International Journal for
QUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
Year 2014, Vol. 1, No. 1
Journal website:
http://www.quality.uaic.ro/index.php?page=revista&detail=despre&lang=en

TOWARDS AN ECONOMICS HIGHER EDUCATION BASED ON LEARNING EXPERIENCES

Carmen Păunescu[1], Hadad Shahrazad[2], Ramona Cantaragiu[3], Oana Găucă[4], Alexandra Pascu[5]

Abstract
The customization of education becomes an obvious option for total quality management-oriented universities, and, therefore, flexible and rapid reactions are expected from universities. In response, universities become more learning outcome - focused as well as more focused on the development of competencies recognized by employers. This paper aims at presenting an integrating perspective on the student-centred-learning concept as an accumulation of practices and learning experiences that determine an individual's professional development and shape his personality. The research explores the best practices achieved through education based on learning outcomes and student-centred economic faculties, within eight universities in Romania. The research was conducted by consulting the websites of the universities and faculties included in the analysis. The review standard for each faculty included: the type and content of the programs of study offered in the three stages of education, organization and methods of disseminating research results, and services provided to students, including extracurricular activities. The results of the analysis confirm that the surveyed universities have dedicated and focused their efforts to reorganize the curricula according to the requirements of the labor market, and increase the overall quality of education. However, student-centred learning practices are dissipated and quite restricted in the study programs. As a result of this analysis, the paper presents various measures that universities may take into consideration in order to ensure the spread of active learning practices in all educational programs.

Keywords: Active learning, Education based on learning outcomes, Student-centred education, Universities / faculties in the field of economics, Factors of change.
JEL classification: I21, I23, M10.

1. Introduction

The future of higher education is a concern regarded with increased awareness at the European as well as at the international level. Naturally, the question of how changes in the universities will keep up with trends and changes in the economy remains. The necessity of change is no longer a questioned issue, having been already understood and internalized. The analyses and

[1] Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 6 Romana Square, 010374, Bucharest, Romania, carmen.paunescu@fabiz.ase.ro.
[2] Bucharest University of Economic Studies, hadad.shahrazad@gmail.com.
[3] Bucharest University of Economic Studies, ramona_cantaragiu@yahoo.com.
[4] Bucharest University of Economic Studies, gaucaoana@yahoo.com.
[5] Bucharest University of Economic Studies, ioana.apascu@gmail.com.

studies developed in this field try to identify as closely as possible the change factors present in the university ecosystem and the alterations they produce, configuring what is called the "University of the Future" (Clark, 2004). Such studies are conducted by universities, international organizations (OECD, EU) or companies that publish comprehensive reports on changes that may affect higher education (OECD, 2010). All these efforts are aimed at providing policy makers with the supporting elements for substantiating the public policies regarding higher education (Da Costa et al., 2008).

For universities, change does not seem to be a novelty. In time, it turned out that higher education institutions occupy a place among the most flexible social institutions, always open to improvement and adding value to the society they serve. As an undeniable proof, today we are witnessing a diversification of forms and types of higher education, from traditional to virtual universities, from a classical education based on knowledge transfer to a student-centered one based on learning outcomes.

Numerous studies focused on the future of Romanian higher education emphasize the potential of the university to adapt to the individual expectations of stakeholders, predominantly those of the students, as being the key for value co-creation and resource generation in universities (Neştian, 2013). The customization of education appears to be an obvious option for total quality management-oriented universities, and, therefore, flexible, and rapid reactions are expected from universities. To respond, universities become more learning outcome-focused as well as more focused on the development of competencies required by the market and recognized by employers.

The internationalization and globalization of the labor market have led to a fundamental change in terms of the requirements and demand for skills for university graduates. Along with professional competences, it increasingly calls for very good communication skills, entrepreneurial skills, good knowledge of foreign languages and cultural skills. Of course, along these, other skills that outline, in the end, the future profile of university graduates can be added: analytical and synthesizing skills, practical ingenuity, creativity, high ethical standards, physical and mental strength, flexibility, agility, initiative, leadership skills, and willingness to learn continuously (Rauhvargers, 2004; Holland, 2009). Such skills and abilities form the educational capital of the individual which is created and developed both within the formal education system, and especially in the non-formal education, by experimenting with multiple and diverse learning methods.

This paper aims to present an integrated perspective of the concept of student-centred learning as an accumulation of practices and learning experiences that determine the professional development of the individual and the shape of his/her personality. Furthermore, the paper seeks to identify the measures to be taken in order to standardize practices of active learning in all cycles of higher education studies.

2. The general context

Universities are dynamic structures that change continuously according to variations in the internal and external environment, be it scientific and technological progress, demographic decline or policies on teaching and research staff. Traditional higher education today is faced with two major challenges: on the one hand, universities are faced with a shortage of resources that forces them to increase tuition fees, participate in competitions to support research and innovation,

capitalize on the market and utilize research results, and raise funds by alternative means (donations, sponsoring etc.); on the other hand, universities cannot survive self-contained, so they have an obligation to cooperate with other institutions of higher education, businesses, government bodies and non-governmental organizations, and with society as a whole (Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997). At the same time, universities are important pools of research and learning within the global economic environment of the information technology era, and innovations are the foundation for creating a competitive and intelligent economy. Thus, to meet the new challenges of the contemporary world, universities need to rethink and to redesign their organization and running methods, without abandoning the fundamental principles and values that define them (Gumport, 2000; Bleiklie and Kogan, 2007).

In the new global economic context, academic governance aims to better integrate the university into the economy by providing educational programs tailored to current economic conditions, in a super-technologised and computerized knowledge society. The massification of higher education in Romania requires rethinking the entire educational process in detail, the process of scientific research, the relationships with students and other stakeholders of the university, and redesigning the organization of faculties and other organizational entities part of the university, while also focusing on the continuous improvement of the teaching staff.

At present, the main challenges that the universities in Romania need to face in order to improve their innovation capacity and meet growing societal demands are related to (European Commission, 2011): the insufficient focus on centers of excellence that would be able to compete at a national, European and international level; the deficiency in terms of inter-, multi- and trans-disciplinary research focused on innovation needs, the lack of effective models of governance and management, research and education; high costs of patenting, low degrees mobility for faculty staff, researchers and students.

The main trends recorded for higher education at the international level, having a visible impact on the strategic development of universities in Romania are (Altbach et al., 2009; Salmi, 2009; Drechsler and Wiesner, 2012): high degrees of mobility for faculty staff members and students; promotion of the internationalization of higher education and transnational education, increasing the number of non-traditional students (e.g. students with a different age than those assigned to a certain degree of education, people seeking alternative forms of education or active learning experiences, concurrently with formal education); increasing importance given to student-centered education, promotion of inter-, multi- and trans-disciplinary character of education, increasing importance given to the development of transversal skills, raising the role of technology in education, growing importance given to monitoring careers of graduates; the revision of the funding schemes for higher education institutions, amending legislation, promoting the social dimension of higher education.

With regard to the national context, in shaping the development and increasing competitiveness directions for the universities in Romania, a number of factors must be taken into account such as: frequent legislative changes and their direct impact on the number of students, the quality of education and the financing institution; in many cases, the poor quality of secondary education; the demographic decline and the decrease in the number of high school graduates; the

large number of universities, both public and private, and study programs with similar specializations; the need for a constant, proactive correlation of theory and practice in the design of study programs and curricula; the changes on the labor market and the need to harmonize systematically the qualifications obtained by the graduates of universities with the labor market requirements; the relative autonomy of universities on human resources policies and the lack of an unitary and coherent evaluation system that would stimulate and reward actual performance; the decrease and instability of public funds allocated for scientific research.

Expanding private higher education at the expense of the public one, along with the emergence of new forms of university education (the 100% online university), including the emergence of equivalent training programs offered by local (or regional) companies and organizations, lead to increased competition on the education supply market, but not necessarily to an increase in terms of quality for the educational services. Also, discrepancies in terms of relevance of learning outcomes in public and private education will persist due to the lack of a uniform set of indicators for evaluating the programs of study, with the view to determine the extent to which the competencies claimed by the universities, and acquired respectively by their graduates, are genuine. However, this divergence occurs due to the deficiency in integrating all study cycles, which could be made possible by developing a uniform set of indicators to assess the skills acquired in secondary education and then, successively, at undergraduate level, in further correlation with the master and doctoral levels. Moreover, as an effect of the labor market globalization, the need to develop new skills determined an increase in the demand for continuous learning programs in various fields of specialization. The necessity to encompass in the educational process the entirety of the individual and all the forms of education determines the latter's design and organization, from the perspective of its development throughout the entire life.

3. Student-centred learning

The concept of "student-centred learning" is intensely utilised in the present, but its origins date back to the beginning of the 20th century. It was mentioned for the first time by Frank Herbert Hayward in 1905 in his paper "*The Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Frobel*", later, the concept being associated with names such as Rogers (by reporting to his educational theory conceived in the 80s), Piaget (who emphasises evolutionary learning – according to the stages of development of an individual) and Malcolm Knowles (who highlights the role of self-directed learning) (O'Neill and McMahon, 2005).

Therefore, student-centred learning does not imply that the student should learn whatever the professor considers fit, but the professor should: coordinate the student's activity, guide/assist him/her with his/her self-development, respectively his/her intellectual matureness, and should act as a facilitator.

According to Bunning (2006), "*learning can be defined as the ensemble of changes in behaviour resulted from the accumulation of experience*". These kinds of approaches of learning based on learning results enhance the relevance of the educational system for the labour market.

The specialised literature associates different characteristics of the learning process in order to define the "*student-centred learning*" concept, such as: flexible learning – this concept was

introduced by Taylor (2000), experiential learning – this concept was developed by Burnard (1999) or self-directed learning – concept which was presented by O'Neill and McMahon (2005).

A stepping stone in defining (even though not explicitly) student-centred learning was the Bologna Convention, which stressed that Europe is not only defined by the Unique Euro Currency, by the European Banking System and by the European Economy (taking into consideration the steps taken towards building the European Monetary Union). Europe has to rely on its intellectual, cultural, social, scientific and technological development. These are just some of the few points of view formulated by the education ministers in 1998.

Student-centred learning is the foundation and predecessor of long-life learning. According to the European Students Union (ESU) and Educational International Association (EI) student-centred learning *"represents both a mindset and a culture within a given higher education institution and is a learning approach which is broadly related to, and supported by, constructivist theories of learning. It is characterised by innovative methods of teaching which aim to promote learning in communication with teachers and other learners and which take students seriously as active participants in their own learning, fostering transferrable skills such as problem-solving, critical thinking and reflective thinking*" (Education International and European Student's Union, 2010).

Student-centred learning is based on constructivism - a theory in which the student builds and rebuilds knowledge in order to get a better understanding and strengthening of knowledge. Concurrently, student-centred learning is adjacent to transformational learning which entails a qualitative change process in the person that learns in a continuous transformation process in which the emphasis is placed on developing and strengthening the abilities of the learner and in this manner nurturing critical thinking (Kember, 2008).

According to the same previously mentioned paper (Education International and European Student's Union, 2010), student-centred learning is characterised by some fundamental principles: a) *Student-centred learning requires an ongoing reflexive process*: given the www generations there is the need of a permanent adaptation of teaching-learning methods, of the infrastructure necessary for the smooth operation of the learning process, all of these contributing to stimulating critical thinking in students; b) *Student-centred learning does not have a 'One-Size-Fits-All':* this principle starts from the fact that professors are different, students are different, and consequently, the topics and subjects taught in higher education institutions are different and therefore, they require different approach methods; c) *Having different personalities, students automatically have different learning styles,* needs, interests, experiences and acquired knowledge*;* d) *The efficiency of the student-centred learning is given by the possibility to choose;* students should have control over the things that they want to learn; e) *Student-centred learning should be based on activities that should determine the student to think,* analyse, etc., not to reproduce a certain aspect; f) *Student-centred learning is based on the professor-student partnership.*

Therefore, student-centred learning can be described by answering the following three key questions: *What do we learn? How do we learn? Why do we learn?*

The student-centred learning concept is defined in the specialised literature by components such as (Kember, 2008; Lavoie and Rosman 2007): active participation of students in the learning

process, learning through in-depth studies and understanding the aspects under study (not only learning them by heart); a greater accountability of the student regarding his/her higher education and professional development (in case the student fails, the fault is not only the teacher's, but also the student's), and also a greater autonomy of the student in the learning process. On the other hand, unlike teacher-centred learning, through student-centred learning there, a greater interdependence between the professor and the student should be ensured, both of them being subjected to the continuous learning process, the teacher having the role of facilitating it.

However, according to O'Neil and McMahon (2005), student-centred learning can be synthesised as being: the concept through which the student chooses his/her educational path, through which he/she is more involved in his/her own development and shaping, ensuring in this way a shift in the student-professor "power relationship" (the former having the power to decide what, how, how much and why to learn).

Student-centred learning encompasses a series of specific practices and methods among which we mention (Brandes and Ginnis, 1986; Kember, 2008): advisory, experience exchange, service learning (this is a teaching and learning approach in which students use the academic knowledge and the acquired abilities in order to address community needs; - for example, collecting residues from the sea shore is a service, studying/analysing with the microscope some water samples represents learning and when students collect and analyse the water samples, they document their results and present the findings to a local pollution control agency, we refer to it as service learning), internships or apprenticeships; project-based learning; problem-based learning; active learning (students solve problems, they answer questions, formulate their own questions, discuss, explain and debate or even brainstorm); cooperative and collaborative learning (students work in teams on different projects or problems in which the conditions ensure both positive interdependency and individual responsibility), induction teaching-learning in which they are firstly introduced to the challenges (questions, problems), and after that, they need to learn the course material by addressing the specific challenges that have been presented (methods – question-based learning, case-study-based teaching, problem-based learning, project-based learning, discovery-based learning, and just-in-time learning), thus involving students in research, blended learning (its methodology means combining both online learning and in-class teaching), role plays, group presentations.

In time, these methods for operationalizing student-centred learning have been proven to be far superior to those centred on the teacher, regardless of the final desired outcome: acquiring the information on the short term, remembering it on the long term, the depth with which the course material was learnt, gaining critical thinking or problem-solving aptitudes, positive attitudes towards the course or the level of trust in the acquired abilities.

4. Methodology

The present research seeks to identify good practices with respect to student-centred learning based on learning outcomes within the Romanian universities encompassing economics faculties. At the same time, it considers identifying the necessary measures that need to be taken in order to generalise the active learning practices in all the study cycles of higher education.

The research is aimed to identify two categories of practices associated with student-centred learning: a) standard practices, and b) specific practices which build on a certain competitive advantage. Simultaneously, starting from the research results, we tried to determine the position of the Bucharest University of Economic Studies in relation to the quality of implementing student-centred learning in the context of higher education in Romania, and to suggest quality improvement methods based on the good practices encountered in the other higher education institutions. The analysis focused on each economics faculty, but the advantages offered by the wider framework of the university have also been taken into account.

The research was conducted through consulting the web pages of the universities and faculties included in the analysis, and also other web documentation sources that contained relevant information about these universities. The standard analysis domains for each faculty were the following: the type and content of the study programmes offered by each of the three study cycles, the organisation of research and the methods of research results dissemination and services offered to students, including extracurricular activities. Whenever circumstances permitted, we also made use of the following dimensions of analysis: information related to the international mobility of the students, apprenticeship, internships and hiring opportunities, their involvement in student life.

Throughout the research, we took into account the uniqueness of the Bucharest University of Economic Studies in the context of its size, nature and number of study programmes offered, as well as its organisational structure, and advanced research and education, education and scientific research universities, both private and public have also been included. Noteworthy is that the accuracy and relevance of the undertaken benchmarking analysis is highly determined by the nature of the available information offered by the sites of each faculty, which vary from case to case.

The faculties subjected to analysis are the following: 1.The University of Bucharest – Faculty of Administration and Business; 2. "Babeş-Bolyai" University in Cluj-Napoca - Faculty of Economics and Business Administration; Faculty of Business; Faculty of European Studies; 3. The "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi – Faculty of Economics and Business Administration; 4. University "Politehnica" of Bucharest - Faculty of Entrepreneurship, Business Engineering and Management; 5. The Technical University "Gheorghe Asachi" of Iaşi - The Faculty of Textile, Leather and Industrial Management; 6. The Tehnical University of Cluj Napoca – Romania – Faculty of Sciences; 7. The "Politehnica" University of Timişoara – Faculty of Management in Production and Transportation, and 8. The Bucharest University of Economic Studies.

5. Results

Most universities in our research agenda have made dedicated and concentrated efforts to reorganize their curricula according to the requirements of the job market, and to increase the quality of the educational process in its entirety. At the same time, these universities are manifesting a growing concern for increasing the interdisciplinary nature of their study programs. Moreover, the researched universities prove to have an interest in systematically harmonizing the qualifications obtained by their graduates with the requirements of the job market.

Furthermore, we have to mention that a part of the universities studied distinguish themselves among the others by the diversity and contents of the study programs, at least from the following perspectives: cultural impact, social impact, the size of the student body, and the international orientation of these study programs.

Nonetheless, the practices of student-centred learning are dissipated and fairly restricted at the level of the study programs in most of the universities and faculties studied. Student-centred learning is most often proven by: organizing conferences, workshops and other scientific events regarding global interest themes for students; organizing summer schools; facilitating access to companies for apprenticeships; offering internships (but for a limited, usually rather low, number of students); teaching and learning methods based on information technology (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, short movies, diverse informational systems); learning based on case studies (but most of them not anchored in Romania's local reality of Romania).

Starting from these results, we can affirm that the implementation of a student-centred educational system based on learning outcomes and able to ensure diverse and personalized learning experiences, presupposes the following:

- Ensuring the interdisciplinary character of the study programs, including by developing programs applied to certain activity domains in the economy such as energy, environment, transportation, agriculture, health, construction, arts, tourism etc. This assumes, for example, developing Bachelor degree programs which allow students to graduate with a base specialization (major) and a complementary one (minor) or developing study programs accredited in interdisciplinary domains.
- Implementing a viable mentoring and tutoring system. This requires, for example, rigorously organizing the program of weekly student consultations, developing annual plans for mentoring by involving students from later years and alumni, developing annual plans for tutoring activities and designating tutors (among professors) for each year of study and series/group of students, including in the professors' evaluation criteria, the tutoring activities and rewarding each according to their results.
- Increasing the visibility of the activities performed by the information, consultation and career orientation centres encountered in universities: choosing the right dimension (as number of employees and jobs performed) for them (to fit the number of university students), facilitating the students' and alumni's access to databases for open job positions; constantly updating these databases, ensuring a permanent link between students/alumni and the job market (for example, companies, public administration, etc.), professional counselling to ensure a smooth transition from student life to work life, elaborating analysis reports concerning the solicitations of the job market, etc.
- Generalizing and extending a set of good practices for active learning to all the disciplines taught in the university. This objective can be operationalized by including in the subject outline certain learning and teaching methods such as: project based learning (individual or group projects anchored in current practice or developed inside companies, having a clear structure), learning by problematizing (students are placed in diverse decisional situations, they generate solutions), learning by cooperation and

collaboration (students work on projects or solve problems in teams, in conditions of positive interdependence and individual responsibility), learning based on case studies, learning through personal experience (professors or students share their professional experiences related to the course subject; company visits, visits to public administration agencies, etc.), role plays / simulations (diverse business situations), study case competitions, debates regarding scientific and professional current events, guest speakers. Moreover, it is necessary to approach the teaching and learning methods mentioned above in a complementary way at the level of each study program, and to ensure the necessary infrastructure to perform didactic activities by applying the learning methods mentioned above.

- Personalizing the educational act. This objective can be put into practice by composing homogenous study formations as level of preparedness (reorganized at the end of each academic year) and, as much as possible, heterogeneous in what regards past experiences, specific needs, learning styles and by implementing blended learning programs in those faculties which have the necessary infrastructure and personnel (professors familiarized with this method of teaching and learning) to perform this type of didactic activities. Moreover, each student can have the possibility to really choose among optional and facultative subjects after going through compulsory subjects (the common subjects).
- Centring attention on the results of the learning process. This is based on developing and applying complex evaluation systems, objective, summative and not based on accumulations, with an emphasis on the results of learning such as: developed competences – specialty knowledge, abilities, skills, attitudes – ethical, civic, behavioural.
- Involving students in research activities by including them in research teams, financed or not financed, led by professors or the university, by writing scientific articles and papers in collaboration with them, by inviting them to participate in scientific communication sessions and rewarding their scientific research results with prizes.
- Instilling a strong sense of responsibility in students for the results obtained at the end of the study programs by treating them as partners and active participants in the educational process.
- Organizing summer schools as a preparatory step for the facilitation of access to a certain study program or for deepening a certain subject taught within a study program.
- Organizing public debates as round tables or workshops with the participation of professors and business people regarding interesting subjects for students, correlated with the subjects they study and the current reality, and also organizing periodical conferences on communicated themes.

6. Conclusions and discussions

Universities need to make sure that they have identified the appropriate selection methods to recruit future students, to ensure the career progress management of students registered in their study programs and offer corresponding social services, as required by students. Simultaneously, universities have to ensure a quality professional orientation and a well organized career service and to facilitate students' contact with the reality of the socio-economic environment.

Universities must support students' personal and professional development beyond the mere acquisition of knowledge. They must help students define their future professional orientation.

The importance of the active learning methods and education based on outcomes resides in the fact that the university has to prepare its students for a complete integration within knowledge society which is characterized by the following:

- Complex phenomena which require a more consistent baggage of professional, social and cultural knowledge than before. Moreover, the speed with which information circulates in high volume inhibits the recipients' capacity for interpretation in time for it to be useful.
- Dynamism and continuous innovation.
- The movement from knowing as an ensemble of knowledge, information, data towards knowing as an ensemble of competences ("to know how to do/ to act").
- The need to form individuals capable to analyse new situations and provide an adequate response, by utilizing their capacity for critical thinking, problem solving, logical thinking, divergent thinking and adaptability to new situations.
- The development of the professor as a facilitator, having the role to create learning situations where students establish their learning methods, are aware of their results and perfect their learning activities.

In order for the results of this article to become useful to the members of the academic community, they have to be used as a basis for dialogue between professors and management structures, on the one hand, and between professors and students, on the other.

Bibliography

Altbach, Ph. G., Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L. E. (2009) *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution* (A report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 world conference on higher education). Paris: UNESCO.

Bleiklie, I. and Kogan, M. (2007) 'Organization and governance in universities.' *Higher Education Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 477-493.

Brandes, D. and Ginnis, P. (1986) *A Guide to Student Centred Learning*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bunning, F. (2006) *The Transformation of Vocational Education and Training (VET) in the Baltic States - Survey of Reforms and Developments (Technical and Vocational Education Training: Issues, Concerns and Prospects)*. London: Springer.

Burnard, P. (1999) 'Carl Rogers and postmodernism: Challenges in nursing and health sciences.' *Nursing and Health Sciences*, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 241-247.

Clark, B. (2004) *Sustaining change in universities: Continuities in case studies and concepts*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Da Costa, O., Warnke, P., Cagnin, C. and Scapolo, P. (2008) 'The impact of foresight on policy-makind: Insights from the FORLEARN mutual learning process.' *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 369-387.

Drechsler, R. and Wiesner, A. (2012) 'Ambitious and agile: The University of Bremen's institutional strategy for advancing research strengths at a mid-sized university.' *The Academic Executive Brief*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 1-5.

Education International (2010) *Enhancing Quality: Academics' Perceptions of the Bologna Process*. Bruxelles.

Education International and European Student's Union (2010) *Învăţământ centrat pe student: Ghid pentru studenţi, cadre didactice şi instituţii de învăţământ superior*. Bruxelles. [Online] [Accessed on the 7th of October 2013] http://www.anosr.ro/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/2012-Toolkit-ICS-cadredidactice1.pdf.

Etzkowitz, H. and Leydesdorff, L. (1997) *Universities and the global knowledge economy: a triple helix of university-industry-government relations*. London: Pinter.

European Commission (2011) *Supporting growth and jobs – An agenda for the modernization of Europe's higher education system*. COM (2011) 567/2, Brussels.

Gumport, P.J. (2000) 'Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives.' *Higher Education*, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 67-91.

Holland, J. (2009) 'Young people and social capital.' *Young: Nordic Journal of Youth Research*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 331-350.

Kember, D. (2008) 'Promoting Student-Centred Forms of Learning across an Entire University.' *Higher Education*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp.1-13.

Lavoie, D. and Rosman, A.J. (2007) 'Using Active Student-Centred Learning-Based Instructional Design to Develop Faculty and Improve Course Design, Delivery, and Evaluation.' *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp.105-118.

Neştian, A.Ş. (coord.) (2013) *Viziunea „Universitatea orientată spre TQM în anul 2025"*: studiu realizat în cadrul proiectului „Comunitate universitară pentru managementul calităţii în învăţământul superior". Iaşi: Sedcom Libris

Rauhvargers, A. (2004) 'Improving the recognition of qualifications in the framework of the Bologna Process.' *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 331-347.

OECD (2010) *Education at a glance 2010*. Paris: OECD.

O'Neill, G. şi McMahon, T. (2005) *Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers?* University College Dublin. [Online] [Accessed on the 4th of October 2013] http://www.aishe.org/readings/2005-1/oneill-mcmahon-Tues_19th_Oct_SCL.html.

Salmi, J. (2009) 'Scenarios for finnacial sustainability in higher education.' In *Higher Education to 2030*, Vol. 2: Globalization. Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. OECD.

Taylor, P.G. (2000) 'Changing Expectations: Preparing students for Flexible Learning.' *The International Journal of Academic Development*, Vol. 5, Nr. 2, pp. 107-115.