

HIGHER EDUCATION POLICY
INTER-UNIVERSITY
NETWORK

1rst seminar academic year 2012-2013

World University Rankings and Greek
Universities: Theoretical Aspects and Greek
Reality

Dionyssis Kladis
University of the Peloponnese
22 September 2012

ABOUT RANKINGS

THE THREE MOST INFLUENTIAL WORLD UNIVERSITY RANKINGS PROVIDING LEAGUE TABLES...

1. Academic Ranking of World Universities

By Centre for World-Class Universities & Institute of Higher Education of Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

<http://www.shanghairanking.com>

2. World University Rankings

By Times Higher Education (THE)

(till 2009 in cooperation with Quacquarelli Symonds and since 2010 in cooperation with Thomson Reuters)

<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings>

3. QS World University Rankings

By US News and World Report in cooperation with Quacquarelli Symonds)

<http://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings>

⇒ Plus 2 more

ABOUT RANKINGS

...PLUS TWO MORE

4. Webometrics Ranking of World Universities

By Cybermetrics Lab. of Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas (CSIC), Spain

<http://www.webometrics.info>

5. World University Rankings by Reputation

By Times Higher Education (THE)

(in partnership with Thomson Reuters)

<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2011-2012/reputation-rankings.html>

For a general information on university rankings, see:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/College_and_university_rankings

For the most recent review of university rankings, see:

"Global University Rankings and Their Impact", EUA Publications, Brussels, 2011

http://eua.be/pubs/Global_University_Rankings_and_Their_Impact.pdf

RANKINGS AND METHODOLOGIES

- **Indicators Webometrics**

- ✓ 1. size of university web: number of pages recovered from: Google, Yahoo, Live Search and Exalead (10%)
- ✓ 2. visibility: total number of unique external links received (inward links) that have been obtained from Yahoo Search (50%)
- ✓ 3. rich files: number of Adobe Acrobat (.pdf), Adobe PostScript (.ps), Microsoft Word (.doc) and Microsoft PowerPoint (.ppt) (10%)
- ✓ 4. scholar: number of papers and citations extracted from Google Scholar (30%)

- **Indicators Shanghai**

- ✓ 1. alumni winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals (10%)
- ✓ 2. staff winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals (20%)
- ✓ 3. highly cited researchers (top 200) in 21 broad subject categories (20%)
- ✓ 4. papers published in Nature and Science (20%)*
- ✓ 5. papers indexed in Science Citation Index-expanded and in Social Science Citation Index (20%)
- ✓ 6. per capita academic performance calculated from indicators 1-5 (10%)

* For social sciences and humanities the weight of indicator 4 is relocated to other indicators

RANKINGS AND METHODOLOGIES

- **Indicators THE**

- ✓ 1. research income from industry per faculty (2,5%)
- ✓ 2. international faculty (3%) and international students (2%)
- ✓ 3. teaching - the learning environment (30%), including reputation survey on teaching (15%)
- ✓ 4. research - volume, income, reputation (30%), including reputation survey on research (19,5%)
- ✓ 5. citation - research influence (32,5%)

- **Indicators QS**

- ✓ 1. academic peer review survey (40%)
- ✓ 2. employer review survey (10%)
- ✓ 3. faculty-student ratio (20%)
- ✓ 4. citations per academic staff (20%)
- ✓ 5. international faculty (5%)
- ✓ 6. international students (5%)

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Harvard US | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Stanford US | 2 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 5 |
| MIT US | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Berkeley US | 4 | 10 | 21 | 5 | 4 |
| Cambridge UK | 5 | 6 | 1 | 16 | 3 |
| CALTEC US | 6 | 1 | 12 | 13 | 10 |
| Princeton US | 7 | 5 | 13 | 39 | 7 |
| Columbia US | 8 | 12 | 10 | 12 | 23 |
| Chicago US | 9 | 9 | 8 | 29 | 15 |
| Oxford UK | 10 | 4 | 5 | 27 | 6 |
| Yale US | 11 | 11 | 4 | 28 | 9 |
| UCLA US | 12 | 13 | 34 | 14 | 12 |
| Cornell US | 13 | 20 | 15 | 4 | 16 |
| Pennsylvania US | 14 | 16 | 9 | 10 | 22 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 2 (THE1) | 1 (ARWU) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| CALTEC US | 1 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 10 |
| Harvard US | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Stanford US | 3 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 5 |
| Oxford UK | 4 | 10 | 5 | 27 | 6 |
| Princeton US | 5 | 7 | 13 | 39 | 7 |
| Cambridge UK | 6 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 3 |
| MIT US | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Imperial College UK | 8 | 24 | 6 | <100 | 11 |
| Chicago US | 9 | 9 | 8 | 29 | 15 |
| Berkeley US | 10 | 4 | 21 | 5 | 4 |
| Yale US | 11 | 11 | 4 | 28 | 9 |
| Columbia US | 12 | 8 | 10 | 12 | 23 |
| UCLA US | 13 | 12 | 34 | 14 | 12 |
| Johns Hopkins US | 14 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 14 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 3 (QS) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Cambridge UK | 1 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 3 |
| Harvard US | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| MIT US | 3 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| Yale US | 4 | 11 | 11 | 28 | 9 |
| Oxford UK | 5 | 10 | 4 | 27 | 6 |
| Imperial College UK | 6 | 24 | 8 | <100 | 11 |
| University College UK | 7 | 20 | 17 | 46 | 19 |
| Chicago US | 8 | 9 | 9 | 29 | 15 |
| Pennsylvania US | 9 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 22 |
| Columbia US | 10 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 23 |
| Stanford US | 11 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| CALTEC US | 12 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 10 |
| Princeton US | 13 | 7 | 5 | 39 | 7 |
| Michigan US | 14 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 13 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 4 (WEB) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 5 (THE2) |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| MIT US | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| Harvard US | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Stanford US | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Cornell US | 4 | 13 | 20 | 15 | 16 |
| Berkeley US | 5 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 4 |
| Michigan US | 6 | 22 | 18 | 14 | 13 |
| Wisconsin Madison US | 7 | 19 | 27 | 41 | 25 |
| Washington US | 8 | 16 | 25 | 56 | 26 |
| Minnesota US | 9 | 28 | 42 | 102 | 43 |
| Pennsylvania US | 10 | 14 | 16 | 9 | 22 |
| Texas Austin US | 11 | 35 | 29 | 76 | 31 |
| Columbia US | 12 | 8 | 12 | 10 | 23 |
| CALTEC US | 13 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 10 |
| UCLA US | 14 | 12 | 13 | 34 | 12 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 5 (THE2) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Harvard US | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| MIT US | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| Cambridge UK | 3 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 16 |
| Berkeley US | 4 | 4 | 10 | 21 | 5 |
| Stanford US | 5 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 3 |
| Oxford UK | 6 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 27 |
| Princeton US | 7 | 7 | 5 | 13 | 39 |
| Tokyo Japan | 8 | 21 | 26 | 25 | 34 |
| Yale US | 9 | 11 | 11 | 4 | 28 |
| CALTEC US | 10 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 13 |
| Imperial College UK | 11 | 24 | 8 | 6 | <100 |
| UCLA US | 12 | 12 | 12 | 34 | 14 |
| Michigan US | 13 | 22 | 15/16 | 14 | 6 |
| Johns Hopkins US | 14 | 18 | 14 | 16 | 15 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (ARWU)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Harvard US | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Stanford US | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| MIT US | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Berkeley US | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| Cambridge UK | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| CALTEC US | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Princeton US | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Columbia US | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Chicago US | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Oxford UK | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Yale US | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| UCLA US | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 |
| Cornell US | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 |
| Pennsylvania US | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (THE1)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| CALTEC US | | | 2 | 1 | |
| Harvard US | | | 1 | 2 | |
| Stanford US | | | 4 | 3 | |
| Oxford UK | | | 7 | 4 | |
| Princeton US | | | 5 | 5 | |
| Cambridge UK | | | 6 | 6 | |
| MIT US | | | 3 | 7 | |
| Imperial College UK | | | 9 | 8 | |
| Chicago US | | | 12 | 9 | |
| Berkeley US | | | 8 | 10 | |
| Yale US | | | 10 | 11 | |
| Columbia US | | | 18 | 12 | |
| UCLA US | | | 11 | 13 | |
| Johns Hopkins US | | | 13 | 14 | |

COMPARING RANKINGS (QS)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Cambridge UK | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Harvard US | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| MIT US | 9 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| Yale US | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Oxford UK | 4 | 5/6 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Imperial College UK | 6 | 5/6 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| University College UK | 7 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 4 |
| Chicago US | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Pennsylvania US | 11 | 12 | 11 | 9 | 12 |
| Columbia US | 10 | 11 | ? | 10 | 11 |
| Stanford US | 17 | 16 | ? | 11 | 15 |
| CALTEC US | 5 | 10 | 9 | 12 | 10 |
| Princeton US | 12 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 9 |
| Michigan US | 18 | 19 | 15 | 14 | 17 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (WEB)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| MIT US | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Harvard US | | | | 2 | 1 |
| Stanford US | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Cornell US | | | | 4 | 5 |
| Berkeley US | | | | 5 | 4 |
| Michigan US | | | | 6 | 10 |
| Wisconsin Madison US | | | | 7 | 8 |
| Washington US | | | | 8 | 23 |
| Minnesota US | | | | 9 | 6 |
| Pennsylvania US | | | | 10 | 7 |
| Texas Austin US | | | | 11 | 14 |
| Columbia US | | | | 12 | 12 |
| CALTEC US | | | | 13 | 24 |
| UCLA US | | | | 14 | 11 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (THE2)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Harvard US | | | | 1 | 1 |
| MIT US | | | | 2 | 2 |
| Cambridge UK | | | | 3 | 3 |
| Berkeley US | | | | 4 | 5 |
| Stanford US | | | | 5 | 4 |
| Oxford UK | | | | 6 | 6 |
| Princeton US | | | | 7 | 7 |
| Tokyo Japan | | | | 8 | 8 |
| Yale US | | | | 9 | 10 |
| CALTEC US | | | | 10 | 11 |
| Imperial College UK | | | | 11 | 13 |
| UCLA US | | | | 12 | 9 |
| Michigan US | | | | 13 | 12 |
| Johns Hopkins US | | | | 14 | 18 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Harvard US | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Oxford UK | 10 | 4 | 5 | 27 | 6 |
| UCL UK | 20 | 17 | 7 | 46 | 19 |
| Northwestern US | 30 | 26 | 24 | 77 | 40 |
| Paris 11 France | 40 | <200 | 208 | <100 | <100 |
| Utrecht Netherlands | 48/50 | 68 | 80 | 74 | 71-80 |
| Melbourne Australia | 60 | 37 | 31 | 78 | 45 |
| National Univ. Australia | 70 | 38 | 26 | 71 | 51-60 |
| Arizona US | 80 | 95/97 | 163 | 38 | 71-80 |
| Basel Switzerland | 89/90 | 95/97 | 151 | <100 | <100 |
| Frankfurt Germany | 100 | <200 | 182 | <100 | <100 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 2 (THE1) | 1 (ARWU) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| CALTEC US | 1 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 10 |
| Berkeley US | 10 | 4 | 21 | 5 | 4 |
| Cornell US | 20 | 13 | 15 | 4 | 16 |
| Tokyo Japan | 30 | 21 | 25 | 34 | 8 |
| National Univ. Singapore | 40 | 102-150 | 28 | 85 | 27 |
| Peking China | 49/50 | 201-300 | 46 | <100 | 43 |
| Pittsburgh US | 59/60 | 57 | 116 | 35 | 51-60 |
| Vanderbilt US | 70 | 52 | 131 | 84 | <100 |
| Lund Sweden | 80 | 102-150 | 86 | <100 | 71-80 |
| Dartmouth US | 90 | 151-200 | 99 | <100 | <100 |
| Alberta Canada | 100 | 102-150 | 100 | 62 | <100 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 3 (QS) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|---------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Cambridge UK | 1 | 5 | 6 | 16 | 3 |
| Columbia US | 10 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 23 |
| Edinburgh UK | 20 | 53 | 36 | 64 | 45 |
| Bristol UK | 30 | 70 | 66 | <100 | 81-90 |
| HKUST Hong Kong | 40 | 201-300 | 62 | 82 | 91-100 |
| Warwick UK | 50 | 151-200 | <200 | <100 | <100 |
| Monash Australia | 60 | 151-200 | 178 | <100 | <100 |
| Tohoku Japan | 70 | 97 | 132 | <100 | 51-60 |
| Utrecht Netherlands | 80 | 48 | 68 | 74 | 71-80 |
| KAIST Korea | 90 | 201-300 | 94 | <100 | 91-100 |
| Alberta Canada | 100 | 102-150 | 100 | 62 | <100 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 4 (WEB) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 5 (THE2) |
|------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| MIT US | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania US | 10 | 14 | 16 | 9 | 22 |
| Texas A&M US | 20 | 99 | 164 | 158 | 81-90 |
| New York US | 30 | 29 | 44 | 44 | 51-60 |
| Southern California US | 40 | 46 | 55 | <600 | 71-80 |
| Virginia US | 50 | 102-150 | 135 | 126 | <100 |
| Oregon US | 60 | 102-150 | <400 | 451-500 | <100 |
| Nebraska Lincoln US | 70 | 151-200 | <400 | 401-450 | <100 |
| Connecticut US | 80 | 201-300 | <400 | 365 | <100 |
| Brigham Young US | 90 | 301-400 | <400 | <600 | <100 |
| Glasgow UK | 100 | 151-200 | 102 | 59 | <100 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Universities | 5 (THE2) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) |
|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Harvard US | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| CALTEC US | 10 | 6 | 13 | 12 | 13 |
| Massachusetts Amherst US | 20 | 102-150 | 64 | 255 | 76 |
| California San Diego US | 30 | 15 | 33 | 77 | 36 |
| Northwestern US | 40 | 30 | 26 | 24 | 77 |
| Osaka Japan | 50 | 82 | 119 | 45 | <100 |
| Manchester UK | 61-70 | 38 | 48 | 29 | <100 |
| Lund Sweden | 71-80 | 102-150 | 80 | 86 | <100 |
| Amsterdam Netherlands | 81-90 | 102-150 | 92 | 63 | 99 |
| HKUST Hong Kong | 91-100 | 201-300 | 62 | 40 | <100 |
| Vienna Austria | 91-100 | 151-200 | 139 | 155 | 81 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (ARWU)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| Harvard US | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Oxford UK | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| UCL UK | 22 | 21 | 21 | 20 | 21 |
| Northwestern US | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 30 |
| Paris 11 France | 49 | 43/44 | 45 | 40 | 37 |
| Utrecht Netherlands | 47 | 52 | 50 | 50/48 | 53/55 |
| Melbourne Australia | 73/75 | 75 | 62 | 60 | 57 |
| National Univ. Australia | 59 | 59/60 | 59/60 | 70 | 64 |
| Arizona US | 77/78 | 77/79 | 78 | 80 | 79 |
| Basel Switzerland | 87 | 85 | 86/87 | 90/89 | 85 |
| Frankfurt Germany | 101-150 | 101-150 | 101-150 | 100 | 101-150 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (THE1)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|-------|------|
| CALTEC US | | | 2 | 1 | |
| Berkeley US | | | 8 | 10 | |
| Cornell US | | | 14 | 20 | |
| Tokyo Japan | | | 26 | 30 | |
| National Univ. Singapore | | | 34 | 40 | |
| Peking China | | | 37 | 49/50 | |
| Pittsburgh US | | | 64 | 59/60 | |
| Vanderbilt US | | | 51 | 70 | |
| Lund Sweden | | | 89 | 80 | |
| Dartmouth US | | | 99 | 90 | |
| Alberta Canada | | | 127 | 100 | |

COMPARING RANKINGS (QS)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|---------------------|------|-------|------|------|-------|
| Cambridge UK | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Columbia US | 10 | 11 | ? | 10 | 11 |
| Edinburgh UK | 23 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 21 |
| Bristol UK | 32 | 34 | 27 | 30 | 28 |
| HKUST Hong Kong | 39 | 35 | 40 | 40 | 33 |
| Warwick UK | 69 | 58 | 53 | 50 | 58 |
| Monash Australia | 47 | 45 | 61 | 60 | 61 |
| Tohoku Japan | 112 | 97 | 102 | 70 | 75/76 |
| Utrecht Netherlands | 67 | 70/71 | ? | 80 | 85 |
| KAIST Korea | 95 | 69 | ? | 90 | 63 |
| Alberta Canada | 74 | 59 | 78 | 100 | 108 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (WEB)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| MIT US | | | | 1 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania US | | | | 10 | 7 |
| Texas A&M US | | | | 20 | 38 |
| New York US | | | | 30 | 22 |
| Southern California US | | | | 40 | 27 |
| Virginia US | | | | 50 | 44 |
| Oregon US | | | | 60 | 82 |
| Nebraska Lincoln US | | | | 70 | 150 |
| Connecticut US | | | | 80 | 151 |
| Brigham Young US | | | | 90 | 154 |
| Glasgow UK | | | | 100 | 131 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (THE2)

| Universities | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|--------|-------|
| Harvard US | | | | 1 | 1 |
| CALTEC US | | | | 10 | 11 |
| Massachusetts Amherst US | | | | 20 | 39/40 |
| California San Diego US | | | | 30 | 36 |
| Northwestern US | | | | 40 | 35 |
| Osaka Japan | | | | 50 | 51-60 |
| Manchester UK | | | | 61-70 | 51-60 |
| Lund Sweden | | | | 71-80 | 81-90 |
| Amsterdam Netherlands | | | | 81-90 | 71-80 |
| HKUST Hong Kong | | | | 91-100 | 61-70 |
| Vienna Austria | | | | 91-100 | <100 |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Against the other four rankings (based on top-14) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Lower rankings <100 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0,0% | 1,8% | 1,8% | 1,8% | 1,8% |
| Lower rankings >100 | 33 | 27 | 35 | 34 | 35 |
| | 58,9% | 48,2% | 62,5% | 60,7% | 62,5% |
| Lower rankings (total) | 33 | 28 | 36 | 35 | 36 |
| | 58,9% | 50,0% | 64,3% | 62,5% | 64,3% |
| Higher rankings | 15 | 21 | 17 | 15 | 14 |
| | 26,8% | 37,5% | 30,3% | 26,8% | 25,0% |
| Equal rankings | 8 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| | 14,3% | 12,5% | 5,4% | 10,7% | 10,7% |
| Total rankings | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 56 |
| | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

COMPARING RANKINGS (2011)

| Against the other four rankings (based on decades) | 1 (ARWU) | 2 (THE1) | 3 (QS) | 4 (WEB) | 5 (THE2) |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Lower rankings <100 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 26 | 13 |
| | 27,3% | 29,5% | 36,4% | 59,1% | 29,5% |
| Lower rankings >100 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 15 | 17 |
| | 34,1% | 22,7% | 45,5% | 34,1% | 38,7% |
| Lower rankings (total) | 27 | 23 | 36 | 41 | 30 |
| | 61,4% | 52,2% | 81,9% | 93,2% | 68,2% |
| Higher rankings | 16 | 20 | 7 | 3 | 13 |
| | 36,3% | 45,5% | 15,8% | 6,8% | 29,5% |
| Equal rankings | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | 2,3% | 2,3% | 2,3% | 0,0% | 2,3% |
| Total rankings | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% | 100,0% |

MULTI-RANKING (OR BY-RANKING) INITIATIVES

The rationale:

- If we do not like or trust rankings, we need to create some rational alternatives in order to ensure transparency and comparability in a largely diversified higher education landscape throughout the world. Furthermore, these initiatives should have multi-dimensional characteristics, in contrary to the existing systems which are considered mono-dimensional.
- Would they be new, more rational ranking methods? Or, would they be something else, something different? Classification or Mapping (or Typologie in French) = New, more neutral and harmless, names for rankings?
- Multi-rankings are university rankings that use a greater number of indicators and usually they do not produce a league table. Instead, they present results of individual indicators or groups of indicators.

MULTI-RANKING (OR BY-RANKING) INITIATIVES

Bologna Process

In the Leuven Communiqué, (April 2009) for the first time an indirect reference to rankings by using the term "transparency tools" which should be based on the principles of quality assurance and which are supposed to be used in order to make the diversity of the European HEIs more transparent and to help them identify and compare their respective strengths.

For the Leuven Communiqué see the official website of the European Higher Education Area:

<http://www.ehea.info>

MULTI-RANKING (OR BY-RANKING) INITIATIVES

European Commission

Upon a call of the European Commission, the U-Multirank project has been initiated in June 2009, run by seven European partners. The project aims at the development of ranking systems which will be multi-dimensional and will reflect the diversity of higher education in Europe. In that sense, the U-Multirank project appears to be a by-ranking initiative offering an alternative to the mono-dimensional characteristics of the existing ranking systems.

Details on the U-Multirank project can be found in its website: www.u-multirank.eu/project

MULTI-RANKING (OR BY-RANKING) INITIATIVES

U-Map Classification of Universities

A European higher education classification tool that reflects the variety of missions and profiles of European higher education institutions.

The U-Map project has been funded by the European Union and is led by the Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) of the University of Twente, the Netherlands.

The final report of the project was published in January 2010: "U-Map: The European Classification of Higher Education Institutions"

http://www.u-map.org/U-MAP_report.pdf

OECD

A new project: Assessment of Higher Education Learning Outcomes (AHELO)

<http://www.oecd.org/edu/ahelo>

Experience from a similar exercise for basic education (PISA)

MULTI-RANKING (OR BY-RANKING) INITIATIVES

EUA (European University Association)

Transparency tools such as rankings or classifications cannot be used as a means of accountability or as a proxy for quality.

They can only - at best - serve as a means of comparing universities and thus indicating their relative position in relation to other universities using certain indicators. Thus, they do not serve the same purpose as internal or external quality assurance which examine processes and outcomes with the aim of producing a judgement reflecting strengths and concerns to be addressed.

(From the policy statement of EUA on quality and quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area, October 2010)

http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/EUA-QA-Policy-2010.sflb.ashx