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Short report on main issues.

General remarks
* The new system, U multiranking, that is suggested is subjective. Some of the stakeholders praise this fact, others see limitations.
* Very good that each stakeholder target group can choose their own priorities and their own point of reference.
* This system makes it possible to make a personal ranking depending on the individual selection. Most stakeholders value this fact very high.
* Good that the instrument is demand driven instead of supply driven.
* Good that there is a possibility to take into account national differences.
* Very important that the competiveness stays between institutions.
* Students want the best institution possible and need one overview. Is not possible when the dimensions are used.
* Target groups are not defined! This is a big strength everybody, every individual can be target group. For now examples are used!
* Some institutions will always be less good than others this can not be avoided.

‘Traffic light’ system
* The ‘traffic light’ system has the same limitations as other ranking when comparing the red, green and yellow outcomes. How to avoid this? Quartiles are being used.
* The three categories (red, green and yellow) are not fixed yet.
* Only formal education is taken into account also but activities of students outside the formal education could be a possible indicator. Such as international exchange.
* There is a need for comparable indicators.
  ○ Need to discuss how to include research institutions that are not educational institutions.
  ○ Need to identify indicators:
    ○ For research some could be the same as being used in current ranking systems
    ○ Need indicators that are countable otherwise it is impossible to see the difference between the institutions.
    ○ When defining indicators include the institutions. They have to give the input, the data and have to work with the indicators.
    ○ It is not possible to include all the institutions off the world but make an representative group. So avoid identifying them all by yourself.
    ○ When defining the indicators there need to be a strong theoretical backbone. There need to be a weight between the indicators. Nobody has an solution to this yet.
* When defining the indicators experts are used to give information about the use of different types of databases.

webtool
* Need for an operational system on how to gather the data from the institutions and how to use it. There are ideas such as:
  ○ a pre filled questionnaire sent to all institutions
  ○ use national information systems and combine the information.
  ○ Institutions have an own responsibility to update the data through a website
* More work and thought needs to be done concerning the suggested webtool. More ideas and information is requested.
* Updating the data every year is not feasible. Need to find an interim e.g. every 2 years, 5 years.

U-Map
* Some are critical against the use of U-map this is European centered and the new U-multiranking should be applicable globally. In the United states a similar system like U-Map is being developed. Combine these systems and test this with the sample group of institutions. Everybody agrees this is
still a challenge.
* U-Map shows diversity in student population need to put this also in the U-Multiranking.

**Media:**
* Problem with media could be that they will still add up all the outcomes and make a league chart.
* Inform media as soon as possible
* Avoid that others will say “European higher education institutions are not doing well within the existing rankings so they come up with their own”
* Involve media to get broader support.

**Field rankings**
* The pilots that are chosen under the field rankings are not unanimously approved and calls for a lot of (further) discussion. But they are accepted as pilots because a test of the methodology is needed. There is always room for discussion. The change that is made is: teaching institutions into: innovation institutions.
* Not forget that field are getting more and more interdisciplinary. Also need to be included in the new system. Still a question how? Are national examples that can be used.
* Suggestion: instead of using just two, business and engineering take a co pilot to compare.

**Workshops**
There is a big interest for participating in the workshops that are yet to come. Stakeholders praise the organizers for their transparency. They see a lot of challenges that still have to be faced and are enthousiastic about the new U Multiranking.