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Context

• European (supranational) policies regarding higher education and research
  - European Research Area (ERA)
  - Bologna Process
  - European Higher Education Area (EHEA)
• ‘diversity’ as a major strength
• wish to increase ‘transparency of diversity’
  - Bologna conference, Leuven, April 2009
• necessary distinction between “horizontal” and “vertical” diversity
The rise of global rankings

- Academic Ranking of World Class Universities (ARWU) Shanghai Jiaotong University, since 2003
- Times Higher Education Supplement World Rankings (THE) Times Higher Education, since 2004
- Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan Ranking (HEEACT), since 2007
- The Leiden Ranking (LR) Leiden University, since 2008
Critique of existing rankings

- focus on ‘whole institutions’ (ignoring internal variance)
- concentrate on ‘traditional’ research productivity and impact
- focus on ‘comprehensive research universities’
- aggregate performance into composite overall indicators
- use constructed ‘league table’
- imply cultural and language biases
- imply bias against humanities and social sciences
- neglect non-university research
- do not adequately imply stakeholder needs
Designing an alternative: the EC Call for Tender

- development of concept and feasibility study
- global ranking (not only European)
- multi-dimensional
  - teaching and learning (incl. employability)
  - research
  - knowledge transfer
  - internationalisation (incl. mobility)
  - community outreach
- institutional and field-based (disciplines)
- all types of higher education and research institutions
- multiple stakeholders
Conceptual approach

- one common ranking of all higher education and research institutions worldwide does not make sense for any group of stakeholders
- identify institutions that are *comparable*
- use the *U-Map classification* tool to find comparable institutions (description of horizontal diversity)
- apply ranking instrument to sets of comparable institutions or fields (assessment of vertical diversity)
U-Map

- a tool to create ‘transparency of diversity’ (mapping diversity)
- *descriptive*, not evaluative
- work in progress
- six dimensions:
  - educational profile
  - student profile
  - research involvement
  - knowledge exchange
  - international orientation
  - regional engagement
- ‘institutional profiles’
Logic of institutional rankings

U-Map ➔ descriptive institutional profiles on six dimensions

U-Multirank ➔ performance profiles of single dimensions, no aggregated institutional rankings

to be called: Focused Institutional Rankings
Pilots focused institutional rankings (150 HEIs)

U-Map profile finder

Target groups

Main target group: National policy makers

Main target group: HEIs/HEI managers

Dimensions

- Teaching & learning
- Research
- Knowledge exchange
- Internationalisation
- Regional engagement
Logic of field-based rankings

U-Map → descriptive institutional profiles on six dimensions

U-Multirank → performance profile of scientific field in institutions with comparable profile

to be called: Field-based Rankings
## Make use of CHE Ranking methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Dimensional</th>
<th>Group approach</th>
<th>Field-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • no composite overall indicator  
• multi-dimensional view on profiles  
• personalised ranking (web tool) | • avoiding false impressions of exactness resp. differences between HEIs given by league tables | • many target groups (e.g. students, researchers) are interested in results about fields  
• ranking as information system supporting student choice and institutional management |
Pilots field-based rankings

Types of HEIs
- Type A: internationally oriented, research intensive universities
- Type B: More regionally oriented, teaching institutions

Target groups
- Main target group: MA/PhD students
- Main target group: HEIs/HEI managers

Dimensions
- Teaching & learning, incl. employability
- Research
- Knowledge exchange
- Internationalisation
- Regional engagement

Fields
- Business
- Engineering

CHERPA - NETWORK
U-Multirank

‘multiple excellences’

- multidimensional perspective of ‘institutional profiles’
- no overall ‘league tables’
- no composite institutional indicators
- two-level analysis (institutional and ‘field’)
- stakeholders driven approach
The CHERPA-NETWORK
CHERPA - NETWORK

Work packages

Design Phase

- WP1: Stock-taking
- WP2: Dimensions and Indicators
- WP3: Instrument Design

Test Phase

- WP4: Selection of Pilot institutions + Pre-test
- WP5: Data base construction
- WP6: Data collection + Data handling
- WP7: Data and feasibility analysis
- WP8: Implementation plan
- WP9: Consultation and Dissemination

Project planning, management, quality assurance
Challenges (I)

Conceptual challenges:

- how to clearly define separate tools (U-Map and U-Multirank)?
- how to combine Focused Institutional Rankings and Field-based Rankings?
- how to avoid ‘one-dimensional’ dominance?
- how to avoid dominance of the profile of excellence in basic research and guarantee multiple excellence?
- how to create stakeholders driven approach?
Challenges (II)

Methodological challenges:

- how to select indicators and produce data elements?
- how to define global testing sample (150 pilot institutions worldwide)?
- how to create a relevant and reliable data base?
- how to organise the quality assurance of the data collection?
- feasibility on world-wide level?
Challenges (III)

Implementation challenges:

• how to organise the sustainable future operation of U-Multirank?
• how to organise stakeholders involvement?
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