

basis anyone can evaluate someone else's teaching without being in their classroom. ARWU uses Nobel Prizes/Field Medals awarded to alumni and faculty as a proxy for educational quality—which is clearly ridiculous.

THE has just launched its "Teaching Quality Ranking for Europe" drawing on the experience of the *Wall Street Journal/Times Higher Education* College Rankings. Fifty percent of that ranking is based on the *WSJ/THE* student survey and another 10 percent on the academic reputational survey. It also allocates 7.5 percent of the final score to the number of papers published and 7.5 percent to the faculty–student ratio. The student surveys appear to draw from the American NSSE methodology, but there is considerable debate about the use of such surveys on an international comparative basis without ensuring a representative sample and accounting for differences among students and the shortcomings of self-reported data. *THE* also uses the proportion of female students (10 percent) as a measure of inclusivity, but this is questionable, given that female students accounted for 54.1 percent of all tertiary students in the EU 28 as of 2015. Thus, it is worth noting how few underlying measures have anything to do with actual teaching—even if it is defined broadly.

CONCLUSION

Despite some scepticism about the methodological and practical aspects of a global ranking methodology, the race is on to establish one. There are various actions by ranking organizations, governments, and researchers to identify more appropriate ways, using more reliable data, to measure and compare education outcomes, graduate employability, university–society engagement, etc. In a globalized world with mobile students, graduates, and professionals, we need better information on how to evaluate an individual's capabilities and competencies.

But one of the lessons of rankings is that, without due care, indicators can lead to unintended consequences. We know that student outcomes will determine future opportunities. But conclusions based on simplistic methodologies could further disadvantage students who could and should benefit most, if universities become more selective and focus on students most likely to succeed in order to improve their position in global rankings.

Thus, it is clear that creating reliable international comparisons of educational outcomes is extremely challenging. Clearly, assessing teaching and learning is central to determining the quality of higher education, but using current methodologies to produce comparative data is foolhardy at best. Rather than deceiving ourselves by believing that rankings provide a meaningful measure of education quality, we should acknowledge that they simply use inadequate indi-

cators for commercial convenience. Or, better yet, we could admit, for now at least, that it is impossible to adequately assess education quality for purposes of international comparisons. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.95.10684>

World-Class Universities and the Common Good

LIN TIAN, YAN WU, AND NIAN CAI LIU

Lin Tian is a PhD student at the Center for World-Class Universities (CWCU), Shanghai Jiao Tong University; Wu Yan is an assistant professor at CWCU; and Nian Cai Liu is a professor and director of CWCU, and dean of the Graduate School of Education at Shanghai Jiao Tong University, P.R. China. E-mails: lintian@sjtu.edu.cn; wuyan@sjtu.edu.cn; and ncliu@sjtu.edu.cn.

This article is a revised version of "A shift to the global common good in higher education," by Lin Tian, Yan Wu, and Nian Cai Liu (2017) in University World News; and it is also based on CWCU's unpublished book chapter for the WCU-7 conference "World-class universities: A double identity related to global common good(s)," by Lin Tian.

Globalization and the development of internationalization, the advancement of science and technology, the enhancement of life-long learning, and trends toward marketization and privatization all contribute to constant changes in the global higher education landscape. Against this backdrop, the term "public good(s)," which once dominated the field of higher education, is now being questioned. In 2015, UNESCO published a report titled *Rethinking Education towards a Global Common Good*, which proposes "common good" as a constructive alternative to "public good(s)" (the latter being traditionally considered closely associated with education and its outputs), with a distinct feature of *intrinsic value* and *sharing participation* (UNESCO, 2015). This article explores the relationship between world-class universities (WCUs) and this newly proposed notion of global common good(s). It states that WCUs, as a network or group, themselves play a role as global common good, and produce and contribute to global common good(s) benefiting not only individual students, but also the larger global society.

FROM “PUBLIC GOOD” TO “COMMON GOOD” IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Many scholars recognize the “public nature” of higher education and universities: creating and distributing knowledge, enhancing the quality of life of people who are educated, supplying innovations for the industry, and preparing citizens for democratic decision-making. However, aspects of this notion are being challenged.

It is argued that the growing privatization and increasing marketization of higher education damage the “public” character of higher education to some extent and blur the boundary between “public” and “private.” Also, the changing global landscape places more emphasis on “common” than on “public” in the educational process. According to UNESCO’s report, “common” learning encourages people to be proactive in the learning process, with shared efforts through various channels, thereby bringing benefits to all participants and changing the process from educating to learning. On the other hand, “public” education is often provided by the government, which easily generates free-riding (since governments often provide public education for free, with less emphasis on the correlation between individuals’ pay and use). Obtaining education may in some cases become a passive process, in which people are not stimulated to actively play a role.

It is argued that the growing privatization and increasing marketization of higher education damage the “public” character of higher education to some extent and blur the boundary between “public” and “private.”

Hence, it is better to shift from the notion of higher education as a “public good” to that of a “common good.” This implies that more emphasis can be placed on its “results” (the realization of fundamental rights for all people) rather than on the “method of supply” (whether it is delivered by a public or a private institution). Also, to a certain extent, the idea of higher education as a common good could justify the idea of diversified providers and financing of higher education, which can in certain cases bring greater efficiency. Moreover, when we think about the current demand for active and lifelong learning, it is clear that the notion of common good complements the concept of public good. A public good does not link pay (a person’s involvement in

the provision of a public good) and use (his or her use of it): a public good is open to free-riding, whereas a common good reflects the collective endeavor of all participants and its benefits are generated through shared action; also, learning through various channels, by people of all ages, results in the notion of lifelong learning.

WCUs’ ROLE RELATED TO GLOBAL COMMON GOOD(S)

In practice, higher education serves the common good through cultivating talents, advancing research, and providing service to society. This new era, which is marked by globalization and internationalization, new information technologies, environmental concerns, and dramatic policy changes such as Brexit, brings both opportunities and challenges for higher education institutions around the world. In addition to providing opportunities for self-development, WCUs, the world’s leading or elite universities, need to position themselves at the forefront of seeking conceptual and practical solutions to the pressing challenges of our time for the benefit of all mankind.

It is widely acknowledged that WCUs consist of both leading public and private universities worldwide, employing the most qualified faculty and attracting the best and brightest students from all around the world; that they focus on the international landscape and constantly adjust themselves according to the outside world; that they are committed to solving globally challenging issues and actively cooperate with other organizations. In this regard, WCUs have already transcended the idea of “public” and “private,” playing a role as global common good with an emphasis on global development and interconnectedness and the well-being of the global community.

This can be demonstrated by their three major functions: talent cultivation, scientific research, and service to society. After analyzing the mission and vision reports of the top 20 universities—widely acknowledged as WCUs—in the Academic Ranking of World Universities (2016), the main keywords relating to their three functions can be generalized as:

- Talent cultivation: international/global; world-class/excellent/best/outstanding; research-led/research-based; professional/skills; innovative/creative; diverse; inspiring; interdisciplinary; inclusive/open/free.
- Scientific research: excellence/world-class/highest-level; international/global/world; cooperation(s)/partnership; new/cutting-edge/original; knowledge/scholarship; interdisciplinary/cross-disciplinary/transdisciplinary; challenging/difficult.
- Service to society: social/society; world/inter-

national/global; community; nation/national; cooperation(s)/coordination(s)/partnership/interaction(s); engage/engagement; challenge(s)/challenging; excellent/significant; mankind/human beings; life/well-being/welfare.

In terms of talent cultivation, WCUs are making efforts to build a human capital pool consisting of the most distinguished and outstanding talents—to become the most important national and global resource. With respect to scientific research, WCUs intend to conduct the most advanced research and discover state-of-the-art knowledge, tackling challenging problems with international concerns so as to improve humankind's well-being. In terms of service to society, WCUs aim to confront the most complex and difficult global challenges for the benefit of human society, making an impact on the development and progress of the world in a transformative way, contributing to sustainable and peaceful development for all mankind and the whole world.

CONCLUSION

As leading research universities with a global reach, WCUs not only constitute a global common good, but also develop global common goods such as advanced knowledge and excellent research and thus contribute to the common good (i.e., peaceful development) intrinsically shared by all humans. Therefore, WCUs serve as a very important global common good. However, this does not mean that WCUs are capable of doing everything successfully. The notion of global common good tends to be a vision or a prospect to guide and lead their efforts of providing extensive world-class education, research, and extensive service to society, embracing opportunities, coping with challenges, and enhancing the sustainable development of the whole world. ■

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.95.10686>

International Higher Education would like to thank the Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY) for its support of coverage of higher education in Africa and for its general support of our publication. CCNY has long recognized the importance of higher education in Africa and beyond, and this generosity significantly enables both our work as well as that of our partner at the University of Kwa-Zulu-Natal in South Africa, home to the International Network for Higher Education in Africa (INHEA).

Access for Refugees into Higher Education: Paving Pathways to Integration

BERNHARD STREITWIESER AND LISA UNANGST

Bernhard Streitwieser is an assistant professor of international education at The George Washington University, Washington, DC, US. E-mail: streitwieser@gwu.edu. Lisa Unangst is a PhD student and research assistant at the Center for International Higher Education, Boston College, US. E-mail: unangstl@bc.edu.

For the past several years, refugee access to higher education has been a critical topic in the German context and represented a chance for universities to scale up services for all students, not just for refugees. Qualitative research on university administrative processes, including the support structures offered through the German Academic Exchange Service's (DAAD) Integra and Welcome programs, has reflected common hurdles refugee students face, including learning the German language; passing university preparation courses (varying in scope and duration); and going through credential assessment and subject matter competency testing. These students also compete for admission with all non-EU international students, who may have years of German language training and cultural familiarity. Finally, and perhaps most difficult, refugees have to work through socioemotional trauma, asylum uncertainty, and a societal backlash from some parts of the population against their presence in the country.

Over the past several years, there have been numerous German and international large-scale studies by governments, institutes, foundations, and researchers that have provided critically important information for understanding the processes and challenges around refugee integration in the tertiary context. Among these, the provision of services and the analytical work by the DAAD stand out. In its critical dual role as both a primary funder for refugee assistance and a convener of the many universities working to facilitate educational pathways for refugee and migrant integration, the DAAD has been uniquely positioned to shine a spotlight on the issue.

THE INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES AT GERMAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

The DAAD's most recent report, *The integration of refugees at German higher education institutions*, is significant for two reasons. First, it "presents [new] evidence-based findings" on a large scale of the progress refugees students are mak-