Universities in Crossroads of National and Global Rankings

Report of the Peer Learning Activity

Dr. habil. György Fábri associate professor

Budapest, May 2017

SZÉCHENYI 2020
HUNGARIAN GOVERNMENT
European Union
European Structural and Investment Funds
INVESTING IN YOUR FUTURE

Universities in Crossroads of National and Global Rankings

Report of the Peer Learning Activity by TEMPUS Hungary – Ranking project

An International Ranking-Workshop promoted by Tempus Public Foundation was held at the Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology of Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE PPK) on March 31, 2017.

At the event titled „Universities in Crossroads of National and Global Rankings" university leaders from Romania, Serbia and Hungary, the representatives of the International Ranking Expert Group as well as Hungarian and foreign ranking-experts discussed the correspondence between national and global rankings. Around fifty participants disputed lectures on the incompetence of global rankings to measure the performance of universities as well as on the fact that the position of the very same universities on the national ranking scales and the international ones are hardly comparable due to indicator differences. Nevertheless, the best universities are at the top of any ranking scale.

According to György Fábri, associate professor of Eötvös Loránd University and initiator of the event, one of the most important idea was that the methodological problems of rankings as well as the demand for rankings decreases the value of global rankings, therefore, rankings by discipline and regional comparisons of institutions become widespread.

The participants welcomed the idea of organizing an international ranking-conference at ELU aimed at examining the rankings based on the performance of individual disciplines, and discussing the launch of regional European rankings.

The next phase of the project would be to arrange professional trainings and online information services for university colleagues working on rankings.

1. Introduction

The implementation, interpretation and incorporation of feedback of university rankings into the institutional and governmental strategies is a complex process in which a variety of aspects need to be validated at the same time - today, there will be plenty of opportunities for discussion.

Universities are rated by different global rankings simultaneously, but by national rankings too. We communicate their latest results of course, especially if we achieve in a better place (as ALISON RICHARD, Former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge said, “Rankings have many faults and do not adequately describe universities and cannot show whether one institution is better than another... ...but I am very happy when Cambridge is rated as the top university in the world.”).

But, beyond communication, what do the results of national and global rankings say to us about the same institution? Experts, university leaders and academics have analyzed and discussed the wide range of the methodological, theoretical and policy-related problems of rankings. Research Group for Social Communication of ELTE PPK has been studying and developing rankings since 2001, and based on this theoretical and practical work we have a general framework about rankings.

The universities are assessed in global and national rankings at the same time, and the use of different frames of references adds a high degree of uncertainty to the relevance of rankings. The media, decision makers and the universities themselves use national and global rankings, with quite confusing results. Our project offers a frame of interpretation to recognize and analyze this crossover-position of universities.

The essence of our frame of interpretation developed during our research is that rankings do not implement the measurement of the performance of the institutions, but are the currently most efficient media communication tools of higher education. Their power and the dynamics of their spread is primarily a result of the media and social communication environment surrounding higher education at present. Therefore, they tend to stimulate rather than inform their target groups, that is, students interested in entering higher education, decision makers, and the institutions themselves.

2. The World of Rankings: Indicators, Effects, Criticism (A Summary)*

Indicators of Global Rankings

ARWU	Quality of Education	Alumni of an institution winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals	10,0%
	Quality of Faculty	Staff of an institution winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals	20,0%
		Highly cited researchers in 21 broad subject categories	20,0%
	Research Output	Papers published in Nature and Science*	20,0%
		Papers indexed in Science Citation Index-expanded and Social Science Citation Index	20,0%
	Per Capita Performance	Per capita academic performance of an institution	10,0%
THE	Teaching	Reputational teaching survey	15,0%
		PhD awards per academics	6,0%
		Undergraduates admitted per academic	4,5%
		Income per academic	2,3%
		PhD awards per bachelors awards	2,3%
	Citations	Citation impacts normalised	30,0%
	Research	Reputational survey research	18,0%
		Research income (scaled)	6,0%
		number of papers published in the academic journals	6,0%
	International outlook	Ratio of international to domestic staff	2,5%
		Ratio of international to domestic students	2,5%
		proportion of a university's total research journal publications that have at least one international co-author and reward higher volumes	2,5%

* Based on ranking-monograph "The Refracted Image of University. University Rankings as the Media Representation of Higher Education" by György Fábri.

	Knowledge transfer	Industry income	2,5%
QS		Peer Review	40,0%
		Recruiter review	10,0%
		Student/Faculty Ratio	20,0%
		International Faculty	5,0%
		International Students	5,0%
		Citations per Faculty	20,0%
LEIDEN	Research productivity	citation (4!)	100,0%
US NEWS	Reputation	Global research reputation	12,5%
		Regional research reputation	12,5%
	Bibliometric	Publications	10,0%
		Books	2,5%
		Conferences	2,5%
		Normalized citation impact	10,0%
		Total citations	7,5%
		Number of publications that are among the 10 percent most cited	12,5%
		Percentage of total publications that are among the 10 percent most cited	10,0%
		International collaboration	10,0%
	School-Level Indicators	Number of Ph.D.'s awarded	5,0%
		Number of Ph.D.'s awarded per academic staff member	5,0%
Webometrics	Web-visibility	Visibility (external link)	50
	Web-activity	Presence The total number of webpages hosted in the main web domain of the university	16,66
	Web-activity	Openness: number of rich files	16,66
	Research productivity	Excellence (the university scientific output being part of the 10% most cited papers in their respective scientific fields)	16,66

SCIMAGO	Research productivity	Output: published documents in scholarly journals.	no weight
		International Collaboration: produced in collaboration with foreign institutions	no weight
		Normalized Impact	no weight
		High Quality Publications Ratio of publications	no weight
		Specialisation index (SI)	no weight
		Excellence rate (ER)	no weight
		Scientific Leadership	no weight
HEEACT	Research productivity (20%)	Number of articles in the last 11 years [per staff FTE]	10%
		Number of articles in the current year [per staff FTE]	10%
	Research impact (30%)	Number of citations in the last 11 years [per staff FTE]	10%
		Number of citations in the last two years [per staff FTE]	10%
		Average number of citations [per publication] of the last 11 years	10%
	Research excellence (50%)	H-index of the last two years	20%
		Number of highly cited papers in the last 11 years	15%
		Number of articles in high impact journals in the last year	15%
MINE	Output	Alumni Management Carrier	100%
RaTer	Educational activity	1. Number of educational bachelor, specialist, master and doctoral programmes	20%
		2. Student/staff ratio	

	Research activity	3. Number of certificates on discoveries and patents since 2001	20%
		4. Performance of the computer centre of the university	
		5. H-index of the university	
	Financial maintenance	6. Total budget of the university per full-time student	15%
	Professional competence of the faculty	7. Number of staff winning world-level awards (Nobel Prizes, Fields medals and others such as Descartes prize; Abel prize, the Lomonosov medal, the Russian «Global Energy» award	20%
		8. Number of staff publications	
		9. Citations and references to staff publications	
	International activity	10. International academic communities in which the university was involved in the last academic year	10%
		11. Proportion of foreign students in the previous year	
	Internet audience	12. Volume of web-products	15%
		13. Request popularity of the university	
		14. Page Rank of the main page of the university's site	
4icu.org2010		Google Page Rank	no weight
		Yahoo Inbound Links	no weight
		Alexa Traffic Rank	no weight
URAP		Citations	21%
		Number of articles	21%
		Journal impact total	18%
		Total documents	10%
		International collaboration	15%
		Journal citation impact total	15%

Considering all the above, the types of indicators used in a lot of rankings can be included in a single coordinate system only with great care – and conclusions cannot be drawn on the various rankings or regarding the importance of specific indicators. Instead, such a typology can demonstrate the image the various ranking makers have of HE (higher education), if we are to use it to classify the various indicators. The joint value of the three dimensions (type of indicators, classification and weight) can only be shown three-dimensionally, so here we only show the schema, while the results of the data analysis can be found at: ranking.elte.hu:

Type of indicator Classification of indicators	Source (independent/ institution/survey)	data or opinion based	level of measurement (institution/ faculty/department	Exactitude of data (quantifiable, measurable)	weight (%)	validity
situation of recruitment (number of applicants, their performance, rate of entry, social and ethnic aspects)						
student performance (scientific work, academic competitions, number of students, student ratios between undergraduate levels, distribution of students by professional field)						
teacher supply (ratio of students/teachers, number of teachers, full-time/part-time teachers, qualification of teachers)						
teaching conditions (square metre, library, IT, budget)						
learning environment (availability of dormitories, fees, scholarships, sports and cultural facilities, education administration, student organizations)						
educational output (ratio of graduates, ratios of graduate levels, time required for graduation)						
usefulness of degrees (job availability, salaries, staying on the career path)						
research (publications, citations, awards, research programmes)						
capacity to raise funds (competition results, economic partnerships, external commissions, ratio of students paying tuition fees)						
reputation (student and teacher						

acknowledgement, recognition, opinion of labour market and social players)						
international character (ratio of students and teachers, intra-institutional relations, number of joint research work, publications, grants, financing, organizational membership, conferences and events)						
social and economic presence (career image of graduates, ties with alumni, financing by alumni, economic and social relations)						
web presence (popularity, number of visitors, links, number of web contents)						

3. Relevancy of Indicators and Ranking-Positions – A Critical Overview

We present the criticism of rankings grouped by the main ranking elements.

a; Rankings present HE one-dimensionally, in a simplified way, falsifying the essence of university performance.

Ranking indicators would reflect how students view universities, however, the image obtained through them is lopsided, since they consider HE as an investment into career development, while being at university is rather a lifestyle for students. The greatest weakness is the ignorance of diversity by considering institutions without regard to their missions, objectives, and structures, as well as featuring mainly institutions, while relevant data are much more accessible on specific training programmes, departments and institutes. Finally, publication routines, possibilities and genres greatly differ by the various disciplines, so rankings that use such indicators present a lopsided picture of HEI.

b; The world of indicators is messy, they distort the reality of HE.

The efficiency of indicators is not examined, the methodologies used are incongruent and neither are they apt for being implemented in different countries nor do they respond to the issue of compatibility. While national rankings try to reflect on this aspect, it is not in the scope of global rankings. The widespread use of scientometric indices itself has a dubious validity. Concerning global university rankings, the linguistic and cultural imbalances, the prevalence of (natural) sciences with the changing positions in publications or support of the various disciplines cast a doubt on global rankings' comparisons using these as key indicators. The opinion of geographically and professionally distant scientists is more likely to be based on past performance, and is of little value for present evaluation. Relying on the so-called

"third party" databases is sometimes unattainable. The data obtained from surveys are very sensitive to sociological-statistical validity, yet empirical surveys often fail to meet such expectations. The use of the reputation indicator raises doubts anyway due to the halo-effect. Availability often overwrites validity in the use of indicators.

c; The conjury of rankings: weightings and calculations are arbitrary and lead to false results.

Simple rankings are developed on the lines of mathematical algorithms without any valid explanation on weighing. The logic of the composition of the various indicators is also attacked by many. Summation of indices from differing factors seems less legitimate. Summated indicators have doubtful results from the users' point of view due to the manifold preferences of future students. Rankings, formed by creating weightings and summated indices are sensible to small deviations, so if elite institutions were not at the top, nobody would take ranking makers seriously. In addition, commercial ranking publications are accused of being interested in publishing novelties year by year for no one would otherwise be interested in the new publications.

d; Rankings are unfulfilled promises.

Rankings, therefore, are inadequate to provide relevant information on HE. The aggregated data characterize institutions as a whole, failing to satisfy the interest of students and university management in training programmes or individual organizational units, and this is particularly true for global rankings. Rankings urge universities through the media to improve their positions on the lists, often resulting in an autotelic drive for a better placement which, depending on arbitrary indicators instead of the complex developments serving real needs, force institutions to make distorted strategic decisions.

How to read rankings?

In 2015 IREG published guidelines for stakeholders on HE and scientific rankings recommending universities to interpret the aim, main target group and the various indices of particular rankings, as well as information other than the content for the users, for whom ranking is a source of information. Long term processes are to be examined with less attention paid to positions and annual fluctuations. The methodology of rankings need to be read and understood carefully. The two most important rules for reading rankings are systematicity and perspectivity (patience).

e; General Rules

Never begin with the numbers – methodology and the indicators, showing what the ranking is about and what to expect from it, should always be studied first. The current ranking position itself does not tell much – its change over time can be informative.

Adhere to certain factors, make comparisons when evaluating the position of your own institution, bearing in mind realistic objectives. Consider commensurability of the financial

and control criteria, historical and economic/social background, research and education offering, field profile; student numbers.

Turning to the segmentation of indicators and to the list of fields. Rankings carry substantive information about the position of an institution in the competitive arena if revealing the orders by indicators. The group of institutions represented on the lists compiled by research or educational fields is more manageable, scientific performance or student attendance is measured on a similar platform, therefore ranking position gives an interpretable feedback.

This, too, shows that the use of rankings requires a methodological approach, but due to the different expectations of their target groups, it is practical to distinguish these groups by their composition and perceptive horizons.

f; Reading Advice According to Target Groups

- For the majority of those continuing their studies in HE national and global rankings presenting the complete institutional sphere are practically meaningless, since field and institution preferences are determined, thus wider comparisons do not add any substantial information. Creating "private rankings" providing realistic institution choices is advisable. For students entering a partial upgrading training choosing an institution has a lower stake, while choices are determined almost as strongly by the fields, professional relations, equivalences and language skills. Though being more informed, they tend to consider institutional prestige as a decisive factor in international rankings.
- Students view the good ranking position of their own institution as a prestige increasing factor, so they can be involved as partners in processing rankings, or in collecting additional information and experiences from within their circle.
- Academic leaders of HE institutions are the most involved readers of rankings. They must separate real professional information of ranking holistic and their communicative effect together with the higher educational policy reflections to be expected. They need to identify the competitor and reference institutions, compare the positions they have obtained and their indicator values with their own data. Substantive professional comparisons can best be made on the research/training level, this is the area where enough information is available.
- The institutional PR department needs to react differently in the case of a negative change: with a communication move to avoid changes in the positioning despite a probable damaging effect. HE institutions can make use of rankings in strategic planning and quality development, and it can also be useful to get information from global rankings when developing international cooperation.
- The leaders of HE policies can rather use indicators than ranking positions to measure real performance. In addition, ranking positions must be compared to institutional

profiles and training structures, dependent on accreditation and quotas/capacities, budget conditions, geographic/socio-geographic position and research infrastructure.

- Users read rankings in field selection: beside a general impression cumulated lists do not offer them anything. For them scientific quality and quantity of training resources, the student/teacher ratios demonstrating the intensity of training and research income is informative.
- The largest user of rankings is the media for whom global rankings "were invented", so journalists are tempted to consider them as a primary source although if they were to provide information, they would have to reflect on the methodology, indicators, etc. of rankings.

Matrix of Reading Rankings

The table below shows the type of information that can be expected from reading rankings in relation to the target groups and types of rankings:

	all institutions global				global regional				global field				all institutions national				national training fields			
applicants to higher education																				
entering partial upgrading training																				
institutional management																				
institutional management, research teams, trainers																				
(institutional PR dept.s)																				
higher education policy-makers																				
media																				
employers																				
factors	quality of education	quality of research	individual or institutional communication	raising interest, attention	quality of training	quality of research	individual or institutional communication	raising interest, attention	quality of training	quality of research	individual or institutional communication	raising interest, attention	quality of training	qualtity of research	individual or institution communication	raising interest, attention	quality of training	quality of research	individual or institutional communication	raising interest, attention

4. Keynote Speakers and Presentations

Waldemar Siwinski, President, Perspektywy Education Foundation, Vice-President, IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence, presented trends and future perspectives in his lecture titled 'Academic Rankings – Where are they Heading?

Dr. Sándor Soós, head of the Research-Analyses Department of HAS, presented the utility of scientific measurability.

Professor Mirceau Dumitru, Rector of the University of Buchurest, reflected on university rankings based on experiences of his university.

Ms. Csilla Stéger, Vice-President of the Educational Authority backing the Ministry of Human Resources, gave an insight to the possible indicators of teaching and experiences of data-providing.

a; 'Academic Rankings - Where Are They Heading?' (Waldemar Siwinski)

US News Best Colleges (1983), the first national ranking, and Shanghai Ranking (2003), the first global ranking, are of the same age as Internet and Facebook, respectively. As for future directions, global ranking system is in a state of substantial transformation that both researchers and experts see. There are 60 national, 20 international global and 9 regional university rankings, 3 international ones by subject, 6 business school rankings, 2 national higher education system rankings totaling in 100!

The European Commission sounded the alarm on the widening gap between the European, American and Asian universities concerning the issue of accreditation vs. ranking, with the former lacking to address the matter of quality, being efficient only for establishing minimum quality level without assuring competitiveness, rankings do not have such limitations.

At the dawn of academic rankings growth of databases meant new possibilities: following the magic circle of 'Top-100', 'Top-200' or 'Top-500' THE published a list of 980 and QS published a list of 916 universities in 2016, doubling the original number. US News – 1000 and URAP – 2000 emerged. In 2017, we have the Top-1000 standard, and rankings can be predicted to cover 2.000 institutions within three years.

More disciplines are the new trend creating a chance for a greater number of institutions to be visible in the rankings. The other benefit of rankings 'by discipline' lies with the fact that each university has strong and weaker departments resulting in loss of differences in overall rankings.

The third trend is to cover more regions, including student and staff mobility as well as academic cooperation within a region. The most attractive ones are the regional rankings in Asia, Latin America and the Arab countries. The main problem here is that of methodology. Regional rankings are not self-standing.

As the fourth trend, national rankings prosper, with new ones appearing every year. Their strength is that they virtually cover all institutions in the given country with the criteria and indicators more accurately selected since all institutions function in the same cultural and legal environment. There are attempts to build “bridges” between national and global rankings.

Broadening dimensions as a fifth trend means search for new means to include missions other than research, like excellence in teaching or university’s social mission. (E.g. Third Mission Ranking Project E3M; or searching for new indicators like ‘value for money’, ‘value to society’, ‘knowledge transfer’, ‘mobility between university and industry’, ’quality of the graduates’, ‘employability of graduates’”.)

b; Indicators of scientific performance (Sándor Soós)

The lessons to learn from decades of scientometrics are the following:

To attain a multidimensional evaluation, universities must be put in a multidimensional environment. Publication performance is multidimensional, so typical taxonomy is production and productivity, scientific impact, publication quality and strategy as well as collaboration; the basic indicators are size-, field- and age-dependent; universities also differ in research; therefore, commensurability can be realized via field- and age-normalized, size-independent indicators. Ranking needs multiple indicators of scientific performance to be transformed into a composite score: weighting scheme and aggregating weighted indicator values, with parallel or user-defined ranking by indicators (Leiden ranking, U-Multirank). But due to the uncertainty of bibliometric samples (year fluctuations, sampling error etc.), to be able to judge whether single indicator values differ ’for real’ or by chance, statistical techniques were proposed to establish intervals for confidence of comparison.

Research output is highly collaborative, so to allocate its credit there are two paradigms: full counting with publications and their citations attributed to each authoring institution or fractional counting, where these are divided among authoring institutions according to various schemes (but cf. ARWU's author rules). But there are conceptual and practical problems with both, as well as with output and disciplinary categorization.

The last issue concerning methodology is the database effect: international rankings with internationally visible output. To conclude we can say that multidimensional approach as well as commensurability is necessary, and since ranking systems grasp different aspects, there is no ’perfect’ operationalization. The tendency to maintain the multidimensional nature of performance necessitates statistical concepts to be incorporated to ensure conceptual clarity via counting methods since single-valued indicators are often misleading in comparison.

c; Institutional approaches (Mircea Dumitru)

The rankings phenomenon is complex and the reactions and strategies of universities to national and global positions are diverse. Professors, researchers have different perceptions

concerning rankings, students are either for or against it, alumni and companies may draw different conclusions. Thus, at institutional level a clear understanding of the rankings' importance is necessary for which relevant rankings selection is needed, and being relevant from the point of view of an institutional profile a permanent monitoring of relevant rankings is essential. In the case of the University, as a reaction to ranking related objectives a rector's management project and strategic plan was implemented with debates and discussions at different levels of management – institutional (Administrative Council, Senate), faculty and departments. The strategy included community involvement in setting up lists of contacts for academics and companies (example QS), comparative analysis among national universities and different ranking indicators to understand the positions revealed by rankings (role: Quality Assurance Committees). The analysis of the institutional positions in relevant rankings was communicated towards the academic community. A new internationalization strategy was elaborated and the website was redesigned.

To conclude, the positions in rankings are dynamic, competition is high, an internal decision is not a guarantee for a ranking position, cooperation and partnership is important and quality based internal differentiations are necessary.

d; Indicators of teaching (Csilla Stéger)

At first, 'excellence' in teaching and studying in higher education, as well as 'useful output' of higher education to society are to be defined. Issues as to acquired/taught credits, time/space allocated to student workload vs. theme in the accomplished curriculum, the result of the lobbying potential of colleagues etc. are to be considered. As to the number of students, mass education is a reality in higher education) It is a must for the employment market if we want smart, sustainable, inclusive growth, yet elite institutions have a better position in rankings due to better possibilities for excellence.

Because the quality of academic staff is measured by academic performance rather than teaching quality, what does it have to do with teaching? And does a low student/staff ratio equal high quality in teaching, or just the contrary? Is it rather an efficiency/methodology issue?

The number of diplomas and the qualifications awarded should also be important, since it means a value at the employment market. Although Ph.D. is often the only 'worthwhile' qualification that counts at rankings, that is not what employment seeks. Yet, is it quality if all students who enter acquire qualification? And what percentage of success and dropout is ideal? What is the added value of the HEIs (higher education institutions) on student competence? Instead of a 'Who cares how a student is taught if he/she acquires competences' attitude, this should count! But still, how to make sure that it is added by the HEI and not by the community the student lives in or the workplace the student might be employed parallel to his/her studies. What is meaningful vs. available, valid and comparable? Data on teaching in HE at an international scale, such as the number of students, staff,

qualifications as well as credits are available in the EU – but are those valid and comparable? AHELO targeted the international assessment of learning outcome gains in HE, but it is being remodeled.

As for Hungary, nearly all the above-mentioned issues are feasible, since data on teaching and studying exist at institutional level, a lot of data is gathered at national level, as well as data gathering is managed and quality assured by the Educational Authority, and competence assessment is planned in higher education.

5. Discussion

The inspiring workshop titled "Universities of East – European Region: Competition or/ and Cooperation at the Ranking Process" chaired by Paszkál Kiss, associate professor of Károli Gaspár University of Reformed Church in Hungary took place with the participation of twenty professionals including directors of universities, ranking analysts, educators and policy makers from all over Europe.

The discussion focused on rankings as a tool for universities in Eastern Europe to position themselves and influence stakeholders' decisions, as well as on best practices of co-operations in the region. As main conclusions of the meeting, a more proactive approach in reaching out for prospective students and awareness of the altered attitudes of students' in making choices about their studies (by viewing it more as an investment as opposed to accomplishment) is necessary. In small countries reputation is still more important than rankings, whereas in larger ones, rankings may play a greater role. Quality of education and research should be raised. The concept of "good school" may be interpreted differently, eg. excellent teachers and/or high quality research work and/ or providing great possibilities for students in the applied field. Rankings by discipline provide younger institutions with the opportunity to stand out. The Leiden ranking gives the freedom to select the various criteria. Stipendium Hungaricum, EU tenders, co-authorships and both informal and formal research co-operations are best practices in the region, educational fares, rankings and non-educational factors are effective ways to attract foreign students. Librarians mean a great resource to increase the visibility of research and publications. Politics and the media have strong impact on rankings. Finally, the strategic question for universities of the countries in the region of Eastern Europe is whether to compete or/ and co-operate in the ranking process.

Here follow some notices by the participants:

Ivanka Popovic (vice rector of University Beograd): suggested to discuss the Bologna 'painful' transitions in view of improvement of education and its controversial results, the mass production of degrees, adding that there is a real chance for co-operation and networking.

Péter Szalay (vice rector of ELTE): there is the need for a proactive way in the future to reach to-be students well before they finish high school. He said the focus – eg. on having excellent

teachers and scientific results, or on application – alters the interpretation of the concept of ‘goodness’ adding, that while each university wishes to be considered a good one, due to the lack of an accurate definition of the term ‘good university’ and ’good’ as such, there are various ways ‘to be a good university’.

Kazimierz Bilanow: the topic of the session – co-operation such as the Visegrád cooperation, Crossboarder cooperations, Age 2020 tender, co-authorships and common research projects, had not been touched upon, adding, that these are happening informally and not necessarily institutionally.

6. Conclusions, initiatives

Common action to give support to further work is necessary. In this learning process, at least five topics should be given new impulse:

- going abroad, students should learn how to use global and national rankings in their university choice;
- the ways national higher education institutions use national rankings of the "target countries" for student recruitment;
- features in the field of HE internationalization and relationship-building for the university and government management;
- decision-makers and the press place emphasis on and give significance to ranking positions, and last, but not least,
- they help universities to use rankings for benchmarking.

Talks to compare national and global rankings of universities will be hosted to discuss:

- indicators of scientific productivity on global and national levels and of teaching;
- measurability of the third mission from a global perspective;
- indicators and results of UnivPress Ranking, the most popular Hungarian university ranking;
- Hungarian universities in global rankings;
- differences in reactions of politicians and the media to national and global rankings;
- as well as diverse reactions and strategies from universities to national and global positions.

The follow-up and initiatives of the workshop:

- a workbook of this workshop would be edited,
- "www.ranking.elte.hu" website will publish news and background papers of ranking-research
- publishing the English version of György Fábri's ranking-monograph in June
- organizing a ranking-training also in June to improve data-provision, analysis and best practice of ranking-usage,
- as well as preparing an international ranking conference at ELTE with emphasis on the specialties of the universities in Eastern Europe and on the reflection from different disciplines on the main points, methods and effects of rankings, eg. scientometrics, sociology, social psychology, statistics, communication, philosophy of university etc.