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Background: methodological problems of international rankings

Unease with existing global rankings

- Cultural and language bias
- Neglect of teaching & learning
- Neglect of non-university research
- Biased against humanities, social sciences
- Only international research universities

High international acceptance of approaches like CHE ranking
Background: Call for Tender

- Development of concept *and* feasibility study
- *Global* ranking (not only European)
- Multi-dimensional ranking
  - teaching & learning, incl. employability
  - research
  - internationalisation
  - community outreach
- Field-based *and* institutional rankings
- Universities and non-university HEIs
- Inclusion of non-university research institutions
- Information for multiple stakeholders: students, HEIs/HEI managers, politics, employers
Background: Call for Tender

Sample for feasibility study, about 150 institutions:

- Big EU member states: 32%
- Small EU member states: 28%
- North America: 19%
- Asia: 19%
- Australia: 2%
One common ranking including all ~4,000 European HEIs irrespective of their missions, structures and fields does not make sense for any group of stakeholders.

Identifying comparable institutions that can be ranked in one ranking.

**CLASSIFICATION**
- Description of horizontal diversity
  - Types/profiles

**RANKINGS**
- Assessment of vertical diversity
  - Performance

Complementary instruments of transparency: Mapping diversity.
Basic Ideas: Mapping diversity

Classification

Institutional rankings
- Dimension 1
- Dimension 2
- Dimension 3
- Dimension ...

Types of institutions
- Type A
- Type B
- ...

Field-based rankings
- Dimension 1
- Dimension 2
- Dimension 3
- Dimension ...

„multiple excellence“

Multi-dimensional global university ranking
Basic ideas: example of two different profiles

- Innovation intensiveness
- Types of degrees
- Regional engagement
- Size
- Range of subjects
- Research intensiveness
- International orientation
- Modes of delivery

Multi-dimensional global university ranking
Basic ideas

General set of indicators (database) for international rankings

Selection according to field / type of institution / target group

Multitude of specific rankings
Basic Ideas

Methodological approach of CHE rankings

Multi-Dimensional
- no composite overall indicator
- multi-dimensional view on profiles
- personalised ranking (web tool)

Group approach
- avoiding false impressions of exactness resp. differences between HEIs given by league tables

Field-based
- Most target groups (e.g. students, researchers) are interested in results about fields
- aggregation across fields blurs profiles

Multi-dimensional global university ranking
Structure of the project

**U-MULTIRANK INTERNATIONAL EXPERT PANEL**

**U-MULTIRANK Stakeholder Consultation process**

**KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

**U-MULTIRANK Project Board**

**U-MULTIRANK Core Research Group**

**U-MULTIRANK Field Associations**

**U-MULTIRANK National Correspondents**

Support to IR/FR in pilot rankings in their countries

Support to FR in pilot rankings in their fields

IR: Institutional Ranking Research Team

FR: Field Ranking Research Team

coordination, integration

Advises

Advises

Multi-dimensional global university ranking
Work packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>WP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock-taking</td>
<td>Selection of Pilot institutions + Pre-test</td>
<td>Data base construction</td>
<td>Data collection + Data handling</td>
<td>Data and feasibility analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td></td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>WP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions and Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td></td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>WP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation and Dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-dimensional global university ranking
there has to be the focus on dimensions, which are the basis for the classification and the rankings

results of U-map project are used to identify dimensions (trade off: capture the profiles and tasks of universities, but keep it simple enough to be transparent)
Model: field-based rankings

objectives
(1) support student choice
(2) Support quality-oriented institutional decision-making

rankings as decision-support systems

realisation
cover the different requests of the Commission by consistent combination of field, university type and major target group
Model: Pilots field-based rankings

### Fields
- Business
- Engineering

### Types of HEIs
- Profile A: internationally oriented, research intensive universities
- Profile 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
- Third mission engagement
- Internationalisation
- Community outreach

Multi-dimensional global university ranking
### Model of indicators

The model presents a multi-dimensional global university ranking framework. It categorizes universities by their stage of development and the enabling and performance aspects.

#### Stages
- Functions / Audiences
- Education
- Research
- Knowledge Transfer
- International Orientation
- Regional Engagement

#### Enabling / Performance
- Input
- Process
- Output
- Impact

The model is designed to evaluate universities based on their functions and audiences across different stages, ensuring a comprehensive ranking approach.
Selection of indicators

- Literature on indicators/rankings
  - Existing national and international rankings
  - Systems of evaluation and accreditation
  - Benchmarking networks

General set of indicators for international rankings

Specification with regard to
- Purpose of ranking
- Target groups
- Level (institutional, fields)
- Types of institutions
- Fields

Methodological criteria
- Relevance
- Validity
- Reliability
- Availability of data
- International comparability

Indicators for specific rankings
Selection of indicators

Intense consultation with stakeholders on relevance of indicators

1. Online-Survey: Rating of relevance of indicators by stakeholders
2. Stakeholder workshop: Delphi method
3. Post-workshop survey
4. Written stakeholder consultation (selected institutions)
   = This is where we are now
Questions for the feasibility study

- What is feasible?
- Global or European?
- Field-based and/or institutional rankings?
- How to ensure clearly defined/separated role of classification and rankings?
- Who can be the „owner“ of an international ranking?
- Can there be a valid global ranking showing excellence beyond the international research university?
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