GOVERNANCE AND RANKINGS

THES - QS World University Rankings Top 200 (2005 & 2006)					
Legend:	Increase	No Change	Decrease		
Country	Freq 2005	Percent 2005	Freq 2006	Percent 2006	Increase 2006
United States	53	26,4	55	27,4	1,0
United Kingdom	24	11,9	29	14,4	2,5
Australia	17	8,5	13	6,5	-2,0
Japan	10	5,0	11	5,5	0,5
Netherlands	10	5,0	11	5,5	0,5
Germany	9	4,5	10	5,0	0,5
Switzerland	7	3,5	7	3,5	0,0
Canada	8	4,0	7	3,5	-0,5
France	9	4,5	7	3,5	-1,0
Belgium	4	2,0	6	3,0	1,0
China	6	3,0	6	3,0	0,0
Hong Kong	4	2,0	4	2,0	0,0
Sweden	5	2,5	4	2,0	-0,5
Austria	3	1,5	3	1,5	0,0
Denmark	3	1,5	3	1,5	0,0
India	3	1,5	3	1,5	0,0
Israel	3	1,5	3	1,5	0,0
South Korea	3	1,5	3	1,5	0,0
Malaysia	1	0,5	2	1,0	0,5
Russia	2	1,0	2	1,0	0,0
Singapore	2	1,0	2	1,0	0,0
New Zealand	3	1,5	2	1,0	-0,5
Ireland	1	0,5	1	0,5	0,0
Mexico	1	0,5	1	0,5	0,0
Norway	1	0,5	1	0,5	0,0
Spain	1	0,5	1	0,5	0,0
Taiwan	1	0,5	1	0,5	0,0
Thailand	1	0,5	1	0,5	0,0
Finland	2	1,0	1	0,5	-0,5
Italy	3	1,5	1	0,5	-1,0
Brazil	1	0,5	0	0	-0,5
Total	201	100,0	201	100,0	

António Magalhães, Susan Robertson Roger Dale

What is governance?

it is…. "The coordination of coordination" (Dale, 1997)

in other words….

….rather than the state carrying out all of the activities of government itself, the state determines how, and by whom, they will be carried out….

What ideologies are shaping education governance projects?

AT THE LEVEL OF BIG ORGANISING IDEAS - OR META-GOVERNANCE

Neoliberal theory – (argues we need to recalibrate the relationship between the state and the citizen – hence vertical and horizontal rescaling of activities and actors)

Human capital theory – (argues that education is an investment which leads to economic growth)

Competition theory (argues competition between individuals/organisations leads to greater efficiencies in inputs and outputs)

AT THE LEVEL OF GOVERNANCE TECHNOLOGIES

New Public Management (audit, self-review, standards, outcomes…)

Governance of Education - Actors, Activity, Scales

	ownership	funding	provision	regulation	policy
Scales: supranational, national, sub-national					
state					
market (for profit/not for profit)					
religious					
community					
household					

Two big projects shaping dynamics

-producing globally-competitive knowledge based economies

- producing a more efficient and effective engine - the university - tied to producing a GCKBE

These dynamics have economic/political and cultural moments (a) new economy (b) relocation of centres of power upward into framing and monitoring activities and (c) new dispositions, identities and practices of academics/students

Framing the GCKBE

OECD began work in the 1980s on development of basis for a new (information?) economy drawing on work of Machlup - but limited access

1990s tried to develop indicators under guidance of Lundvall to measure knowledge and learning

Mid 1990s settled on idea of knowledge economy - and influence turns to work of new growth theorists (innovation/research quality/learning)

Rise of Indicators and Analysis Division, Education Directorate in OECD under master 'framer' Schleicher

TABLE 1 U.S. Rankings in Various International Competitiveness Indicators

Current innovation-based competitiveness[a]	6th	(in the world)
Percentage of young adults who have graduated from high school[b]	11th	(in the OECD)*
Science literacy among top students[c]	15th	(of 65 countries/regions tested)
College completion rate[b]	16th	(in the OECD)*
High school completion rate[b]	20th	(in the OECD)*
Density of broadband Internet penetration[d]	22nd	(in the world)
Science proficiency of 15-year-olds[c]	23rd	(of 65 countries/regions tested)
Proportion of college students receiving S&E degree[b]	27th	(in the OECD)*
Mathematics literacy among top students[c]	28th	(of 65 countries/regions tested)
Mathematics proficiency of 15-year-olds[c]	31st	(of 65 countries/regions tested)
Improvement in innovation-based competitiveness in the past decade[a]	40th	(in the world)
Quality of mathematics and science education[e]	48th	(in the world)
Density of mobile telephony subscriptions[d]	72nd	(in the world)

*The Organization of Economic Cooperation, and Development (OECD) currently has 34 members.

[a] Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, *The Atlantic Century: Benchmarking EU & U.S. Innovation and Competitiveness*, February 2009. See: *http://www.itif.org/files/2009-atlantic-century.pdf*.

[b] OECD, 2009. Rankings include OECD members and partners, and college graduation ranking is based on Tertiary-A institutions. See: Tables A1.2.a, A2.1, A3.1, and A.3.5 at *http://www.oecd.org/document/24/0,3343,en_2649_39263238_43586328_1_1_1_1,00.html*.

[c] National Center for Education Statistics, PISA 2009 Data Tables, Figures and Exhibits, Tables S1, S3, M1, and M3. See *http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011004_1.pdf*.

[d] S. Dutta and I. Mia, *Global Information Technology Report 2009–2010: ICT for Sustainability*, World Economic Forum, 2010.

[e] World Economic Forum, *The Global Information Technology Report 2009-2010*, Available at: *http://www.weforum.org/node/48197*.

2. BUILDING KNOWLEDGE

1. Investment in knowledge
2. Human resources and knowledge-based capital
3. Learning for innovation
4. Skills for innovation
5. New doctorates
6. Doctorate holders
7. Researchers
8. R&D
9. Higher education and basic research
10. Business R&D
11. R&D tax incentives
12. International funding of R&D

Notes and References

'Producing' the GCKBE

Combination of actors -international agencies and multilateral, national science academies, rankings agencies, governments, universities, publishing houses, entrepreneurs, experts, cities,

Operating at multiple scales

To promote a top down 'race to the top' mentality around the basis for the new economy

Annual monitoring and feedback loops, but this process is full of contradictions

Governance narratives 1

- 'Governance' appropriated by the neoliberal discourses on the retreat of state regulation disseminated as 'good governance' models (European Commission, 2001; OECD, 1995; World Bank, 1992).
- Governance narratives put together normative/ideological ingredients with technical elements.
- Narratives are policy and management stories aimed at making sense of policy processes and action, mediating between national and institutional contexts and processes and structures of decision-making.
- Argument: without denying the hegemony of NPM inspired narratives there are mixed developments related to collegial governance, New Public Management (NPM), Network Governance (NG) and New Governance (NewG).

Governance narratives 2

NPM narrative elements in HE…

1. Stimulation of competition for students between HEIs;
2. Hardening of budgetary constraints;
3. Vertical steering of the system/institution through setting targets and performance contracts;
4. Market based research funding;
5. Development of management under the aegis of "management must manage";
6. Strong managerial roles of rectors, deans, heads of department;
7. Efficiency and value for money; and
8. Strong rectorates and reduction in the representation of academics in HE structures and processes (Paradeise, Reale, Bleiklie, & Ferlie, 2009).

Governance narratives 3

Network Governance narrative elements-

1. Development of networks designed with the explicit goal of joint problem recognition, joint problem solving;
2. Networks between HEIs playing a significant role in governance of the higher education system;
3. Soft leadership;
4. External control systems taking the form of "light touch" systems. (Paradeise, Reale, Gostellec, & Bleiklie, 2009: 245)

Governance narratives 4

New Governance narrative elements in HE

- focus on governance techniques rather than on state programs;
- focus on networks rather than on hierarchy;
- shift from public vs. private to public+private;
- shift from command and control to negotiation and persuasion;
- shift from management skills to enablement skills (Salamon, 2002).

Collegial narrative elements in HE

- academics play a central role in university governance;
- emanates at the core decision-making structures

[(neo)bureaucratic models]

Governance narratives, discourse struggling and alternatives…

- **"A mix of signs and symptoms of NPM and NG"** - NG has been developed to counterbalance NPM **.**

- **Governance narratives show mixed narrative elements, reconfiguring the relationships between governance and management** (Magalhães and Veiga, forthcoming)

- **NPM Governance reform in European universities gave origin to other, sometimes counterbalancing, narratives** grounded on national and institutional contexts, e.g.:

      - the Netherlands: signs of NewG emerged associated with the fragmentation of decision-making power;
      - in France NPM was not the main driver of governance reform (Musselin, 2009) ;
      - in UK ongoing influence of academic bodies;
      - Germany: non formal dean's bodies

The relationships between rankings and governance

There are a number of recognised understandings of the *relationship between* rankings and governance (and not just the 'effects' of the former on the latter); what is the nature of the other relationships between them

Unclear because of 'fetishisation' of rankings, the tendency to reduce them to methodological issues, to 'take' them, rather than to 'make' them as a problem

At the same time, to regard their relationship with Universities as predominantly related to issues of Governance (e g, via conceptions of 'reputational risk')

Problematising rankings

- What/whose problems are Rankings designed to address (clearly multiple, but which versions are made visible)?

- What are the consequences of Rankings, for whom, under what conditions, in what aspects?

- On what 'programme theories'/'logics of intervention' do they work? Incentives? Threats? Naming and shaming?

- To bring about what ends; Behaviour change? Competitiveness? Increased control of Universities?

- What might be their unintended consequences?

- NB Rankings as policy instruments with independent effects (Lascoumes and Le Gales)

Governance Outcomes

All education governance frameworks have outputs that in turn have social justice outcomes. That is, (combinations of) different *actors*, *activities*, *technologies* and *scales of rule* are structurally and strategically selective of particular interests, which in turn distribute (uneven) social opportunities and structure social relations.

References

- Dale, R. (1997) The state and the governance of education, C. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown, and A. Stuart Wells (eds). Education, Culture, Economy, Society, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dale, R. (2009) Contexts, constraints and resources in the development of European Education Space and European education policyR. Dale and S. Robertson (eds.), Globalisation and Europeanisation in Education, Oxford: Symposium Books.

- Robertson, S.L. Bonal, X. and Dale, R. (2002). GATS and the Education Service Industry, *Comparative Education Review,* Vol 46 (4), pp. 472-497

- Magalhães, António and Veiga, Amélia (to be published) "Governance and management in European universities". Paradeise, C., Reale, E., Bleiklie, I., & Ferlie, E. (2009). University Governance: Western European Comparative Perspectives. Dordrecht: Springer.