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Majority of students study in their own country. Out of 150 million students only 3 million study abroad (2%).

Prospective students think in terms of a country where to study and in terms of language.

Students are consumers, not ranking analysts.

- National rankings provide more information
Key role of national rankings

Global ranking

Only two Polish universities in ARWU 2011.
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Global ranking

National ranking

Only two Polish universities in ARWU 2011.

In Poland exist some 40 fine universities.
Key role of national rankings

- National rankings beat the limitations of international rankings.

Limited set of indicators and comparable data enabling coherent description of higher education in different countries.

On the national level the universities operate in similar cultural and legal systems and comparable data is available.

The picture of universities evaluated on the national level is fuller and richer that in case of international evaluations.
Key role of national rankings

- National rankings are an effective method of ensuring quality of higher education.

Accreditation itself does not solve the problem of education quality.

Accreditation is efficient but only in establishing a minimum quality level. Rankings do not have such limitations.

- National rankings improve universities’ competitiveness.
### Percentage Distribution of Top 100 Universities by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percentage Distribution of Top 100 Universities by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Universities</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>US News &amp; World Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Centre for Higher Education (CHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asahi Shimbun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maclean’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>L’Etudiant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Good University Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>URank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SwissUp (last results 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Keuzegids Hoger Onderwijs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interfax Ranking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key role of national rankings

- National rankings facilitate monitoring of reforms.

The feedback in the case of international rankings comes very late.

The only honest answer for the ambitious rectors: Pay attention to national rankings. Only by improving position in national ranking, your university may improve the standing in international rankings!
Perspektywy Education Foundation is independent, non-profit organization. Board consists of former rectors and outstanding public figures.

[www.perspektywy.org](http://www.perspektywy.org)

Perspektywy collaborates with the Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland (CRASP).

Perspektywy organizes public debates, seminars, conferences, educational fairs, and prepares rankings.
Perspektywy Ranking - Methodology

Perspektywy Ranking criteria 2011

- Academic Potential: 15%
- Prestige: 25%
- Learning Environment: 10%
- Internationalization: 15%
- Innovation: 5%
- Academic Effectiveness: 30%
ACADEMIC POTENTIAL - 15%
Parametric rating (7%)
Authorizations to award academic degrees (4%)
Proportion of staff with highest qualifications (3%)
Accreditations (1%)

ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS – 30%
HEI faculty growth (8%)
Academic titles awarded (7%).
Effectiveness in raising external research funding (4%)
Publications (2%)
Citations (3%)
h-index (3%)
Participation in EU-financed projects (2%)
Doctoral programs (1%)
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT - 10%
Student access to staff with highest qualifications (5%)
Library - printed holdings, e-holdings, facilities (3%)
Facilities for out-of-town students (1%)
Sports achievements (1%)

INTERNATIONALISATION - 15%
Study programs conducted in foreign languages (4%)
Students studying in foreign languages (3%).
Student exchange (outbound) (2,5%)
Student exchange (inbound) (2,5%)
International students (1%)
Foreign teaching staff (1%)
Courses taught in foreign languages (1%)
PRESTIGE - 25%
Academics’ reputation (10%)
Employers’ reputation (11%)
Olympians’ preferences (2%)
International recognition (2%)

INNOVATION - 5%
Patents, copyrights and licenses (2%)
EU funding obtained (2%)
HEI innovation infrastructure (1%)
Evolution of criteria 2000-2011
In order to assure the ranking process is done properly procedures are supervised by the Ranking Board, it:

- approves methodology (including the weights of particular criterions)
- Supervises the whole ranking process
- Announces the results.
Prof. Michał Kleiber, President of the Polish Academy of Sciences – *Chair of the Ranking Board*

Prof. Marek Safjan, judge on the European Court of Justice and former President of the Poland Constitutional Tribunal serves as an *Honorary Chair of the Board*.

*Mention of Members of the Board:*

Prof. Marek Rocki, Chairman of the Polish Accreditation Committee,
Prof. Franciszek Ziejka, former Rector of the Jagiellonian University,
Prof. Bogusław Smólski, former Director of the National Center for Research and Development,
Dr. Alicja Adamczak, President of the Patent Office
Prof. Tadeusz Tołłoczko, former Rector of the Warsaw Medical University
Dr Jan Krzysztof Frąckowiak, Director, Polish Science Contact Agency “PolSCA” in Brussels
Waldemar Siwiński, President, Perspektywy Education Foundation, former President of the Polish News Agency (PAP)
Włodzimierz Kiciński, President & CEO, Nordea Bank (Poland)
Data for the ranking were collected primarily from sources independent of the ranked HEIs, including:

- **Quantitative and Qualitative Survey** conducted by the *Perspektywy* Education Foundation;
- **Survey of employers** conducted by PENTOR Research International SA;
- **Data on Polish academics’ publications in the SCOPUS abstract and citation base**;
- **Report on HEIs** and their finances by the Central Statistical Office (GUS 2010);
- **Data of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education**, Ministry of Regional Development, Republic of Poland Patent Office and EU National Contact Point for Research Programmes.
Perspektywy Rankings

Ranking of best academic institutions
- Ranking of best private Master level HEIs
- Ranking of best private Bachelor level HEIs
- Ranking of best public Bachelor level HEIs

Rankings by the field of study:
- humanities - social sciences - economics
- natural sciences, agriculture and forestry
- medicine - sciences
- technology and computer science

Rankings by the grup of criteria:
- internationalisation
- academic effectiveness
- publication & citations
- innovation
- employers reputation

Ranking Symposium, Brussels, 12 April 2012
www.ranking.perspektywy.pl (in Polish)

www.perspektywy.org (in English)
Announcement of the Perspektywy Ranking 2011

Ranking Symposium, Brussels, 12 April 2012
# Best Academic HEIs in Poland 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University of Warsaw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jagiellonian University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Warsaw University of Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wrocław University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mining and Metallurgy University in Krakow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wrocław University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Łódz University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Warsaw Main Commercial University in Warsaw</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Medical University of Karol Marcinkowski in Poznan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gdańsk University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Białystok Medical University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nicolaus Copernicus University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Łódz University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wrocław University in Gliwice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. University of Warsaw
2. Jagiellonian University
3. Warsaw University of Technology

Perspektywy - Results of the Ranking Symposium, Brussels, 12 April 2012
Best Private HEIs in Poland 2011

1. Kozminski University
2. Warsaw School of Social Psychology
3. Polish-Japanese Institute of Information Technology
President Bronisław Komorowski: „Perspektywy Ranking is a reliable and valid measure of teaching and research capabilities of Polish universities.”
The second wave of new national rankings - new or modernized.

IREG Forum on National Rankings, Bratislava 2011
IREG Inventory of National Rankings
IREG Ranking Audit started

www.ireg-observatory.org
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International rankers can:

1. Refere readers of international rankings to relevant national rankings - link to web-page(s) of national rankings.

2. Introduce a criterion reflecting institution’s position in national ranking - *prestige in country* criterion weight of 1 to 3%.
International rankers can:

1. Refere readers of international rankings to relevant national rankings

2. Introduce criterion reflecting institution’s position in national ranking - *prestige in country* criterion weight of 1 to 3%.

National rankers can:

1. Introduce a criterion *international prestige* or *international recognition* into national rankings with weight 1-3%.
Perspektywy Ranking 2011

Ranking criteria:

- PRESTIGE 25%
- ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS 30%
- INNOVATION 15%
- INTERNATIONALIZATION 15%
- LEARNING ENVIRONMENT 10%
- ACADEMIC POTENTIAL 15%
- INTERNATIONALIZATION 15%
- INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION 2%

Ranking Symposium, Brussels, 12 April 2012
# International Recognition in Perspektywy Ranking 2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>ARWU</th>
<th>THE</th>
<th>QS</th>
<th>Webometrics</th>
<th>Leiden</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>FT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Warsaw</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagiellonian University</td>
<td>97.27</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw University of Technology</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>690</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw University of Technology</td>
<td>19.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>501</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Lodz</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>587</td>
<td>496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGH University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>752</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Mickiewicz University</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wroclaw</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdansk University of Technology</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolaus Copernicus University</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Silesia</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznan University of Technology</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodz University of Technology</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Curie-Skłodowska University</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Gdansk</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Kozminski University</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw School of Economics</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusions

Why national university rankings (NUR) are here to stay?

1. National rankings improve the universities’ competitiveness.
2. National rankings beat the limitations of global rankings.
3. NUR are an effective method of ensuring quality of higher education.
4. NUR provide more information for prospective international students.
5. National rankings facilitate monitoring of reforms
6. New database facilitate creation of better national rankings.
7. Appearance of new national rankings.
In order for a country to efficiently use the innovation potential of its higher education system, it should have a national university ranking, professionally prepared by independent organization.
What kind of an independent organization can secure the most harmonious development of rankings? Media are best fit to do the job.
Thank you!

Waldemar Siwiński
w.siwinski@perspektywy.pl
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