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Transparency and quality tools, such as accreditation and rankings, are stuck in an unclear and controversial situation.
The situation is unclear and controversial

"We have accreditation and quality assurance, we don't need rankings"

Do they really have the same function?

"We are number 10 in the world, this already proves our quality"

"Rankings do not improve quality, we just play the game"

data from rankings might be usable for QM

What about teaching quality in research- and reputation-driven rankings?

"QA/accreditation could inform stakeholders better than rankings"

only experts understand peer reports

"Accreditation refers to universities' goals, but rankings refer to the world-class-excellence-research-monoculture"

True for traditional league tables, but are there alternatives?
The situation is unclear and controversial

„consumers´ choice is not only based on academic quality“

Both instruments fail, do we need something else?

„rankings don´t create market entry barriers, accreditation does“

But rankings don´t address the diversity of HEI

„The cost of all these data requests and reviews kills us“

Could joint databases help?

„rankings provide more consumer information than accreditors“

Do consumers for example know that rankings use estimates?
Transparency and quality tools, such as accreditation and rankings, are stuck in an unclear and controversial situation

There are a couple of reasons for this (picking 3)
Reason 1: The functions of the instruments have become blurred and overburdened

**Accreditation**
- Consumer information (public HEI, minimal standard)
- Gatekeeper function (private HEI)
- Institutional improvement
- Political instrument (Bologna Process)

**Ranking**
- Political instrument (Shanghai)
- Publicity show
- Institutional improvement
- Consumer information (position)
- Gatekeeper function (cooperation, immigration)
Reason 1: The functions of the instruments have become blurred and overburdened

The problems of accreditation and rankings are:

- they can’t serve all these „masters“ at the same time
- they become exchangeable
- they are used for purposes they are definitely not made for
- if all instruments want to fulfill all the functions, duplication increases cost (and leads to frustration)
Reason 2: the instruments are not able to play their roles adequately

- They can't help with consumer choice if information hides behind a composite score
- They lead to wrong choices if research performance is taken for overall performance
- Methodological flaws of league table rankings
- Rankings determining immigration policies or scholarships have gone beyond their decent role
- The overall performance of a university might not say much about the subject level
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Reason 3: Rankings and accreditation/QM don’t learn from each other

Quality measurement refers to the different core functions of the university.

Understanding of quality is related to goals / strategies / profiles of universities.

QA/ accreditation uses perspectives of stakeholders.

QA/ accreditation in learning + teaching has a focus on subjects / programs.

Standards from QM:

- Rankings should be multi-dimensional, not only focus on research.
- Rankings should integrate and show the diversity of profiles.
- Rankings should be user-driven (flexible rankings according to variety of needs of stakeholders).
- Rankings should include information on subject level.

Lessons learnt for rankings:
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Transparency and quality tools, such as accreditation and rankings, are stuck in an unclear and controversial situation.

There are a couple of reasons for this.

Addressing these reasons shows us the way out, and U-Multirank tries to go that way.
The solutions for the problems seem to be quite obvious

- focus the instruments
- optimize the methods
- mutual learning

→ how U-Multirank tries to do this
U-Multirank focuses on data for evidence-based decision making.

- Political instrument
- Publicity show
- Institutional improvement
- Consumer information
- Gatekeeper function

„compare“
„for students“
U-Multirank presents a performance profile instead of a league table.

U-Multirank measures performance in five dimensions.

U-Multirank Sunburst: Performance Indicators

www.umultirank.org
U-Multirank relates performance measurement to profiles of HEIs

There are performance profiles, but there is no such thing as the best university in the world.
Looking at top performance per indicator also proves the need to make diversity transparent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Top 3 Performers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Cited Publications</td>
<td>Rockefeller U, MIT, Stanford U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Publications</td>
<td>Tallaght IoT, China Medical U, Taipei Medical U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Publications with Industrial Partners</td>
<td>Reutlingen UAS, Nuremberg IoT, Munich UAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility</td>
<td>IESEG School of Management Lille, U of Management Varna, WHU School of Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Joint Publications</td>
<td>Hanze UAS, Moscow Institute Physics+Tech, Polytechnical Institute Lisbon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U-Multirank follows a user-driven approach

The web tool/app allows users to make their own personal rankings.
U-Multirank integrates information on the field level

The performance of different subjects within a university differs (example: University Duisburg-Essen).

**INTERNATIONAL ORIENTATION OF BACHELOR:**
- Mechanical engineering A
- Mathematics E
- Computer Sciences B
- Biology C

**CONTACT WITH TEACHERS:**
- Mechanical engineering D
- Electrical Engineering B

**INCOME FROM PRIVATE SOURCES:**
- Electrical engineering E
- Mathematics B
- Medicine A
- Physics E

U-Multirank has learned from QA....
… but what could QA learn from U-Multirank?

- apply relevant metrics also for internal QA and accreditation
- realize the importance of presentation modes of information
- end the debate on indicators vs. peer review by introducing “informed peer review“
- include benchmarks into quality assessments
Transparency and quality tools, such as accreditation and rankings, are stuck in an unclear and controversial situation.

There are a couple of reasons for this.

Addressing these reasons shows us the way out, and U-Multirank tries to go that way.

This creates the vision of a multi-dimensional performance database, connecting data with applications of quality and transparency tools.
The vision of a connected system is based on the previous arguments

- Use joint methodological base for different tools (multi-dimensional, stakeholder-oriented, etc.)
- Create open database to serve various applications (independent, keep politics out)
- Combine performance data with other methods to create an application
- Flexible use of data according to institutional needs
Potential applications of an open database

- + qualitative info for students
  = ranking for students (consumer information tool)

- + process to find best practices
  = benchmarking

- + peer review
  = informed peer review, input for strategy process

- + own quality goals within QA system
  = system accreditation

global multi-dimensional performance database
Transparency and quality tools, such as accreditation and rankings, are stuck in an unclear and controversial situation.

There are a couple of reasons for this.

Addressing these reasons shows us the way out, and U-Multirank tries to go that way.

This creates the vision of a multi-dimensional performance database, connecting data with applications of quality and transparency tools.

Examples with U-Multirank data demonstrate how this would work.
Data as input for peer review and development of research strategy

Research profile - physics

- External research income
- Research publications (absolute numbers)
- Citation rate
- Top cited publications
- Interdisciplinary publications
- Regional joint publications
- International joint publications
- Publications cited in patents
- Patents awarded (absolute numbers)
- Co-publications with industrial partners
- Research orientation of teaching
- Income from private sources

U Göttingen
U Paderborn
Data for benchmarking exercise to look for best practice in industry relations

### Computer Science

Which level of study are you interested in: bachelor, master

### u multirank

2.5.2016

www.umultirank.org

### Teaching & Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contact with work environment (bachelors)</th>
<th>Contact with work environment (masters)</th>
<th>Inclusion of work/practical experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantheon-Sorbonne U</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya Inst. Tech</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama National U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech U Berlin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara Inst. Sci &amp; Tech</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama National U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Erlangen-Nürnberg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Zagreb</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS Paris</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytech. U Milano</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Knowledge Transfer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income from private sources</th>
<th>Co-publications with industrial partners</th>
<th>Patents awarded (absolute numbers)</th>
<th>Publications cited in patents</th>
<th>Student internships in the region</th>
<th>Regional joint publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantheon-Sorbonne U</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya Inst. Tech</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama National U</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech U Berlin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara Inst. Sci &amp; Tech</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama National U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Erlangen-Nürnberg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Zagreb</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS Paris</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytech. U Milano</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student internships in the region</th>
<th>Regional joint publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pantheon-Sorbonne U</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya Inst. Tech</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama National U</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech U Berlin</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara Inst. Sci &amp; Tech</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama National U</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Erlangen-Nürnberg</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Zagreb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENS Paris</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytech. U Milano</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teaching & Learning (Students’ views)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Other universities</th>
<th>Better &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall learning experience</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of courses &amp; teaching</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with teachers</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of work/practical experience</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library facilities</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT provision</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room facilities</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teaching quality circles use data on teaching + learning to reveal problems to be addressed.

### Psychology

#### Teaching & Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Other universities / better &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-staff ratio</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating on time (bachelors)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating on time (masters)</td>
<td>82.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff with doctorates</td>
<td>76.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with work environment (bachelors)</td>
<td>5/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with work environment (masters)</td>
<td>5/9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Teaching & Learning (Students' views)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Other universities / better &gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall learning experience</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of courses &amp; teaching</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of program</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with teachers</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of work/practical experience</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library facilities</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT provision</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room facilities</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use data for quality dialogue, analyse reasons, take actions, monitor effects.
Combine ranking with more information in a tool for student choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent/ dorms (housing fees) (€)</th>
<th>Research profile</th>
<th>Graduating on time</th>
<th>Assistance from teachers</th>
<th>Student numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SORTIERUNG**

- alphabetisch
- nach Ranggruppen

**Hochschulen markieren und vergleichen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hochschule</th>
<th>Studenten</th>
<th>Rent/ dorms</th>
<th>Graduating</th>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>Student numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RWTH Aachen</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>123-550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni Augsburg</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>171-364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni Bayreuth</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>120-248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FU Berlin</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>120-380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Berlin</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>120-380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU Berlin</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>120-380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni Bielefeld</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>145-394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Studium und Lehre**

1. Betreuung durch Lehrende (S)  
   - Dozenten (S)  
   - Kontakt zu Studierenden (S)  
   - Laborpraktika (S)  
   - Studiengangsphase (F)  
   - Studienendestag (S)  
   - Studierbarkeit (S)  
   - Wissenschaftsbezug (S)  

**Ausstattung**

- Bibliotheksausstattung (S)  
- IT-Infrastruktur (S)  
- Räume (S)  

**Studienergebnis**

2. Abschlüsse in angemessener Zeit [%] (F)  
   - Abschlüsse in angemessener Zeit Master [%] (F)  

**Internationale Ausrichtung**

- Anteil englischsprachiger Arbeitsgruppen [%] (F)  
- Internationale Ausrichtung [Punkte] (F)  
- Internationale Ausrichtung Master [Punkte] (F)  

**Studierende**

1. Hauptfach-Studierende insgesamt (F)  

**Forschung**

- Rent  
- housing fees  
- €  
- Research profile  
- Graduating on time  
- Assistance from teachers  
- Student numbers  

More information to choose  
Ranking academic performance + study conditions + content
We could have a lot in common (but it remains difficult with the traditional league tables)

There is the potential to work together

U-Multirank is ready to promote this

More collaboration with US universities and quality managers is more than welcome
Thank you for your attention!

frank.ziegele@che.de

www.che.de
www.umultirank.org