculty are populated by professors of lesser distinction who debate at great length without commanding much respect from their colleagues. Many more are too large to deal expeditiously with the problems before them. The participants are not accountable for their performance, nor do they receive any reward if they perform well. Some are selected for the wrong reasons (Bok, 2003).

I agree with Keenan (2011) when he argues that a great step forward for any university would be to establish school wide committees to do post-tenure and post-promotion reviews. Unlike most professions, at most universities we find little horizontal accountability once faculty receive tenure, permanent appointments, or endowed chairs. Though we have seen some initiatives in which a provost or academic vice-president requires some reporting from faculty in these appointments, we need some horizontal structures of accountability, like a university wide post-tenure review committee.

Bok (2003) asserts that committees often have too few professors possessing relevant knowledge and experience and too many who are appointed for other reasons. Under these conditions, faculty governance can easily sink into longer and longer debates about less and less, accomplishing little of real importance for professors while causing frustration and delay for the administration.

A quite similar approach (Macfarlane, 2004) considers that adopting a virtue ethics approach does not provide simple rules for ethical decision making. It does not prescribe a particular course of action for any given circumstance. It also assumes a certain level of agreement about the nature of virtues within the community.

There is now a pressing need for greater understanding of academic integrity across all practice elements (i.e. teaching, research and service) and the raising of standards of professional conduct. There is already ample evidence, sadly, that academics can behave unethically (Macfarlane, Zhang, & Pun, 2014).

Another interesting aspect is offered by Moore (2006). He argues that while the language of ‘managers’ and ‘annual plans’ may be somewhat alien to HEIs, the concepts of fostering good conversations and embedding them in organisational mechanisms are not difficult to assimilate. Here, then, is an alternative suggestion for how HEIs might ‘manage ethics’: rely primarily upon, and encourage, the integrity of staff and students; reinforce among staff and students the institution’s mission and values, ensuring that the latter includes a high-level, aspirational statement about moral values as well as those to do more with ‘what this organisation values’ such as research or teaching or making a contribution to the local community.

Bratton and Strittmatter (2013), for example, ask that with so many demographic, personality, and behavioral traits affecting ethical behavior, is there one characteristic that outweighs the others? Given that past studies have found such strong and statistically significant relationships between academic and workplace integrity, it can be argued that academic honesty is a defining element in the relationship between individual factors and business ethics.

It is important to remember that it is not only in industrializing nations that publishers have been noted to engage in dubious practices. Even high-status established and reputable academic publishers in the West have been found to be in breach of expected academic norms. Perhaps one of the best examples was the decision by Elsevier Australia to publish six “academic journals” sponsored by the pharmaceutical company Merck (e.g., Australasian Journal of Cardiology) (Houghton, 2017).

Rujoiu and Rujoiu (2014) state that it is known by many names: unethical behavior in higher education, academic fraud, academic misconduct. It takes many forms: plagiarism, cheating on tests or exams, cybercheating. But all describe the characteristics of the same phenomenon: academic dishonesty.

A fundamental premise in university education is that it must be based on the learning of scientific and pertinent knowledge in systematically critical perspective, which contributes to the future professional to think on its own and it is always open to confront certainties within its professional field. This educational perspective is annulled when holders of courses say that “there is no need to look for problems where knowledge is already solved, as this will take us to question everything, there is no point to destabilize what has been achieved and create insecurity among students and teachers” (Zavala, 2015).

Speight’s (2016) comprehensive study suggests that should a university desire to resolve the whistleblowing issue, the ways to solve it include: a strong and clear commitment to ethical behavior, open lines of communication within the university, which gives access to the university administration by any student, faculty, or staff members who feel there is a need to present their concerns, and above all willingness on the part of the university administration to admit mistakes, publicly if necessary.

In a different approach, Zavala (2015) reveals that there are strong critical signs of the scarce ethicity in the type of university teaching dominated by conservatism and the central concern to keep the job position, even, at the expense of castrating students’ creativity and autonomy. An ethical weakness of the teachers is embodied in the type of educational economism as they do not fulfill the social commitment and the institutional mandate of contributing to the development of professional competencies, as well as forming the university ethos in student’s culture, where critical vision and vocation from every field of knowledge is one of the guidelines of teaching and learning.

Some countries have acquired a reputation for academic dishonesty, raising questions about all graduates and doubts about all institutions. Corruption can arise at the early stage of recruitment and admission. Students may feel they have to pay a shadow price, to be admitted to a particular university program. Some students pay bribes as an insurance policy, because they do not want to be left behind for not paying a bribe (Heyneman, 2014).

Ospian (2008) criticizes the fact that corruption in faculty–administration relations finds its expression in unfair treatment, promotions, and dismissals. The major form of corruption in student–administration relations is breach of contract, when the university administration fails to deliver quality educational services as stipulated by the contract. Finally, corruption in relations between state and students includes financial aid fraud, when students defraud the government about their ability to pay, and legal status, when students use educational programmes to gain and maintain their alien status in the country.

In consequence, management needs ethics, because people are not born ethical or unethical. Ethics is taught and these facts make it necessary for an implementation in organizational management. The most important ethical issues for universities are: fair treatment, academic freedom, responsibility for content expertise, plagiarism, teacher-student relationship, discrimination, conflict of interest, impaired performance, use of institutional resources and also the classical virtues like truth, honesty, respect (Puiu & Ogarca, 2015).

In her comprehensive study, Feoktistova (2014) observes that Stephen P. Heyneman also characterizes a school system free from corruption: equality of access to education opportunity; fairness in the distribution of educational curricula and materials; fairness and transparency in the criteria for selection to higher and more specialized training; fairness in accreditation in which all institutions are judged by professional standards equally applied and open to public scrutiny; fairness in the acquisition of educational goods and services; balance and generosity in curricular treatment of cultural minorities and geographical neighbors; maintenance of professional standards of conduct by those who administer education institution and who teach in them, whether public or private.

Corruption is becoming customary for a substantial number of participants in the educational process. For example, the results of an empirical survey showed that 47 percent

of the respondents had taken part in corruption dealings (accepting a dacha or a bribe); 27 percent had not taken part in that phenomenon but had witnessed such cases; and 26 percent did not give an answer. In addition, 58 percent have a negative attitude toward corruption, while 14 percent have a positive attitude, 13 percent are indifferent toward it, and 15 percent did not give an answer (Gostev, Demchenko, & Borisova, 2015).

According to Puiu and Ogarca (2015), the issues being more specific for the Romanian context are: financial management practices, forgery, falsification, receiving payments for hours not worked or bribe. To fight against them, there should be proper committees, regular controls, rules and procedures to combat plagiarism and a better communication and a deep analysis of the reported problems.

A quite similar approach (Sabic-El-Rayess, 2013) considers that in other words, classification of corruption, its extensiveness, and the degree of tolerance for corruption have become important determinants in whether corruption perpetuates itself: when students believe corruption is widespread and acceptable form of behavior with no consequences, they may be more inclined to engage in it. Such conditionalities, however, are more likely to exist when higher education systems are fragmented and when institutional leadership is motivated by ethnic or political aspirations rather than by a quest for academic excellence.

However, the legal aspect is designed to combat those who commit acts of corruption rather than the causes of corruption; the practice of detecting and punishing particular offenders is not capable of defining corruption in education as a systemic phenomenon that acts over a prolonged period. The fundamental limitation of the legal approach in research on corruption in the system of college and university education is the point, first and foremost, that the corruption is covert. Complicity also plays a role. As a rule, an act of corruption does not lead to complaints, since the guilty parties all gain mutual benefit from an illegal deal (Borisova, 2014)

For instance, Osipian (2009) reveals that some students may want to solve their examinations problems not through professors but through the dean's office, moving from semester to semester and from examination session to examination session. Clientelism can exist between certain HEIs and the state regulating authorities. In this case, HEI that have clientele relations with the authorities may be granted certain privileges, such as easy accreditation, state funding, research funds, etc.

Corruption has a negative effect on quality. The university becomes a high-priced, low-quality good if officials admit or give high grades to the less qualified. Instead of increasing internal competition, corruption limits it. Since honesty rests on the proof of a lack of violations, a university suspected of being corrupt reduces the power of its graduates in the labour market. (Heyneman, 2015).

The study by Chapman and Lindner (2016) examines the efforts to combat corruption. The authors suggest that may also require the creation or modification of organizational structures and administrative procedures aimed at breaking the grip of entrenched practices. This is particularly true in universities that operate as steep hierarchies, with decision-making power tightly held by those at the top. Steep hierarchies tend to work against transparency. As organizational structures are flattened, information tends to become more transparent and accessible, allowing more oversight of institutional practices.

A renowned scholar, Cahn (2011) offers a brief sketch of a professor he once knew. In his day he was a respected scholar. He regularly canceled classes. At those he attended, he arrived late, and when he did arrive he was generally unprepared. He gave no examinations, so he would have none to correct. In each course he assigned one term paper, to which he gave a cursory reading. If he liked the few pages he read, he gave the paper an A. If he didn't like them, he gave the paper a B. Students who submitted no paper received a C.

The author reveals that this grading system avoided most complaints, although on occasion a student who had received a B would protest that the grade should have been an A. The matter would always be settled quickly by the instructor's graciously consenting to alter the grade as requested. He left his mail unopened for weeks at a time, thus missing one deadline after another. He never attended a faculty meeting. He did attend departmental meetings, but whenever a critical vote was to be taken, he managed to be out of the room. When he was asked to fulfill an administrative task, his strategy was simple: he failed to appear at school and left the matter to the departmental secretary.

The same author concludes that this man was unethical. He held the honorable title of "professor" but systematically abused the responsibilities of that position. He should have been viewed in the same light as a corrupt corporate executive or a crooked judge. Like the marketplace or the courtroom, the university has its share of scamps (Cahn, 2011).

2.2. Quality in higher education

Kamarudin (2017) highlights that nowadays, the activities of a university are underpinned with market values: individualism, choice, competition, innovation, efficiency and measurable performance outcomes, dictating every aspect of higher education activities.

The first US ranking, which appeared in 1906 and was managed until 1933, is attributed to James McKeen Cattell, a professor of psychology. Many others followed such as Stephen Visher in 1921 or Beverly Waugh Kunkel and Donald Prentice from 1930 onwards. In 1925, a university president, Raymond Hughes, a former professor of chemistry, was the first to publish a ranking of graduate programmes from a range of departments in 20 fields covering 36 institutions. After World War II, three increasingly comprehensive assessments became major references and dominated the field until the 1970s (Paradeise & Thoenig, 2015).

For example, state-run higher education assessment schemes were formulated in China at three levels in the following sequence: undergraduate education, postgraduate education, and vocational education and private higher education. Undergraduate level assessment was first to be conducted in China. From 1994 to 2001, three forms of quality assessment, quality accreditation, excellence assessment, and random assessment, were put into practice in China. (Shuiyun, 2016).

According to Naidoo (2013), external quality assurance is not necessarily a value-free and neutral exercise aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning, as promised in its early conceptualisation and implementation phases. Even when its political agenda is explicitly articulated, especially in societies in transition, where the stated goal is linked to democratisation and advancement of communities neglected by previous regimes, the implementation and outcomes (intended and unintended) may not necessarily result in those seemingly noble and morally justifiable intents.

The implementation of quality at institutional level is dependent upon a host of interrelated factors which can serve as barrier or driver: attitude, leadership, adequate resourcing, clear policy signalling, effective communication, historical tradition, planning and managerial commitment, stakeholder resistance or non-engagement, staff training and development, effective measurement and feedback loops. Policy always has to be filtered, in its institutional implementation, through organisational cultures, with their relative degrees of dynamism and flexibility (Eggs, 2014).

Šedžiuvienė & Tamutienė (2016) show that the conception of quality is disclosed in the paradigm of quality culture orienting the perception of quality into the corporate level of higher education in the scientific and practical discourse. Neither scientific discourse, nor projects and discussions dedicated to practical issues provide a unified definition of quality culture..

Some studies, such as Gaftandzhieva, Doneva, & Totkov (2018), argue that a globally recognized approach to quality assurance in HE is using complementary systems from internal and external forms of monitoring and evaluation carried out under standardized rules, methodologies and procedures. Worldwide, a number of specialised independent institutions are involved with the development of standards, specifications and guidelines for QE. Because of the collaborative work of ISO, ICE and CEN, a number of standards related to the quality of learning and education have been established.

The provision of education in the area of public administration has increased significantly in recent years, raising questions about its quality and adequacy. These questions are intrinsically linked not only to the higher education system but also to country-specific characteristics relating to the organisation of public administration and its long-standing traditional approaches to issues of public administration (Sarrico & Alves, 2016).

Resistance was found to be due to different reasons, including academics' perceptions that quality assurance is an imposition and prescription; has a highly bureaucratic character; is not aligned with the 'academic endeavour'; has unintended consequences on personal and organisational behaviour; promotes inspection, regulation and standardisation; relates more to monitoring and control and less to enhancement and transformation; grasps the 'academic world' through the language and ideology of managerialism; and is based on procedures that are not entirely reliable and capable of addressing the 'essence' of the educational process, inducing improvements (Cardoso, Rosa, & Stensaker, 2016).

Yingqiang & Yongjian (2016) claim that during the step-by-step process of rationalization, higher education quality assurance as a kind of power gradually alters the power divisions within and outside institutions. The appearance of quality assurance indicates that the power to define and assess quality is increasingly transferred into the hands of external stakeholders. Such a transfer of power breaks the power monopoly of academic personnel to define and practice quality, enabling more stakeholders to intervene in the quality assurance agenda, so that traditional academic work continues to reflect the interests and demands of the external community.

Calls for more variegated activities and assessment forms, for providing more systematic and constructive feedback to students, for creating more supportive learning environments through technology use and for involving students in research and research-like activities, are frequently brought to the fore as ways of enhancing the quality of higher education at the study programme and course levels (Nerland & Prøitz, 2018).

Friedman & Friedman (2018) highlight that college or university that wants to improve efficiency and quality has to emulate the new corporate models that stress reducing layers of bureaucracy. The goal at many innovative organizations is to flatten the organizational hierarchy as a way to promote open communications and enhance employee involvement.

Quality in higher education at institutional level cannot be ensured unless regular monitoring information based systems are put in place, so that decision is taken based on documented and recent information that takes into account the transformations in the requirements and expectations of the multiple educational stakeholders (Nicolesco & Dima, 2010).

Elkington & Evans (2017) observe that assessment practice is an integral part of curriculum design and it should be driving curriculum change in order to support students to better manage the learning requirements of 21st century environments within and beyond higher education. To support transformational assessment practices an integrated approach to assessment underpinned by sound pedagogical principles is required.

Mukhopadhyay, Tapaswi, Sudarsan, & Sudarsan (2018) underline that the quantum of funding plays an important role in determining the quality and quantity of research which in

turn could determine the number of publications, etc. This could bias opportunities for smaller HEIs with lesser funding in obtaining better ranks. The rational method would be to compare the publication rate – i.e. number of publications per teacher rather than absolute number of publications for HEIs.

A quality culture, as far as the well-being of students is concerned, requires that the institution is committed to, and is effective in promoting, their development. If the institution is ineffective in these respects, then it is very likely that it is lacking a strong quality culture and is experiencing some internal dysfunctioning (Yorke, 2000).

Cheng (2016) claims that current quality evaluation focuses on the assessment of designated knowledge and skills and the measurement of performance, ignoring that the fluid nature of the student mindset may affect their academic performance unpredictably. This, together with increased student fees and the view of students as customers, has encouraged the practice of universities needing to provide better ‘service’ to meet the expectation of students. As a result, it will compromise student learning in what to learn and limit their opportunities to fulfill their potential.

3. Methodology

The aim of this study is to discover the main issues regarding the quality and ethics, including the nexus between them.

In order to get a deep understanding of the quality and ethics in a particular context, an interpretive case study design was used. The interpretive case study design provides the possibility to explore the quality and ethics, including the nexus between them, within a particular setting and recognize relevant themes or patterns. This applies to a business school within a Romanian university that experienced the difficulties of transition to democracy and free market economy.

Quality and ethics in higher education is processual and relational. Hence, the topic rather calls for qualitative approaches to investigate how practices are organized and authorized and how their various elements relate to each other. This study provides exemplary elements that together contribute to answering the overall questions regarding quality and ethics.

The selection of the site was an important issue for this study in order to gain an in depth understanding of quality and ethics. The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration (FEAA) within the “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University (UAIC) in Iasi, Romania was the choice for this case study.

This case study is based on multiple sources of data in order to reveal the complexity of the quality and ethics issues. The main data sources were informal observation and document review (such as internal regulations, reports available to the public)

The methods for data collection include participant observation of teaching and learning activities in the courses, and the collection of course documents, assessments, knowledge resources and other materials. These data sources allowed obtaining information about the quality and ethics issues.

Informal observations were included, as they seemed relevant to gaining a broader understanding of the case. The present study is also based on public websites of “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University in Iasi, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration (FEAA), The Romanian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (ARACIS).

In order to cover most of the aspects regarding quality and ethics, the following public documents were used:

1. Assesment report ARACIS 2015;
2. Students’ Report ARACIS 2015
3. ARACIS foreign assesor report 2015

4. The Quality Assurance Code of the "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi
5. Quality Manual of "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi
6. Institutional Development Operational Plan UAIC 2019
7. Regulation on the organization and operation of the quality assurance department
8. Code of Ethics and professional deontology
9. Annual Ethics Committee Reports 2016-2018
10. Regulation of the Ethics Committee
11. FEAA Operational Plan for 2019
12. Decisions of the Ethics Committee from 2016-2018
13. Results of teacher evaluation by students
14. Internal Quality Assessment Reports 2017-2018
15. Rector's Annual Report 2018

Although they are public too, it was not possible to get from the University and from the faculty other documents like:

1. Statistics on taught courses updating
2. Statistical data on the employment of graduates in recent years
3. Statistical data on abandoning and interruption of studies by students
4. Statistical data on the quality of the teaching and research process
5. Data on collaboration with the business environment
6. Academic positions of the Department of Management, Marketing and Business Administration
7. Structure of teaching staff at the Department of Management, Marketing and Business Administration (hourly payment, assistants, lecturers, associate professors, professors)
8. Statistical data on the publication of scientific research results (books, articles by category, etc.) or access to the Register of the research and development activity results

Themes and issues from informal observation were reviewed and compared to documents to discern the main matters that form the big picture of quality and ethics.

University staff may benefit from the conclusions of this study. It depends on the University's leadership to choose to share the conclusions with members of the university following the conclusion of the study.

In line with the resources of this study, I decided to include a number of issues selected on the following criteria:

- Critical thinking supporting
- Transparency
- Ethics regulations
- Feedback importance
- Academic staff evaluation
- Quality assessment
- Benchmarks and performance indicators
- The relevance of study programs on the labor market
- Ethics and relevance of research
- General Regulations

Assuming that quality and ethics aspects may be of greater importance for management students, I decided to focus more on the Management, Marketing and Business Administration Department within the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration.

4. FEAA Presentation and History

Founded on the 26th of October 1860, shortly after the formation of the United Principalities, the University of Iasi, as it was originally called, is the first modern university in Romania. In 1942, the institution's name changed to "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University.

The total number of students in the academic year 2018-2019 is shown in the table below:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Bachelor studies (full time and distance learning) | 16 604 |
| Master studies (full time and distance learning) | 5 240 |
| Doctoral studies (full time and distance learning) | 772 |
| Total | 22 616 |

The structure of the tenured teaching staff is presented in the following table:

| | |
|----------------------|------------|
| Professors | 160 |
| Associate Professors | 236 |
| Lecturers | 273 |
| Assistant Professors | 63 |
| Total | 732 |

Other categories of staff are listed in the following table:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Total number of associated teaching staff | 715 |
| Total number of research staff | 95 |
| Total number of auxiliary teaching staff | 479 |
| Total number of non-teaching staff | 550 |

The Faculty of Economics was established on the 19th of July 1962. During the academic year 1998-1999, the name changed to "The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration". Since 2005, the Faculty has been implementing the Bologna system of education: 3 years (180 credits) for BA studies; 2 years (120 credits) for MA studies, and 3 years for PhD studies.

5. Ethics at FEAA

Ethical behavior is based on the transparency and fairness of stakeholder information. Unfortunately, the FEAA and university leadership does not provide public data and some of the data provided is incorrect. For example, external assessor Prof. Dr. Winfried Muller mentions in his report that: "The Internal Quality Assessment Report 2013/14 (IQAR) is not totally clear with respect to the number of teaching positions and the number of students. The presented tables are partially contradicting. Similarly the information on study programmes needs some additional explanations. Some programmes seem to exist only on paper. The financial resources of the University do mainly come from the government, from tuition- fees of students as well as from research and consulting. In the IQAR details are only given for the research income" (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

The same assessor noticed the following: "UAIC did not prepare a separate self-evaluation report for this ARACIS evaluation. The Internal Quality Assurance Report 2013/14 (IQAR) was provided for information. Naturally this Report is not very self-critical and does not contain any Swot Analysis. In addition, the data provided in the Report is not always consistent. The number of students in the year 2012/13 is given as 19177, probably counting only undergraduate students. The total number of teaching positions is given as 1407, but the detailed table shows 1761 positions including 84 research positions. Another

table gives 94 Bachelor degree programmes but the following table shows only 79 such programmes. Evidently the bigger number also contains 13 distance-learning programmes and 2 part-time programmes, which were not considered separately in the table.” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

FEAA and UAIC have a great resistance to any change although the changing environment brings many challenges and opportunities. External evaluator Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller remarks: “University will certainly survive also the next 50 years without considerable changes. Hence the majority of its members does not feel a strong pressure to change anything. This makes it difficult for the university management to respond to new challenges and changing contexts” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

In UAIC there is no culture of encouraging students' critical thinking. On the contrary, there are cases where critical thinking is repressed by members of the UAIC and FEAA leadership. External assessor Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller notes: “The meetings with the huge groups of students, graduates and employers did not really disclose any big problems. As usual students and graduates did not have severe complaints. ... Contact and information flow between regular students and their representatives in the different boards seem to be very loose. The involvement and engagement of students in UAIC’s activities and governing bodies is not noticeable. Graduates and employers argued for a broad education at the University, because special skills and competencies have to be learned anyhow in the job” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

The same assessor recommends the following: Try to motivate students to take more responsibility and ownership for the development of the University (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

Unfortunately, there is no real dialogue, although university documents mention that it is necessary (UAIC, n.d.d.; UAIC. n.d.e.).

The existence of a “habit” of voting decisions that should be made by the rector or the dean, to convert individual responsibility into a collective one, may embody an unethical or even unlawful aspect (for example, the approval of problematic teaching staff appointments). External evaluator Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller makes a recommendation: “Try to avoid huge collective decision boards and exempt as many academic teachers as possible from administrative and bureaucratic work in order to give them time for teaching and research” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

Some teaching staff have even more leadership positions (apart from attending councils and committees). For example: a vice-rector is the director of the Botanical Garden, the director of the Doctoral School of Economics and Business Administration is also the director of the Department of Social and Human Sciences. These job concentrations raise questions about the quality of work, but also about ethics.

The lack of transparency regarding the academic positions and the filling of the vacant positions is an unethical practice that leads to a decrease in the quality of the didactic process. External evaluator Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller comments in his report: “UAIC should stop the carry-over of unrealistic vacant staff positions from year to year and open new positions when necessary. Similarly, only existing study programmes should be listed and programmes figuring only on paper should be at least marked” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

The presentation of documents must be clear and transparent. The evaluating experts recommend: “... improving the presentation of the curriculum...” (ARACIS, nd.a.).

The UAIC Ethics Committee, as constituted according to the UAIC's internal regulations, not only that can not achieve its natural purpose but can be a tool of pressure on students and teaching staff. Foreign assessor Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller underlines: “I do not think that an ethic commission composed only by members from the institution can really handle sensitive cases. I strongly recommend to install — if necessary informally - an inter-

university commission with half members coming from UAIC and the other half from other universities” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

Interestingly, the Ethics Committee has no legal responsibility (UAIC, n.d.k.).

Furthermore, it may be a breach of ethics to grant various rewards to members of the Ethics Committee, in accordance with Article 22 of the Ethics Commission Regulation (UAIC, n.d.k.).

Although there are clear provisions on how to refer the Ethics Committee, they are violated by the University's leadership and the violation is accepted by the Ethics Committee. For example, the Dean of FEAA notifies the Committee on behalf of a group of subordinates, the referral is sent to BECA (Board of Directors) and from there it is forwarded to the Ethics Committee signed by the interim Rector.

Another complaint that is an attack on person and not based on evidence of alleged acts is accepted by the Ethics Committee, and the one accused is placed in a position to exculpate facing assumptions and lies of the person who filed the complaint.

The above are contrary to Article 11 of the Ethics Committee Regulation (UAIC, n.d.k.).

Perhaps most serious is the fact that the Ethics Committee is judging by an Unlawful Ethics Code (so declared by the Romanian Ministry of Education). According to the Committee's annual reports, this has been going on for years (UAIC, n.d.m.; n.d.n.)

The existence of critical views of some students is repressed by opposition with a large number of students who, from disinterest or fear, make critical views irrelevant. Foreign evaluator Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller highlights: “I think that the visited universities and ARACIS should reconsider limits for the size of the meetings with students, graduates and employers. Discussions within huge groups of more than 50 participants do not really contribute to a good knowledge of the institution or disclose problems. It is also somehow embarrassing to invite about 40 employers when there is only time for at most 10 participants to give a statement.” (ARACIS, n.d.b.)

The Ethics Committee is sometimes used as a tool to suppress critical thinking and freedom of opinion by breaking the Code of Ethics and Professional Deontology. It is abusively used to cover abuses made by senior executives (Dean of FEAA, Director of the Department of Management, etc.), violating the provisions of the Code of Ethics and Professional Ethics (UAIC, n.d.j.). The Ethics Committee is abusively seized by members of the leadership (Dean of FEAA, Director of Management Department, based on so-called evidence provided by the director of the Doctoral School of Economics and Business Administration) about the choice of dissertation topics, even if violates regulations and exceed attributions of the Ethics Committee. These should be within the competence of a Research Ethics Committee, which unfortunately does not exist within the UAIC. The Master's Degree Regulation states "The results of their own scientific research can be capitalized by articles published either in specialized journals or in the dissertation." (UAIC, n.d.h.)

More serious is that members of the Ethics Commission want to control the publications, which is a censorship attempt.

The ethics committee is used against those who report irregularities, although according to the regulations the notification of irregularities is not just a right but even an obligation (UAIC, n.d.i.)

Discussions with stakeholders are not organized to get fair and honest feedback. There is a practice of selecting people who are obedient or pressured. Foreign assessor Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller mentions: “The involvement of stakeholders into curricula discussions seems to be very informal based on personal relations. In the meeting with

graduates, it turned out that many of the attendees were following a master or PhD-programme at UAIC.” (ARACIS, n.d.b.)

Some discipline sheets are drawn up negligently and often are not respected. The evaluator students note: "There are cases of teachers who do not follow the discipline sheet or the examination method announced to the students" (ARACIS, n.d.c.). The same is remarked by the evaluating experts: "Respecting the examination procedure, according to the way presented in the discipline sheet" (ARACIS, n.d.a.).

These aspects are also acknowledged in the University's documents: "As negative aspects, we keep in mind the incomplete posting of the necessary information for the students on the course supports, the discipline sheets, the evaluation criteria, etc." (UAIC, n.d.c.).

The evaluator students also note that the results of the teachers' assessment by the students are not public despite the legal provisions (ARACIS, n.d.c.).

There is a lack of transparency regarding the income and expenditure, as noted by the evaluator students (ARACIS, n.d.c.).

Transparency occurs declaratively in several UAIC documents and in various forms (UAIC, n.d.d.; UAIC, n.d.e.),

Evaluator students note problems with litigation the marks (ARACIS, n.d.c.) although these aspects are clearly regulated: (FEAA, n.a., UAIC, n.d.h). Although the regulations have clear specifications, the FEAA dean treats them with indifference

Can you at least discuss the ethics and quality in the teaching process when the articles below are grossly broken and those who report this violation are threatened and filed to the Ethics Committee by the Director of the Management Department, the Dean of the FEAA with the BECA (Board of Directors) agreement?

The Recruitment, Evaluation and Promotion Regulation for Teaching and Research Staff has clear provisions: "Occupation of vacant teaching positions, with hourly payment, with own teaching staff or associate staff, is only made through a public offer. Faculties have the obligation to make public, each year, by September 1, the list of disciplines available to be filled by cumulation and hourly payment by the next academic year ... The list of all the disciplines and vacancies is made public by one of the following procedures: the web site of the faculty or department, the publication in the press, informative materials made available to other interested universities and institutions, from the country and abroad ... The assignment, with hourly payment, assumes full fulfillment of the responsibilities stipulated in the norm structure of teaching activity and other activities) "(UAIC, n.d.t.).

Unfortunately, not only assigning hours to hourly payment is a non-transparent process. Those who teach by hourly payment did not display the CV and scientific activity report on the website. Not even all the tenured teaching staff have posted the mentioned documents on the site. More serious is that some FEAA and UAIC leaders have not posted the documents on the site.

Academic positions are also not displayed on the FEAA website. The FEAA Dean even declined the request to provide the position of the Department of Management.

The lack of transparency can be exemplified by the impossibility of photocopying PhD thesis (according to the legal and regulatory provisions) from the FEAA branch of University Central Library Iasi. The request to photocopy parts of the doctoral thesis of the Director of the Management Department (Ph.D. supervisor himself) had as a result only the applicants' file to the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee should consider suspicious of plagiarism rather than those who make such a request.

The UAIC 2018 annual report contains an ambiguous statement: "In order to comply with copyright law, as well as H.G. 681/2011, public access is currently only allowed for consultation with doctoral dissertation summaries uploaded to the platform "(UAIC, n.d.c.).

The lack of transparency with serious influences on quality and ethics goes so far as to hide the results of teachers' evaluation, although the following article is very clear: "The University will publish the results of teacher evaluation by the students on each faculty's website, through the management of the faculty, in a readable format, according to the legislation. The results will include the centralization of all evaluations for each professor "(UAIC, n.d.s.).

Under the pretext of complying with personal data protection rules, the FEAA Board publishes anonymized reports to make them non-transparent (eg, taxes, scholarships, grades,)

Prohibiting public access to competitions for the employment of teaching staff is not just a breach of ethics but also a serious violation of UAIC law and regulations

The non-transparent system for scholarships is another negative example.

Introducing score points for attendance and obedience in the discipline sheet, including student appraisals by students that are taken into account in the final grade, also represent not only violations of ethics but also violations of regulations. The obedience brought higher grades than knowledge. For example, the grades in Organizational Communication and, ironically, in Quality Management show clearly that a student can get a high final grade, although the exam's grade was low and vice versa.

Perhaps most suggestive for lack of ethics is to include in the course support for Project Management discipline the method of getting rid of an unwanted employee.

Even the Guide to Dissertation elaboration includes provisions that would be hilarious if they could not be considered as a fraud inducement: "The bibliographic references will contain the bibliographic resources used by the graduate for the purpose of work realization.. It is the list of works that were quoted in the dissertation content, but also papers read from which it was not quoted. "

6. Quality at FEAA

UAIC leadership has no real concern about quality evaluation and improvement. Foreign assessor Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller remarks the following: "In my eyes UAIC has missed the opportunity to use this evaluation for a broad internal discussion of its present state and its future. This is surprising as UAIC has experienced an JEP-evaluation in 2012, a procedure, where the importance of the self-evaluation process for the development of a higher education institution is clearly emphasized. In general, I believe that the University should look more into the future than into its past. A healthy self- evaluation process resulting in a compact self-evaluation report of 25 to 30 pages concentrating on the improvements and changes since the last ARACIS visit in 2009 and describing the present situation (governing structure, budget, facilities, staff, students, study programmes, research, quality assurance, strategic planning and internationalisation) would have been a very useful experience for the institution and a very good basis for further strategic planning. The benefits of such a process arise from the necessity to set priorities and to concentrate on important things." (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

It would be useful to implement ideas from FEAA and UAIC documents but, unfortunately, reality demonstrates the opposite.

We cannot speak of quality without having a system of indicators, as Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller highlights: "Introduce benchmarks and performance indicators drawn from comparable institutions" (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

For example, the FEAA 2017 operating plan and the 2018 plan are approximately 99% identical. The FEAA 2019 operating plan is a little different with a new confuse section (FEAA, n.d., FEAA, n.d.c; FEAA, n.d.d).

Quality assurance is considered useless by many members of the UAIC and FEAA leadership, any attempts to discuss on this subject are doomed to failure. Quality data should

be made public in order to have a debate on this issue. Foreign assessor Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller remarks the following: “Many university members still appear to consider quality assurance management as an obligation and have little understanding of its purpose and benefits. Hence in order to establish a real quality culture at UAIC the quality assurance actions should shift from inspection and control to an improve-oriented approach providing support to staff and students.” (ARACIS, n.d.b.)

Very suggestive is the case of an Associate Professor from FEAA. He teaches Quality Management and he is also Head of the UAIC Quality Management Bureau. It is not just about the low quality of his teaching activity. It does not have its own course support and teaches Quality Management based on a book published more than a decade ago. The book is written based on books published in Romania almost half a century ago.

Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller suggests also: “The collected data and the results of evaluations should be used more explicitly for further improvement of teaching, research and administration. Try to minimise burden of quality assurance procedures. Promote more clearly to staff and students the benefits and improvements deriving from quality assurance procedures in order to increase motivation of staff and students for taking ownership of quality assurance. Formalise the involvement of stakeholders and employers in order to monitor and improve the quality of education.” (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

FEAA and largely UAIC propose too many study programs that in many cases have no relevance on the labor market and are not prepared to a satisfactory level of quality. Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller observes: “The high fragmentation and specialisation of the study programmes (at least on paper) contradicts the demand of the graduates and employers for a broad education. The big number of similar programmes makes the selection of the appropriate programme difficult for students. (ARACIS, n.d.b.).

Although similar actions appear in documents, unfortunately, they remain on paper. Some examples: "Harmonizing the study programs with the requirements of the dynamic economic environment." (FEAA.), "Encouraging students to play an active role in creating teaching, learning and evaluation processes ... Applying correct and transparent recruitment and development of academic staff determines the existence of competent staff ... Monitoring and periodic evaluation of programs to ensure that they meet their objectives and respond to the needs of students and society, thus leading to continuous improvement of programs ... Periodic evaluation reports for each study program , carried out internally and approved by ARACIS ... Consultations with Student Representation Structures, Learning and Evaluation Processes ... Periodical Evaluations of the Teaching, Research and Administrative Staff Activities, according to the Procedures ... University Periodical Reviews and the results obtained ... Results of international evaluations and the position of the university in international rankings "(UAIC, n.d.f.)

Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller recommends:”Reconsider the number of different study programmes (especially in the master area) in order to offer a broad education and to make better use of synergies. Involve stakeholders systematically into curricula discussions. e Increase interdisciplinarity and flexibility of study programmes (optional courses, joint courses of different programmes, etc.); Make more clear the correspondence between ECTS and working load.” (ARACIS, n.d.b.)

Similar issues appear only in the declarative way in various university documents: "Elimination of master programs or operation with less than 25 students ... Establishing similar programs in different faculties leads to a decrease in the number of candidates ... The decrease of the number of students as a result of dropping out of studies ... Inconsistencies between program requirements and student expectations ... Closer individualization of master programs by updating content, teaching / learning methodologies and material resources needed for modern education centered on employers' demands and according to student

expectations ... "(UAIC, nd)," Ensuring correct and transparent processes of recruitment and development of academic staff and determining the existence of competent personnel ... Monitoring and periodic evaluation of programs to ensure that they reach objectives and respond to the needs of students and society, leading to continuous improvement of programs "(UAIC, n.d.).

Research is often irrelevant, publication of results is done in conference volumes and unimportant journals, often paid. Some teachers from FEAA (including a vice Dean, professor of accounting) became full professors on the basis of papers published in a chemistry journal Prof.Dr.Winfried Muller notes: "Research is highly fragmented and of a large proportion grown historically". El recomienda: "Recommendations: @ Develop a research strategy based on clear priorities and already existing fields of excellence; Try to simplify the organisational structure of research (number of research centres, separation of academic departments from research departments, etc.); Further increase visibility of research by intensifying international activities (e.g. participation in international research groups, publication in international recognised journals)" (ARACIS, n.d.b.). The evaluators recommend: "to identify the possibilities of targeting the truly relevant research and the possibilities of disseminating the results with major impact, in the context in which the promotion criteria often lead to a speculative research" (ARACIS, nd.a.).

Unfortunately, I notice an unethical practice at two didactic competitions to which I attended: the committee chair and some members are coauthors to the candidate's papers published shortly before the competition. In this way, the candidate and the members of the committee ensure the fulfillment of the minimum standards of their position.

Regarding the strategy and research results of FEAA, the vice Dean in charge of Scientific Research and Projects, who is also the Director of the Research Department, does not know the situation of the scientific research in the faculty and assumes no responsibility.

There is a rigidity of study programs that could be diminished by introducing optional subjects. (ARACIS, n.d.a.).

UAIC regulations are contradictory, in some cases unethical, or even contain unlawful provisions. Expert assessors recommend: "initiate processes of analysis and improvement of the content of the regulations applicable in the University, in order to adapt them to the own functional specifics; the real use of the data obtained as a result of the evaluations carried out in order to continuously improve the activities concerned, the development and especially the consistent and unitary application of procedures related to the processes needed to be implemented, for example the teacher evaluation procedure by the student " (ARACIS, n.d.a.)

High quality can not be discussed when more than half of the hours are not taught by the tenured staff, hourly paid courses are often distributed according to subjective criteria or at the discretion of the department manager (see examples from the Department of Management)

The annual report of the UAIC in 2018 states: "Compared with the academic year 2017-2018, in the academic year 2018-2019, the number of teaching positions increased by 41 and the occupancy rate decreased from 49.60 % to 47.68%. In the academic year 2018-2019, there are 3 tenured teachers aged over 65 years. On 31.12.2018, out of 216 research positions, 95 positions were occupied (43.98%) and 121 were vacant "(UAIC, n.d.c.).

Transparency is a fundamental condition not only of academic ethics but also of quality, as it is mentioned in many UAIC and FEAA documents but does not apply in many cases.

The Quality Assurance Code in the UAIC states: "Transparency means the free access of each interested party to all information of interest to him regarding the activity of the university. Through transparency, the university demonstrates the quality offered. Recognition of the present value and setting of future expectations depend on the university's

transparency in relation to stakeholders "(UAIC, n.d.g.). The UAIC Quality Manual mentions similar principles (UAIC, n.d.f). A fundamental objective of quality is "to produce and disseminate systematic information on the quality of UAIC (educational, research, social, etc.) services to stakeholders" (UAIC, n.d.g.).

However, the 2017 UAIC Activity Report recognizes: "the low level of response to surveys initiated by specialized departments and addressed to students" (UAIC, n.d.a.).

Low quality has effects recognized by the UAIC leadership itself: "Knowledge Transfer - Low" (UAIC, n.d.a.).

Negligent discipline sheets, lack of course support, student evaluation based largely on subjective criteria, unnecessary or inappropriate disciplines, duplicated disciplines, negligence in drawing up materials for the portal and posting them with great delay, existence of projects inadequately prepared are just a few examples of practices that lead to lowering the quality of the teaching process at FEAA

Claims such as "It's my discipline and doing what I want" should not be heard at the FEAA.

Very important provisions of the regulations do not apply. Just an example: developing and publishing the Study Guide (UAIC, n.d.h.).

An analysis of the Masters Program Project Management (within the FEAA) reveals that it does not fulfill its mission and objectives. The teaching, learning and assessment process is not centered on the needs of students and the necessary human resources are not provided (some teachers are below a minimum level of competence). Also, the internal quality assurance procedures and the legislation are not respected. The teaching and learning process is not flexible enough to allow different levels of student preparation and different learning styles. The forms of assessment are not appropriately chosen to validate the fulfillment by graduate students of the declared learning objectives of the study program. Student assessment methods and criteria for developed competencies are inadequate and do not allow verification of their actual acquisition of the stated knowledge and skills. The curriculum does not provide students with a structured and meaningful pathway that leads to the acquisition of competencies corresponding to the declared learning outcomes. The curriculum is not centered on the student and is not able to provide the student with quality learning experiences. Some of the teaching staff do not have the training and experience appropriate to the taught subjects. Policies on integrity and academic freedom, and vigilance against academic fraud are not promoted and enforced. There is no preoccupation to prevent university dropout. There is a lack of interest in collecting and integrating student feedback on the content and the way the learning and research process takes place.

7. The link between ethics and quality at FEAA

There is a strong bi-directional connection between ethics and quality in any field of activity, including, of course, business. But perhaps more than anywhere, this link is important in higher education. FEAA combines both areas: higher education and business.

Ethics and quality are closely linked, as quality stems from moral attitudes as a result of consciousness, from culture as a result of education, and from the use of know-how as a result of professional training. These two concepts seem to overlap over a wide area in terms of their meanings.

There is a relationship between the cognitive meanings of these two concepts. When ethics try to answer the question of "what is good and right" for man and society, it overlaps with the quality.

Quality can have different meanings for different people, just like ethics. Quality refers to good or bad patterns that guide our actions, which reminds us of ethics. Quality

refers to our beliefs, actions and experiences through a philosophical rhetoric with "good" or "bad", "right" or "wrong," "ethical" or unethical "attributes as ethics.

Modern organizations have developed explicit codes of conduct or ethics. These codes prescribe acceptable and unacceptable behaviors and also specify the conditions under which certain behaviors would be considered acceptable or unacceptable.

Total quality management is implicitly covered by such codes because they deal with the field of moral judgments about what is good and bad. But although total quality management has obvious ethical implications, it can not be explicitly mentioned in the organization's code of ethics.

Business Ethics has been defined as the application of moral norms and rules in professional life. Thus, the ethical aspect is highlighted in the concept of quality when quality is seen as an improvement of organizational processes as well as the characteristics of the product or service based on respect for the beneficiaries.

Conceptually, ethics and quality serve the same purpose. Both concepts evoke what is good, good and just. The objective of these two concepts is to raise the standards of human life. While ethics strives to raise society and social standards to be compatible with human dignity, the concept of quality seeks to raise the standards of human life, which is the center of this social structure. Thus, ethics targets more macro targets compared to quality. The main concern of ethics is given by interests and ideals related to feelings, while quality is more focused on products and services.

Analyzing the evolution of quality management and ethics in the organization, it can be observed that there are several links. Both quality management and business ethics focus on the responsibilities of an organization towards different actors. But responsibility in quality management refers to organizational responsibility of employees, while business ethics is more concerned with professional and social responsibility.

The apparent paradox of control shows that excellent performance can only be achieved by a balance between control of behavior on the one hand and liberation to act on the other. The ability to act in concordance with personal reasons at the individual level and a code of conduct at the collective level must be effectively managed. Quality management tools, including internal processes control, create an essential part of this ability.

Ethics and social responsibility develop and change according to social requirements and expectations. In order to determine social requirements, it is necessary to maintain open channels of communication with the organization, to establish relationships with elements that could influence the expectations of the environment, to evaluate the data obtained and to determine the actions that could be taken as social responsibility. Adopting ethical sensitivity as a quality policy will create a competitive edge. Quality is a strategy that is not just about profitability. If social benefits, respect for the environment and the right of future generations are ignored and if the rights of others are at risk in the interest of a group, the quality produced is far from being true.

Having an ethical reasoning for total quality management, the resulting goals, strategies, and processes can help the organization's leadership in trying to train, inform, motivate and support employees in achieving these goals and strategies. Understanding ethics can help members of the organization to see the need for total quality management and to overcome the resistance to implementing the systems and processes needed to achieve and sustain a high quality.

Some practical examples regarding the link between ethics and quality:

- Hiring close relatives in the same department is profoundly unethical (even if the ban has been removed from the UAIC Code of Ethics) and has obvious implications for the quality of the teaching and research process (e.g. the disciplines Project Costs

Management and Organizational Communication, the director of the Doctoral School of Economics and Business Administration)

- Defending a possible plagiarism case in the Doctoral Thesis of the Director of the Management Department, by the Director of the Doctoral School of Economics and Business Administration and by the interim Rector, which is profoundly unethical, may affect the quality or raise suspicions about the plagiarism of several doctoral theses, even those of doctoral supervisors.
- Defending by the FEAA Dean, the interim Rector, and the Vice-Rector for Masters and Doctoral Studies, of the Director of the Management Department's violation of the rules and the law, in the case of the competition for filling the teaching positions and in the case of the assignment of hourly payment teachers is profoundly unethical and has a negative impact on the quality of the teaching process through the low quality of the human resource. Moreover, a lawful request is considered by the human resource management professor. as professional harassment, which raises serious questions about his competence and ethics at the same time.
- The FEAA Dean has a "not to be discussed" answer formula. The absence of dialogue in the university environment is an unethical behavior with serious consequences on the quality of the activity. In the case of insisting to discuss, the Dean complains to the Ethics Committee. It can be summed up by the formula: "do not talk if you do not want to bear the consequences"
- The phrase used by the FEAA dean "the discipline holder can do what he wants" is profoundly unethical with serious implications for quality
- The phrase "at FEAA is the same as in the top Western faculties" used by the FEAA Dean and the Doctoral School of Economics and Business Administration Director to reject any suggestion to improve the didactic and research process has serious implications for quality
- The large number of students proposed for admission, for which the FEAA does not have enough well trained teachers, causes a dramatic drop in quality. At the same time, it is a breach of ethics for future students to be attracted with the misleading offer. One of the consequences is dropping out studies.
- Speculative research of some teachers without targeting truly relevant themes and without disseminating results with major impact is not just a negligence with a major impact on the quality of research but is supported by some FEAA leaders (e.g. the Doctoral School of Economics and Business Administration Director). Attempts to block some "inconvenient" research topics culminated in discussing this issue in the UAIC Ethics Committee, although it is not the responsibility of this committee. It is superfluous to add that censorship is not ethical.
- Transparency is a fundamental condition of a high level of quality. At the same time, transparency is a foundation for ethical behavior. How could be interpreted the FEAA Dean and the UAIC interim Rector refusal to provide public information?
- Perhaps the most suggestive lack of ethics is the inclusion in the course support for the Project Management discipline of the method of getting rid of an unwanted employee. The mentioned course, of questionable quality, should have addressed other relevant topics.

8. Conclusions

The implicit assumption that there may be quality in the absence of ethics and vice versa is questionable.

If we can see quality and ethics as integrated systems, we can begin to see how quality and ethics are integrated into the whole, and therefore how they tend to have meaning

and harmony in this context. As a result, endowed with such an understanding, employees in organizations should be in a more advantageous position to face the different challenges.

The most important contribution of this paper is that it formally links research into quality with ethics research in higher education. For a long time, research into ethics has taken place in apparent isolation from quality research. Understanding the educational, systemic and personal factors that contribute to quality and ethics can help develop innovative organizational methodologies to improve higher education practice. It is also necessary to develop organizational strategies to increase familiarity with quality and ethics issues.

More research based on organizations that go through a change in ethics and quality culture could increase understanding of processes and strategies in the field that are developing new challenges. What structures and strategies are effective in which settings? What are the key challenges and limiting factors? How can they be overcome or redefined? What changes in norms and practices actually arise? Such studies would allow teachers and faculty and university leadership to learn from the experience of others and lead to a wider discussion of how to make their organizations more efficient.

Due to the competitive and turbulent nature of higher education, even the best organizations will start experiencing performance problems if they are not willing or able to innovate and introduce change. However, strategic management, especially when it is personalized for the university, can provide the processes necessary for organizations to cope with the major changes that take place. Over time, these procedural approaches have been increasingly altered to define the specificities of universities.

Ethics is a priority in balance with economic outcomes, as ethics focus on the human good, which implies an absolute priority over interests like profitability, which is good in terms of economic efficiency, but not absolutely good.

The organizational culture of quality and ethics is an instrument for leaders to communicate about beliefs and values to all members of the organization. But often this does not cause the individual to act ethically. If the culture of quality and ethics is considered incompatible with organizational beliefs and goals, then this will weaken the ethical culture of the organization in making an ethical decision. Without an appropriate ethical climate within an organization, an organization can not apply ethical decisions because of the orientation and priorities that appear in practice, focusing on personal and organizational interests.

In any society and organization, research at the intersection of quality domains and professional ethics can be an important catalyst to preserve and promote an open and equitable society. We can be optimistic about the potential not only to achieve cross-disciplinary enrichment among ethics and quality researchers but also an intercultural dialogue on the ethical considerations of the profession and the standards of the profession.

Without focus on ethics, professional groups may miss the opportunity to strengthen responsibility for their internal and external environment. This failure can lead to a negative image among public opinion, or even worse, to legal issues. The measure of ethical success in professional groups has always been important, but never more than in the current public regulatory and control environment. Equally, leaders or managers, as members of the organization, are responsible for it in a legal and moral sense, and it is essential that they operate within the limits of ethical standards. Otherwise, in the absence of a correct approach, on the basis of predetermined procedures, they will harm the profession and the organization to which they belong.

Considering the issues outlined above, it can be said that in order to incorporate ethics and quality into the organization, the organization's leadership should set the direction for values, behaviors and ethical practices throughout the organization. Organizations should

ensure that there is sufficient engagement and communication between management and members of the organization to ensure best ethical practices, continuous improvement of the code of ethics and the consequences of lack of ethics of the organization. All members of the organization should be encouraged to bring into question the ethical dilemmas encountered in the workplace, and management should facilitate and properly manage this ongoing process.

Organizations must reflect quality and ethics in their day-to-day relationships with all stakeholders, including society as a whole, and have responsibilities towards all parties involved. This will help build a positive reputation and a good example by setting ethical and high-quality standards.

In conclusion, research in the field of quality and ethics indicates that it is essential to promote ethical values by organizations. Organizations implement clear quality and ethical standards, transparent procedures and openness in communication to increase accountability, promote mutual trust and support among members of the organization, along with transparent analysis of ethical issues and dilemmas that mark the existence of organizations.

The organization, as a strategic decision, must create its own ethical rules and scope and recognize that it could be an ethics-based, not a strategy-based decision.

This analysis shows that ethics and culture are closely linked, but it is still ambiguous if they can be treated separately, with some studies showing emphasis on quality and others, arguing that ethics is critical in an organization. Moreover, it should be stressed that some researchers and practitioners emphasize the role of cultural differences and even deliberately blame cultural differences for ethical and quality issues. At the same time, other causes of poor quality and ethical breaches may go unnoticed.

Some recommendations for FEAA and UAIC leadership:

- Transparency and fairness of stakeholder information.
- Reducing resistance to change to meet challenges and opportunities
- Encourage critical thinking of students and eliminate those who repress critical thinking.
- Promoting a real dialogue with the academic community
- Eliminating the “habit” of voting decisions that should be made by the rector or the dean, to convert individual responsibility of unethical or unlawful decisions into a collective one
- Transparency regarding academic positions and filling of vacant positions.
- Eliminate people who take advantage of a leadership role and try to turn the UAIC Ethics Committee into a possible tool of pressure on students and teachers (for example FEAA Dean and Director of the Management Department)
- Considering critical views and avoiding their repression by opposing a large number of students who, from disinterest or fear, make critical views irrelevant
- Setting up a Ethics Commission for Research
- Combating censorship attempts by senior management or members of the Ethics Commission
- Discussing with stakeholders to get a fair and honest feedback and not by selecting obedient or pressured people.
- Transparency of both financial statements and project funding
- Strict observance of the regulations for the recruitment, evaluation and promotion of teaching and research staff
- Transparency of teacher evaluation results
- Transparency regarding the CV and the scientific activity of both the tenured and associate teachers, without excluding the persons with leading positions

- The unrestricted possibility of photocopying the doctoral thesis (according to the legal and regulatory provisions) from the FEAA branch of the University Central Library Iasi (see the case of the director of the Management Department).
- Unrestricted public access to the teaching competitions (according to the law and UAIC regulations)
- Transparency of the scholarship system
- Removing scoring for attendance and obedience from the discipline sheet
- Introducing a system of quality indicators
- Awareness of the need for quality assurance by UAIC and FEAA leadership
- Publishing quality data and stimulating debates on this topic.
- Reducing the number of study programs at FEAA by eliminating those who are not relevant to the labor market and are not prepared to a satisfactory level of quality
- Eliminate irrelevant research with publication of results in conference volumes and unimportant journals, often paid.
- Eliminating contradictory, unethical or unlawful provisions in the regulations.
- Elimination of subjectivism and violation of regulations in filling the vacant positions
- Transforming the FEAA portal into a useful tool for students by posting information that is truly useful to learning
- Elimination of habits like "It's my discipline and I am doing what I want"
- Develop and publish the Study Guide according to the regulations
- Focusing the process of teaching, learning and evaluating on the needs of students and providing the necessary human resources
- Compliance with internal quality assurance procedures.
- Flexibility of the teaching and learning process to allow different levels of student education and different learning styles.
- Choosing of assessment methods so as to validate graduate students' fulfillment of the declared learning objectives of the study program.
- Adequate assessment methods and criteria for students to develop their skills and to allow to verify the actual knowledge and skills they have acquired.
- Focus the curriculum to provide students with quality learning experiences
- Selection of teaching staff with the training and experience corresponding to the subjects taught.
- Promoting and implementing policies on integrity and academic freedom, and vigilance towards academic fraud.
- Collecting and integrating student feedback on the content and the way the learning and research process takes place.

Despite a growing volume of research on quality and ethics in higher education, one can conclude that notions of "quality" and "ethics" are still poorly understood. It can be said that researchers have to eliminate the gap between theory and practice. Also, separation between quality and ethics can lead to major misunderstandings for both researchers and practitioners. Moreover, research on quality and ethics is still fragmented, leaving loopholes to be addressed. To sum up, future research should focus on the concept of performance in higher education and the relationship between ethical and quality aspects.

Given the results of this study suggesting a strong link between quality and ethics in higher education and beyond, future studies could examine the dynamic nature of a wider spectrum of cultural influences on perception of quality and ethics. Such exploration would lead to an in-depth understanding of the cultural aspects of quality and ethics.

9. References

1. ARACIS. (n.d.a.). Raport Departament de evaluare privind UAIC [Evaluation Department report on UAIC]. Retrieved from http://proiecte.aracis.ro/uploads/media/Raport_Departament_de_evaluare_cfd8b3.pdf.
2. ARACIS. (n.d.b.). Raport evaluator strain privind UAIC [Foreign assessor valuation report on UAIC]. Retrieved from http://proiecte.aracis.ro/uploads/media/Raport_evaluator_strain_b93239.pdf
3. ARACIS. (n.d.c.). Raport studenti privind UAIC [Students report on UAIC]. Retrieved from http://proiecte.aracis.ro/uploads/media/Raport_studenti_1a3490.pdf.
4. Bendermacher, G. W., Egbrink, M. G., Wolfhagen, I. H., & Dolmans, D. H. (2017). Unravelling quality culture in higher education: A realist review. *Higher Education*, 73(1), 39-60. doi:10.1007/s10734-015-9979-2.
5. Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
6. Borisova, E. A. (2014). An Analysis of the Mechanisms of the Social Control of Corruption in the Higher Education System. *Russian Education & Society*, 56(4), 27-39. doi:10.2753/res1060-9393560402.
7. Bratton, V. K., & Strittmatter, C. (2013). To Cheat or Not to Cheat?: The Role of Personality in Academic and Business Ethics. *Ethics & Behavior*, 23(6), 427-444. doi:10.1080/10508422.2013.811077.
8. Cahn, S. M. (2011). *Saints and scamps: Ethics in academia*. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield.
9. Cardoso, S., Rosa, M. J., & Stensaker, B. (2016). Why is quality in higher education not achieved? The view of academics. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 950-965. doi:10.1080/02602938.2015.1052775.
10. Chapman, D. W., & Lindner, S. (2016). Degrees of integrity: The threat of corruption in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(2), 247-268. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.927854.
11. Cheng, M. (2016). *Quality in higher education: Developing a virtue of professional practice*. Rotterdam: Sense.
12. Denkova, J., Stojanovski, S., & Dzamtovska Zdravkovska, S.. (2016). Criteria and Standards in the Higher Education – Basis for Quality Higher Education Staff in Republic of Macedonia. *Balkan Social Science Review*, 7, 87-111. Retrieved from <http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/BSSR/article/view/1490>.
13. Eggins, H. (2014). *Drivers and barriers to achieving quality in higher education*. Rotterdam: Sense.
14. Elkington, S, & Evans, C. (2017). *Transforming Assessment In Higher Education* (Report). Retreved from Higher Education Academy (HEA) website: <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/hub/download/Transforming%20Assessment%20in%20Higher%20Education%20-%20A%20Case%20Studies%20Series.pdf>.
15. FEAA. (n.d.a.). Plan strategic FEAA 2016 [Strategic Plan FEAA 2016]. Retrieved from <http://www.feaa.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Plan-strategic-FEAA-2016.pdf>.
16. FEAA. (n.d.b.). Plan operațional FEAA 2017 [Operational Plan FEAA 2017]. Retrieved from <http://www.feaa.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Plan-operational-2017-FEAA.pdf>.
17. FEAA. (n.d.c.). Plan operațional FEAA 2018 [Operational Plan FEAA 2018]. Retrieved from <http://www.feaa.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Plan-operational-2018-FEAA.pdf>.

18. FEAA. (n.d.d.). Plan operational FEAA 2019 [Operational Plan FEAA 2019]. Retrieved from <http://www.feaa.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Plan-operational-2019-FEAA.pdf>.
19. Feoktistova, Y. (2014). Corruption in Higher Education and Government Measures for its Prevention. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 112, 167-172. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1152.
20. Friedman, H. H., & Friedman, L. W. (2018). Does Growing The Number Of Academic Departments Improve The Quality Of Higher Education? *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, 6(1), 96. doi:10.22381/pihrm6120184.
21. Gaftandzhieva, S., Doneva, R., & Totkov, G. (2018). Dynamic Quality Evaluation in Higher Education. *TEM Journal*, 7(3), 526-542. doi:10.18421/TEM73-08.
22. Goos, M., & Salomons, A. (2017). Measuring teaching quality in higher education: Assessing selection bias in course evaluations. *Research in Higher Education*, 58(4), 341-364. doi:10.1007/s11162-016-9429-8.
23. Gostev, A., Demchenko, T., & Borisova, E. (2015). Corruption in the System of Higher Education. *Russian Education & Society*, 57(3), 163-188. doi:10.1080/10609393.2015.1018746.
24. Heyneman, S. P. (2014). How Corruption Puts Higher Education at Risk. *International Higher Education*, (75), 3. doi:10.6017/ihe.2014.75.5425.
25. Heyneman, S. (2015). The Corruption of Ethics in Higher Education. *International Higher Education*, (62). doi:10.6017/ihe.2011.62.8530.
26. Houghton, F. (2017). Ethics in academic publishing: A timely reminder. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 105(3). doi:10.5195/jmla.2017.122.
27. Kamarudin, M.F. (2017). *Restructuring in Higher Education: A Case Study in an Australian University*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Deakin University. (DU:30103453).
28. Keenan, J.F. (2011). (The Lack of) Professional Ethics in the Academy. *Louvain Studies*, 35, 98-116. doi: 10.2143/LS.35.1.2084430.
29. Macfarlane, B. (2004). *Teaching with integrity: The ethics of higher education practice*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
30. Macfarlane, B., Zhang, J., & Pun, A. (2014). Academic integrity: A review of the literature. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(2), 339-358. doi:10.1080/03075079.2012.709495.
31. McGhee, P. (2011). *The academic quality handbook: Enhancing higher education in universities and further education colleges*. London: Routledge.
32. Moore, G. (2006). Managing ethics in higher education: Implementing a code or embedding virtue? *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(4), 407-418. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8608.2006.00462.x.
33. Mukhopadhyay, P., Tapaswi, M. P., Sudarsan, P. K., & Sudarsan, K. (2018). Assessing the Quality of Higher Education Institutions in India: An Alternative Framework. *Current Science*, 114(06), 1167. doi:10.18520/cs/v114/i06/1167-1173.
34. Naidoo, D. (2013). Reconciling organisational culture and external quality assurance in higher education. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 24(2), 85-98. doi:10.1787/hemp-24-5k3w5pdwhm6j.
35. Nerland, M., & Prøitz, T.S. (2018). *Pathways to quality in higher education* (Report 2018:3). Retrieved from Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education (NIFU) website: <https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/2478911/NIFUreport2018-3.pdf>

36. Nicolesco, L., & Dima, A.M. (2010). The Quality of Educational Services – Institutional Case Study from the Romanian Higher Education. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 29E, 100-108.
37. Olaskoaga-Larrauri, J., Barrenetxea-Ayesta, M., Cardona-Rodríguez, A., Campo, J. J., & Barandiaran-Galdós, M. (2016). Between Efficiency and Transformation: The opinion of deans on the meaning of quality in higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 51(2), 257-269. doi:10.1111/ejed.12141.
38. Orkodashvili, M. (2010). Corruption in Higher Education: Causes, Consequences, Reforms. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1729903.
39. Osipian, A. L. (2008). Corruption in Higher Education: Does it Differ across the Nations and Why? *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 3(4), 345-365. doi:10.2304/rcie.2008.3.4.345.
40. Osipian, A. (2009). Glossary of Higher Education Corruption with Explanations. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1397322.
41. Orsingher, C. (2006). *Assessing quality in European higher education institutions: Dissemination, methods and procedures*. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
42. Paradeise, C., & Thoenig, J. (2015). *In search of academic quality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
43. Paulson, M.E.H. (2016). *Stressful Change in Higher Education: An Interpretive Case Study*. *Education Doctoral Dissertations in Organization Development*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from University of St. Thomas. (56).
44. Popoola, I., Garner, B., Ammeter, A., Krey, N., Ammeter, D. B., & Schafer, S. (2017). How does ethics institutionalization reduce academic cheating? *Journal of Education for Business*, 92(1), 29-35. doi:10.1080/08832323.2016.1274710.
45. Puiu, S., & Ogarca, R. F. (2015). Ethics Management in Higher Education System of Romania. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23, 599-603. doi:10.1016/s2212-5671(15)00564-x.
46. Rujoiu, O., & Rujoiu, V. (2014, November). *Academic Dishonesty and Workplace Dishonesty. An Overview*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of The 8th International management conference "Management Challenges For Sustainable Development", Bucharest, Romania. Retrieved from <http://conferinta.management.ase.ro/archives/2014/pdf/91.pdf>.
47. Sabic-El-Rayess, A. (2013). When Corruption Gets in the Way. *European Education*, 45(2), 6-27. doi:10.2753/eue1056-4934450201.
48. Sarrico, C. S., & Alves, A. A. (2016). Academic staff quality in higher education: An empirical analysis of Portuguese public administration education. *Higher Education*, 71(2), 143-162. doi:10.1007/s10734-015-9893-7.
49. Šedžiuviėnė, N., & Tamutienė, L. (2016). Strategic Dimensions of Quality Culture in Higher Education Institution. *Professional Studies: Theory and Practice*, 1(16), 21-26. Retrieved from <https://svako.lt/uploads/pstp-2016-116-2.pdf>.
50. Shuiyun, L. (2016). External Higher Education Quality Assurance System in China. *Chinese Education & Society*, 49 (1-2), 1-6. doi:10.1080/10611932.2016.1192380.
51. Silva, M. F., Borges, L. H., Borges, M. S., & Elias, I. P. (2017). Higher education policy: A case study on quality assessment towards a model of university management. *Avaliação: Revista Da Avaliação Da Educação Superior (Campinas)*, 22(1), 249-269. doi:10.1590/s1414-40772017000100013.
52. Speight, J. G. (2016). *Ethics in the university*. Hoboken: Scrivener Publishing/Wiley.
53. Turner, D. A. (2011). *Quality in higher education*. Rotterdam: Sense.

54. UAIC. (n.d.a.). Raport de activitate UAIC 2017 [UAIC Activity Report 2017]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Raport_activitate_UAIC_2017_apobat_Senat-1.pdf.
55. UAIC. (n.d.b.). Raport de activitate UAIC 2018- sinteză [UAIC Activity Report 2018 – Synthesis]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/RAPORT_ANUA_UAIC_2018_28-martie.pdf.
56. UAIC. (n.d.c.). Raport de activitate UAIC 2018 [UAIC Activity Report 2018]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/RAPORT_ANUAL_UAIC_2018.pdf.
57. UAIC. (n.d.d.). Planul Operațional al UAIC pentru anul 2018 [UAIC Operational Plan for 2018]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/PO_UAIC_2018.pdf.
58. UAIC. (n.d.e.). Planul Operațional al UAIC pentru anul 2019 [UAIC Operational Plan for 2019]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/PO_UAIC_2019.pdf.
59. UAIC. (n.d.f.). Manualul calitatii UAIC [UAIC Quality Manual]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/Manualul-calitatii_UAIC_vers-1.0_2018.05.pdf.
60. UAIC. (n.d.g.). Codul de asigurare a Calitatii in UAIC [Quality Assurance Code in UAIC]. Retrieved from <https://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Codul-de-asigurare-a-Calitatii-in-UAIC-1-1-2.pdf>.
61. UAIC. (n.d.h.). Regulamentul privind activitatea profesională a studenților din ciclul de studii universitare de master aplicabil studenților înmatriculați începând cu anul universitar 2017 – 2018, anul I de studii [Regulation on the professional activity of students in the Master's degree program applicable to enrolled students from the academic year 2017 - 2018, the first year of study]. Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Regulamentul_studiilor_de_master_Senat_27.06.2017_FIN_AL.pdf.
62. UAIC. (n.d.i.). Drepturile și obligațiile studenților UAIC [Rights and Obligations of UAIC Students]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Drepturileșiobligatiilestudentilor.pdf>.
63. UAIC. (n.d.j.). Codul de etică și deontologie profesională al UAIC [Code of ethics and professional deontology of UAIC]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/3CoduldeEtica.pdf>.
64. UAIC. (n.d.k.). Regulamentul Comisiei de Etică a UAIC [UAIC Ethics Commission Regulation]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Regulamentul-Comisiei-de-etica.pdf>.
65. UAIC. (n.d.l.). Raportul Comisiei de Etică a UAIC (2013-2014) [Report of the UAIC Ethics Committee (2013-2014)]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Raport-CE.pdf>.
66. UAIC. (n.d.m.). Raportul Comisiei de Etică a UAIC pe anul 2017 [Report of the UAIC Ethics Committee for 2017]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/Raportul-Comisiei-de-Etica-pentru-anul-2017.pdf>.
67. UAIC. (n.d.n.). Raportul Comisiei de Etică a UAIC pe anul 2018 [Report of the UAIC Ethics Committee for 2018] . Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Raportul-Comisiei-de-Etica-pentru-anul-2018.pdf>.
68. UAIC. (n.d.o.). Raport de evaluare internă a calității 2017 [Internal Quality Assessment Report 2017] . Retrieved from http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Raport-de-evaluare-interna-2017_aprobat.pdf.

69. UAIC. (n.d.p.). Raport de evaluare internă a calității 2018 [Internal Quality Assessment Report 2018] . Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/2019-Raport-de-Evaluare-Institutionala.pdf>.
70. UAIC. (n.d.q.). Bilanț 2017 [Balance sheet 2017] . Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Bilant-2017.pdf>.
71. UAIC. (n.d.r.). Bilanț 2018 [Balance sheet 2018]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/despre-uaic/informatii-publice/informatii-financiare-despre-universitatea-alexandru-ioan-cuza/>.
72. UAIC. (n.d.t.). Regulamentul de recrutare, evaluare și promovare a personalului didactic și de cercetare [Regulation on the Recruitment, Evaluation and Promotion of Teaching and Research Staff]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Recrutare-promovare-complet.pdf>.
73. UAIC. (n.d.u.). Statutul studenților înmatriculați la Universitatea “Al. I. Cuza” din Iași [Status of students enrolled at "Al. I. Cuza " University of Iași]. Retrieved from <http://www.uaic.ro/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Statutul-studen%C8%9Bilor-%C3%AEnmatricula%C8%9Bi-la-UAIC.pdf>.
74. Warter, I. & Warter, L. (2018a). Etică dincolo de cultură. O viziune de management intercultural [Ethics beyond culture. A vision of intercultural management]. In M.G. Buta (Ed) Resacralizarea relației medic-pacient [Re-sacralization the physician-patient relationship] (pp. 23-48). Cluj-Napoca: Editura Renașterea. [In Romanian]
75. Warter, L. & Warter, I. (2018b). Perspective etice în managementul strategic [Ethical Perspectives in Strategic Management]. In M.G. Buta (Ed) Resacralizarea relației medic-pacient [Re-sacralization the physician-patient relationship] (pp. 109-128). Cluj-Napoca: Editura Renașterea. [In Romanian]
76. Warter, I. & Warter, L. (2017a). Aspecte etice dincolo de culturi. Caracteristici naționale versus coduri de etică [Ethical aspects beyond cultures. National characteristics versus codes of ethics]. In M.G. Buta (Ed) Tendințe și politici demografice ale României într-o Europă unită [Trends and demographic policies of Romania in a united Europe] (pp. 549-558). Cluj-Napoca: Editura Renașterea. [In Romanian]
77. Warter, L. & Warter, I. (2017b). Ingredientul ascuns în etică: Cultura organizațională [The hidden ingredient in ethics: Organizational culture]. In M.G. Buta (Ed) Tendințe și politici demografice ale României într-o Europă unită [Trends and demographic policies of Romania in a united Europe] (pp. 529-537). Cluj-Napoca: Editura Renașterea. [In Romanian]
78. Warter, L. & Warter, I. (2017c). Explorând aspecte ale eticii prin lentilele culturii profesionale [Exploring aspects of ethics through professional culture lenses]. In M.G. Buta (Ed) Tendințe și politici demografice ale României într-o Europă unită [Trends and demographic policies of Romania in a united Europe] (pp. 351-357). Cluj-Napoca: Editura Renașterea. [In Romanian]
79. What is Quality. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.lifetime-reliability.com/cms/free-articles/work-quality-assurance/what-is-quality/>.
80. Yingqiang, Z., & Yongjian, S. (2016). Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Reflection, Criticism, and Change. *Chinese Education & Society*, 49(1-2), 7-19. doi:10.1080/10611932.2016.1192382.
81. Yorke, M. (2000). Developing a quality culture in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 6(1), 19-36. doi:10.1080/13583883.2000.9967008.
82. Zavala, R.L. (2015). Professional Ethics of University Professors A Weakness of Higher Education in Mexico. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*,

5(9(1)), 215-222. Retrieved from
http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_9_1_September_2015/20.pdf.