SOCIETY. INTEGRATION. EDUCATION
Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference. Volume VI, May 24th -25th, 2019. 117-132

CONTENT AND EVALUATION OF INNOVATIVE COMPONENTS OF HUMAN POTENTIAL IN THE RATINGS OF UNIVERSITIES

Tatiana Davydova
Voronezh State Technical University, Russian Federation

Sergey Barkalov
Voronezh State Technical University, Russian Federation

Vera Poryadina
Voronezh State Technical University, Russian Federation

Abstract. *The aim of the research is to study the content of the innovation component of human potential in the rankings of universities, its assessment through the prism of the educational environment and its individual elements. The article considers the innovation component of human potential from the standpoint of its importance on the scale of the fourth industrial revolution. The research focuses on the formation, development and realization of human potential in the system of higher education. The analysis of global, national, regional ratings of the performance of universities is presented. Ratings are abstracted from nationality and classified by target and structural features. The ratings are classified according to the target and structural features. Features of the content and evaluation of human potential and its innovative component in the structure of ratings of various groups are revealed. The directions for improving the rating structure are identified, taking into account the essential importance of the innovative component of human potential for the modern economy. The characteristics of the structure of the rating allowing estimating the innovative component of human potential is given. An innovative component of the rating of universities was developed. A list of indicators was synthesized, which is the basis for the implementation of the rating assessment of the innovation component of human potential. Using the method of mathematical modeling developed an innovative component of the ranking of universities.*
Keywords: *human potential, innovative component, universities, university rating.*

Introduction

Intellectual production requires specialists to be able to set and solve the problems of designing innovative products, innovating their production, implementation and use by means of modern information and communication technologies. This ability is based on the innovative component of human potential. The formation, development and realization of human potential is

http://dx.doi.org/10.17770/sie2019vol6.3736

largely determined by the existing system of education, with reference to the topic of the work - primarily higher education. Accordingly, the activities of higher education institutions focused on the needs of a dynamic labour market come to the forefront. In modern conditions, there is a tendency to increase the significance of the integrated assessment of the activity of the higher education system on the basis of ratings. The target audience of a rating is educational institutions, representatives of the corporate sector, the state, the society as consumers, service providers, intermediaries, investors and partners interacting in a unified system. Each subject of interaction assesses the quality of the activity of the other, taking into account its own goals, missions, processes, results and resources. This circumstance makes it expedient to characterize the innovative component of human potential through the prism of evaluating the educational environment and its individual elements. This circumstance determines the goal of our research - the study of the content of the innovative component of human potential in the ratings of universities, its assessment through the prism of the educational environment and its individual elements.

In the process of work, data analysis methods were used, a list of indicators necessary for evaluating the innovation component of human potential was synthesized. The method of scientific abstraction was used to characterize human potential and university ratings. Using the method of mathematical modeling developed an innovative component of the ranking of universities.

Scientific significance of the question concerned substantiated by a brief review of literature

The scientific community notes the importance of the ideology of Industry 4.0 for determining the development strategy of the modern state. Therefore, the researchers focus on changing the approach to the development, production, realization and use of products from the viewpoint of changing the nature of tasks of business entities (Cervantes & Meissner, 2014; Миронова, 2012; Saritas, 2013; Wu, Chen, & Chen, 2010; Yudina, 2017). In the theory and practice of the industrial revolution, the future people are faced not primarily with routine but creative tasks. The person with his/her abilities and needs is brought to the forefront.

In the context of innovative global and regional development, there is a revision of its priorities: there is a transition from the goals of economic development to the goals of human development. The qualitative improvement of all spheres of development of society in general and of man in particular is at the forefront. In comparison with the evaluation of a person as a resource (human capital), the evaluation of man as a goal and the foundations of universal development (human potential) is gaining increasing importance both in the

works of researchers, and in projects of strategic development of the state (Kizim & Vorozhtsova, 2017; Миронова, 2012; Twelve solutions for a new education, 2018).

Our analysis of existing publications shows that human potential in association with human capital and as a local category is explored from the standpoint of economics, sociology, psychology, statistics, linguistics, etc. The human potential in modern scientific works is considered as a basic characteristic of the long-term development of the nation as a whole and its individual elements. There are two main approaches to its study (Anand & Sen, 2000; Salmi & Altbach, 2011). The first approach involves linking human potential to the growth of general welfare, the second one brings to the fore the personal development of the individual as such.

The contradiction arising in the choice faced by society is noted separately. This contradiction is revealed, for example, in the work of J. Salmi, where it is noted that not all countries need world-class universities, and that they should focus on developing quality national universities that meet the fundamental needs of the educational system of these countries (Salmi & Altbach, 2011). The structural aspect of the contradiction is touched upon by A. Boni, in whose paper the matrix interpreting the activity of university subjects taking into account the basic values of human development is presented (Boni, 2009). At the same time, both the human potential as a whole and its components can be considered from the point of view of the priority of implementation for a given generation or accumulation for generations of the future (Davydova & Barkalov, 2018; Krakovskaya, 2011).

Innovative and scientific development of the country is determined by the human potential, first of all, its innovative component (Kizim & Vorozhtsova, 2017; Kurgalin & Shershen, 2016; Миронова, 2012; Yudina, 2017). The presence of ideas depends on the creative potential of man. Innovation is the result of the creative work of a person who has certain knowledge, realized as a product, process and technology. The innovative component of human potential is explored from the standpoint of the existing abilities of a person to realize discoveries, generate ideas and positions of knowledge accumulated throughout life, ensuring the realization of the abilities. It is the education that determines the accumulation of human potential and the possibility of its realization (Boni, 2009; Davydova & Barkalov, 2018; Salmi & Altbach, 2011; Twelve solutions for a new education, 2018). The quality of education is interconnected with the quality of human potential, and the link is two-way. The evaluation of the quality of education is indicative in assessing the quality of human potential and its components, including the innovative component.

The assessment of the activities of universities is increasingly unified, tending to use the rating system (Balatsky & Ekimova, 2012; Polikhina &

Trostyanskaya, 2018; Ratings, 2018). Researchers note both the advantages of using ratings and argue critical remarks on the existing theory and practice of rating evaluation of universities. In particular, the researchers note the fact that representatives of a certain target audience can be misled on the basis of studying both general and specified ratings of universities, especially regarding the position of highly specialized and regional universities (Ivanov & Volkova, 2010; Trotsuk, 2009). Further, E. Balatsky, N. Ekimova, I. Trotsuk call into question the objectivity of ratings using unique indicators that are typical only of a small number of universities. The advantages of English-speaking universities, the scale of state support, and the features of infrastructure and territories are indicated (Balatsky & Ekimova, 2012; Davydova & Barkalov, 2018; Trotsuk, 2008).

The analysis of scientific works allows stating that the human potential as a whole and its innovative component in the rating structure are not isolated, or are not sufficiently taken into account.

Within the framework of this paper, the main task is the development of the rating component of higher education institutions, which will allow assessing the state and prospects for the development of the innovative component of human potential. To solve this problem, firstly, it is necessary to review and classify existing ratings. This is due to the choice of options for calculating the innovative component of the rating adaptive to the overall basic rating component used in the existing evaluation system of the activities of universities.

Secondly, it is important to study the structure of existing ratings, taking into account the methods of their calculation. The indicators that determine the components of the rating make it possible to orient the evaluation of the activity of the university to the targeted satisfaction of the need to obtain the necessary information by representatives of a certain target audience.

Thirdly, we consider the representation of the characteristics of the rating structure to be significant, according to our position, which allows us to evaluate the innovative component of human potential. For this purpose, it is necessary to select the indicators corresponding to the task.

History of classification and classification of ratings

Researchers consider the reasons for the emergence of ratings in education the growth of competition among systems of different states, increased competition between universities, the need for representatives of different target groups to obtain objective information about universities from independent sources. S. Ivanov notes that most of the methodologies, on the basis of which the ratings were compiled, can be divided into three groups (Ivanov & Volkova,

2010). The first is based on the achievements of teachers of colleges and universities, the second on the achievements of students, the third on the quantity and quality of the resources of educational institutions. The first integral rankings of higher education institutions, similar to the modern ones in terms of content, were appraisal publications in "U.S. News and World Report" in 1983 and "Business Week" in 1987. Global ratings used in modern conditions have appeared since 2003 (for example, the ARWU rating), QS and Webometrics since 2004.

In the published works, there are various variants of classification of rankings by scale (global, national, regional), by types (unified assessment of the university or a number of assessments of each of the educational programmes implemented by the university), by structure (one subject and multi-subject), by data sources (statistics, surveys), by groups of indicators (sectoral, subject) and so on. Among the global international ratings, in which modern leading Russian universities are included, there are: the QS, the THE, the ARWU, the rating of Webometrics, U-Multirank, the rating of the Best Global Universities by the media company U.S. News & World Report, CWTS (Balatsky & Ekimova, 2012; Davydova & Barkalov, 2018; Ivanov & Volkova, 2010; Pugach & Zhukovskaya, 2012; Ratings, 2018).

Among the global international ratings, in which modern leading Russian universities take part, the ratings of the agency Quacquarelli Symonds QS, the British weekly "Times Higher Education", the Chinese Academic Ranking of the World Universities ARWU, the rating of Webometrics, or Ranking Web, multidimensional U-Multirank, US rating News Best Global Universities of media company U.S. News & World Report, Leiden Ranking of the Center for Science and Technology Studies of Leiden University (CWTS) are named. In particular, according to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation on May 31, 2018, the reputational rating of THE World Reputation Rankings 2018 was announced on May 30.

According to published data, in Russia there is a significant number of national ratings of universities, among which the following ones are the main. The first is the National University Ranking; it has been calculated from 2009 on the basis of the contract of the International Information Group "Interfax" with the Federal Agency for Education. The purpose of the creation was the need to develop the foundations of an independent rating system and the formation of ratings of Russian universities. Then there is RAEX rating of Russian universities (Expert RA): the agency has been making annual ratings of the reputation of higher education institutions in enlarged directions since 2012. The rating reflects the result of the assessment of universities by participants in the surveys conducted by the agency: students and graduates, representatives of academic and scientific communities, representatives of employer companies. In

addition, the Rating of the Russian Rating Agency RUR (Round University Ranking), operating since 2013, and is the official representative of the British international rating of Times Higher Education (THE) in Russia and CIS countries is published. Data for the rating system RUR is provided by the international company Clarivate Analytics. Further, on November 2, 2016, the Moscow international rating "Three missions of the University" was run. The rating uses a number of criteria calculated by objective data, and excludes subjective reputational surveys.

The results of the analysis of the calculation variations of the ratings considered by us are as follows. Webometrics, U-Multirank, Leiden Ranking, "Three missions of the University" ratings are calculated only in the general version. The national university rating is presented in the general (consolidated) version and by components of the general calculation, that is, according to the positions of Research, Education, Innovation, Brand, Internationalization, Socialization. A similar variation is present in one of the calculations of the RUR rating, which presents the Teaching ranking, the Research ranking, the International diversity ranking, the Financial ranking, the Sustainability ranking. Let us add that all variations of the RUR are calculated in a number of countries in the world.

QS, ARWU, THE, US News, Expert RA and RUR ratings have several target variations. For most ratings, the calculation of general and subject variants is typical (QS, ARWU, THE, US News). The sectoral (QS, ARWU), regional (QS, US News), reputational (THE, RUR) settlement variants are widely represented. As special cases, options for calculating the employment of graduates (QS), the rating of young universities (THE), academics (RUR) are presented. Our analysis showed that, in conjunction with other Russian ratings, the above mentioned ratings are focused on the target audience, which can be represented by three main groups.

The first group is applicants. Ratings on reputation (the rating of "Interfax" The best brands of universities), on the quality of budget and paid admission to universities in Russia, infrastructure, scholarships, conditions for obtaining high-quality education in Russian universities (ratings "Expert RA" and "Interfax"), on the employment and salary of graduates (for example, the salary rating of the portal Superjob.ru), on additional education (global U-Multirank) are significant.

The second group is employers. The following ratings are of significant importance: foreign common and reputational QS, THE, US News & World Report Best Global Universities, ShanghaiRanking's subjects Global Ranking of Academic Subjects, Eduniversal Best Masters Ranking, Russian reputation ratings, employment monitoring of graduates of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, monitoring quality of admission to

universities HSE (partner is the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation).

The third group is potential and current investors (Ministries and Departments, funds, groups and so on). We consider reputational global and Russian ratings, subject ratings reflecting the results of scientific research (for example, Top Universities by Google Scholar Citations, Webometrics, Best Russian Universities in the Level of Scientific Research Activity "Expert RA", Rating of Higher Educational Establishments for version of the Vladimir Potanin Charitable Foundation) and others. The selected target groups should be considered in relation to the global, national and regional university ratings. To solve our problem, we need to study the structure of ratings.

Innovative component of human potential

J. Schumpeter introduced the definition of innovation, which included five items: the introduction of a new product, the introduction of a new mode of production, the opening of a new market, the acquisition of a new source of raw materials or semi-finished products, the application of a new form of organization (Schumpeter, 1980), that is, the generation of ideas, the process of their implementation, the receipt and use of the result. At the same time, M. Cervantes and D. Meissner Cervantes & Meissner, 2014) identify the asymmetry of information; weak demand from small and medium-sized enterprises; legal problems; differences in the aims of universities and enterprises; lack of funds necessary for demonstration projects.

Our research has shown that a number of ratings of different levels (mainly global ones) are presented in general and applied - reputational, subject, sectoral, regional - variations.

For example, the global ranking takes into account data from international ratings in a number of areas of activity to calculate the desired ratio, and the national rating relies on cost-benefit analysis by discipline over a five-year period (Hedman, Kivinen, & Kaipainen, 2011). The scientific literature presents the results of a study of the impact of university rankings on assessing its reputation (Bowman & Bastedo, 2011), the impact of university reputation on the objectivity of third-party peer review (Pleggenkuhle-Miles, Khoury, Deeds, & Markoczy, 2013), studying the significance of the ethical component of university ranking from the perspective of student performance (Sedigh, 2017).

Separately, we note an ambiguous assessment of such a practically obligatory structural component of the overwhelming majority of ratings, such as citing and publishing activity, including the selection of specific scientific

journals (Coupe, 2003; Frey & Rost, 2010; Willcocks, Whitley, & Avgerou, 2008).

We offer variations that are not directed at the spheres and aspects of the university's activity, but on the needs of the target audience of the rating system. We believe it is important to identify generalized sets of subjects in the system of interaction among subjects of innovative development.

Above we talked about three main target groups: applicants, employers, investors. In our opinion, however, the study of the rating structure involves changing the characteristics of the target groups from the position of their common interests. For example, researchers have noted the importance of microanalysis of research efficiency in universities and their relationship with production (Cherchye & Abeele, 2005). In addition, there is an opinion that a significant component of the rating assessment of an educational institution is both evidence of the satisfaction of the user of educational services and an independent external expert assessment of this activity (Gomez et al., 2015). Let us consider not the target groups from the point of view of the university, but the university from the point of view of the target groups.

The researchers, taking part in the development and implementation of Project 5-100, identify the main target groups of university ratings. Among them, there are entrants and their parents; students choosing the trajectory of training; scientific and administrative employees, teachers; industrial sector and innovative companies in the search for business partners; organizations in the search for a base for staff development; universities (Polikhina & Trostyanskaya, 2018). With this list in mind, we propose the formation of three aggregate target groups whose interests with respect to interaction with the university coincide. The first group is focused on the production process (employers, consumers of products and technologies, when potential partners are interested in commercialization of the developed technologies, joint production). The second group is focused on the investment process (administrative resource, enterprises in the search for innovation count on the delayed effect, evaluate the effectiveness of potential investments taking into account the potential of the university). The third group is focused on the educational process (national and regional authorities, university entrants, partner universities, their professional development, joint research).

Thus, the production, investment and educational target groups can be identified. We do not put strict boundaries between representatives of these groups, since one subject may have interests related to production, and to investments, and to education (the state, for example). Accordingly, we propose the formation of a general rating and variation ratings: industrial, investment, educational.

We have analysed the methods for calculating a number of general and variation ratings of various groups, including: QS, THE, ARWU, Webometrics, U-Multirank, U.S. News, Leiden Ranking, RUR, Expert RA, Three university missions, National rating of Interfax universities, Higher education institutions rating according to the Potanin Charitable Foundation version, rating of inventive activity of the Analytical Center Expert (Methodology for rating the inventive activity of the Analytical Center Expert [MRIA], 2018, Methodology of the Graduate Employability Ranking (QS Grading Employee Ranking) for 2017 [MGER], 2018, The rating methodology Innovation and entrepreneurship [RMIE], 2018). Among other things, the works of a number of researchers have been studied on the structure of ratings (Alasheev, Kogan, & Tyurina, 2016; Balatsky & Ekimova, 2012; Polikhina & Trostyanskaya, 2018; Ratings, 2018; MRIA, 2018; MRIA, 2018; RMIE, 2018). Add that, in particular, among the indicators of innovative capital, selected by researchers (Wu et al, 2010) when measuring the intellectual capital of educational institutions, the number of new ideas, the number of publications, tangible assets, financial support, research results are named. Taking into account the ratings studied by us and the methods of their calculation, it can be argued that, based on the calculated indices, the basic components are almost unchanged, while the variational ones are focused on the local needs of the target groups.

As a result, we have found it possible to come to a number of conclusions, among which the following are particularly significant in the framework of this paper.

Indicators should correspond to the specifics of the national education system, be clear, as transparent as possible and accessible. Indicators should be sufficiently universal, suitable for assessing the activities of different universities. If the indicator is unique, it is advisable to make it in the variational calculation of the rating. It is necessary to prove the sufficient objectivity of the indicator in order to avoid conflicting estimates. As a rule, as an example of a subjective indicator, the results of surveys are given. As an example of an indefinite, ambiguous indicator, the information of assessments of entrants at entrance examinations is given. The allocation of a clear list of indicators that characterize the human potential and its components is impossible, since indirectly all indicators can be considered as such. The allocation of target indicators is at the discretion of the rating developers and does not claim uniqueness of the sample. When choosing a rating calculation option, it is possible to effectively prioritize indicators using weight coefficients. The rating should be considered as one of the options for reference information, not claiming for absolute accuracy of the evaluation of the university.

In addition to the above positions, we separately consider it necessary to single out a special indicator, which seems to us mainly qualitative, difficult to

integrate into the structure of the rating, but extremely important. We will characterize it as thrust achievement of the goal related to the innovative development of the state and its territorial entities on the basis of accumulation, development and attraction of human potential. An example is the experience of the Chinese city of Dalian.

The development of the system of higher education in China is carried out in accordance with a number of strategic projects, primarily Project 211 (allocation and development of key universities) and Project 985 (development of higher education in cooperation with local governments), the content of which is discussed in sufficient details, for example, S. Guanzi and A. Golobokov (Guanzi, 2018; Golobokov, 2016). According to the general plan for the development of the higher education system, work is carried out with universities classified as key universities for the training of elite specialists; highly specialized universities that are not among the key ones, and universities far from the center of the regions.

In particular, the Dalian Maritime University, ranked 122nd in the national ranking of the country in attracting students focuses on improving the campus, laboratory buildings, a multimedia instructor center, a marine science research center, navigational training simulators, technical simulators, oceanic training vessels.

Taking into account the topic of our work, we believe it is important to focus on the policy of attracting and introducing innovative solutions in selected spheres of economic activity in modern China with the active support of an administrative resource. As an example, let us recall the experience of Dalian. The International Coordination Council of the graduates of the educational institutions INCORVUZ-XXI, in cooperation with the Center for Russian-Chinese Humanitarian Cooperation and Development, sent an invitation to participate in the International Innovation Congress in the city to major Russian universities in 2018 Dalian.

The Congress was organized by the Ministry of Science and Technology of the People's Republic of China, the Ministry of Education of China, the Ministry of Labor and Social Security of China, the State Committee on Foreign Affairs of China and the Academy of Sciences of China. The goal is to attract world developers of innovative technologies and business structures to unite the potential of specialists, technologies, capital and information, aimed at making Dalian City a regional capital of innovative cooperation of Northeast Asia. The developers of innovative technologies in the spheres, including artificial intelligence, large data technology, and intellectual production, were being invited.

It was specially noted that the participants would have additional opportunities to establish links with interested Chinese enterprises and business

structures for the purpose of possible improvement, carrying out development tests and implementation of the proposed technologies. The host country paid the leaders of the selected projects for the international flight and accommodation in Dalian for the period of the Congress.

Such experience allows allocating and using the innovative human potential in a narrowly focused and rational way. In this case, the effective interaction of the subjects of innovative development, the scale of the event, indicative of both the current and the delayed impact of the project implementation is indicative.

So, we found it possible to designate an indicative list of indicators on the basis of which a rating assessment of the innovative component of human potential can be carried out. Indicators are not tied to the group rigidly, they can be moved.

Production indicators: reputation among employers (survey); number of university partnerships (internships, employment); number of former alumni supporting partnerships; share of graduates who received a referral to work; ratio of the number of companies organizing a job fair in the territory of the university to the number of students; proportion of existing patents; and the share of income from research and educational programmes for organizations in the total income of the university.

Investment indicators: number of issued patents, licenses; share of patents developed in collaboration with companies; funds paid and received for the acquisition and use of patents, licenses, trademarks, projects, know-how and technical services; and the share of funds from the commercialization of intellectual products.

Education indicators: ratio of the number of wins of students in the university in Olympiads, contests to the total number of students; proportion of students who published articles in scientific journals with a non-zero citation index; participation of students in joint research projects with companies; number of scientific awards; citation rates in national and international citation systems; number and proportion of publications written in cooperation with one or more industrial organizations; number of online courses of the university, placed on the largest global online platforms; share of patents developed in collaboration with universities; and the share of cited patents.

Results and discussions

The analysis of existing ratings and their structure, as well as authoritative opinions of scientists, suggests that the trend in using ratings at different levels to assess the performance of universities will at least remain in the near future. We believe that the formation of a universal rating that takes into account the

interests of all subjects of the economic activity under consideration is impossible due to the existence of the expressed features of the activity of universities and the specifics of the rating itself. Consequently, the optimal resolution of the problem noted is the calculation of a rating having a corrective component, or a rating aimed at solving a highly specialized problem.

The importance of introducing weights into the calculation, taking into account the influence of various criteria, is emphasized by researchers when assessing a benevolent ranking of universities (De Witte & Hudrlikova, 2013). On the contrary, the complexity of an objective assessment of the weight of a component in the composition of the rating is noted by M. Bougnol and J. Dula (Bougnol & Dula, 2015). Taking into account their position, we agree with the ambiguity of using weights in the base rating and the expediency of introducing them into the variation component of the rating.

To evaluate the innovative component of human potential, we offer two options for calculation.

The first option is a complementary (corrective) innovation component that characterizes the innovative component of the human potential of the university. Variational component with change in the weights of the indicators by their groups is added to the basic rating with the purpose of its adjustment taking into account the innovative component (1).

$$Ki_n^f = 0{,}5k_1^f + 0{,}25k_2 + 0{,}25k_3 \quad (1)$$

Ki_n^f - innovative component, formed from the priority at the given moment characteristics k_1^f, having a maximum weight of 0.5 from n positions, and two others, with weights of 0.25. So, if the rating is focused on one of the target groups we have identified, the priority characteristic is the corresponding group of indicators - 1, 2 or 3. The weight of the innovative component in the general rating is evaluated depending on the task of the rating evaluation.

The second option is the calculation of the local rating of innovative human potential. We propose a calculation of the overall rating and variational calculation of the rating for each of the target groups. Overall investment rating Rig (2) is calculated as the sum of groups of indicators (components) k_q, represented in the total number m, in our example m=3.

$$Rig = \sum_{q=1}^{m} k_q , \quad (2)$$

Variational calculations of the rating Rig are positioned as Rig_{var} (3), where var is the designation of the target audience to which the local assessment is focused. Accordingly, Rig_{var} is the sum of the locally selected indicators of the

overall rating x_l in the amount of v.

$$Rig_{\text{var}} = \sum_{l=1}^{v} x_l \,, \tag{3}$$

Depending on the significance of this or that indicator for the representatives of a particular target group at a given time, the sample can be changed, indicating in the methodology the appropriate adjustment of the calculation for the considered billing period.

Accordingly, the component can be targeted to a particular audience, or be universal. The indicators of the innovation component and the local rating of the innovative human potential with its variations are adaptive to the purposes of the rating assessment. They can move through groups of the innovation component and variations in the local rating while strengthening the priorities of the development strategy of the subject of interaction in the higher education system.

Thus, the priorities of representatives of the target audience are automatically built into the mechanism for managing the development of the university, and without additional influence, the emphasis is on developing and implementing the innovative component of human potential.

Conclusions

So, the authors of the paper determined the desirability of characterizing the innovative component of the human potential through the prism of assessing the educational environment and its individual elements.

The analysis of the existing ratings by assessing the activities of universities. Studied methods for calculating the base ratings. The variants of their classification are investigated and the own classification of ratings is proposed taking into account the target groups. The groups of indicators of rating components are determined when assessing the innovative component of human potential from the standpoint of their availability, reliability, universality and clarity for representatives of the target audience.

It was revealed that the formation of a universal rating, taking into account the interests of all business entities, is impossible due to the existence of pronounced features of the activities of universities and the specifics of the rating itself. The resolution of the noted problem is the calculation of a rating with a corrective component, or a rating aimed at solving a highly specialized task.

The authors proposed two options for the calculation. The first option is a complementary (corrective) innovation component, which characterizes the innovation component of the human potential of the university as part of the

basic rating. Variation component, with a change in the weights of indicators by their groups. The second option is to calculate the local rating of innovative human potential without using weights. Accordingly, the component can have a universal character, or focus on a specific audience in accordance with the requirements existing in specific conditions.

References

Alasheev, S., Kogan, E., & Tyurina, N. (2016). Demand for universities: approaches to measurement. *Voprosy obrazovaniya [Education], 4*, 186-205,

Anand, S., & Sen, A. (2000). Human Development and Economic Sustainability, *World Development, 28*(12), 2029-2049.

Balatsky, E., & Ekimova, N. (2012). International ratings of universities: the practice of compilation and use. *Ekonomika obrazovaniya [Economics of education], 2,* 67-80.

Boni, A. (2009). *Contributions of a human development approach to re-visioning the quality of universities.* Retrieved from http://www.guninetwork.org/articles/contributions-human-development-approach-re-visioning-quality-universities.

Bougnol, M.L., & Dula, J.H. (2015). Technical pitfalls in university rankings. *Higher Education, 69*(5), 859-866. DOI:10.1007/s10734-014-9809-y

Bowman, N.A., & Bastedo, M.N. (2011). Anchoring effects in world university rankings: exploring biases in reputation scores. *Higher Education, 61*(4), 431-444. DOI:10.1007/s10734-010-9339-1

Cervantes, M., & Meissner, D. (2014). Commercialising Public Research under the Open Innovation Model: New Trends. *Foresight-Russia, 8*(3), 70–81.

Cherchye, L., & Abeele, P.V. (2005). On Research Efficiency - A Micro-analysis of Dutch University Research in Economics and Business Management. *Research Policy, 34*(4), 495-516. DOI:10.1016/j.respol.2005.03.005

Coupe, T. (2003). Revealed Performances: Worldwide Rankings of Economists and Economics Departments, 1990-2000. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 1*(6), 1309-1345. DOI:10.1162/154247603322752557

Davydova, T., & Barkalov, S. (2018). Human potential in the development strategy of the region: public-private partnership in the higher education system. *Ekonomika i menedzhment sistem upravleniya [Economics and management control systems], 2.3*(28), 348-359.

De Witte, K., & Hudrlikova, L. (2013). What about excellence in teaching? A benevolent ranking of universities. *Scientometrics, 96*(1), 337-364. DOI:10.1007/s11192-013-0971-2

Frey, B.S., & Rost, K. (2010). Do Rankings Reflect Research Quality? *Journal of Applied Economics, 13*(1), 1-38. DOI: 10.1016/S1514-0326(10)60002-5

Hedman, J., Kivinen, O., & Kaipainen, P. (2011). From global performance rankings towards national productivity ratings: Productivity of scientific action in technology and management/social sciences. *IMCIC'11: The 2nd International Multi-Conference on Complexity, Informatics and Cybernetics, 2*, 296-301.

Ivanov, S., & Volkova, I. (2010). What universities are smarter: why did academic ratings appear in the West? *Obrazovatelnaya politika [Educational policy], 7-8*(45-46), 19-29.

Golobokov, A. (2016). The Territory Of New Opportunities. *The Herald of Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service, 4*, 27-37.

Gomez, M.D.O., de Luna, E.B., Moreno, E.M.O., Eisman, L.B., Lopez, J.E., Nunez, C.S., Ramirez, E.A., Moral, M.P., & Pelegrina, J.J.R. (2015). Assessment of quality indicators in Spanish higher military education. *ERPA International Congresses on Education 2015 (ERPA 2015), 26,* UNSP 01138. DOI:10.1051/shsconf/20162601138

Guanzi, S. (2018). *Building World-Class Universities in China: From the View of National Strategies.* Retrieved from http://www.guninetwork.org/articles/building-world-class-universities-china-view-national-strate gies.

Kizim, A., & Vorozhtsova (Anistratenko), A. (2017). Human potential in the implementation of innovative development of organizations. *Ekonomika ustojchivogo razvitiya [The Economy of Sustainable Development]*, *2*(30), 307-316.

Krakovskaya, I. (2011). Investments in the Human Capital of an Innovative University: A Systems Approach to Management. *Kreativnaya ekonomika [Creative Economy]*, *2*.

Kurgalin, S., & Shershen, I. (2016). Formation of creative educational environment in universities. *Vestnik VGU. Seriya: Problemy vysshego obrazovaniya [Vestnik VSU. Series: Problems of Higher Education]*, *1*, 73-78.

Methodology for rating the inventive activity of the Analytical Center Expert (2018). Retrieved from http://www.acexpert.ru/analytics/ratings/reyting-izobretatelskoy-aktivnosti-universitetov-2.html#metod.

Methodology of the Graduate Employability Ranking (QS Grading Employee Ranking) for 2017 (2018). Retrieved from https://5top100.ru/upload/iblock/52d/Metodologiya-reytinga-QS-po-trudoustroystvu-vypusknikov-universitetov.pdf.

Pleggenkuhle-Miles, E., Khoury, T.A., Deeds, D.L., & Markoczy, L. (2013). Exploring cognitive bias: expert ratings of business schools. *Management Decision*, *51*(9), 1905-1927. DOI:10.1108/MD-12-2012-0877

Polikhina, N., & Trostyanskaya, I. (2018). *University ratings: development trends, methodology, changes.* Moscow, Ministry of Education and Science of the RF, FGANU Sociocentre.

Pugach, V., & Zhukovskaya, M. (2012). University ratings: international and Russian approaches. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii [Higher education in Russia]*, *8-9*, 15-25.

Ratings (2018). The project to increase the competitiveness of leading Russian universities among the world's leading research and educational centers (Project 5-100). *Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation.* Retrieved from http://5top100.ru/rankings/.

Salmi, J., & Altbach, P.G. (2011). *New 'World Class' Universities: Cutting Through the Hype*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/New-World-Class/129480/

Saritas, O. (2013). Human Enhancement Technologies: Future Outlook and Challenges. *Foresight-Russia*, *7*(1), 6–13.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1980). *The Theory of Economic Development*. *London.*

Sedigh, A.K. (2017). Ethics: An Indispensable Dimension in the University Rankings. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *23*(1), 65-80. DOI:10.1007/s11948-016-9758-1

Shultz, T. (1968). *Human Capital in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York.

*The rating methodology Innovation and entrepreneurship (*2018). Retrieved from https://5top100.ru/upload/iblock/878/Metodika-reytinga-Innovatsii-_-Interfaks.pdf

Trotsuk, I. (2009). Rating of universities: ideology and methodology of compilation (Russian practice). *Vestnik RUDN, seriya Sociologiya [Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, series Sociology]*, *1*, 90-97.

Trotsuk, I. (2008). Rating of universities: the ideology and methodology of drawing up "tables of leagues" (foreign practice). *Vestnik RUDN, seriya Sociologiya [Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, series Sociology], 1*, 39-48.

Twelve solutions for a new education (2018). *Report of the Center for Strategic Research and the Higher School of Economics*. - Moscow: NIU HSE, 1-106.

Willcocks, L., Whitley, E.A., & Avgerou, C. (2008). The ranking of top IS journals: a perspective from the London School of Economics. *European Journal of Information Systems, 17*(2), 163-168. DOI:10.1057/ejis.2008.9

Wu, H.Y., Chen, J.K., & Chen, I.S. (2010). Innovation capital indicator assessment of Taiwanese Universities: A hybrid fuzzy model application. *Expert Systems with Applications, 37*(2), 1635-1642. DOI:10.1016/j.eswa.2009.06.045

Yudina, M. (2017). Industry 4.0: Prospects and Challenges for Society. *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie. Elektronnyj vestnik. Public Administration. Electronic bulletin, 60*, 197-215.

Миронова, А. (2012). *Вызовы развития человеческого капитала и новая модель социальной политики.* Retrieved from http://www.csr-nw.ru/files/csr/file_ content_696.pdf