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1. How Rankings Measure Research
The Policy Context

- Globalisation and Knowledge Society,

- ‘Battle for Brainpower’ (Economist, 2006), ‘Scramble for students’ (Matsumoto and Ono, 2008, p1) or ‘Skilled Migration’ (OECD, 2008),

- ‘New Public Management’,

- Student is savvy participant/consumer/customer as link between HE and career/salary grows.
Rankings and the K-economy

- If HE is the engine of the economy, then productivity, quality and status of HE/HE research is vital indicator;

- Global competition reflected in the rising significance and popularity of rankings
  - Provide a framework or lens through which the global economy and national (and supra-national) positioning can be understood by giving a ‘plausible’ explanation of world excellence;
  - Measure national competitiveness as expressed by number of HEIs in top 20, 50 or 100...
  - Attempt to measure knowledge-producing and talent-catching capacity of HEIs;
  - Appear to (re)order global knowledge by giving weight and prominence to particular disciplines/fields of investigation.
## Comparing What Rankings Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SJT ARWU</th>
<th>Times QS</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td>Peer Appraisal</td>
<td>Research Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Faculty</td>
<td>Graduate Employability</td>
<td>No. Articles in last 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Nobel Prize/Field Medal</td>
<td>Teaching Quality/SSR</td>
<td>No. Articles in current year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. HiCi Researchers</td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Research Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Output</td>
<td>International Faculty</td>
<td>No. Citations in last 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Articles in Nature/Science</td>
<td>Research Quality/Citations per Faculty</td>
<td>No. Citations in last 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Articles in Citation Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avr. no Citations in last 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HiCi index of last 2 years</td>
<td>No. HiCi Papers, last 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>Quality of Education</td>
<td>Peer Appraisal</td>
<td>Research Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>Quality of Faculty</td>
<td>Graduate Employability</td>
<td>No. Articles in last 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>No. Nobel Prize/Field Medal</td>
<td>Teaching Quality/SSR</td>
<td>No. Articles in current year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>No. HiCi Researchers</td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Research Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>Research Output</td>
<td>International Faculty</td>
<td>No. Citations in last 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>No. Articles in Nature/Science</td>
<td>Research Quality/Citations per Faculty</td>
<td>No. Citations in last 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>No. Articles in Citation Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avr. no Citations in last 11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td></td>
<td>HiCi index of last 2 years</td>
<td>No. HiCi Papers, last 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT ARWU</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Articles in High-Impact Journals in Current Year</td>
<td>No. of Subject Fields where University Demonstrates Excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SJT ARWU: 10%, 20%, 20%, 20%, 10%
- Times QS: 40%, 10%, 20%, 5%, 5%, 20%
- Taiwan: 10%, 10%, 10%, 10%, 20%, 10%, 10%, 10%, 10%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators used for Research</th>
<th>Ranking System (Country)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall grants (money amount)</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants per faculty (money amount)</td>
<td>Austria, Germany, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants per faculty (absolute numbers)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research projects funded by EU</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in int’l research programmes</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of publications</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications per researcher</td>
<td>Germany, Slovakia, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per faculty</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations per publication</td>
<td>Germany, Slovakia, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of int’l publications</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% articles cited within 1st two years after publication</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of publications with 5+ citations</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% articles belonging to top 5% most cited articles (HiCi)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of patents (absolute number)</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents per faculty</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of pg research students</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality</td>
<td>Germany, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for research</td>
<td>Austria, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hendel and Stolz, 2008
2. Institutional Responses to Rankings
How Institutions are Responding

63% HE leaders have taken strategic, organisational, managerial or academic actions in response to the results.

Of those,

- Overwhelming majority took either strategic or academic decisions and actions,

- Only 8% respondents indicated they had taken no action.
Translating Rankings into Action (1)

- Identify indicators easiest to influence, and set targets for different units and levels of organisation.
- Simplest, most cost-neutral actions affect brand, institutional data, and choice of publication or language:
  - Ensure ‘best’ data presentation,
  - Publish in English language highly cited/international journals,
  - Ensure common institutional brand used on all academic publications.
- Because size matters, organisation of research important:
  - Aggregate departments and abolish weak performing departments,
  - Focus on research institutes and graduate schools,
    - Separate undergraduate and postgraduate activity.
- Direct resources (physical & human) to particular units, build new dedicated labs and other facilities, reward productive & successful departments.
Translating Rankings into Action (2)

Education
- Develop/expand English-language facilities and capacity through specialist language centres, new programmes esp. at pg level, recruitment of international scholars and students,
- Preference postgraduate over undergraduate activity.

Research
- Bio-sciences best represented in international data bases
- Focus resource allocation towards fields which are more productive, better performers, and indicator sensitive/responsive,
- Arts, humanities and social sciences feel vulnerable, but also professional disciplines without strong tradition of peer-reviewed publications.

Faculty and Students
- Head-hunt and reward Hi-Ci faculty,
- Positively affect staff-student ratio,
- Recruit more high-achieving student, preferably at PhD level.
## Mapping Institutional Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specific Actions</th>
<th>Weightings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Research** | • Relatively develop/promote bio-sciences rather than arts, humanities & social sciences  
• Allocate additional faculty to internationally ranked departments  
• Reward publications in highly-cited journals  
• Publish in English-language journals  
• Set individual targets for faculty and departments | SJT = 40%  
Times = 20% |
| **Organisation** | • Merge with another institution, or bring together discipline-complementary departments  
• Incorporate autonomous institutes into host HEI  
• Establish Centres-of-Excellence & Graduate Schools  
• Develop/expand English-language facilities, international student facilities, laboratories | SJT = 40%  
Times = 20% |
| **Curriculum** | • Harmonise with EU/US models  
• Discontinue programmes/activities which negatively affect performance  
• Grow postgraduate activity in preference to undergraduate  
• Favour science disciplines  
• Positively affect student/staff ratio (SSR) | SJT = 10%  
Times = 20% |
| **Students** | • Target high-achieving students, esp. PhD  
• Offer attractive merit scholarships and other benefits | Times = 15% |
| **Faculty** | • Head-hunt international high-achieving/HiCi scholars  
• Create new contract/tenure arrangements  
• Set market-based or performance/merit based salaries  
• Reward high-achievers  
• Identify weak performers | SJT = 40%  
Times = 25% |
| **Academic Services** | • Professionalise Admissions, Marketing and Public Relations  
• Ensure common brand used on all publications  
• Advertise in high-focus journals, e.g. *Science* and *Nature* | Times = 40% |
3. Policy Responses to Rankings
National Competitiveness

If rankings measure national competitiveness, then gap between ambition and global positioning of national HEIs.

- Only 10 European universities featured in top 50 compared with 35 for the US in 2004 SJT,
  - Europe ‘behind not just the US but other economies’ (Dempsey, 2004).
- Many OECD countries face sharp demographic shifts evidenced by the greying of population and a decline in PhD graduates.
Translating Rankings into Action (1)

- Using Rankings to restructure HE system;
- Devising Appropriate Indicators to Influence/Incentivize Behaviour Vs. Use Global Rankings;
- Allocating Resources According to Mission, Performance or Rankings;
  - Will intensify as economies/financial situation tightens
- Concentrating Resources in Few ‘Centres of Excellence’ Vs. Support Excellence Wherever it Exists;
- Using Rankings to Foster Differentiation Vs. Mission Profiling.
How are governments responding?

2 main policy regimes

1. Create greater vertical (reputational) differentiation [neo-liberal model] (e.g. German, Japan, France):
   - ‘excellence initiatives’ to concentrate research in 10/30 world-class universities;
   - ‘to compete globally, the government will close down some regional and private universities and direct money to the major universities’

2. Create greater horizontal (mission) differentiation [social-democratic] (e.g. Australia, Norway):
   - ‘Create diverse set of high performing, globally-focused HEIs’
   - ‘Move towards self-declaration of mission, setting own metrics and a corresponding funding model’
   - Link ‘compacts’ to mission and performance
Translating Rankings into Action (2)

- EU Classification Project.
- EU Expert Group: Assessment of University-Based Research.
- Declaration on Ranking of European Higher Education Institutions.
- EU Tender for a European Ranking of HE.
4. Some Implications for the Production of Knowledge
Redefining Knowledge? (1)

SJT rankings provide a ‘plausible’ measurement of research and knowledge creation (Marginson and van der Wende, 2007).

- Trend of simple to complex knowledge reflected in
  - Rise of new disciplines, methodologies and ways of thinking;
  - Shift from Mode 1 to Mode 2.
- Focus on traditional indicators threatens these developments:
  - Over-reliance on research that is easily measured;
  - Over-emphasis on bio-sciences, with limited social science accuracy, and no humanities and arts;
  - Use of peer-publication & citations narrowly defines ‘impact’;
  - Difficulty measuring interdisciplinary research;
  - Ranking journals attempts hierarchically order theoretical and conceptual knowledge;
  - Values some disciplines and research as more valuable than other work.
Concentrating research in a few elite institutions or scientific disciplines will maximize involvement in world science (Chubb, 2008).

- Emphasis on S&T as only form of innovation disregards social innovation and threatens return to Mode 1 (NESTA, http://www.nesta.org.uk/),

- But equally, not obvious that this kind of investment will create breadth of patentable knowledge that can be exploited,

- Concentration could reduce national research capacity with ‘knock-on consequences for regional economic performance and the capacity for technology innovation’ (Lambert, 2003, p6),

- Misunderstands the research/innovation process (Rothwell, 1994).
To summarise...

- Rankings are a manifestation of globalization,
- They have gained popularity because they (appear to) gauge world class status, provide accountability and measure national competitiveness,
- Because of linear assumptions linking HE research and economic growth, rankings induce governments and HE to adopt simplistic solutions and skew research agendas/policies,
- Rankings value some research more highly than other research, and influence how performance is measured and evaluated – especially in periods of economic crisis,
- At the extreme, rankings provoke
  - Return to classical conceptions of knowledge conducted by elites in selected institutions and
  - Retreat from new ways of thinking, Mode 2 knowledge and interdisciplinary solutions to global problems.
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