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Meeting Times
This course will meet for nine sessions over five days. In addition, students will complete ten "lab hours" by working on team projects, course prep assignments, and independent work assigned in class. The course meeting times are as follows:

January 5, Thursday
  Session 1: 9am-2pm
  Session 2: 3-6pm

January 6, Friday
  Session 3: 9am-1pm
  Session 4: 2-6pm

January 12, Thursday
  Session 5: 9am-1pm
  Session 6: 2-6pm

January 13, Friday
  Session 7: 9am-1pm
  Session 8: 2-6pm

January 17, Tuesday
  Session 9: 7-10pm
Course Overview and Purpose
Each year college administrators and faculty hold their breath as college and university ranking systems are released. Did they move up or down? What will this mean for their programs and the resources they can attract for them? At the same time, many students begin their higher education experience with little to no knowledge of how their programs are ranked by such magazines as *Money* and *USNWR*. Rather they care about their college’s location within 100 miles of their home, the cost, and career placement upon graduation. At the same, many students log-in to websites that rank party schools, their professors, and fraternities and sororities. Somehow, ranking systems seem to be endemic to the higher education experience today. Yet what is being ranked, rated, or categorized varies greatly, and has differing levels of consequence for various stakeholders of higher education: the student, the parent, the faculty member, the college president or provost, the alumni, the donor, the higher education researcher, the community member nearby, and the state legislator. These stakeholders become even more diverse and complex when we consider global rankings and their influence on the world stage.

If you had the chance to create your own ranking system of higher education institutions, what criteria would you hold up as most important? How would you collect your data? Ranking systems, not unlike reward systems, are important symbolic representations of what we think are important and value about higher education. Would you rate the diversity of the student body or faculty? Would community engagement or teaching be a criterion? What about the degree to which the institution contributes to social mobility or is a good steward of the environment? Would you take a historical approach to see how many political leaders, Nobel Laureates, Fortune 500 CEOs, or social activists graduated from the institution in the last 20 years? Maybe, you might assess the social capital students leave with or the “pull.” In this imagined universe, institutions begin to work toward your criteria and your ranking system has power in shaping their priorities. Which institutions are included in your “field” to be ranked? Which institutions will win and which will lose in your new ranking system for higher education? What kinds of behaviors will your new ranking system promote? We will discuss all of these issues as we survey the literature on ranking systems and their influence on higher education.

Objectives
The learning outcomes intended for this course are that by the end of the seminar students:

- Understand the history of ranking systems in higher education and their evolution
- Have working knowledge of the major ranking systems used today and how they identify fields, determine criteria, collect data, and assign ranks, as well as the impact they have on institutional and individual behavior
- Are able to effectively critique major ranking systems on the basis of (a) the criteria used to identify quality (b) the methods used to collect data on these criteria and (c) the impact on behavior—the consequences of the criteria for how institutions behave
- Are able to design their own ranking system, use their system to rank 10 institutions, defend the criteria, methods, and consequences of their ranking system using research on higher education, and make a persuasive argument for why it would be preferable to other major ranking systems
**Required Texts**

*Ranking Systems Course-pack:* Most articles listed on the syllabus are available on the Blackboard site for this class. Some readings will be handed out in class.

**Course Assignments and Expectations**

This course represents a relatively short but intense learning experience. Over three weeks we will meet together and work intensely in our nine class sessions. You will also be expected to do ten additional hours in course preparation assignments and in class projects, viewing relevant websites and ranking reports. Each student is expected to prepare very thoroughly and carefully for each class session. As such the grade for this course will be distributed between three key areas—active classroom preparation and engagement (including course preparation assignments and attendance), reflective essays, and final team projects.

**Classroom Engagement (20%)**

Classroom engagement will be evaluated based on (a) attending and engaging in all classes, (b) preparing for each class using course preparation guidelines at the end of the syllabus.

- Contributions in class should reveal a substantial familiarity with assigned readings, a capacity to analyze the issues and problems under discussion, and an ability to listen, incorporate, synthesize and constructively criticize the comments and work of classmates. Class members are encouraged to bring questions, issues, critiques, and insights from the readings and from professional experiences to every class.
- Because this course relies so heavily on classroom participation and interactive dialogue, it is essential for you to **attend all classes**. In the case of an absence caused by sickness, it is your responsibility to inform Dr. O’Meara of your absence via email and to connect with classmates to cover work covered during the absence. Attendance will influence participation grades. We will need to reconsider your enrollment in this class if you miss more than one class session. Missed classes should not be for work reasons. Please do not read email or work on other class assignments or projects during the class. Students should be ready and prepared to start class at 9am. Repeated lateness will hurt the course grade.

**Reflective Essays (40%)**

Each student will be required to submit **three** of the following five reflective essays (**Essay 2 and two others**). These essays should be completed in 4 pages, 1.5 spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font. They must be submitted at the beginning of class on the day assigned in hard copy.

*Reflective Essay One:* Building on the articles for Sessions 1 and 2, discuss the history of the ranking systems and whom they were created to serve. Consider carefully their earlier purposes and then compare those to the way the system operates today. In doing so, integrate at least two theories or concepts from the Key Concepts Handout. Finally,
imagine how the evolution of rankings might be different if they were created by a different set of organizations, or for different stakeholders and different reasons. Due January 5th

Reflective Essay Two: Building on articles from Sessions 1-4, critique the USNWR Ranking system. Concisely summarize the criteria and weights used by the ranking system. Use evidence from the readings to discuss several strengths and weaknesses. Make recommendations for how this ranking system could be improved. Due January 6th

Reflective Essay Three: Building on readings from Sessions 1-6, discuss the specific behaviors of institutions that are in active “striving mode.” Be careful to distinguish between striving behaviors (what you do to move up) versus consequences. What are the benefits for students, administrators and faculty of being in an institution in active striving mode? What are the likely negative aspects? Due January 12th

Reflective Essay Four: Building on readings from Sessions 1-6, consider the consequences that have been found from striving behavior. Given this is a new area of research, document what the readings suggest is known about consequences for institutional mission, for student engagement, equity and access, faculty work-life, but also acknowledge what is unknown or areas where further research is needed. Due January 13th

Reflective Essay Five: Building on readings from Sessions 1-8, consider carefully the different stakeholders of ranking systems. What are they getting and not getting from the existing ranking systems out there today? Discuss some of the alternative attempts to measure quality outside ranking systems and the strengths and weaknesses of other approaches. What purposes and criteria are currently being ignored and how might they be measured in a future system? In answering these questions please integrate at least two key concepts from the Key Concepts Handout. Due January 17th

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing clarity, presentation, editing and grammar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and focus—well organized response to the question(s) asked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical analysis—major points are clear, made effectively, and are persuasive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical analysis—major points are supported by details from the readings-facts, research findings, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*extra credit goes for making these innovative, creative and bringing different sources into them than what is in the course pack

4 points = A
3 points = B+
2 points = B
1 point = Fail
Final Project—Creating a Ranking System (40%)

Students’ final project will be to create an original ranking system, using criteria they have selected. Students must:

1. Clearly identify criteria and methods of their system.
2. Use class readings and importantly—higher education research—to substantiate the importance of criteria chosen and/or ignored, the methods used to measure quality, the likely stakeholders and behavior.
3. Actually provide a ranking of 10 institutions using their ranking system and publicly available data.
4. Differentiate characteristics of the system from those of other ranking systems.
5. Explain the implications of these differences.
6. Argue persuasively as to why their system is superior. Which stakeholders will it serve and how? What kinds of likely institutional, faculty, or student behavior is it likely to catalyze?
7. Discuss the limitations of their system.
8. Use APA, be double spaced, normal margins, 12-point font, Times New Roman.
9. For individual projects, be a minimum of 15 pages plus references and appendix. For Team Projects, be a minimum of 20 pages plus references and appendix and include a one-paragraph description of the role of each team member in the project, signed off by the entire team.

Final projects will be comprised of two parts: (1) a 15-20 page paper, and (2) a 20 minute class presentation of the ranking system. Students will receive feedback on a proposal for the project in class on Friday, January 6th. The feedback here will focus on the key ideas, sources of data and field proposed. The presentation will occur on January 17th and will allow instructors and students to provide feedback that can be integrated into the final paper, due January 24th in hard copy by 1pm to 2202 Benjamin. Here the focus of feedback are ways the ranking system is presented, and criteria and methods justified by higher education research.

Grading Criteria for Final Projects

- Organization, structure, and clarity of writing and presentation.
- Employment of higher education research to justify criteria, methods and field.
- Quality of critical analysis and reasoning for chosen criteria; consideration of field.
- Effectiveness of comparison and contrast with extant ranking systems.
- Effective use of class feedback to improve the final product.
- Creativity, innovation, and significance.

Policy on Incomplete Grades

We will restrict the grade of Incomplete to documented emergencies at the end of the semester only. Such emergencies are not based on work commitments; rather students should not take the course if work or other course responsibilities make it clear at the beginning of the semester that they will not be able to complete assignments by the end of course deadlines. A grade of incomplete requires the instructor’s prior approval.
Policy on Students with Documented Disabilities
Please let the instructor know at the beginning of the class if you have a documented disability so that accommodations can be made to support your learning.

Course Evaluation
As a member of our academic community, you as a student have a number of important responsibilities. One of these responsibilities is to submit your course evaluations each term through CourseEvalUM in order to help faculty and administrators improve teaching and learning at Maryland. Please watch for the dates the system will open for evaluation of the semester and make a note of the link at which you can access the submission system: https://www.courseevalum.umd.edu/. We greatly appreciate your completing the course evaluations when the email invitation is sent to you.

Class Sessions

Session One - January 5: In this session we consider the history of striving in the last half century and what is meant by striving for prestige? What were some of the key social, political and economic forces that influenced the emergence of rankings? We will also compare and contrast how competition operates in higher education versus other fields such as health care. We will also introduce key concepts and theories and how these might be used throughout the class.

**Session Two - January 5:** In this session we analyze one of the most dominant and influential of ranking systems: USNWR. We will use a rubric created for this class to analyze the most popular prestige oriented ranking systems and the criteria that are used to measure performance. We will carefully consider what is ranked, rated, and categorized and why in USNWR and other dominant ranking systems.

**Guest Speakers:**

Dr. Mona Levine, *Associate Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment* and Pamela Phillips, *Associate Director for Reporting and Special Projects*. Dr. Levine and Ms. Phillips are responsible for collecting and reporting University of Maryland data to ranking systems. They will discuss their experiences as institutional researchers working with data collection for USNWR and other ranking systems.


**Session Three - January 6:** In this class we extend our conversation of dominant ranking systems to the world stage. What are the dominant international ranking systems for world universities and within other national systems of higher education? What are the criteria they are using to assess performance?

**Guest Speaker:**

Dr. Ellen Hazelkorn, *Director of Research and Enterprise, and Dean of the Graduate School, Dublin Institute of Technology*. Dr. Hazelkorn also leads the Higher Education Policy Research Unit (HEPRU), and is a Consultant to the OECD Programme on Institutional Management of Higher Education (IMHE). Dr. Hazelkorn is currently leading an international research project on the Impact and Influence of League Tables and Ranking Systems on Higher Education Decision-Making and Academic Behaviour in association with IMHE and IAU [http://www.oecd.org/edu/imhe/rankings]. Ellen is also working with the Institute for Higher Education Policy on a New Agenda for College and University Ranking.


**Session Four - January 6:** We will continue with our critique of dominant ranking systems with a particular focus on criteria used to measure performance and their strengths and weaknesses. We will also consider the “fields” and contexts specific to different ranking systems.

**Guest Speakers:**

**Allison Bell** serves in the University of Maryland’s Office of Undergraduate Admissions as the Senior Associate Director for Marketing and Communication. While a job in marketing wasn’t necessarily in her plans, trying to understand people was always her goal. With a bachelor’s degree in anthropology, a master’s in counseling psychology for higher education, and over twelve years professional experience in undergraduate admissions, Ms. Bell brings to her role a keen understanding of what messages students, parents and counselors are most interested in hearing.

**Matthew Meekins** is currently Assistant Director of Graduate Admissions for the School of International Service at American University. His role entails recruiting both domestically and internationally for MA and PhD candidates. Previously, he worked in the undergraduate admissions office at Salisbury University (part of the University System of Maryland). He is also a 2010 MA graduate of the Higher Education Program at the University of Maryland.


Session Five - January 12: Having considered the dominant rankings systems in the US and abroad we will consider the behavior of institutions trying to move up within them. What do campuses do when they are striving? What kinds of behaviors do they exhibit? Here we begin to consider the consequences of striving, with particular focus on admissions, access, equity and educational quality.


Session Six - January 12: We will continue our conversation about the impact of striving by turning to the influence of ranking systems and striving within the prestige hierarchy on faculty work-life and administrative expenditures. We will also look at cases of striving institutions in liberal arts colleges and research universities for how striving impacts the culture of a place.

Guest Speakers:
Amanda Nachman '07, founded College Magazine during her senior year with the advisory assistance of the University's Dingman Center for Entrepreneurship. The magazine consists of student editors mentoring over 40 staff writers, bloggers and photographers from universities nationwide. College Magazine has done several rankings of institutions as well as several “top campus” lists, such as the 10 most hipster campuses or the 10 most LGBT-friendly universities. http://www.collegemagazine.com

Donna L. Wiseman, Ph.D., assumed the duties of Dean of the College of Education at the University of Maryland in May 2008. She served as interim dean of the college during the 2007-08 academic year. Prior to that, she held the position of Associate Dean for Academic
Programs responsible for student services and advising, international activities, outreach, teacher education and accreditation. Wiseman is also a professor in the Teaching, Learning, Policy and Leadership Department.


**Session 7 - January 13:** There are many stakeholders of ranking systems, including but not limited to students, parents, alumni, legislators, donors, administrators, higher education researchers, and state legislators. In this session we consider whether stakeholders are getting what they want from ranking systems.

**Guest Speakers:**

*Dan Fisher*, Research Analyst for the Smith School of Business. One of Dan’s primary duties is overseeing the data gathering, submission and analysis of the Smith School internal data to several publications for rankings purpose.


**Session 8 - January 13:** How should we measure quality in higher education? How should we assess whether institutions are achieving their missions? During this class we consider several dominant alternative projects underway and critique the strengths and weaknesses of each, as well as consider the challenges of measuring performance in higher education. Please reference the tables at the end of the syllabus for helpful links and other information.
**Guest Speaker:**

**Dr. George Mehaffy**, Vice President for Academic Leadership and Change at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. AASCU is a Washington-based higher education association of nearly 420 public colleges, universities and systems whose members share a learning- and teaching-centered culture, a historic commitment to underserved student populations and a dedication to research and creativity that advances their regions’ economic progress and cultural development. Dr. Mehaffy has done a lot of thinking about the negative consequences of striving in AASCU institutions as well as the opportunity of these institutions to become something more distinctive: stewards of place, or institutions that mark their quality by the degree to which they provide unique service to a specific region and location.


**Session 9 - January 17:** Future Projections: What should be ranked, how and why? Final project presentations will begin during this class session. Each group will have 20-30 minutes for their presentation of a new ranking system. Students in the class will raise questions and provide feedback which should be integrated into the final paper submitted January 24, 2012.

**Guest Speaker:**


Course Preparations
These will usually be 1-2 pages, pass/fail, and evaluated for content, not form.

Session One: January 5: After reading the Eckel and Porter pieces consider three ways health care and higher education are similar and three ways they are different with relationship to competition. Please use three concepts from the key concepts handout in providing your analysis.

Or

Have you ever been a part of a striving institution as described in the table at the end of the O'Meara piece? Describe the origins of this experience from your perspective, connecting at least three ways your institution was striving that parallels the striving characteristics described in this piece.

Session Two: January 5: Every student will be assigned a different ranking system to analyze using Table B. Be especially careful to include detail on the field, criteria, and measurement in your ranking system so you can explain it to the class. Please bring 15 copies of your ranking system table to class.

Session Three: January 6: Use the readings to consider three ways the world rankings are influencing colleges and universities worldwide. Do the world rankings encourage “strategic imitation,” international distinction, or some of both?

Session Four: January 6: Consider Table C at the end of the syllabus. Also consider the differences between institutional types and their missions. Choose a ranking system other than USNWR. Please create a table that identifies some additional categories of critique of this ranking system.

Session Five: January 12: Please go to the USNWR page and specifically to the writings of Robert Morse. Develop four well-considered questions for discussion at the class with Mr. Morse, based on your readings and experiences of rankings.

Session Six: January 12: Use the readings today (especially Dubrow, O'Meara & Bloomgarden, and Ward & Wolf-Wendel) to consider how striving becomes part of the culture of a place. Try to identify values and assumptions that impact every day practices.

Session Seven: January 13: Using readings from today and previous sessions, develop a table (with three columns). In the first column put the names of the different stakeholders of ranking systems. In the second column critique what they are getting out of them—the benefits. Be specific about which ranking systems and which benefits. In the third column consider what each stakeholder is not getting from the same ranking system that might be helpful.

Session Eight: January 13: What do you think are the most compelling new ranking systems or assessments out there and why? Be very specific in your observations.
Alternatively, what purposes and missions of higher education have no spotlight or a limited one because of the difficulty of measurement (also be specific about this observation)?

**Table A: Ranking Systems for Higher Education (not an exhaustive list)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic Focus</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>A mix of non-reputational, government reported data</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stateuniversity.com/">http://www.stateuniversity.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Prowler Rankings</td>
<td>A variety including campus dining, housing, strictness, social life, safety, parking, and weather</td>
<td><a href="http://collegeprowler.com/rankings/">http://collegeprowler.com/rankings/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Center for Measuring University Performance</td>
<td>Total research dollars, funding, endowments, annual giving, faculty awards, student competitiveness</td>
<td><a href="http://mup.asu.edu/">http://mup.asu.edu/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index</td>
<td>Citations, publications, research funding</td>
<td><a href="http://chronicle.com/stats/productivity/">http://chronicle.com/stats/productivity/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiplinger’s 100 Best Values</td>
<td>Academic quality (selectivity), cost, and financial aid for public institutions</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kiplinger.com/tools/colleges/">http://www.kiplinger.com/tools/colleges/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Chances College Rankings</td>
<td>Aggregated from student admissions decisions</td>
<td><a href="http://college.mychances.net/college-rankings.php">http://college.mychances.net/college-rankings.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Global Language Monitor’s College Rankings (TrendTopper MediaBuzz Rankings)</td>
<td>Based upon number of keyword appearances on the Internet</td>
<td><a href="http://www.languagemonitor.com/college-rankings/">http://www.languagemonitor.com/college-rankings/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### International Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Focus on</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Academic Ranking of World Universities” (Shanghai Jiao Tong University) – often referred to as “the Shanghai rankings”</td>
<td>Nobel and Field winners, citation indices, publications in Nature and Science, per capita performance</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arwu.org/">http://www.arwu.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Higher Education (UK) (as of 2010 publishing separate from QS)</td>
<td>Teaching, citations, research (volume, income, and reputation), international mix, and industry income</td>
<td><a href="http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/index.html">http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking Name</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS World University Rankings (UK) (Quacquarelli Symonds Limited)</td>
<td>Academic reputation (peer review), employer reputation, student-to-faculty ratio, citations per faculty, and international students and faculty.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.topuniversities.com/">http://www.topuniversities.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Factor International University Ranking (USA)</td>
<td>Using Google search engine, ranks links to a particular institution from the websites of others.</td>
<td><a href="http://universitymetrics.com/g-factor">http://universitymetrics.com/g-factor</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclean's (Canada)</td>
<td>Student award winners, student-to-faculty ratio, faculty grants and awards, resources, student support, library, and reputation (peer review).</td>
<td><a href="http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/rankings/">http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/rankings/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RatER (Rating of Educational Resources) (Russia)</td>
<td>Educational activity, research activity, faculty professional competence, financial maintenance, international activity, web volume.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.globaluniversitiesranking.org/">http://www.globaluniversitiesranking.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE Excellence Ranking (Center for Higher Education Development) (Germany)</td>
<td>European graduate study (by discipline/department).</td>
<td><a href="http://www.excellenceraanking.org/eusid/EUSID">http://www.excellenceraanking.org/eusid/EUSID</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scimago Institutions Rankings (Ibero-American Rankings) (Spain)</td>
<td>Research: scientific output, international collaboration, average scientific quality, publication rate</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scimagoir.com/">http://www.scimagoir.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Table B: Framework for Analysis of Ranking Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>Why was this ranking system created? By whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>For whom? Who is it intended to serve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The field</td>
<td>Who is included and excluded? What are the boundaries? (e.g. national or international, 2 or 4 year institutions?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>What counts in this ranking system and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td>How are the criteria evaluated? What are the methods for collecting data? What is the process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>To what end? What behavior and outcomes do the rankings encourage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria and alternatives</td>
<td>What is distinctive and useful for this ranking? How could it be more effective at accomplishing its stated goals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Table C: Weaknesses of Dominant Ranking Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critiques of Dominant Ranking Systems</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mistaken Identity or False Advertising</td>
<td>Research reputation is taken as a proxy for academic program quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival of the craftiest</td>
<td>They encourage fabrication of data, questionable strategic decisions to play to the criteria and not all institutions have the same resources to compile the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s what she said...</td>
<td>They rely heavily on reputational surveys that are highly network driven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fix is in</td>
<td>Highly input focused – you can predict the institutional ranking easily by knowing the input measures such as student selectivity, age of institution, endowment, alumni giving. There is very little movement in rankings and most movement is not based on quality change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as much as shifts in how criteria are measured from year to year.

The glow in dim light
Rater bias and halo effect—raters not knowing information to rate appropriately and time lag of knowledge

They encourage “strategic imitation.”
The rankings encourage institutions to mimic the behaviors of higher ranked institutions; they do not reward distinctive missions, cultures and identities.


Additional Recommended Readings
