

1st Stakeholder Consultation summary report

Multi-dimensional Global University Ranking
First stakeholder consultation meeting: Brussels, 8 October 2009
Short report on main issues.

General remarks

- The new system, U multiranking, that is suggested is subjective. Some of the stakeholders praise this fact, others see limitations.
- Very good that each stakeholder target group can choose their own priorities and their own point of reference.
- This system makes it possible to make a personal ranking depending on the individual selection. Most stakeholders value this fact very high.
- Good that the instrument is demand driven instead of supply driven.
- Good that there is a possibility to take into account national differences.
- Very important that the competitiveness stays between institutions.
- Students want the best institution possible and need one overview. Is not possible when the dimensions are used.
- Target groups are not defined! This is a big strength everybody, every individual can be target group. For now examples are used!
- Some institutions will always be less good than others this can not be avoided.

'Traffic light' system

- The 'traffic light' system has the same limitations as other ranking when comparing the red, green and yellow outcomes. How to avoid this? Quartiles are being used.
- The three categories (red, green and yellow) are not fixed yet.
- only formal education is taken into account also but activities of students outside the formal education could be a possible indicator. Such as international exchange.
- There is a need for comparable indicators.
 - Need to discuss how to include research institutions that are not educational institutions.
 - Need to identify indicators:
 - For research some could be the same as being used in current ranking systems
 - Need indicators that are countable otherwise it is impossible to see the difference between the institutions.
 - When defining indicators include the institutions. They have to give the input, the data and have to work with the indicators.
 - It is not possible to include all the institutions off the world but make an representative group. So avoid identifying them all by yourself.
 - When defining the indicators there need to be a strong theoretical backbone. There need to be a weight between the indicators. Nobody has an solution to this yet.
- When defining the indicators experts are used to give information about the use of different types of databases.

webtool

- Need for an operational system on how to gather the data from the institutions and how to use it. There are ideas such as:
 - a pre filled questionnaire sent to all institutions
 - use national information systems and combine the information.
 - Institutions have an own responsibility to update the data through a website
- More work and thought needs to be done concerning the suggested webtool. More ideas and information is requested.
- Updating the data every year is not feasible. Need to find an interim e.g. every 2 years, 5 years.

U-Map

- Some are critical against the use of U-map this is European centered and the new U-multiranking should be applicable globally. In the United states a similar system like U-Map is being developed. Combine these systems and test this with the sample group of institutions. Everybody agrees this is

still a challenge.

- U-Map shows diversity in student population need to put this also in the U-Multiranking.

Media:

- Problem with media could be that they will still add up all the outcomes and make a league chart.
- Inform media as soon as possible
- Avoid that others will say “ European higher education institutions are not doing well within the existing rankings so they come up with their own”
- Involve media to get broader support.

Field rankings

- The pilots that are chosen under the field rankings are not unanimously approved and calls for a lot of (further) discussion. But they are accepted as pilots because a test of the methodology is needed. There is always room for discussion. The change that is made is: *teaching institutions* into: *innovation institutions*.
- Not forget that fields are getting more and more interdisciplinary. Also need to be included in the new system. Still a question how? Are national examples that can be used.
- Suggestion: instead of using just two, business and engineering take a co pilot to compare.

Workshops

There is a big interest for participating in the workshops that are yet to come.

Stakeholders praise the organizers for their transparency. They see a lot of challenges that still have to be faced and are enthusiastic about the new U Multiranking.