

2012

European "Transparency Instruments": Driving the Modernisation of European Higher Education

Ellen Hazelkorn

Technological University Dublin, ellen.hazelkorn@tudublin.ie

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/cserbk>



Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hazelkorn, E. (2012). European Transparency Instruments: : Driving the Modernisation of European Higher Education In S.Curaj et al (eds) *Between the Bologna Process and National Reform*. Vol. 1, Springer.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Centre for Social and Educational Research at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Books/Book chapters by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie, vera.kilshaw@tudublin.ie.

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Series Title		
Chapter Title	European “Transparency Instruments”: Driving the Modernisation of European Higher Education	
Chapter SubTitle		
Copyright Year	2012	
Copyright Holder	Springer Science + Business Media B.V.	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Hazelkorn
	Particle	
	Given Name	Ellen
	Suffix	
	Division	Graduate Research School, Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU), Directorate of Research and Enterprise
	Organization	Dublin Institute of Technology
	Address	143-147 Rathmines Road, Dublin 6, Ireland
	Email	ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie

Abstract	<p>This paper reviews the background and assesses the usefulness of the various transparency instruments (e.g. college guides, accreditation, classification systems, benchmarking models, global rankings). While there are differences between these various “instruments”, they can all be considered as part of the growing trend for greater transparency, accountability and comparability which began with college guides or handbooks around 1970. It will then place the most recent European developments (e.g. U-Map and U-Multirank) and other EU-funded initiatives (Expert Group on the Assessment of University-based Research and the 3-M Project on Third Mission) within this context. In doing so, the paper will discuss the extent to which these initiatives provide greater transparency and information for stakeholders, and the impact that such initiatives are having on higher education. The paper asks to what extent these initiatives support broad higher education policy objectives, e.g. the modernisation agenda of higher education institutions, their strategic orientations and the requirements of knowledge-driven societies.</p>
----------	---

Chapter 19 1
European “Transparency Instruments”: 2
Driving the Modernisation of European 3
Higher Education 4

Ellen Hazelkorn 5

19.1 Globalisation and Accountability 6

Even before the global financial crisis of 2008 (GFC), there were question-marks 7
over the degree to which higher education is accountable for its actions/activity to 8
public stakeholders and students, and the needs and demands of society and the 9
economy. Some of these questions arose in response to the ideological shift in many 10
countries since the 1980s which favoured neo-liberal values of the market, business 11
efficiency models and unquestioned support for public services. But the queries also 12
focused on more fundamental issues. 13

Higher education and the application of knowledge has become the undisputed 14
source of social, economic and political power in the age of globalisation. Its con- 15
tribution to economic growth can be so significant that higher education is regularly 16
described as “the engine of development in the new world economy” (Castells 1994, 17
14). It is considered an essential component of the productive economy and a key 18
plank of government strategy for growth and innovation. Studies regularly show the 19
strong correlation between educational attainment and social and economic advan- 20
tages for individuals and society (OECD 2009). National pre-eminence is no longer 21
sufficient to guarantee success. Seen in this context, it is not surprising that the 22
productivity, quality and status of higher education institutions (HEI) and 23
university-based research have become vital indicators of a nation’s ability to com- 24
pete successfully in the global economy. 25

This trigger has been amplified by the emergence and rising prominence of 26
global rankings – an inevitable development in a globalised world. They have 27

[AU1] E. Hazelkorn (✉)
Graduate Research School, Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU),
Directorate of Research and Enterprise, Dublin Institute of Technology,
143-147 Rathmines Road, Dublin 6, Ireland
e-mail: ellen.hazelkorn@dit.ie

28 linked the investment attractiveness of nations with the talent-catching and
29 knowledge-producing capacity of higher education. Universities are vital magnets
30 for mobile talent, students and faculty – the crude oil of the twenty-first century. The
31 world order is regularly presented as a league table, in which the fortunes of nations
32 are reflected in the performance of universities. Recognising this significance, the
33 Irish Minister for Education and Science, speaking on behalf of the European
34 Council at the time of the first edition of the Shanghai *Academic Ranking of World*
35 *Universities* (ARWU), said the “news is not all that good” that too few European
36 universities featured among the world’s top 500 (Dempsey 2004) – especially for a [AU2]
37 region which seeks to be the “the world’s most competitive and dynamic economy
38 by 2010” (European Commission 2000). In the intervening years, the status of
39 European universities has barely changed while the US continues to dominate global
40 rankings, and China and other Asian countries have begun to challenge (European
41 Commission 2011, 2; Levin 2010).

42 These developments have “sparked a public debate on university reform”
43 (Dewatripont 2008, 6; Lambert and Butler 2006; Aghion et al. 2007; Ritzen 2010)
44 across Europe and beyond, intensifying in the aftermath of the GFC, which has seen
45 many countries struggling with large public deficits. How higher education is gov-
46 erned and managed has itself become a major policy issue. At the same time, there
47 are heightened “concerns about quality, particularly the quality of graduates and
48 research outputs”, especially in publicly-funded systems (Harman 2011, 36). And
49 the public is not the only stakeholder asking questions; students are concerned about
50 escalating costs and tuition fees, when compared with employability, career oppor-
51 tunities and potential salary. Whether funded from public or private sources, rising
52 costs prompted *The Economist* to suggest higher education could be the next bubble
53 (Schumpeter 2011).

54 In response, governments have embarked on significant reshaping and “modernis-
55 ation” of their higher education and research systems; the EU is no exception
56 (Maassen and Stensaker 2011; Van Vught 2006). The common theme is value-
57 for-money and efficiency, greater/better accountability and transparency, and ensur-
58 ing investor confidence. Verifiable evidence of quality and excellence are two key
59 mantras dominating higher education. A wide range of stakeholders are now taking
60 an interest in the performance and productivity of higher education including
61 national and regional governments, students and their parents, employers in the
62 public and private sector, industry and businesses of all kinds, civil society, the
63 media and the public opinion.

64 Initially, higher education appeared reluctant to engage fully with the questions
65 suggesting it represented an unwarranted interference in “academic freedom” or
66 was the unsavoury side of “new public management”. Indeed, it is probably fair to
67 say that higher education has been poor at showcasing willingness to demonstrate
68 value beyond the L’Oreal mantra: “because we’re worth it”. The confluence of
69 events has however heightened policy, public and student interest in the perfor-
70 mance and productivity of higher education – at the organisational level, and also at
71 the level of the individual faculty member and student. Calls for greater account-
72 ability and transparency are driving change across systems and institutions, in

academic contracts, in service-level agreements with students, and with society at large. While higher education yearned for the time it would head the policy agenda, it never anticipated the intensity of scrutiny that would follow.

This paper provides an overview and brief assessment of the different transparency instruments – from college guides to global rankings. While there are differences in approaches and purposes, each instrument can be considered as part of the growing trend for greater transparency, accountability and comparability – the level of enquiry increasing in response/reaction to global and stakeholder pressure. It is in this context, that the European Union, beginning in 2005, provided funding to develop alternative methodologies. Section 19.2 provides a typology of transparency instruments, comparing and contrasting their purpose, methodology and audience. Section 19.3 looks in more detail at recent EU initiatives, asking whether these initiatives provide robust alternatives. Finally, Sect. 19.4 discusses whether these instruments provide real accountability and transparency for stakeholders, and makes some recommendations.

[AU3]

19.2 Accountability and Transparency Instruments 88

University rankings had their origins in the US in the early part of the twentieth century. According to Webster (1986, 14, 107–119), the man who invented rankings was James McKeen Cattell; in 1910, he published *American Men of Science* to show the “‘scientific strength’ of leading universities using the research reputation of their faculty members”. *U.S. News and World Report Best College Rankings* (USNWR) marks the second phase in 1983, providing consumer-oriented information to students and parents. Its rise to prominence coincided with the ideological and public “shift in the Zeitgeist towards the glorification of markets” (Karabel 2005, 514). Today, there are over 50 different nationally-oriented rankings (Salmi and Saroyan 2007; Usher and Jarvey 2010). Global rankings, which have become an international phenomenon since 2003, represent the latest and most popularised form of measuring and comparing higher education performance and organizational effectiveness (Shin 2011). As such, they should be seen alongside other formats and methodologies, inter alia, college guides, accreditation, quality assurance, benchmarking and classification (see Table 19.1). Operating in tandem but differing considerably with respect to purpose, policy orientation, stakeholder and customer, and methodology (see Table 19.2 and discussion below), the different formats form part of a broad movement for greater transparency and accountability.

19.2.1 Overview of Instruments 107

- COLLEGE GUIDES can be divided into three categories, depending upon whether they provide basic statistical information, a narrative account of

t1.1	Table 19.1 Typology of transparency and accountability instruments
t1.2	College Guide: fulfil public service role, helping and informing domestic undergraduate
t1.3	students and their parents;
t1.4	Accreditation: used to certify the legitimacy of a particular HEI including the authority to
t1.5	award qualifications, either directly or via another agency;
t1.6	Quality Assurance, Evaluation and Assessment: used to assess quality of research, teaching &
t1.7	learning, institutional processes and/or governance structures in order to compare and
t1.8	improve performance;
t1.9	Benchmarking: used to more strategically, effectively and efficiently manage and make
t1.10	decisions through systematic comparison of practice and performance with peer
t1.11	institutions;
t1.12	Classification Systems: provides a typology or framework of higher education institutions to
t1.13	denote diversity usually according to mission and type;
t1.14	National Rankings: national comparison of performance to underpin accreditation, aid resource
t1.15	allocation, improve quality, etc.;
t1.16	Global Rankings: international comparison of institutional performance and reputation.
t1.17	Source: Hazelkorn (2011, 41)

110 “what it is really like” to be a student at a particular college or university or an
 111 audience-focused guide to help students find “good matches” (Hunter 1995, 5–9).
 112 This market has grown in response to the rising costs of higher education,
 113 student mobility, and the importance attached to a qualification for future
 114 career opportunities and quality of life. Many of these are published under a
 115 generic *Good University Guide* title and are widely used by domestic under-
 116 graduate students. While they began life in hard-copy format, the rise of the
 117 internet and new forms of communication have revolutionised access to infor-
 118 mation, stimulating growth of many on-line versions. The type of information
 119 varies from one publication to the next, but broadly they provide information
 120 about the overall student experience, e.g. student housing, social life, costs to
 121 resources and education/teaching quality. They are developed and promoted
 122 by commercial organisations, which are a clear driver for the annual updates
 123 and supplements.

124 • As the number and range of higher education providers has expanded to meet
 125 demand, ACCREDITATION has taken on increasing significance. Undertaken
 126 by governments directly or through specialized agencies, it recognizes the legiti-
 127 macy or authority of particular HEIs to offer programmes of instruction and
 128 award qualifications. It focuses on the capacity of an institution to achieve the
 129 appropriate standard, in addition to improving and expanding provision in accor-
 130 dance with national qualifications framework and institutional missions. The
 131 process may be considered “voluntary” and is generally non-competitive but
 132 without accreditation HEIs cannot operate or receive government funding – and
 133 herein lies the influence or power of government even in more diffusely regu-
 134 lated regimes such as the US. The trend towards enhanced government involve-
 135 ment and regulation reflects increasing “pressures of accountability and concern
 136 about the quality of provisions and outputs” (Harman 2011, 46). Accreditation

Table 19.2 Comparison of characteristics and uses of transparency instruments

	College guide	Accreditation	Quality assurance, evaluation and assessment	Benchmarking	Classification	Rankings
t2.1	Student information	Recognize legitimacy or authority	Enhance quality	Enhance quality, performance & competitiveness	Differentiate & categorise HEIs	Compare performance
t2.2	Media organisation or publisher	Government	Government HEIs	HEIs	Government HEIs	National government agency
t2.3	Media organisation or publisher	Government	Government agency	Government	Government HEIs	Media or research organisation
t2.4	Professional organisation	Government	Government agency			
t2.5	College information & description	Recognize programmes or level instruction	Quality assurance	Share data	Categorise by mission or specialisation	Ranking by institution
t2.6	College information & description	Award	Quality audit	Share best practice	Categorise by student cohort or programme	Ranking by field or discipline
t2.7	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Staff development & mentoring	Categorise by student cohort or programme	Ranking by region or nation
t2.8	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.9	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.10	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.11	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.12	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.13	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.14	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.15	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.16	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.17	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.18	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.19	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.20	College information & description	Award	Quality enhancement & improvement	Peer-to-peer	Categorise by pedagogy, research, engagement, etc.	
t2.21	Student life	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.22	Fees & living costs	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.23	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.24	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.25	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.26	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.27	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.28	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation
t2.29	Education & teaching	Institutional mission & breadth of provision	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Teaching & learning Research	Research Reputation

(continued)

Table 19.2 (continued)

	College guide	Accreditation	Quality assurance, evaluation and assessment	Benchmarking	Classification	Rankings
Data sources	Institutional data Student feedback On-site visits	Institutional data National data	Institutional data National data Survey information Peer-to-peer	Institutional data National data	Institutional data National data Survey information	Institutional data National data Public data
Link to policy	Not directly	Institutional legal status Degree awarding authority Operational funding Research funding	Institutional legal status Degree awarding authority Operational funding Research funding	Influence policy direction if led by government	Funding Accreditation Status	Funding Accreditation Status
[AU4] Customers	Students & their parents	Government HEIs Students	HEIs Government Students	HEI	Government, Students & parents Employers, industry & business Civil society Foundations & philanthropy Other HEIs Media & public opinion	Government, Students & parents Employers, industry & business Civil society Foundations & philanthropy Other HEIs Banks and rating agencies Media & public opinion

Source: Based on Shin (2011, 26)

uses similar criteria as rankings, e.g. faculty reputation and research productivity, number of research students and ratio to total student population, etc. – but there is increasing attention to output factors (Brittingham 2011).

Accreditation may also be undertaken at the programme level, e.g. business, medicine, architecture, engineering or law, by their respective professional organisation to ensure an overall quality standard to reassure the public, students and the profession. In this way, the profession asserts control over its bailiwick, as in many instances, graduates are refused permission to practice in a particular field unless the programme has been accredited. While programme accreditation may be voluntary, the imprimatur of, for example, the Association to Advance the Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), Accreditation Council for Business Schools Programs (sic) (ACBSP) or European Quality Improvement System (Equis) run by the European Foundation for Management Development suggests it is an essential quality-mark. In a global professional labour market, accreditation brings necessary international recognition and is used by prospective students to identify a good place to study.

- **QUALITY ASSURANCE** “refers to national and institutional systems designed to assess and improve the quality of teaching and research, and provide relevant information to key stakeholders on the academic standards and employment of graduates” (Harman 2011, 36). Conducted at the whole-of-institution or sub-institutional level, these systems emerged during the 1980s and have acquired “more systematic and rigorous approaches” over subsequent decades (Harman 2011, 40). Their purpose is to assess, monitor and audit academic standards, on a regular basis, so that all stakeholders can be confident of the quality of student outcomes. In Europe, this process is generally driven at the nation-state level, but there have been efforts to establish a European framework and standard, to underpin student mobility. In response to 2003 Berlin communiqué, ENQA developed “an agreed set of standards, procedures and guidelines on quality assurance” and explored “ways of ensuring an adequate peer review system for quality assurance and/or accreditation agencies or bodies” (ENQA 2005). The way may also be “sub-contracted out” to other organisations; for example, the EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme is often conducted under the auspices of a national agency using the principles of self-evaluation and peer-to-peer exchange to encourage continual improvement rather than top-down imposition of criteria. The focus of most QA processes has been on teaching and learning, but more recently attention has turned to the administrative units.

Research assessment is a multifaceted review of performance using peer-review and quantitative indicators; conducted by public agencies, it has become a major policy driver. As public funding of scientific-scholarly activity has risen, questions have been asked about value-for-money, impact and benefit. Research assessment is not without controversy because in addition to monitoring performance, it is often used to allocate resources and drive differentiation between academics and HEIs (AUBR 2010, 53–55). The UK’s research assessment exercise (RAE) is a good example. Organized every 5 years since 1986, it

182 is based on institutional submissions in subject areas or units of assessment,
183 which are ranked by a panel of subject specialist peer reviewers. The results
184 determine the level of resource allocation. This is in sharp contrast to other sys-
185 tems that focus mainly on quality assurance, such as in the Netherlands (Spaapen
186 et al. 2007; for a summary of different systems, see AUBR 2010, 84–144). In
187 recent years, concern about the financial cost, the human and time resources,
188 and bureaucracy, plus allegations of “gaming”, have led to the adoption of indi-
189 cator-based assessment systems using data sources. Results are often published
190 in a hierarchical format called a “league table”. This practice has led to a grow-
191 ing convergence between assessment and rankings (Clarke 2005).

192 • **BENCHMARKING** has transformed institutional comparison processes into a
193 strategic tool, helping higher education leaders, governing authorities and gov-
194 ernments to systematically compare practice and performance with peer insti-
195 tutions or countries. Benchmarking can also be used as a diagnostic tool
196 underpinning a programme of continuous improvement. The process is gener-
197 ally voluntary, and often justifies joining or establishing an international net-
198 work; indeed, many of these networks indicate that sharing good practice is a
199 key objective (Labi 2011). Alternatively, HEIs may identify a basket of peer
200 institutions with which to compare performance or activity by choosing an
201 appropriate sub-set within one of the global or national rankings. While not
202 generally considered a transparency instrument, benchmarking uses soft power
203 to improve quality, performance and competitiveness through peer-to-peer
204 learning and mentoring. This is the approach used by the European Centre for
205 the Strategic Management of Universities (ESMU) which says benchmarking
206 is a “powerful management tool designed to help modernise higher education
207 management and to promote the attractiveness of European Higher Education”.
208 Data exchange for strategic decision-making formed the basis of unique part-
209 nership formed by ten Canadian universities (Proulx 2010). A different
210 approach is used by the OECD, whose Programme for International Student
211 Assessment (PISA) intends that the publication of comparative national data
212 on educational performance will jolt governments into assessing policy in
213 order to achieve improvements.

214 • **CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS** provide a typology or framework to “describe,
215 characterize, and categorize colleges and universities” usually according to mis-
216 sion. The most well-known is the US Carnegie Classification of Institutions of
217 Higher Education (CCEHE); first established in 1973, it provides an all-purpose
218 basis to “represent [the]...diversity [of HEIs] by grouping roughly comparable
219 institutions into meaningful, analytically manageable categories” (McCormick
220 and Zhao 2005, 52–53; Jaschik 2005). While the audience for classification
221 systems is primarily policy makers, HEIs or researchers, they have had a consid-
222 erable influence on how different institutions are described and describe them-
223 selves – with positive and perverse effects. The former has brought greater clarity
224 and understanding about the differences between types of HEIs, while the latter
225 has confused institutional change with “striving” (O’Meara 2007, 123–124). To
226 eradicate the worst offences, Carnegie was redesigned in 2005 creating a

multi-dimensional system whereby HEIs can reside in multiple categories. 227
U-Map (see below), the European version has been developed as a profiling 228
instrument for policymakers and HEIs. 229

- Over the last decade, the number and type of UNIVERSITY RANKINGS have 230
grown exponentially, in response to "public demand for transparency and infor- 231
mation that institutions and government have not been able to meet on their own" 232
(Usher and Savino 2006, 38). Today, there are national rankings in more than 50 233
countries, and ten global rankings of varying degrees of popularity, reliability 234
and trustworthiness. There are also discipline-based rankings, e.g. medicine, law 235
and business, and ranking by higher education system or specialist theme, e.g. 236
green agenda, community colleges, contribution to community/city. Global rank- 237
ings have become a phenomenon since the 2003 publication of *ARWU*, quickly 238
followed by, inter alia, *Webometrics* (produced by the Spanish National Research 239
Council), *THE-QS World University Ranking (THE QS)* 2004–2009, Taiwan 240
Performance Ranking of Scientific Papers for Research Universities (HEEACT) 241
in 2007, *The Leiden Ranking* (2008) by the Centre for Science and Technology 242
Studies (CWTS) and *SCImago* (2009) by a team of Spanish researchers. More 243
recently, *QS World University Rankings* (2010), and *THE-Thomson Reuters* 244
World University Ranking (*THE-TR*) (2010) have emerged, the latter represent- 245
ing a significant market intervention by the producer of a major bibliometric 246
database. The EU is sponsoring U-Multirank (2011). 247

Rankings' popularity is largely related to their simplicity – but this is also the 248
main source of criticism (Hazelkorn 2009, 2011; Rauhvargers 2011). They com- 249
pare HEIs using a range of different indicators, which are weighted differently 250
according to "some criterion or set of criteria which the compiler(s) of the list 251
believe ... measure or reflect ... academic quality" (Webster 2001, 5). The choice 252
of indicators and weightings reflect the priorities or value judgments of the pro- 253
ducers; there is no such thing as an objective ranking. Given the difficulties of 254
identifying meaningful internationally comparable data, most global rankings 255
focus unduly on research. They also focus primarily on whole institutions, 256
although there is an increasing attention to sub-institutional rankings at the field 257
of science level (natural science, mathematics, engineering, computer science, 258
social sciences) or by discipline or profession (e.g. business, law, medicine, grad- 259
uate schools). Rankings have become a more powerful tool because of the 260
"appearance of scientific objectivity" as a means to measure performance 261
(Ehrenberg 2001, 1). 262

Due to their popularity, few countries and institutions are unaffected by them. 263
The users of rankings exceed the original target audience of students and their 264
parents, and embrace government and government agencies, industry and the 265
civil society, businesses and employers, other HEIs, philanthropists, public opin- 266
ion and the media. The latter is both a producer, e.g. *The Times Higher Education*, 267
Sunday Times, *Macleans*, *USNWR* and *The Guardian*, and promoter of rankings 268
regularly covering results and reaction. There are over 16,000 HEIs worldwide, 269
yet rankings have encouraged a fascination with the standing and trajectory of 270
the top 100 universities – less than 1%. 271

[AU5]

272 19.2.2 Discussion

273 Each transparency instrument has developed in reaction to the increasingly more
274 inquisitive and demanding environment in which higher education operates. College
275 guides responded to the massification of higher education, the diverse array of new
276 models of higher education, greater mobility and the need for students to make better
277 informed choices about where to study. As market principles intruded further, most
278 countries witnessed the emergence and expansion of private and for-profit providers,
279 franchising and subsidiaries – sometimes of international providers. In some countries,
280 there has been a growing controversy about “diploma mills” (CHEA n.d.). The
281 transformation of internationalisation from a student cultural exchange of short duration
282 to an intrinsic part of undergraduate and most critically post-graduate study is also a key
283 driver. How can students learn about different HEIs if they are unknown outside their
284 own national boundary or basic information is unavailable or difficult to understand?

285 As a consequence and arguably of necessity, there has been a need to regulate
286 the marketplace. This has led inexorably towards greater government involvement
287 either directly in the process or in the use of the outcomes in policy and decision
288 making. Hence, the “voluntary” or “self-regulating” aspect of many transparency
289 instruments hides the reality that failure to participate can have significant implica-
290 tions for institutional legitimacy, funding or reputation. Even the US, where higher
291 education is largely the remit of individual states (Tierney 2009), has seen the pro-
292 gressive incursion of federal oversight; the Commission on the Future of Higher
293 Education or Spelling Commission controversially recommended the “creation of
294 a consumer-friendly information database on higher education” and the “develop-
295 ment of a *privacy-protected* higher education information system that collects,
296 analyzes and uses student-level data as a vital tool for accountability, policy-mak-
297 ing, and consumer choice” (CFHE 2006, 21–22). Transparency instruments at
298 supra-national level, e.g. those designed by the EU or OECD, represent a paradigm
299 shift. Voluntary internalised processes or self-regulation with confidential out-
300 comes are no longer acceptable. This is evidenced also by the fact that with the
301 exception of college guides and global rankings which are commercially-oriented,
302 the process is driven directly or indirectly by government; benchmarking can oper-
303 ate at either the national or institutional level. Rankings effectively put the issue of
304 higher education quality, performance and productivity onto the public and policy
305 agenda. This suggests that higher education is effectively losing its role as the pri-
306 mary guardian of quality (Harman 2011, 51; Dill and Beerkens 2010, 313–315).

307 19.3 Recent European Developments

308 19.3.1 Overview of Initiatives

309 The publication and rising obsession with global rankings, especially regarding what
310 they mean for European competitiveness, has been a key driver behind the EU's
311 involvement. The Bologna Process, beginning 2000, anticipated the need for

enhanced convergence across national systems to create a coherent system of higher education able to compete internationally (van Damme 2009, 40–41). The Sorbonne Declaration (1998) said the “harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system”, paved the way for Bologna with the objective that “the Europe we are building is not only that of the Euro, the banks and the economy, it must be a Europe of knowledge as well”. While Sorbonne represented a “quantum leap” in European higher education policy (Witte 2006, 124), it was the arrival of global rankings in 2003 that was the clarion call for urgent reform or “modernisation”. The results of *ARWU* and *THE-QS*, first published in 2003 and 2004, respectively, challenged the perceived wisdom about the reputation and excellence of European universities especially when placed alongside the Lisbon strategy’s objectives. The German Ministry of Education and Research put the situation in context:

We have a lot of very good universities across the board in Germany, a high average standard, but what we lack are really top universities ... The latest ranking table clearly shows why it is that Germany needs top universities (Dufner 2004).

A year later, June 2005, the German government launched the *Exzellenzinitiative* (Initiative for Excellence). Similarly worried by France’s overall weak showing in the rankings, the French Senate issued a report arguing its researchers were disadvantaged in favour of English-speaking institutions (Bourdin 2007–2008). In 2008, under the auspices of the French Presidency of the European Commission, a conference was organised championing a new EU ranking (EU Presidency 2008). *Europa 2020* restated the challenge: “Europe must act: ... According to the Shanghai index, only two European universities are in the world’s top 20” (European Commission 2010).

Enhancing transparency and boosting performance and competitiveness are integral to the success of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research Area (ERA), and meeting the goals of the *Lisbon Strategy* and *Europa 2020*. Bologna was predicated on the free movement of students, faculty and workers across national boundaries facilitated by “trustworthy information and with the assurance that their performance will be recognised in other parts of Europe” (Reichert 2009, 107). The vision was equally outward-looking, on the basis that to encourage and facilitate talent and investment from around the world requires a system easily understood and harmonious and not constrained by parochialism. By stressing the importance of measuring performance and competitiveness, the European Commission is saying the future will be based on demonstrated merit rather than assertion.

- “Universities should be funded more for what they do than for what they are, by focusing funding on relevant outputs rather than inputs...” (2006, 7);
- The “challenges posed by globalisation require that the European Higher Education Area and the European Research Area be fully open to the world and that Europe’s universities aim to become worldwide competitive players” (2007, 3);
- The “performance of education systems must be enhanced, and the international attractiveness of Europe’s higher education reinforced” (2010, 34).
- The “potential of European higher education institutions to fulfil their role in society and contribute to Europe’s prosperity remains underexploited. Europe is no longer setting the pace in the global race for knowledge and talent, while emerging economies are rapidly increasing their investment in higher education” (2011, 2).

358 Thus, in 2005, the EU sponsored the first phase of a European classification
359 system, launched as U-Map in 2009 (van Vught 2009), and in 2009, a consortium
360 was established to test the feasibility of a multi-dimensional ranking, launched as
361 *U-Multirank* in 2011 (DGEAC 2008; CHERPA 2010a, b). In parallel and feeding
362 into the process, an Expert Group, in 2008, was asked to propose a comprehensive
363 methodological approach for research assessment (AUBR 2010, 10), and another
364 project was funded to identify, measure and compare Third Mission activities (E3M
365 Study 2011, 4).

- 366 • U-MAP is the European classification system; based on the Carnegie system, it
367 aims to map/profile the diversity of European higher education landscape. Its
368 multi-dimensional format, enabled by interactive web-based technologies, facili-
369 tates different “users and stakeholders to make deliberate choices about which
370 dimensions are relevant for their purposes” (Bartelse and van Vught 2009, 68).
371 By broadening the dimensions of comparability to include teaching and learning,
372 student, research, knowledge exchange, international orientation, and regional
373 engagement, U-Map is making an important statement about the breadth of
374 higher education’s endeavours and a critical comment about the narrowness of
375 existing practices, most notably global rankings.
- 376 • *ASSESSING EUROPE’S UNIVERSITY-BASED RESEARCH* was the outcome of
377 an Expert Group tasked with developing a multidimensional methodology to
378 assess university-based research. It also challenged the unidimensional approach
379 of rankings by stating that there is “no single set of indicators capable of captur-
380 ing the complexity of research and research assessment” (AUBR 2010, 12). In
381 order to value the full breadth of research across all disciplines, assessment
382 should (1) combine peer assessment and bibliometric indicators, in other words,
383 qualitative and quantitative process; (2) include information on the impact of
384 research on teaching; (3) embrace self evaluation as a key component in the
385 assessment process; (4) measure societal impact and benefit; and (5) adopt a
386 multi-level approach focusing on “units of assessment positioned somewhere
387 between the individual researcher and the entire institution” (AUBR 2010, 13).
388 Finally, any assessment process should *a priori* consider possible unintended
389 consequences and guard against perverse incentives.
- 390 • E3M/EUROPEAN INDICATORS AND RANKING METHODOLOGY FOR
391 UNIVERSITY THIRD MISSION sought to demonstrate the breadth of European
392 higher education by highlighting continuing education, technology transfer and
393 innovation, and social engagement activity. By validating basic indicators, the
394 objective is “to create a ranking methodology to benchmark European Third
395 Mission Services providers of HEI” to “allow funding bodies and industry to
396 better understand the Third Mission and assess institutions based on perfor-
397 mance” (E3M 2011).
- 398 • U-MULTIRANK, the sister of U-Map, was conceived to directly challenge the
399 dominance of global rankings at a conceptual and concrete level; by demonstrat-
400 ing the full diversity of higher education missions and activities, European HEIs
401 might perform better against peers and students can “make informed study

choices” (European Commission 2011, 10). Using techniques developed by the Centre for Higher Education (CHE) for its own ranking, U-Multirank is based on four design principles: (1) user-driven whereby each individual or stakeholder group can rank according to his/her own preferences, (2) multi-dimensional with information collected according to five different characteristics, (3) peer-group comparability whereby HEIs of similar mission are compared, and (4) multi-level analysis whereby HEIs can be examined at the whole institutional level but also at disciplinary or department level. It plans to link with the OECD AHELO project which is a systematic attempt to measure student learning outcomes – a higher education sister of PISA.

19.3.2 Discussion

The intention of European initiatives is to challenge the narrow conceptual framework and methodology of global rankings in which older, well-endowed (US) universities with big-lab bio-medical research tend to dominate. Imposing a single set of criteria, a “one-size-fits-all” approach, has led to a growing perception among policymakers and HEIs, and broader society, of a single model of “world class” university based on a narrow concept of excellence. This has encouraged downgrading of teaching, ignoring the diversity of higher education activity and institutional missions, and underestimating the extent of Europe’s research. From a methodological standpoint, the objective has been to highlight the diversity of European higher education and research, clustering and classifying institutions – for use by students, higher education, policymakers, and other stakeholders. This involved identifying the different dimensions of HEIs (U-Map), the breadth of research (AUBR), and “third mission (E3M), and ultimately linking these results to a ranking system (U-Multirank).

[AU6]

The projects were launched with great fanfare, but the ultimate ambition that U-Multirank would be the alternative global ranking has been tempered. The number of HEIs and countries volunteering has been fewer and more restricted than hoped (van Vught 2011). Enough progress has been made to underwrite phase 2, but the limitations of the choice indicators and the absence of meaningful internationally comparative data means it will suffer from many of the same problems afflicting other rankings. Indeed, by the time it overcomes these difficulties, the wind may have gone from its sails. Moreover, while U-Multirank says it will not produce an ordinal ranking, this role could be undertaken by others once the data becomes manifest. Thus, it may be shrewd to retake the advantage by asserting itself as a benchmarking or information tool – and making a bold statement by renaming itself accordingly.

The link between the different projects is potentially more profound, and fits with the overarching drive to fundamentally restructure European higher education under the rubric of “modernisation”. While there are many statements applauding the diversity of European higher education, there is on-going criticism

443 that too many mediocre universities are responsible for Europe's poor showing in
444 global rankings.

445 ...higher education institutions too often seek to compete in too many areas, while com-
446 paratively few have the capacity to excel cross the board. As a consequence, too few
447 European higher education institutions are recognised as world class in the current, research-
448 oriented global university rankings... (European Commission 2011, 2; Butler 2007)

449 Linking U-Multirank with U-Map may provide sustenance to both groups; it will
450 enable different institutional missions to be profiled, but it will also facilitate greater
451 demarcation between and within categories. Likely policy implications include
452 greater system differentiation but also institutional stratification and targeted
453 resource allocation, at the national and European level. However, given the uneven
454 distribution of capability and capacity across the EU's 32 member and candidate
455 countries and HEIs, it is not clear if the full implications for individual institutions
456 and member states are understood. There is likely to be greater hierarchical differ-
457 entiation, with increasing concentration of resources in a handful of institutions and
458 countries – in other words, more peaks. While global rankings may be riddled with
459 methodological and definitional problems, they have unquestionably commanded
460 significant policy attention.

461 **19.4 Transparency Instruments Driving Modernisation**

462 What started as small-scale nationally-focused college guides for students and their
463 parents has been transformed into a rapidly expanding global intelligence informa-
464 tion business providing some transparency about higher education for a wide range
465 of stakeholders and the basis for the modernisation and restructuring of European
466 HEIs and systems. This is undoubtedly a far cry from the initial intentions of these
467 initiatives, but is reflective of the forces now shaping higher education. The adage
468 “it's too important a matter to be left to the...” comes to mind.

469 To what extent do these different transparency instruments uphold the principles
470 of the Leuven/Louvain-la-Neuve Communiqué (2009) to “fully recognize the value
471 of various missions of higher education, ranging from teaching and research to
472 community services and engagement in social cohesion and cultural development”?
473 Do they provide the quality of information required for different stakeholders to
474 make real decisions? The basic answer is: it depends upon the purpose and the indi-
475 vidual user.

476 **19.4.1 Using Instruments Cautiously**

477 “Which university is best” can be asked differently depending upon who is asking
478 the question and which question is being asked. Is the user a student choosing a col-
479 lege/university in his/her own country or abroad or a government agency seeking to

make decisions about resource allocation? The multi-user perspective adopted by both U-Map and U-Multirank seek to overcome some of these difficulties by empowering the user to select those indicators most appropriate for their purpose, whether the user is a student, peer HEI or policymaker. But the choice is still from a pre-selected set of indicators determined by the provider. In contrast, most QA and benchmarking processes are sui-generis, e.g. they are custom designed for the purpose. This enables a significant degree of flexibility but it also makes cross-jurisdictional comparison more difficult.

In moving away from self-regulation, policymakers, and the public, have become obsessed with quantitative indicators such as those presented by rankings on the basis that "perfect" information exists. Is it possible to measure higher education quality through measurements of quantification? While data collection at the national level is relatively easy, the international situation is complex. National contexts defy simple comparisons. HEIs are complex institutions; they provide education from undergraduate to PhD level, conduct research, participate in outreach initiatives, and are a source of innovation and entrepreneurship. As a group, they sit within vastly different national context, underpinned by different value systems, meeting the needs of demographically, ethnically and culturally diverse populations, and responding to complex and challenging political-economic environments. In such circumstances, it is difficult to imagine a single methodology that can transcribe complex institutional activities into a wealth of quantitative information.

Because these instruments incentivize behaviour, the choice of indicators is critical. Yet, there is no objective or universal set of meaningful indicators for measuring higher education quality. The most common focus is: students' entry level, acceptance/selectivity ratio, completion/graduation rates and employability of graduates; quality of faculty and PhD students; research capacity and infrastructure: quality of facilities; and alumni contributions, which, in turn, influence an institution's financial resources, per-student expenditures, faculty/student ratios, faculty compensations, etc. Care needs to be taken that the results do not disproportionately benefit older well-endowed universities rather than newer public institutions. To paraphrase Einstein, are we measuring what counts or counting what can be easily measured (Hazelkorn 2011, 59–77; Martin and Sauvageot 2011)?

Measuring student entry level or the proportion of students admitted at a particular level may perversely discourage widening participation. Entry scores and standardized testing often simply reflect socio-economic advantage, and unintentionally discriminate against students from culturally or ethnically diverse backgrounds (Hazelkorn 2012). Undoubtedly, having lots of bright students around makes for a more challenging academic environment, but as Hawkins (2008) remarks, "many colleges recruit great students and then graduate great students [but is] that because of the institution, or the students?" If the

critterion of success is "value added," it may be better to admit students who are academically very weak, rather than those with a strong record, since presumably it will be easier to raise the performance of those who start low than of those who are already performing well (Trow 2006, 579; see also AHELO).

525 Completion and graduation rates can skew assessment processes, while measuring
526 employability can be difficult during a recession. Many instruments seek to measure
527 the quality of teaching or the student experience through proxies, such as faculty/
528 student ratio, on the basis that the smaller the ratio, the better. But, in reality this may
529 say more about the funding or efficiency level of the institution and system.

530 There are more fundamental difficulties with the way different instruments con-
531 sider teaching and research. By counting students or research outputs, teaching and
532 research are portrayed as homogeneous blocks of activity. Yet, there is important
533 variation in educational provision, pedagogy, curriculum and disciplinary
534 approaches ignored by this method. The critique of how bibliometric practices
535 privilege basic big-lab bio/medical science research (Hazelkorn 2011, 70–74) still
536 ignores the fact that using citations to measure research impact overlooks impact
537 and benefit to society and the economy. To get around this deficit, some instru-
538 ments count patents and licenses, but this is a very limited interpretation of knowl-
539 edge transfer as the E3M project revealed. Focusing only on research which can be
540 easily measured disregards the diversity of research fields and methods of inquiry
541 across the full spectrum of discovery, integration, application and engagement
542 (Boyer 1990, 1996). At a time when society's challenges require multi- and inter-
543 disciplinary solutions, these instruments reinforce a traditional ivory-tower form of
544 inquiry (Hazelkorn 2009). Rather than promoting diverse missions, this approach
545 perpetuates a crude binary between research and teaching, and world-class and
546 regional institutions – whereby these characteristics are seen as oppositional when
547 in reality they may be compatible.

548 Correcting for these conceptual and methodological shortcomings is vital to
549 establishing a process appropriate to the twenty-first century. A multi-tool approach
550 is important but can/should the different instruments be used in tandem, e.g. can
551 rankings be linked with classification or accreditation or benchmarking? One of the
552 main criticisms of rankings is that they compare different types of HEIs using a
553 single set of criteria, e.g. one-size-fits-all. In response, governments see merit in
554 linking rankings with classification. For example, U-Multirank is linked with U-Map
555 so that only peer institutions are ranked, e.g. apples with apples rather than apples
556 with pears. But, there can be dangers with this process. Classification systems tend

557 to be retrospective, based on observations from the past. And it is static rather than
558 dynamic: the fixed categories of a classification or fixed classifications of individual enti-
559 ties may not keep up with phenomena that are subject to change over time (McCormick
560 and Zhao 2005, 53).

561 Some governments are also linking accreditation with ranking; in other words,
562 using ranking to assess quality and then utilizing the result to decide whether par-
563 ticular HEIs should/should not be accredited. In some instances, governments have
564 invited ranking organisations to undertake an assessment of their HEIs (CHE 2011;
565 Anon 2011). This process raises alarm bells because, as discussed above, rankings
566 do not assess of the higher education quality. Because it's a hierarchical system,
567 rankings effectively signal that some institutions or disciplines are more important
568 not necessarily better than others.

Finally, governments and institutions may see virtue in using rankings to drive improved performance at a national level, particularly in the circumstances of a burgeoning number of institutions. Ranking indicators are often rolled-into performance indicators used for resource allocation (Hazelkorn 2011, 163). HEIs have used rankings in a similar fashion (Hazelkorn 2011, chapt. 4), and as the basis for benchmarking, primarily as the basis for identifying a basket of comparable institutions (Proulx 2011). However, rankings are too limited to conduct a meaningful analysis – the indicators are not appropriate and the level of granularity insufficient to provide real usefulness and comparability. Ultimately, it’s not evident that the various rankings, despite modifications, “effectively address information deficiencies in the higher education market in socially beneficial ways” (Dill and Beerkens 2010, 318).

19.4.2 Recommendations and Conclusions 581

What is the best way forward? Usually transparency, accountability, comparability and information are linked together – but there are differences between them, and poorly conceived and operated instruments (whether self-regulation, market or government) can produce perverse and unintended consequences.

More information is certainly needed – but this must be in a format that stakeholders find useful and meaningful. The EU’s efforts in this regard are admirable but it’s not evident that either *U-Map* or *U-Multirank*, in their current formats, are instruments that students or other stakeholder will easily use. Would more indicators solve these problems? Yes and no. There is certainly a need to identify more appropriate ways to assess and showcase higher education performance. Both AUBR and E3M identify a wide range of indicators, but the multiplicity of indicators and methodologies may only serve to highlight the complexity (and cost) of transparency. And, simply publishing QA reports which may be jargon-laded and impenetrable for students and other stakeholders fools no-one. Ultimately, new media technologies and formats, such as social media, consumer websites (see Boffey 2011) and the internet, and the use of search engines and open source facilities, will dramatically transform the debate over the coming years – and put more control into the hands of users.

What actions might be helpful? 600

1. Engage a wider public discussion around “socially valued” higher education outcomes in order to establish rigorous criteria and standards of quality. It should identify valid indicators for what matters, including improvements in performance not just absolute performance, and accord parity of esteem across the system to diverse institutional profiles in order to facilitate public comparability, democratic decision-making and institutional benchmarking (Hazelkorn 2011, 202–206; Dill and Beerkens 2010, 321, 333). There are limits to existing data and data collection, but it’s important to measure what’s important not

609 what's easy. To be meaningful, any comparison should be conducted at, say,
610 5 year intervals.

- 611 2. Establish common guidelines and/or format setting out minimum information
612 which all HEIs must provide – as a public good – about the quality of the total
613 student experience. This should be qualitative and quantitative of value and
614 importance to domestic and international students and parents.
- 615 3. Benchmarking is a more appropriate instrument because the range of indicators
616 can be better tied to strategic and public objectives and institutional mission, and
617 it puts the onus on HEIs to develop a culture of continuous improvement,
618 autonomous strategic management and leadership capability. These attributes
619 are necessary to meet the objectives of *Europe 2020*.
- 620 4. Recognize, incentivize and reward the full spectrum of higher education's endeavours
621 across teaching, research and engagement at the institutional and individual
622 academic level. This is key. For example, while political and institutional
623 leaders proclaim the value of teaching, favour collaborative interdisciplinary
624 research or encourage third-mission and regional engagement, recruitment, tenure
625 and promotional policies reward research or traditional academic activity.
626 This applies to incentives for Vice-Chancellors/Presidents, who are often hired
627 and rewarded on the basis of making their institutions more elite.

628 Ultimately the purpose is to develop instruments which can help policymakers,
629 HEIs, students and other stakeholders better understand the system, and make clearer
630 judgements. But aligning systems and institutions to indicators set by others for commercial
631 or other purposes threatens the very foundations of national sovereignty and
632 society. There are also lessons for higher education. It must respond in a constructive
633 manner to the need for greater transparency, and identify smarter ways to assess and
634 demonstrate impact and benefit. Good data collection provides the basis for autonomous
635 strategic leadership and evidence-based decision-making, and underpins quality
636 assurance and discussions about what constitutes success. Benchmarking enables
637 HEIs to identify peer institutions and programmes, and share good practice. Students
638 need confidence in the information, so that they can make informed judgements
639 about their studies and future life-chances and opportunities. Ultimately, political
640 and societal support for higher education, for systems dependent upon public funding
641 and on tuition fees, can only be maintained by quality profiling, performance
642 enhancement and value-for-money which provides (public) investor confidence.

[AU743 **Acknowledgments** Thanks for comments and suggestions from Wolfgang Mackiewicz,
644 Jacqueline Smith, Andrée Surssock, and participants at the Bologna Process Researchers Conference,
645 Bucharest, 2011.

[AU846 **References**

- 647 Aghion, P., Dewatripont, M., Hoxby, C., Mas-Colell, A., & Sapir, A. (2007, September). Why
648 reform Europe's Universities? *Bruegel Policy Brief*, (4). http://www.bruegel.org/uploads/tx_btbreugel/pbf_040907_universities.pdf. Accessed 30 Apr 2010.

Anon. (2011). Shanghai University to rank Macedonian universities. *Macedonian International News Agency*. <http://macedoniaonline.eu/content/view/17372/45/>. Accessed 25 Sept 2011. 650-651

AUBR – EU Expert Group on Assessment of University-based Research. (2010). *Assessing Europe's University-based research*, EUR 24187 EN, DG Research. Brussels: European Commission. 652-654

Bartelse, J., & Van Vught, F. (2009). The European higher education classification: Objectives and concepts. In F. A. Van Vught (Ed.), *Mapping the higher education landscape. Towards a European classification of higher education* (pp. 57–70). Dordrecht: Springer. 655-657

[AU9] Boffey, D. (2011). Which? Magazine to test value of degrees. *The Guardian*. 658

Bourdin, J. (2007–2008). *Enseignement Supérieur le Défi des Classements*, Les Rapports du Sénat, 442, France. 659-660

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered. Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation. 661-662

Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 1, 11–20. 663-664

Brittingham, B. (2011). *Global competition in higher education: Student learning outcomes/ measurement and quality*. Paper to the 2nd International Exhibition and Conference on Higher Education, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. 665-667

[AU10] Butler, N. (2007). Europe's universities – time for reform. *Centrepiece*, 10–11. <http://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/cp233.pdf>. Accessed 29 Aug 2011. 668-669

Castells, M. (1994). *Technopoles of the world: The making of 21st century industrial complexes*. London: Routledge. 670-671

CFHE. (2006). *A test of leadership. Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. Commission on the Future of Higher Education, Report of the Commission appointed by Margaret Spellings, Secretary of Education, Department of Education, USA. <http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>. Accessed 6 June 2010. 672-674

CHE. (2011). *Development of a ranking in Albania final report*. Gütersloh: Centre for Higher Education gGmbH. http://www.che.de/downloads/Ranking_Albania_Final_report_1307.pdf. Accessed 25 Sept 2011. 675-678

CHEA. (n.d.). *Degree mills: An old problem and a new threat*. <http://www.chea.org/degremills/frmpaper.htm> 679-680

CHERPA_Network. (2010a). *U-Multirank Interim progress report. Design phase of the project: Design and testing the feasibility of a multi-dimensional global university ranking*. http://www.u-multirank.eu/UMR_IR_0110.pdf. Accessed 13 July 2010. 681-683

CHERPA_Network. (2010b). *U-Multirank Interim progress report: Testing phase*. Unpublished. 684

Clarke, M. (2005). Quality assessment lessons from Australia and New Zealand. *Higher Education in Europe*, 30(2), 183–197. 685-686

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of ‘new managerialism’ in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217–235. 687-688

Dempsey, N. (Minister for Education and Science). (2004, April 24). Address at the Europe of Knowledge 2020 Conference, Liege, Belgium. 689-690

Dewatripont, M. (2008). Reforming Europe's universities. *BEPA [Bureau of European Policy Advisers] Monthly Brief*, 14. 691-692

Dill, D. D., & Beerkens, M. (2010). Reflections and conclusions. In D. D. Dill & M. Beerkens (Eds.), *Public policy for academic quality. Analyses of innovative policy instruments* (pp. 313–335). Dordrecht: Springer. 693-695

Dufner, B. (2004, November 12). Educating the elite. Ministry of Education and Research, *DW-World. DE*. <http://www.dwworld.de/dw/article/0,,1393321,00.html>. Accessed 29 May 2010. 696-698

E3M PROJECT. (2011). *Final report of Delphi study*. European Indicators and Ranking Methodology for University Third Mission, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia and the Universidad de León. Unpublished. 699-701

Ehrenberg, R. G. (2001). Reaching for the Brass Ring: How the U.S. news & world report rankings shape the competitive environment in U.S. higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 226(2). 702-704

- 705 ENQA – European Association for Quality Assurance in Europe. (2005). *Standards and guidelines*
 706 *for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. Helsinki: ENQA. http://www.ihqeqn.ie/_fileupload/Publications/ENQABergenReport_43799078.pdf. Accessed 26 Aug 2011.
- 707
 708 European Commission. (2000, March 23–24). *Presidency conclusions*. Lisbon European Council.
 709 http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm or [http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/](http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/research_and_development_en.htm)
 710 [research_and_development_en.htm](http://europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/research_and_development_en.htm). Accessed 3 May 2010.
- 711 European Commission. (2006). *Delivering on the modernisation agenda for universities:*
 712 *Education, research and innovation*. Communication to the Council and the European
 713 Parliament, (COM) 2006 208 final. http://www.madrimasd.org/proyectoseuropeos/documentos/doc/education_research_and_innovation.pdf. Accessed 11 Aug 2009.
- 714
 715 European Commission. (2007). *Council resolution on modernising universities for Europe's com-*
 716 *petitiveness in a global knowledge economy (2007/CXXX/YY)*. Brussels: Council of the
 717 European Union. www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/newsWord/en/intm/97237.doc. Accessed
 718 26 Apr 2010.
- 719 European Commission. (2010). *EUROPE 2020 A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive*
 720 *growth*. Communication from the Commission, Brussels, COM(2010) 2020. [http://europa.eu/](http://europa.eu/press_room/pdf/complet_en_barroso___007_-_europe_2020_-_en_version.pdf)
 721 [press_room/pdf/complet_en_barroso___007_-_europe_2020_-_en_version.pdf](http://europa.eu/press_room/pdf/complet_en_barroso___007_-_europe_2020_-_en_version.pdf). Accessed 29
 722 Aug 2011.
- 723 European Commission. (2011). *Supporting growth and jobs – An agenda for the modernisation of*
 724 *Europe's higher education system*, COM(2011)567/2, Brussels. [http://ec.europa.eu/education/](http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/com0911_en.pdf)
 725 [higher-education/doc/com0911_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/higher-education/doc/com0911_en.pdf). Accessed 25 Sept 2011.
- 726 Harman, G. (2011). Competitors of rankings: New directions in quality assurance and account-
 727 ability. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *University rankings. Theoretical*
 728 *basis, methodology and impacts on global higher education* (pp. 35–54). Dordrecht: Springer.
- 729 Hawkins, D. (2008). Commentary: Don't use SATs to rank college quality. *CNN*. <http://edition.cnn.com/2008/US/10/17/hawkins.tests/index.html>. Accessed 27 Mar 2010.
- 730 Hazelkorn, E. (2009). The impact of global rankings on higher education research and the production
 731 of knowledge. *UNESCO forum on higher education, research and knowledge occasional paper*
 732 *no 16*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001816/181653e.pdf>. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 733
 734 Hazelkorn, E. (2011). *Rankings and the reshaping of higher education: The battle for world class*
 735 *excellence*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 736 Hazelkorn, E. (2012). Student choice and institutional selection. In B. W. A. Jongbloed &
 737 J. J. Vossensteyn (Eds.), *Access and expansion post-massification. Opportunities and barriers*
 738 *to further growth in higher education participation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 739 Hunter, B. (1995). College guidebooks: Background and development. In R. D. Walleri &
 740 M. K. Moss (Eds.), *Evaluating and responding to college guidebooks and rankings* (pp. 5–12).
 741 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- 742 Jaschik, S. (2005, November 18). The new Carnegie classifications. *Inside Higher Ed*. <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2005/11/18/carnegie>. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 743
 744 Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen. The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale*
 745 *and Princeton*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- 746 Labi, A. (2011). As universities globalize, consortia take on a new meaning. *Chronicle of Higher*
 747 *Education*. [http://chronicle.com/article/As-Universities-Globalize/128633/?sid=at&utm_source=](http://chronicle.com/article/As-Universities-Globalize/128633/?sid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en)
 748 [at&utm_source=](http://chronicle.com/article/As-Universities-Globalize/128633/?sid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en)
 749 [at&utm_medium=en](http://chronicle.com/article/As-Universities-Globalize/128633/?sid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en). Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 749 Lambert, R., & Butler, N. (2006). *Future of European universities. Renaissance or decay?* Centre
 750 for European Reform. http://www.cer.org.uk/pdf/p_67x_universities_decay_3.pdf. Accessed
 751 30 Apr 2010.
- 752 Levin, R. C. (2010, May/June). Top of the class: The rise of Asia's universities. *Foreign Affairs*.
 753 [http://0-web.ebscohost.com.ditlib.dit.ie/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=104&sid=fd1858fd-c90a-](http://0-web.ebscohost.com.ditlib.dit.ie/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=104&sid=fd1858fd-c90a-423f-8eff-51f25a1699d-2%40sessionmgr110&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=49154216)
 754 [423f-8eff-51f25a1699d-2%40sessionmgr110&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d](http://0-web.ebscohost.com.ditlib.dit.ie/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=104&sid=fd1858fd-c90a-423f-8eff-51f25a1699d-2%40sessionmgr110&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=49154216)
 755 [#db=aph&AN=49154216](http://0-web.ebscohost.com.ditlib.dit.ie/ehost/detail?vid=3&hid=104&sid=fd1858fd-c90a-423f-8eff-51f25a1699d-2%40sessionmgr110&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=aph&AN=49154216). Accessed 30 May 2010.
- [AU156] Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2011). The knowledge triangle, European higher education policy
 757 logics and policy implications. *Higher Education*, 61(6), 757–769.
- 758 Martin, M., & Sauvageot, C. (2011). *Constructing an indicator system or scorecard for higher*
 759 *education. A practical guide*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, UNESCO.

[AU14] McCormick, A. C., & Zhao, C. M. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *Change*, 37, 51–57. 760
761

O’Meara, K. (2007). Striving for what? Exploring the pursuit of prestige. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, XXII, 123–124. 762
763

OECD. (2009). *Education at a glance*. Paris: OECD. 764

Proulx, R. (2010, July–September). Benchmarking 10 major Canadian universities at the divisional level. A powerful tool for strategic decision making. *Planning for Higher Education*, 38, 20–34. 765
766
767

Proulx, R. (2011). Using world university ranking to inform and guide strategic policy making: A case study of a Canadian Research University. In K. Yu & A. L. Stith (Eds.), *Competition and cooperation among universities in the age of internationalization. Proceedings of the AC21 International Forum 2010* (pp. 151–168). Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press. 768
769
770
771

Rauhvargers, A. (2011). *Global university rankings and their impact*. Brussels: European University Association. 772
773

Reichert, S. (2009). Using the classification in the European Higher Education Area. In F. A. van Vught (Ed.), *Mapping the higher education landscape. Towards a European classification of higher education* (pp. 105–122). Dordrecht: Springer. 774
775
776

Ritzen, J. (2010). *A chance for European universities or: Avoiding the Looming University crisis in Europe*. Amsterdam: University Press. 777
778

Salmi, J., & Saroyan, A. (2007). League tables as policy instruments: Uses and misuses. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19(2), 31–68. 779
780

Schumpeter. (2011). Higher education. The latest bubble? *The Economist*. http://www.economist.com/blogs/schumpeter/2011/04/higher_education 781
782

Shin, J. C. (2011). Organizational effectiveness and university rankings. In J. C. Shin, R. K. Toutkoushian, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *University rankings. Theoretical basis, methodology and impacts on global higher education* (pp. 19–34). Dordrecht: Springer. 783
784
785

Sorbonne Declaration. (1998, May 25). *Joint declaration of the architecture of the European higher education system*. Paris. 786
787

Spaapen, J., Dijkstra, H., & Wamelink, F. (2007). *Evaluating research in context. A method for comprehensive assessment* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Consultative Committee of Sector Councils for Research and Development (COS). 788
789
790

[AU15] Tierney, W. G. (2009). Globalization, international rankings, and the American model: A reassessment. *Higher Education Forum*, 6, 1–17. 791
792

Trow, M. (2006). Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access (pp. 556–610). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Reprinted in *Twentieth-century higher education. From elite to mass to universal* by M. Trow). 793
794
795

Usher, A., & Jarvey, P. (2010). *Let the sun shine in: The use of university rankings in low- and middle-income countries*. Paper to International Rankings Expert Group (IREG) 5th Conference, Berlin. 796
797
798

van Damme, D. (2009). The search for transparency: Convergence and diversity in the Bologna Process. In F. A. van Vught (Ed.), *Mapping the higher education landscape. Towards a European classification of higher education* (pp. 39–56). Dordrecht: Springer. 799
800
801

van Vught, F. A. (2006). *A supranational European university policy? An analysis of the European Union’s higher education and research policies*. Draft contribution, The Public Interest and Academic Research project. http://www.utwente.nl/mb/chepps/summer_school/Literature/Van%20Vught%20EU%202.pdf. Accessed 29 Aug 2011. 802
803
804
805

van Vught, F. A. (Ed.). (2009). *Mapping the higher education landscape. Towards a European classification of higher education*. Dordrecht: Springer. 806
807

van Vught, F. A. (2011). *A user-driven and multi-dimensional ranking tool in global higher education and research*. Paper to UNESCO Global Forum on Rankings and Accountability in Higher Education: Uses and Misuses, Paris. 808
809
810

van Vught, F. A., Kaiser, F., File, J. M., Gaethgens, C., Peter, R., & Westerheijden, D. F. (2010). *U-Map: The European classification of higher education institutions*. Enschede: Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente. http://www.u-map.org/U-MAP_report.pdf. Accessed 29 Aug 2011. 811
812
813
814

- 815 Webster, D. S. A. (1986). *Academic quality rankings of American colleges and universities*.
 816 Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- 817 Webster, T. J. (2001). A principal component analysis of the U.S. news & world report tier rank-
 818 ings of colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 20, 235–244.
- 819 Witte, J. (2006). *Change of degrees and degrees of change, comparing adaptations of European*
 820 *higher education systems in the context of the Bologna Process*. Enschede: Center for Higher
 821 Education Policy Studies, University of Twente.

822 **Webography**

- 823 AHELO – Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes. Paris: OECD. [http://www.oecd.org/](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,3746,en_2649_35961291_40624662_1_1_1_1,00.html) [AU17]
 824 [document/22/0,3746,en_2649_35961291_40624662_1_1_1_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,3746,en_2649_35961291_40624662_1_1_1_1,00.html). Accessed 25 Sept 2011.
- 825 CCIHE – Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, US. <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 826 CHE Ranking, Centre for Higher Education, Germany. [http://www.che-ranking.de/](http://www.che-ranking.de/cms/?getObject=615&getLang=en)
 827 [cms/?getObject=615&getLang=en](http://www.che-ranking.de/cms/?getObject=615&getLang=en). Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 828 DGEAC – Directorate-General for Education and Culture. (2008). *Public open tender EAC/36/2008: Design and testing the feasibility of a multi-dimensional global university ranking*. http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/calls/3608/index_en.html. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 829 E3M – European Indicators and Ranking Methodology for University Third Mission. <http://www.e3mproject.eu/index.html>. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 830 ENQA – European Association for Quality Assurance in Europe. (2005). *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. Helsinki: ENQA. http://www.iheqn.ie/_fileupload/Publications/ENQABergenReport_43799078.pdf. Accessed 26 Aug 2011.
- 831 ESMU – European Centre for the Strategic Management of Higher Education. (n.d.). Benchmarking in European higher education. <http://www.esmu.be/benchmarking.html>. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 832 PISA – Programme for International Student Assessment, OECD. http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,2987,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1,00.html. Accessed 29 Aug 2011.
- 833 U-Map. <http://www.u-map.eu/>. Accessed 31 Aug 2011.
- 834 U-Multirank. <http://www.u-multirank.eu/>. Accessed 31 Aug 2011.

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 19 0001494944

Queries	Details Required	Author's Response
AU1	Please check affiliation details for the author "Ellen Hazelkorn" for appropriateness.	
AU2	The citations Europa (2000), Maassen and Stensaker (2010), and E3M (2001) have been changed into European Commission (2000), Maassen and Stensaker (2011), and E3M (2011), respectively. Please check if appropriate.	
AU3	Please check the inserted section cross-references.	
AU4	This should be (,) delete from here. Please check.	
AU5	Usher and Savino (2006) and EU Presidency (2008) are not listed in the references list. Please provide.	
AU6	Please provide corresponding closing quotes in the sentence starting with "This involved identifying the...".	
AU7	Footnote 1 has been set as "Acknowledgements". Please check if this is fine.	
AU8	Please provide in-text citation for the following references: Deem and Brehony (2005), and van Vug et al. (2010).	
AU9	Please provide page range in the reference Boffey (2011).	
AU10	Please provide volume number in the reference Butler (2007), if appropriate.	
AU11	Please provide article title in the reference Dempsey (2004).	
AU12	Please provide page range in the reference Ehrenberg (2001).	
AU13	Please check the updated details in the following references: Maassen and Stensaker (2011) and ENQA (2005).	
AU14	Please check the inserted volume number in the following references: McCormick and Zhao (2005) and Proulx (2010).	
AU15	Please check the inserted page number in the following references: Tierney (2009) and Webster (2001).	
AU16	Please check the inserted initial for the author in the reference van Vught (2011).	
AU17	Please provide year of publication in the following references: AHELO, CCIHE, CHE Ranking, Centre for Higher Education, and E3M, if appropriate.	