

Measuring and Funding Danish University Research: Instruments and Impacts

Sue Wright
suwr@dpu.dk

Competition State

- World of states competing for advantage in a global knowledge economy
(Danish Lib/Cons govt 2001)



- State's role: invest in the capacity of institutions and individuals to compete on a global scale
- Method: Steering not rowing – develop and steer others' capacities, not manage services through a bureaucracy

Steering technologies

- State needs instruments to steer institutions and individuals to develop and deploy their capacities in 'desired' direction.
- Use 'political technologies' which look neutral and administrative but cloak the operation of power (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982:196)
- Tool of modern governance – aims to act on 3 scales simultaneously and bring them into alignment:
 - Reorganise a sector – organisations compete with each other and on a global scale
 - Re-purpose organisations and internal management – units compete over target production and funding
 - Individuals know 'what counts' – become 'auditable selves'

Universities in Competition State

- Universities central to Danish govt's concept of competition state
- Universities to 'drive' Denmark's capacity to compete globally by:
 - 'From idea to invoice' – speedy transfer of new knowledge to industry (esp. Pharma, Life Science, IT)
 - Graduates with up-to-date knowledge, international networks and personal capacities to work in 'knowledge organisations'

2003 University Law

- Expand universities' own ambition and capacity to compete globally – Minister wanted 1 university in European top 10 by 2020, as measured by THE
- Drive Danish industry's global competitiveness (new duty of 'knowledge spreading' to 'surrounding society')
- Install strong centralised leadership to manage resources strategically, and act as interlocutor for govt and industry
- Restore politicians' trust, so they can increase university funding, to drive the economy. (2006 1% GDP in 'globalisation pool')

Technologies for Competitive Allocation of Extra Funding

- Vice chancellors said indicators should be:
 - Simple
 - Applicable to all disciplines
 - Not costly in academic or administrative time
- Teaching – funding already based on outputs (per student who passed exams)
- Knowledge spreading - Commission broke up is disarray – could not list all knowledge spreading of all disciplines. Govt dropped that indicator

Research Indicator

- Not peer review (REF, PBRF) – too costly
- Not citations – too biased against humanities
- Norwegian bibliometric indicator (NIFU-STEP)
 - Each discipline lists all journals - defines top 20%
 - Humanities lobbied for recognition of monographs and edited volumes
 - Differential points for level 1 & 2 publications
- Database of all academics' publications - Add up score for each university.

Research Indicator (2)

- Late 2007 set up 68 Disciplinary Groups (360 academics) (*not costly in academic time?*)
 - List of journals, top 20%
 - March 2009 Ministry consolidated lists – petition from 58 chairs disowning lists
 - Disciplinary Groups revised lists – published Oct 2009
 - No list of publishers of books and edited volumes
- Points allocation
 - Political agreement - then Ministry produced a 'temporary' points system (Humanities disadvantaged again)

Danish publications points system

Form of publication	Low level	Top level	'Temporarily'
Scientific monograph	5 points	8 points	All: 6 points
Article in scientific journal	1 point	3 points	
Article in edited volume with ISSN (sic) number	1 point	3 points	All: 0.75 points
Article in edited volume	0.5 point	2 points	All: 0.75 points

Allocation Formula: Weighting of indicators for competitive allocation of extra funding

(Political agreement – Nov 2009 started Jan 2010)

	Teaching outputs	Externally funded research	Research publication points	Completed PhDs
2010	45	35	10	10
2011	45	30	15	10
2012	45	20	25	10

Impact on Sector

- Only very small amount of extra funding was allocated by research points – enough to mobilise competition in the sector
- Universities compete to increase their publication output each year to maintain their share of a fixed pot of money – i.e. treadmill effect



Impact on University Management

- Ministry's contracts with university boards
 - Develop a competitive system of budget allocation within 1 year
- KU Rector's contract with faculties
 - competitive budget allocation to departments or lose 10% of budget
- New financial management model
 - Pass all money earned from research points and external overheads to department – the more you earn the more you get
 - Pay central admin out of basic funding
 - i.e. basic value of the university is admin – academics are a cost and have to pay their own way

Impact on Academics – Life Sciences

- Politically favoured
 - central to government's notion of Global Knowledge Economy
 - special funding for years
 - New science-industry-finance complex (Shorett 2003)
- Economy
 - Only ca. 30% from basic grant.
 - Teaching not very important
 - Continually increasing income from EU, foundations, industry
(200m 1999 – 386m 2007)
- Points system
 - Since 1998 - system of allocating 2-year budgets using 'performance indicators' over 6 years
 - Ministry's points system suited dominant publication pattern

Interviews – Life Sciences

Mature experience of performance culture

- Continual expansion
- Performance on what counts
- Performance time versus invisible time
- 'Limit ambition', 'suppress passion'

'Karoshi' style stress – 4 cases

Impact on academics - Humanities

- Politically threatened
 - Irrelevant to government's notion of Global Knowledge Economy
 - Low funding for years
 - Very strong links with media etc industries – not rich funders
- Economy
 - Main income – teaching payments - historically low
 - Basic grant also important
- Points system
 - Dean established committees to devise research and 'knowledge spreading' points systems
 - Inter-linked from 80 points for 'doktor' thesis to ½ point for press interview
 - Uproar

Forskningskvalitetskriterier og pointfastsættelse

Kategori	Pointskala
1. Doktordisputats	81
2. Anonymt fagfællebedømte værker	
2a) Anonymt fagfællebedømt monografi, ordbog, tekstkritisk udgave, kommenteret oversættelse	60
2b) Anonymt fagfællebedømt tidsskriftartikel	15
2c) Bidrag/kapitel i anonymt fagfællebedømt antologi/kongresberetning (samleværk)	15
2d) Redaktør på anonymt fagfællebedømt antologi/kongresberetning (samleværk)	15
3. Kendt fagfællebedømte værker	
3a) Kendt fagfællebedømt monografi, ordbog, tekstkritisk udgave, kommenteret oversættelse	48
3b) Kendt fagfællebedømt tidsskriftartikel	12
3c) Kendt fagfællebedømt bidrag/kapitel i antologi/kongresberetning (samleværk)	12
3d) Redaktør på kendt fagfællebedømt antologi/kongresberetning (samleværk)	12
4. Ikke fagfællebedømte værker	
4a) Ikke fagfællebedømt monografi, ordbog, tekstkritisk udgave, kommenteret oversættelse	36
4b) Ikke fagfællebedømt tidsskriftartikel	9
4c) Ikke fagfællebedømt bidrag/kapitel i antologi/kongresberetning (samleværk)	9
4d) Redaktør på ikke fagfællebedømt antologi/kongresberetning (samleværk)	9
5. Faglitterære bidrag (af artikellængde)	12

Interviews - Humanities

- Pragmatic – use it as a cloak or test it
- Opportunity – use 'star' success to create self-contained unit, collegial research, on new academic area not possible before – undermine male cronyism
- Principled opposition - existential stress

Conclusion

- System prioritises academic publications not knowledge spreading and innovation for GKE
- Not achieved improved global rankings – size matters more than publications
- Research points have very little effect on university funding, but set up treadmill competition in the sector and are used effectively for internal management
- Academics know widely that 'performance' counts and know their own score
 - many adopted points *instead* of passion, or searched for ways to sustain passion *against* points system
 - Passion and points only aligned when a star researcher gets special centre funding that insulates a group from management.

References

- Dreyfus, Hubert and Rabinow, Paul. 1982 *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Shorett, Peter, Rabinow, Paul, and Billings, Paul R. 2003. 'The Changing Norms of the Life Sciences.' *Nature Biotechnology* 21(2): 123–125.
- Wright, Susan 2012 'Ranking universities within a globalised world of competition states: to what purpose, and with what implications for students?' in Hanne Leth Andersen & Jens Christian Jacobsen (eds) *Uddannelseskvalitet i det 21. århundrede [Quality in Higher Education in 21st Century]* Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur, pp: 79-100.
- Wright, Susan forthcoming 'Knowledge that Counts: Points Systems and the Governance of Danish Universities' in Smith, Dorothy and Griffith, Alison (eds) *Governance on the Front Line*. Toronto: University of Toronto