

2019 全球教育智库影响力评价 PAP 研究报告

长江教育研究院|方略研究院

目录

一. 智库建设和研究的背景	1
二. 全球教育智库的兴起与发展	3
三. 我国教育智库的发展和研究	4
四. 智库影响力研究的背景	6
五. 智库影响力评价的理论基础	9
六. 全球教育智库影响力评价指标体系	11
1. 决策 (Political) 影响力	11
2. 学术 (Academic) 影响力	12
3. 大众 (Public) 影响力	13
七. 全球教育智库影响力评价	15
1. 智库名单确认	15
2. 评价结果	16
3. 评价局限性与不足	22
4. 小结	24
附录	25
长江教育研究院简介	25
方略研究院简介	26

Contents

1. CONTEXT OF THINK TANK CONSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH.....	28
2. THE RISING AND DEVELOPMENT OF THINK TANKS ON GLOBAL EDUCATION	31
3. THE DEVELOPMENT AND STUDY ON CHINA’S EDUCATIONAL THINK TANKS.....	33
4. THE BACKGROUND OF THE IMPACT ON THINK TANKS	36
5. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF THINK TANK EVALUATION	41
6. GLOBAL EDUCATION THINK TANK INFLUENCE EVALUATION INDEX SYSTEM	44
(1) <i>Political influence</i>	44
(2) <i>Academic Influence</i>	46
(3) <i>Public Influence</i>	47
7. GLOBAL EDUCATION THINK TANK IMPACT EVALUATION.....	51
(1) <i>Think-Tank List in the Study</i>	51
(2) <i>Evaluation result</i>	52
(3) <i>Limitations and shortcomings of the evaluation</i>	58
(4) <i>Conclusion</i>	61
APPENDIX	62
<i>Changjiang Educational Research Institute (CERI)</i>	62
<i>SquareStrategics Research Institute (SSRI)</i>	64

一. 智库建设和研究的背景

智库，也称“思想库”、“智囊团”、“脑库”，是相对稳定且独立运作的政策研究和咨询机构，以“外脑”的形式对政府的政策决策进行辅助¹。现代意义上的智库起源于西方国家。20世纪初，在进步主义运动改革和重建两大潮流的推动下，美国引领了现代智库的兴起。第一次世界大战及其毁灭性影响，催生了全球第一波智库热潮。这一时期美国的卡耐基国际和平基金会、对外关系委员会，英国的英国国防事务研究所，法国的“外交政策研究中心”等纷纷成立，为国家的政治经济发展服务。二战结束后，由于战后各国经济都受到重创，恢复并促进经济的发展与维护社会的长期稳定成为各国政府关注的首要任务，各国以国内事务研究为导向的智库迅速地发展起来，专业型智库出现。尤其是70年代到80年代期间，政治、科技、经济、外交、教育、社会、国际化等问题成为政府和公众关注的焦点，催生了大量的智库，各种经济、公共政策论坛和辩论兴起。进入二十一世纪以来，随着全球化脚步的不断加快，各国面临着日益复杂的共同问题，智库作为政府的“外脑”，逐步形成了面向国际事务、区域事务和国内事务的多层次体系²。

和西方相比，我国智库建设相对较晚，自改革开放后真正起步。十八大后，党和国家越来越重视智库的建设和发展，智库建设的成效成为国家提升软实力和竞争力的重要体现。自2013年至2018年，中国智库建设经历了重要的五年发展期。2013年4月15日，习近平总书记作出了关于中国特色新型智库建设的“4·15”重要批示，习近平首次提出建设“中国特色新型智库”的目标，把智库建设提升到国家战略的高度。“加强中国特色新型智库建设，建立健全决策咨询制度”的22字方针为新时期中国智库建设指明了方向，开启了新时代探求智库定位、智库职能、智库制度等基础性问题的元年。同年11月，中国共产党第十八届三中全会通过了《中共中央关于全面深化改革若干重大问题的决定》，明确要求“加强中国特色新型智库建设，建立健全决策咨询制度。”³ 2015年中共中央办公厅、国务院办公厅正式印发《关于加强中国特色新型智库建设的意见》，指出中国特色新型智库是“党和国家科学民主依法决策的重要支撑”，“国家治理

¹ 薛澜,朱旭峰. “中国思想库”:涵义、分类与研究展望[J]. 科学学研究,2006(03):321-327.

² 王佳宁,张晓月. 智库的起源、历程及趋势[J]. 重庆社会科学,2012(10):102-109.

³ 《中共中央关于全面深化改革若干重大问题的决定》，《人民日报》2013年11月16日第1版。

体系和治理能力现代化的重要内容”，“国家软实力的重要组成部分”，并为智库建设提出总体目标。《意见》的颁布为中国新型特色智库建设指明了方向，激起了全国各类智库建设的热潮。2017年5月4日，《关于社会智库健康发展的若干意见》出台，旨在进一步规范和引导社会智库发展，保障社会智库依法参与智库产品供给，拓展社会智库参与决策咨询服务的有效途径。同年十月，党的第十九次代表大会上再次提出“建设新时代中国特色的新型智库”，这不仅再次重申了智库建设的重要性，而且把中国智库建设提到了长久发展的层面。

纵观近二十年来中国智库建设的历程，智库的发展与中国社会的发展需求息息相关，每次智库成果激增都顺应着政治经济领域的新形式新需求。在政策需求与制度利好推动下，中国智库近年来进入史上最好机遇期，促进智库建设的政策文件频频出台，政策制定点面俱到，智库政策体系逐步建立；同时，智库相关研究蓬勃开展，研究成果出现井喷式增长，为中国特色新型智库建设奠定了理论基础。国务院和地方各级发展中心、研究所、各高校、社会智库等众多力量为中国各层次、各方面的智库建设发挥着重要的作用。

二. 全球教育智库的兴起与发展

作为智库建设的重要环节,教育智库建设是实现教育现代化及教育强国目标的重要手段。随着我国教育智库的不断发展,如何培育新型智库,发展面向国际,有国际影响力的优秀智库,成为当下又一发展目标。研究国际教育智库的发展特点,借鉴国际优秀智库发展过程中的有益经验,可以为我国教育智库发展增砖添瓦。

教育智库,主要指有关专业人士开展公共教育政策研究,为政府教育决策提供咨询和服务的机构。从世界范围来看,自20世纪80年代,教育智库便开始在世界各地兴起。其中,美国的教育智库数量居于世界首位,在功能、数量、种类方面同样居于世界领先水平。在宾夕法尼亚大学2018年《全球智库报告》评定的世界前十的教育政策智库中,美国共占八所。可以说,美国的教育智库是全球智库中研究能力最强大的。

从时间上来看,美国智库起步于20世纪初期,最初致力于公共政策的研究。随着智库数量和功能不断完善与发展,美国教育智库应运而生。20世纪70年代末到80年代初,美国教育智库开始进入萌芽时期。1957年,随着苏联人造卫星的发射,苏联科技一度超越了美国并引起高层人士的强烈反思。美国高层人士把科技的落后归咎于教育的落后,政府因此开始高度重视教育问题,先后出台了各种促进性政策措施⁴。除此之外,20世纪中期的“反贫困战争”促使智库的研究重心发生转移,使得其更关注国内政策,从而教育政策的智库数量大幅上升,尤其是1983年《国家处在危机之中》报告发布后,美国掀起了教育改革的浪潮,教育问题成为人们关注的重点,关注教育政策领域的智库也由此大幅增长⁵。进入二十一世纪,随着信息技术飞速发展,全球一体化趋势加剧,经济政治文化环境持续复杂化,智库发展迅猛。在过去的半个多世纪中,教育智库为国家提供制定教育政策的方案,评估教育政策的实施情况,推动教育政策辩论,已经成为教育政策制定过程中不可缺少的角色。

⁴ 李清刚.美国教育智库的发展演变及特点[J].教育学术月刊,2017(02):27-32+75.

⁵ 赵章靖,邢欢.美国教育智库的发展过程、趋势与特征[J].世界教育信息,2016,29(04):5-11.

三. 我国教育智库的发展和研究

我国对教育智库的研究主要集中在以下三个方面：

第一，对国外教育智库的发展历程、影响力、组织结构、功能运行等方面的研究。邢欢（2012）《美国教育智库研究——以“教育政策中心”为例》通过对美国教育智库发展历史以及美国教育政治与政策进行梳理，总结教育智库在政策制定过程中的功能，从而提出我国建立独立教育智库的必要性；谷贤林，邢欢（2014）《美国教育智库的类型、特点与功能》对美国教育智库的特点和功能进行了较为系统的分析，对我国教育智库的发展与教育决策科学化提供了有益的借鉴和启示⁶；王建梁，郭万婷（2014）《“专业化发展”理念下的澳大利亚教育智库建设——以澳大利亚教育研究委员会为例》介绍了澳大利亚最具影响力的教育智库澳大利亚教育研究委员会（ACER）高水准，专业化的教育研究对我国教育智库建设和发展的启示⁷。王俊生（2018）《美国智库运行模式及其对我国智库建设的启示》提出要学习美国智库的开放性，增加智库的时效性，邀请政府官员参与智库，并建立实习生制度⁸。李龙等（2018）提出要借鉴马来西亚智库，建立以政府为主导的公共政策与社会经济相关的智库⁹。

第二，教育智库的运行、发展及其特殊性。王建梁，郭万婷（2014）《我国教育智库建设：问题与对策》对我国教育智库的分类及功能进行了分析，提出了我国教育智库现阶段存在的问题，并提供了今后智库发展的几点建议¹⁰；邬大光（2015）《教育智库建设的特殊性》分析了教育智库与综合性智库比较之下的特殊性，提出我国教育智库发展中存在的问题及一些合理建议¹¹。

第三，我国新型教育智库的建设及问题。其一，新型教育智库内涵研究。庞丽娟（2015）在《我国新型教育智库若干重要问题的思考》中指出了新型教育智库本质上就是影响决策、为决策服务，且新型教育智库应具有强烈的国家使命、客观的研究立场、专业的意识与精神以及开放的协同创新¹²。张武升（2015）《中

⁶ 谷贤林,邢欢.美国教育智库的类型、特点与功能[J].比较教育研究,2014,36(12):1-6.

⁷ 王建梁,郭万婷.“专业化发展”理念下的澳大利亚教育智库建设——以澳大利亚教育研究委员会为例[J].高校教育管理,2014,8(02):33-37+48.

⁸ 美国智库运行模式及其对我国智库建设的启示[J]. 王俊生. 中国发展观察. 2018(22)

⁹ 马来西亚智库的现状、特点与启示[J]. 李龙,梁伦博,唐翀. 南亚东南亚研究. 2018(03)

¹⁰ 王建梁,郭万婷.我国教育智库建设:问题与对策[J].教育发展研究,2014,34(09):1-6.

¹¹ 邬大光.教育智库建设的特殊性[J].教育研究,2015,36(04):14-16.

¹² 庞丽娟.我国新型教育智库若干重要问题的思考[J].教育研究,2015,36(04):4-8.

中国特色新型教育智库的本质特征》总结了我国新型教育智库的特点¹³。其二，新型教育智库建设研究。新型教育智库的建设是教育智库研究领域的一大热点问题，尤其是在教育部和中共中央相继推出关于新型智库建设的政策文件之后，学者纷纷对其展开了思考和研究。针对当前新型教育智库建设存在的一些问题，教育部教育发展研究中心张力（2015）在《新型教育智库建设进入一个全新阶段》指出，新型教育智库需要精准锁定、开拓培育用户需求；关注政策分类和话语特征；提升智库服务的可靠性、有用性¹⁴；翟博（2015）《中国特色新型教育智库建设要有新视野》指出了中国特色新型教育智库建设的方向和目标，阐释了中国特色新型教育智库的“特”和“新”¹⁵。

综合以上文献综述我们可以发现，目前国内对教育智库的研究相对还比较薄弱，研究起步较晚，内容上也还处在较为浅显的层面。现阶段我国教育智库还处于起步阶段，学习国外先进教育智库的优秀做法可以为我国教育智库的建立和发展提供有益借鉴，而通过文献综述我们可以发现我国在教育智库研究方面存在的不足，从而加以补充，为我国教育智库建设献上绵薄之力。

¹³ 张武升.中国特色新型教育智库的本质特征[J].教育研究,2015,36(04):16-19.

¹⁴ 张力.新型教育智库建设进入一个全新阶段[J].教育研究,2015,36(04):13-14.

¹⁵ 翟博.中国特色新型教育智库建设要有新视野[J].教育研究,2015,36(04):21-24.

四. 智库影响力研究的背景

自 2015 年《关于加强中国特色新型智库建设的意见》颁布以来，中国智库建设高潮迭起，各种智库不断涌现但质量参差不齐，如何衡量智库建设成果成为亟需解决的问题。对于国家而言，智库评价有助于国家总体把握智库发展的形势、针对性的出台支持智库发展的政策；对于智库而言，智库评价有助于智库行业规范和行为准则的建立，还有助于智库间在竞争、学习中发现不足，激发智库持续发展的动力；对于决策部门、基金会、媒体、学术界、社会大众而言，智库评价有助于展示智库行业、智库个体的公共形象。

智库的政策研究与一般性学术研究的区别在于其研究目标明确指向对政府决策及相应社会环境进行影响，其研究环节超越了一般性学术研究中“事实(fact)-数据(data)-信息(information)-知识(knowledge)-情报(intelligence)-成果(result)”所构成的信息链，增加了最终实质性的“方案(solution)-政策(policy)-措施(measure)”环节，从而最终形成了信息-解决方案链¹⁶。因此，智库的影响力成为智库工作的关键目标与发展基础。影响力是评价智库的重要标准之一，是智库生命力的源泉。美国著名智库布鲁金斯研究院理事会主席约翰·桑顿认为，“质量、独立性和影响力”是一个顶级智库必须坚持的三个核心价值观。

目前，国际最具影响力的智库排名，是由美国宾夕法尼亚大学“智库与公民社会”(TTCSP Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program)项目每年发布一次的《全球智库报告》。该报告自 2006 年开始，逐年发布全球智库综合排名。该报告按照地域和研究领域对全球智库进行分类，从智库资源、使用率、产出和影响四个一级指标层面综合考虑，采用“主观整体印象评价法”，根据专家打分构建智库评价体系¹⁷。这份报告开创性早，传播范围广泛，是目前最具影响力的智库评价报告。

我国的智库评价体系起步较晚，但随着近年来国内智库的发展迅猛，各种类型的专门从事智库研究的学术机构也开始出现，其中，有不少机构还构建了自己的智库评价体系，并推出了各具特色的智库排名。国内最早的智库评价体系是上

¹⁶ 李宏,杨文慧,冷伏海.国外智库影响力的形成及传播过程——基于信息-解决方案链的视角[J].科技导报,2018,36(16):70.

¹⁷ 荆林波.智库评价方法综论[J].晋阳学刊,2016(04):135.

海社会科学院在 2014 年发布的《中国智库报告》。该报告将智库的影响力分为决策影响力、学术影响力、社会影响力和国际影响力，并辅之以智库的成长能力作为参考指标建立中国智库影响力评价指标体系。决策影响指标主要包括领导批示、建言采纳、规划起草和咨询活动；学术影响力指标主要包括论文著作和研究项目；社会影响力指标分为媒体报道和网络传播；国际影响力指标分为国际合作和国际传播；智库成长能力指标主要考察智库的属性和智库的资源。采用多轮主观评价法，根据 4 个一级指标对中国活跃智库进行打分和排名。

中国社会科学院中国社会科学评价中心于 2014 年 2 月发起全球智库评价项目，对全球 1781 家智库进行综合评价。AMI 评价体系（A，Attractive Power，吸引力；M，Management Power，管理力；I，Impact Power，影响力）从吸引力、管理力、影响力三个层次对全球智库进行评价，吸引力指标主要考察智库的声誉、人员、产品和资金；管理力主要考察智库机构的系统、组织、人员结构等；影响力指标分为政策影响力、学术影响力、社会影响力和国际影响力。2017 年，中国社会科学院在全球智库指标体系的基础上进行修订，构建了“中国智库综合评价 AMI 模型”，发布了研究报告。

2015 年 1 月 15 日，零点国际发展研究院与中国网联合发布了《2014 中国智库影响力报告》。根据智库影响力分类，采用四类影响力指标：专业影响力、政府影响力、社会影响力和国际影响力。每类影响力设置 3-5 个客观指标。这份《2014 中国智库影响力报告》，与上海社科院的评价体系相比，其运作模式有所创新，评价机构来自民间研究机构与媒体合作研究是一个亮点，而且，他们也试图改进评价方法，创造出主观评价与客观评价相结合的评价方法¹⁸。

四川省社会科学院与中国科学院程度文献情报中心也从 2014 年起推出《中华智库影响力报告》，从决策、舆论、社会、专业、国际影响力五个方面构建智库影响力评价体系。

2016 年，南京大学中国智库研究与评价中心与光明日报智库研究与发布中心联合研发了中国智库垂直搜索引擎（CTTI）和数据管理平台，并在当年年底发布了 MRPA 测评报告。MAPA 测评体系由 M（治理结构）、R（智库资源）、P（智库成果）、A（智库活动）等 4 个一级指标和 19 个二级指标构成。MAPA 评测体系根据专家填报的数据自动对智库进行打分排序，首次对我国的大学智库进行了

¹⁸ 荆林波.智库评价方法综论[J].晋阳学刊,2016(04):139.

详细的区分评价。

清华大学于 2016 年首次发布《中国智库大数据报告》，是国内智库评价机构首次通过大数据评价方法和社交大数据资源对智库活动进行的综合性评价与评级。主要从中国智库微信公号影响力、中国智库微博专家影响力和中国智库微信引用影响力三个一级指标出发进行评价。

2018 年 11 月 10 日，由长江教育研究院、教育智库与教育治理研究评价中心、南京晓庄学院联合开发的 CETTE 中国教育智库评估系统宣告上线，发布了《中国教育智库评价 SFAI 研究报告（2018 年）》，全国近 60 家教育智库入选 2018CETTE 智库榜单。这是我国首套全面描述、收集教育智库数据，为用户提供数据整理、数据检索、数据分析、数据应用等功能的智库索引系统。基于教育智库的结构（S—Structure）、功能（F—Function）、成果（A—Achievement）和影响力（I—Influence）等四个要素，课题组研发了中国教育智库评价体系（SFAI）分析模型，通过相关 SFAI 指标体系的收集、评价等，形成了 CETTE 核心榜单教育智库和来源教育智库。2019 年 4 月 27 日，《中国教育智库评价 SFAI 研究报告（2019 年版）》发布。这是国内第一部关于教育智库评价的中英文双语版报告。经过汇总分析，共有 40 家单位入选核心智库，26 家单位入选来源智库；并对中国教育智库的建设提出了政策建议。

五. 智库影响力评价的理论基础

影响力是智库的核心竞争力，也是评价智库的重要指标之一。上述 5 个报告基本都将影响力作为最核心的指标。“影响力是权力的一种形式，但与控制力、力量、强迫和干涉截然不同。它通过告诉其他人行动的理由，这些理由是对他人有利的，或者是道义上以及善意的考虑，来对其行为进行影响，但是这些理由和考虑必须是对他有分量的，从而影响其决策。”¹⁹ 在思想竞争自由的市场上，智库的产品是思想，目标客户是政策制定者，智库的成功不是以利润的多少来衡量，而是取决于是否产生了影响力。其影响力的核心就在于“通过直接或间接途径，使政策过程或政策决策者的观点发生改变”²⁰，最终推动政策的制定和执行。

从影响力的作用机制而言，有学者从政策过程的五个阶段（议题提出、形成建议、政策制定、政策实施、政策评估）研究智库发挥作用的方式²¹。在议题提出阶段，智库依据政府决策需求、社会问题需求或政策问题需求，提出政策议题，引领社会舆论，或对已有的政策进行评议进而引发新一轮的政策议题；形成建议阶段，智库对政府、社会大众关心和讨论的政策议题进行界定，并从事深入研究，为政策博弈注入活力，深深影响政策制定过程；政策制定阶段，智库为政府提供政策研究和政策分析证据，并提供政策方案，对政府决策或行为有潜在影响，辅助决策者形成或采用或拒绝的态度；政策实施阶段，智库对政策操作中的相关问题进行深入调研，为政策调整做好前瞻性导向工作，进而实现政策实施状况的监测；政策评估阶段，智库针对前期政策执行中存在的问题进行调查研究，对现有政策进行评估，为下一轮政策调整指导方向，也为政府和社会公众下一轮政策讨论提供议题。

从影响力的作用层次而言，有学者用“社会结构”的概念进行类比²²。加尔东 (Johan Galtung) 根据社会各阶层与政策决策的关系将社会结构分成三个层次，即决策核心(decision -making nuclear, DN)、中心(center)和边缘(periphery)。决策核心层指决策者，也就是掌握政策决策权力的人，他们的政策主张对政策决策起到决定性作用。在核心层以外是中心层，主要包括具有一定政策影响能力的媒体、企业界、学术界的精英。智库就属于中心层范畴。边缘层主要是普通大众，

¹⁹ 王莉丽.美国智库的“旋转门”机制[J].国际问题研究,2010(02):13-18.

²⁰ 王桂侠,万劲波.基于政策过程的智库影响力作用机制研究[J].中国科技论坛,2018(11):151-157.

²¹ 王桂侠,万劲波.基于政策过程的智库影响力作用机制研究[J].中国科技论坛,2018(11):151-157.

²² 周洪宇. 智库的转型[M]. 武汉: 湖北教育出版社. 2016.11: 8

虽然从数量上是真正的社会主体，但由于大众离政策制定的核心与中心很远，并且普通大众不可能直接得到与政策有关的信息的渠道和能力，所以他们处于政策决策的“边缘”。智库内的研究人员本身处于社会精英阶层，面对社会结构中处于不同地位的参与者，智库将采用截然不同的策略。智库正是通过与三个层次中的各个参与者互动，从而进入政策过程的各个阶段，发挥影响力。

课题组以社会结构的影响力分析框架为理论基础，以决策（核心）影响力、学术（中心）影响力和大众（边缘）影响力三个层次为一级评价维度，对教育智库的影响力进行分析。

六. 全球教育智库影响力评价指标体系

1. 决策 (Political) 影响力

决策影响力是指智库专家参与政策导向、政策制定、政策实施或政策评估,为决策者提供专家意见、辅助决策的能力。智库通过委托研究、国会活动、政府决策顾问等方式,建立与政府的政策决策机构正规或非正规的沟通渠道,将自己的研究成果以口头或书面的形式提供给决策者,使其愿意抽出时间来关注其研究成果,并最终采纳其建议²³。这是思想库试图影响政策所采取的最直接的方法。然而,评估智库的决策影响力是相当艰难的。每个国家或政府政策的制定都是一个经过了众多利益相关者商讨的复杂过程,且极少有政府会将特定政策的推行明确归功于某一智库,因而很难明确某一智库的建议在政策过程中是否起到了决定性作用。

本课题组以智库与政府及决策者的关系为二级指标,衡量智库的决策影响力。由于高层领导们工作繁忙,几乎没有阅读时间,因此学术研究论文式的沟通方式是无效的。最好的方法是在小型会议上亲自向领导呈上言简意赅的研究成果,而这取决于智库能否通过其卓越的人脉关系接触到领导者。因此从这个角度看,智库的人际关系网络是其决策影响力的重要决定因素之一。智库与政府之间的人际网络在美国的政治机制中尤为重要。在美国,每隔四年很多卸任的官员会到智库从事政策研究,而智库的研究者也有机会到政府担任要职。这种学者和官员之间流通的“旋转门”机制,使得智库得以直接与政府决策者进行沟通,从而对政策制定产生影响。以布鲁金斯协会为例,布鲁金斯协会现任的 200 多名研究员中,有二分之一的人具有政府工作背景,担任过驻外大使的就有六位之多。在奥巴马执政时期,加入奥巴马政府的布鲁金斯学会学者有 36 人之多。这种人际关系网络带来最直接的效果就是,布鲁金斯学会的政策建议可以迅速到达白宫、国会和政府各个机构,从而对政策制定产生直接影响²⁴。

由于政治体制、基本国情的不同,“旋转门”机制在中国实行的可能性不大,但在国内也已出现了政府与智库之间人才流动的现象。尤其在我国,党政机关隶属的官方教育智库由于自身独特地位,与政府和教育主管部门接触机会多,成果

²³ 朱旭峰,苏钰.西方思想库对公共政策的影响力——基于社会结构的影响力分析框架构建[J].世界经济与政治,2004(12):24.

²⁴ 王莉丽.美国智库的“旋转门”机制[J].国际问题研究,2010(02):14.

上呈通道顺畅，参与和影响政府决策的机会多²⁵。除此之外，部分高校和民间教育智库的职员也在政府中具有相当的社会关系网络，他们中有些人和政府高层有过多年的合作关系，也有些本身就是从政府卸任的高级官员。因此，以智库与政府间的人际关系网络作为衡量智库决策影响力的二级指标，不仅适用于中外智库的现状，从可行性上而言，也便于收集到相对客观的数据。

在此基础上，课题组以“核心成员曾任或兼任国家/联邦级或省部/州政府官员等级”作为三级指标，同时考察智库获得内参、批示和承担政府课题的数量，加以智库发布的高影响力，特别是有国际影响力和政策参考效果的报告，综合判断智库的决策影响力。

2. 学术 (Academic) 影响力

学术影响力是指智库机构或专家通过在学术刊物上发表学术论文、出版著作、召开研讨会等形式，将自己的研究成果展现给同行及其他社会精英。学术影响力是智库综合影响力的重要组成部分。只有深厚的学术能力和知识积淀作根基，智库才得以有源源不断的养分为现实政策出谋划策。正如有学者所言：“智库要提供思想和智慧，需要有潜心的学术研究，才会有创新的思想 and 解决问题的智慧；解决当前的政策决策不能仅仅从当前社会问题出发，还要结合历史经验，历史规律来决策，通过学者的研究，历史可以昭示现实，从而避免决策者犯历史虚无主义的错误。”²⁶ 从现实意义来看，智库如果能够说服其他社会精英赞同并支持自己的政策观点，同时能够联合其他智库和研究机构一起倡导自己的学术主张，那么其政策观点就更容易成为中心阶层的主流观点，从而影响政府的核心决策。

课题组从论文、研讨会和连续出版物三个层面来评估学术影响力。论文指标是指近三年署名为该教育智库的论文篇均被引次数。学术总引用量越高，一方面说明智库的发文被其他学者及机构的认可度越高，证明其学术价值，另一方面也意味着发文被呈现在读者面前的机会越大，可能对大众产生的影响力越强。其次，研讨会由于多由专业人士参加，受众面更窄，学术认可度也更强。因而收集近三年间召开的研讨会数量能够反映出该智库在专业领域的活跃度与学术认可度，是体现智库学术影响力的重要指标。最后，是否有连续出版物反映智库学术成果方

²⁵ 周洪宇. 智库的转型[M]. 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 2016.11.

²⁶ 转引自 陈媛媛. 智库学术影响力评价研究[J]. 图书馆论坛, 2017, 37(12): 60.

面的连续性和稳定性，是对智库的量化评估，不对其出版物的优劣进行评价²⁷。

3. 大众 (Public) 影响力

大众影响力是指在与媒体及公众的互动中影响大众对某政策的看法，扩大智库政策宣传的舆论影响力。在“互联网+”时代，网络成为信息传播的主要媒介，因此要增进大众对智库的了解，最好的方法是借助大众媒体的宣传平台进行传播。有学者曾以美国布鲁金斯学会为案例，探究高社交媒体影响力的原因²⁸，发现其尤其注重通过社交媒体平台与政府、公众的信息沟通。建立了官方网站、博客、播客，并在主要社交媒体 Facebook、Twitter、YouTube 上开设账号进行信息发布，更新速度快，且善于将专业研究报告转化成通俗易懂的社交媒体语言，从而实现社交媒体信息发布的专职化和专业化。由此可见，充分利用大众媒体平台，是智库发挥自身大众影响力、塑造舆论影响力的有力手段，对其引导和影响政府、公众对议题的深度认知，推动议题建构具有价值。

根据网络传播平台的不同，课题组将大众影响力分为搜索引擎、社交媒体和官方网站三个二级指标。搜索引擎指标指在百度、Google 两个主要搜索引擎上某教育智库全称或简称的搜索量。社交媒体关注量关注智库在主要社交媒体平台上的粉丝数量。对于国外智库，考察其 Facebook/Twitter 的粉丝总数；对于国内智库，则是官方微博账号和微信公众号的粉丝总数。最后，通过 Alexa 全球和地区排名，考察智库独立网站的官网流量。

基于上述影响力传播路径，参考已有智库榜单指标体系，确定三类影响力下的二级和三级指标。具体如下表所示。

²⁷ 费雷德·昆斯,刘柯兰,冯胜,郑吟秋.智库的传播与影响力指标[J].决策与信息,2016(08):98.

²⁸ 相德宝. 新媒体时代全球智库社交网络影响力探析[A]. 上海市社会科学界联合会.中国特色社会主义: 实践探索与理论创新——纪念改革开放四十周年(上海市社会科学界第十六届学术年会文集-2018年度)[C]. 上海市社会科学界联合会:上海市社会科学界联合会,2018:18: 589

一级指标	二级指标	三级指标（观测值）	数据来源
决策影响力	与政府及决策者关系（旋转门经历）、内参、承担课题、政策影响力等		教育智库官网、专家打分
学术影响力	论文	近三年署名为该教育智库的论文篇均被引数	Microsoft Academic、CNKI
	研讨会	近三年召开研讨会数量	智库网站报道
	连续出版物	是否有连续出版物	智库网站报道
大众影响力	搜索引擎	教育智库全称/简称的Google 搜索量	Google Ads
		教育智库全称/简称的百度搜索量	百度推广
	社交媒体	社交媒体影响力和关注度	facebook, twitter, 微博, 微信
	官方网站	独立网站的官网流量(独立一级域名)	Alexa 全球排名, 地区排名

七. 全球教育智库影响力评价

1. 智库名单确认

本研究中，教育智库包括国际智库名单、国外智库名单和国内智库名单。

国际智库名单来自于代表性国际组织的教育政策研究机构，包括联合国教科文组织国际教育规划研究所、联合国教科文组织终身学习研究所、联合国教科文组织统计所、世界银行发展研究小组、经济合作与发展组织教育与技能局等，共计 5 家。

国外智库名单参考了 2018 年宾大智库排名（*2018 Global Go To Think Tank*）专项排名——Top Education Policy Think Tanks、2017 年清华大学智库大数据报告等国际智库的榜单报告，并从中遴选出涵盖主要国家，以教育为主要研究领域或有专门的教育研究团队的教育智库 58 家。

国内智库名单主要来源于国内各大智库排名和研究报告（南大 2015-2016 和 2018、上海社科院、清华大数据、浙大、周洪宇和刘大伟《中国教育智库评价 SFAI 研究报告（2019 版）》）中出现的教育智库，并遴选代表性智库共计 14 家。

2. 评价结果

排名	机构	地区
1	美国城市研究所	国外
2	美国卡托研究所	国外
3	世界银行发展研究小组	国际
4	卡耐基教学促进基金会	国外
5	美国布鲁金斯学会布朗教育政策研究中心	国外
6	美国兰德公司教育研究部	国外
7	美国教育政策研究中心	国外
8	美国 SRI 国际公司教育政策中心	国外
9	美国教育政策研究联盟	国外
10	斯坦福大学胡佛研究所	国外
11	经济合作与发展组织教育与技能局	国际
12	美国国家教育统计中心	国外
13	联合国教科文组织终身学习研究所	国际
14	澳大利亚教育研究委员会	国外
15	联合国教科文组织国际教育规划研究所	国际
16	联合国教科文组织统计所	国际

排名	机构	地区
17	英国伦敦大学教育学院	国外
18	美国国家教育科学研究所	国外
19	斯坦福大学教育学院教育政策分析中心	国外
20	韩国教育开发院	国外
21	日本国立教育政策研究所	国外
22	新西兰教育研究委员会	国外
23	法国国家高等教育战略委员会	国外
24	美国国家教育进步评价中心	国外
25	中国教育科学研究院	国内
26	国家教育发展研究中心（教育部教育发展研究中心）	国内
27	印度国家教育规划与管理研究所	国外
28	美国教育信托基金会	国外
29	美国国家教育政策中心	国外
30	美国教育政策与数据中心	国外
31	匈牙利教育政策分析中心	国外
32	芬兰教育研究协会	国外
33	美国国家教育与经济中心	国外

排名	机构	地区
34	英国教育政策研究所	国外
35	斯洛文尼亚教育政策研究中心	国外
36	土耳其教育改革倡议	国外
37	日本中央教育审议会	国外
38	21 世纪教育研究院	国内
39	芬兰教育研究院	国外
40	荷兰 SOCIRES	国外
41	波士顿学院国际高等教育中心	国外
42	亚美尼亚教育和培训部	国外
43	塞尔维亚教育政策中心	国外
44	格鲁吉亚国际教育政策、规划和管理研究所	国外
45	北京师范大学中国教育与社会发展研究院	国内
46	克罗地亚教育研究与发展中心	国外
47	哈佛大学全球教育创新中心（研究生院）	国外
48	墨西哥经济研究与教育中心	国外
49	北京大学中国教育财政科学研究所	国内
50	阿塞拜疆教育创新中心	国外

排名	机构	地区
51	韩国教育课程评价院	国外
52	立陶宛教育策略中心	国外
53	爱沙尼亚政策研究实践中心	国外
54	德国科学审议委员会	国外
55	华东师范大学国家宏观教育政策研究院	国内
56	俄罗斯教育政策研究中心（现教育管理學院）	国外
57	美国国家教育评估改进中心	国外
58	乌克兰教育研究中心	国外
59	长江教育研究院	国内
60	英国教育基金会	国外
61	乌克兰国家教育科学院	国外
62	伊利诺伊大学香槟分校国家学习成果评估所	国外
63	清华大学教育研究院	国内
64	厦门大学教育研究院	国内
65	布朗大学安纳伯格学校改革研究所	国外
66	美国赫金杰教育与媒体研究所	国外
67	伊曼尼(IMANI)政策教育中心	国外

排名	机构	地区
68	北京师范大学联合国教科文组织国际农村教育研究与培训中心	国内
69	上海师范大学联合国教科文组织教师教育中心	国内
70	亚利桑那州立大学全球教育高级研究中心	国外
71	东北师范大学农村教育研究所（东北师范大学中国农村教育发展研究院）	国内
72	美国创新教育研究所	国外
73	弗吉尼亚大学柯里分校教育政策和劳动力竞争中心	国外
74	北京教育科学研究院	国内
75	英国教育捐赠基金会	国外
76	上海教育科学研究院	国内
77	瑞典斯德哥尔摩大学国际教育研究所	国外

从决策影响力的角度来看，国际和国内智库中均存在智库领导人与政府官员之间的旋转门机制，这种人员流通拓展了智库掌握的人脉关系网络，使其得以直接与政策决策者进行沟通。以布鲁金斯学会为例，其现任的 200 多名研究员中，有二分之一的人具有政府工作背景，担任过驻外大使的就有六位之多。其现任主席 John R. Allen 是美国海军陆战队退役的四星级将军，以及北约国际安全援助部队和美军的前指挥官。副主席 Stephanie Aaronson 曾任美联储宏观经济分析部门负责人和国家财政部宏观经济政策副助理部长。在我国，中国教育科学研究院、国家教育发展等官方教育智库隶属于党政机关，地位独特。许多负责人本身就是

从政府卸任的高级官员，与政府和教育主管部门接触机会多，成果上呈通道顺畅。

除却旋转门机制外，国际知名教育智库曾发布很多具有国际影响力的报告，推动本国乃至世界层面的政策制定与推行。卡耐基教学促进基金会于 1973 年发布的《高等院校分类标准》对美国通过认证、可授予学位的学院和大学进行分类，从而对美国多样化的高等教育机构进行识别和描述。其确立的高等教育机构分类标准被广泛应用于大学排名、教育立法、政府决策、会费确定等诸多方面，对美国乃至世界各国高等教育机构分类都产生了深刻的影响。相比之下，大部分国内智库虽积极为政策建言，发布了相当数量的研究报告，但总的来说在影响力上有所欠缺

从学术影响力的角度来看，英国伦敦大学教育学院、美国城市研究所是近三年发表论文数前两位的国际教育智库；美国城市研究所、斯坦福大学胡佛研究所是近三年被引数最高的两个国际智库；斯坦福大学胡佛研究所、卡耐基教学促进基金会是篇均被引数前两位的国际教育智库。厦门大学教育研究院、中国教育科学研究院是近三年发表论文数最多的国内教育智库前两位；清华大学教育研究院，厦门大学教育研究院是近三年被引数最高的两个国内智库；清华大学教育研究院、北京大学教育财政科学研究所是篇均被引前两位的国内教育智库。在发文量上，国内教育智库与国际教育智库差异不大，但是引用数上还有较大的差异。相比较而言，上榜的 14 所国内教育智库中，篇均引用量与国家优秀教育智库还存在差距。

从大众影响力的角度来看，国际和国内教育智库在社交媒体影响力上的表现存在明显差异。国际教育智库重视社交媒体的力量，基本每个智库都有 Facebook 和 Twitter 的账号，且账号基本很容易在官网找到。相比较而言，国内教育智库则更多向上面向决策层，只有很少的教育智库有自己的官方微博和微信公众号，在上榜的 14 所国内智库中，只有北京师范大学中国教育与社会发展研究院和 21 世纪教育研究院开通了官方微信公众号。两个党政智库“中国教育科学研究院”和“国家教育发展研究中心”都没有微博账号，微信公众号阅读量也非常低。相比之下，民间智库更加注重社会影响力的辐射，其微信或微博的开通率和粉丝数都要远远大于其他种类的国内教育智库。例如 21 世纪教育科学院，在微信和微博的粉丝数量统计评估中得分较为靠前。这说明民间智库作为第三种力量，通过在社交媒体平台的输出影响着大众，推动社会热点议题的出现和思考。

3. 评价局限性与不足

基于加尔东的社会结构模型，本报告从决策影响力、学术影响力和大众影响力三方面，运用文献调研法、过程分析法和统计分析法，综合评价国内外共 84 所教育智库的影响力。课题组通过对 12 个三级指标进行计算和综合排名，旨在量化智库影响力，从而对各智库进行相对客观的评价。然而正如前文所述，影响力作为从心理上促成对方改变想法的力量，很难被具体指标所量化。尤其是决策影响力，由于参与政府决策建议主体的多元性、部分政策委托咨询项目的保密性、部分智库夸大自己对政策影响等原因，更加难以被明确衡量和量化。南京大学与光明日报 2018 年发表的“中国智库索引”(CTTI) 来源智库发展报告选用内参、报告和批示三项指标来衡量政策影响力。其数据统计结果发现，来源智库累计贡献单篇内参近 7000 篇，但 76%的内参上报后未能得到回应；在被批示的内参中，仅 2%的内参获副国级或正国级批示²⁹。这说明尽管内参作为我国智库最具特色且最为重要的决策咨询成果，但由于大部分智库都未得到国家级内参且反馈结果不明，因此无法代表性地反映智库政策影响力。上海社科院、南京大学、四川省科院发布的报告均采用“专家评议”的方式评估智库政策影响力。虽较为直观地体现各智库在业内权威人士心中的影响力，但无法避免打分专家的主观性。本报告以旋转门经历和内参、批示、承接课题数量为指标，也无可避免的受到影响力难以量化、数据匮乏、评判主观性等问题的制约，在决策影响力的评估方面略显局限。

其次，在学术影响力的评估方面，课题组在 Microsoft Academic 和 CNKI 平台上检索近三年署名为该教育智库的论文被引总数和论文发表总数，并以此作为一组三级指标。虽然可量化，但具体数量受制于两个数据库的完备情况，可能有所疏漏。其次，本报告只检索了以英文或中文发表的论文，不排除有部分智库的论文成果由于语言而被遗漏的情况。除却论文外，研讨会和连续出版物的数量是根据智库网站报道进行人工统计而得，容易有所遗漏。在二级指标的层面，由于难以从质量上对研讨会和连续出版物进行评判，课题组只关注数量，存在一定局限性。

最后，课题组以智库在 Facebook、Twitter、微博和微信四个平台上的粉丝数

²⁹ 南京大学中国智库研究与评价中心、光明日报智库研究与发布中心：《CTTI 来源智库发展报告》，第 3 页。

量判断其社交媒体影响力。但不排除部分智库的微博或微信的官方账号不以其全称或简称形式存在的情况，因而可能在社交媒体账号的检索方面出现遗漏。除此之外，通过 Alexa 全球和地区排名统计网站流量只能统计到一级域名，无法统计到二级域名。因此部分智库的官网流量数据可能包含遗漏。

4. 小结

十八大以来，智库建设的文件频频出台，智库相关研究蓬勃开展，中国智库进入史上最好机遇期。本报告选取国内外智库共 77 所，从决策影响力、学术影响力和大众影响力三个层次综合评估影响力。评价结果显示，和国外知名教育智库相比，中国智库在报告的国际影响力上有明显欠缺，对于利用大众媒体平台重视不足。通过系统、科学的评价反馈，国内智库得以学习国际知名智库的成功经验，反思自身短板，从而更加稳健的推进中国特色智库建设。总的来说，中国教育智库尚处于起步阶段，还有很大提升空间。随着中国的崛起和教育现代化的推进，中国教育智库必将不断提高自身的咨询与服务能力，围绕国家战略需求，开展更多具有前瞻性、针对性、储备性的政策研究，在国内教育政策的制定过程中发挥更大影响力，为党和政府科学民主决策提供重要支撑。

附录

长江教育研究院简介

长江教育研究院是在湖北省教育厅的支持下，由华中师范大学和湖北长江出版传媒集团有限公司联合发起，于 2006 年 12 月 16 日成立的教育研究机构。由全国人大代表、中国教育学会副会长、湖北省人大常委会副主任，华中师范大学教授周洪宇担任院长。

长江教育研究院本着“全球视野、中国立场、专业能力、实践导向”的指导思想，“民众立场、建设态度、专业视野”的立院原则，聚集了一批国内外知名教育专家资源，搭建了一个以文化出版企业为依托、联系相关教育专家和教育管理部门的平台，形成了以学术研究为基础、政策研究为重点、出版企业为依托、政府支持和社会参与为支撑，“学、研、产、政、社”优势互补、协同推进的新型体制机制。

12 多年来，长江教育研究院一直致力于打造新型教育智库“重器”，努力让智库的“谋划”转化为党和政府的决策，智库的“方案”转化为实际行动，智库的“言论”转化为社会共识，更好地为改革贡献力量。2016 年、2017 年连续两年在中国智库索引评选中社会中智库类 MRPA 测评综合排名全国第三，MRPA 资源效能测聘全国第一。2017 年入选中国社会科学评价研究院“2017 年度中国核心智库”。2018 年在中国智库索引社会智库类 PAI 值评分榜排名全国第二。

方略研究院简介

方略研究院是践行教育研究的全球智库，总部设于北京，在美国、加拿大、澳大利亚、英国、法国、德国、日本、新加坡、中国香港等世界多个国家和地区均设有分站。研究院设有专业的学术指导委员会和特约顾问委员，连通政策管理、学术研究、教育实践等多方视角，通过分布在全球各地的研究分站，携手教育研究员针对高校战略与管理、学科与科研建设、学生培养等教育主题，进行严肃的调研和科学的分析，结合规范研究与实证研究的范式，活用量化研究和质性研究的方法，提炼形成研究结论和观点。

方略研究院旗下拥有专注于教育的研究性媒体“一读 EDU”为代表的媒体矩阵，通过提交内参文件、发布研究报告和榜单、参与承担课题和项目、组织行业活动和专业会议、提供专题策划和宣传报道等多种形式持续发声。同时，依托平方创想教育科技（北京）有限公司的数据、技术优势，方略研究院还为教育主管部门、教育研究机构、高等院校、科研机构、学术组织等提供双一流、国际化、人才培养、教育质量保障等主题的线上、线下解决方案，为教育研究和教育决策者：

- 提供从教育理论到教育应用的研究支持
- 协助教育决策从战略到战术的落地执行
- 加强对教育决策从制定到执行的有效评估
- 提供数据支撑的开放式智库共建和协同合作

2019

Global Educational Think Tank Influence PAP Evaluation Report

Changjiang Education Research Institute
SquareStrategics Research Institute

1. Context of Think Tank Construction and Research

Think tanks, also known as “brain factory”, "brain tanks", "brain trust", are relatively stable and independent policy research and consultation institutions. It assists the government policy formulation in the form of “exo-brains”. Modern think tanks originated from Western countries. In the early 20th century, the United States led the rise of think tanks under the trend of reform and reconstruction during the Progressive Movement. World War I along with its devastating effects hastened the first wave of establishing think tanks. During this period, to serve national political and economic development, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Foreign Relations Committee were established in the United States, the British Institute of Defense Affairs started in the United Kingdom, and the French Foreign Policy Research Center was founded in France. After World War II, since the economies of participating countries were hit hard, restoring and promoting economic development along and maintaining the long-term stability of society became the primary tasks of their governments. At that time, think tanks focused on domestic affairs research developed rapidly, and professional think tanks emerged. Especially from the 1970s to the 1980s, issues of politics, science and technology, economy, diplomacy, education, society, and internationalization became the focus of the government and the public, which encouraged the establishment of a large number of think tanks, and various forums and debates on economics and public policy started to grow. In the 21st century, with the accelerating pace of globalization, western countries are facing increasingly complex common problems. As an "exo-brain" of the government, think tanks gradually developed a multi-level system for international affairs, regional affairs and domestic affairs.

Compared with the West, the establishment of Chinese think tanks is relatively late. It started after China's opening up in 1978. After the 18th National Congress, the Communist Party of China and the State paid more and more attention to the development of think tanks. The effectiveness of building think tanks has become an important manifestation of the country's effort in increasing soft power and competitiveness. From 2013 to 2018, Chinese think tanks construction experienced an important five-year development period. On April 15, 2013, General Secretary Xi Jinping made the "4·15" announcement in which he proposed to "strengthen the construction of a new type of think tanks with Chinese characteristics and establish a sound decision-making consultation system". Xi for the first time proposed to establish think tanks with Chinese characteristics and emphasized the task of think tanks construction as a national strategy. This policy pointed out the direction of building think tanks in the new era, and represented the starting year of Chinese think tanks construction in exploring new issues such as Chinese think tanks positioning, functions and systems. In November that year, the Third Plenary Session of the 18th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China adopted the "Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Several Major Issues Concerning Comprehensively Deepening Reforms", which clearly require "strengthening the construction of a new type of think tanks with Chinese characteristics and establishing and perfecting the decision-making consultation system."

In 2015, the General Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the General Office of the State Council officially issued the "Opinions on Strengthening the Construction of New Types of Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics", pointing out that the new type of think tanks with Chinese characteristics is "an important support for the decision-making of the party and the state in scientific and democratic law", "the key content of the modernization of the national governance system

and governance capacity" and "an important component of the national soft power". It further put forward the overall goal for building think tanks. The promulgation of the "Opinions" pointed out the direction of building new think tanks with Chinese characteristics, which ignited think tank building boom across the country. On May 4, 2017, the "Opinions on the Healthy Development of Social Think Tanks" was promulgated to further standardize and guide the development of social think tanks, to ensure social think tanks participating in the supply of think tank products in accordance with the law, and to expand the effective channels for social think tanks to participate in decision-making consulting services. In October that year, the 19th Congress of the Party once again put forward the idea of "building a new type of think tank with Chinese characteristics in the new era". This not only reaffirmed the importance of think tank construction, but also included the construction of Chinese think tanks in the country's long-term development plan.

Throughout the course of Chinese think tanks construction in the past two decades, its progress is closely related to the development needs of Chinese society. The surge of think tank development is in line with new forms and new demands in the political economy. Driven by the policy demand and the favorable system, Chinese think tanks entered into the best opportunity period in recent years. The policy documents for promoting think tank construction were issued frequently, policy formulation has been fully developed, and the think tank policy system has been gradually established. At the same time, research on think tanks has flourished. The research results have shown a spurt of growth, laying a theoretical foundation for the construction of a new type of think tank with Chinese characteristics. The State Council and local development centers, research institutes, universities, and social think tanks have played an important role in building think tanks at all levels and in all aspects of China.

2. The Rising and Development of Think Tanks on Global Education

As an important link of the construction of think tanks, educational think tanks is an important vehicle to realize the modernization and power of education. With the sustainable development of China's educational think tanks, how to cultivate the new and international think tanks has become another goal. Studying the characteristics of international education think tank, drawing on the invaluable experience in the development of international excellent think tanks can promote to the development of China's educational think tanks.

Educational think tanks mainly refer to institutions that conduct research on public education policies and provide advice and services for government education decision-making. From a global perspective, educational think tanks have sprung up all around the world since the 1980s. Among them, the number of educational think tanks in the United States is of the first rank all around the world, and it is also the world's leading level in terms of function, quantity, and variety. In the top ten educational policy think tanks evaluated by the University of Pennsylvania's 2018 The Global Go To Think Tank Index Reports , the United States has a total of eight. It can be said that the educational think tank of the United States is the most powerful research ability in the global think tank.

In terms of time, the American think tank started in the early 20th century and was devoted to the study of public policy in the initial stages. With the sustainable continuous improvement and development of the quantity and quality of think tanks, the American education think tank came into being. From the late 1970s to the early 1980s, American educational think tanks began to come into bud. In 1957, with the launch of Soviet satellites, Soviet

technology once surpassed the United States and caused deep reflections from people in authority in America. Senior US believe that the backwardness of science and technology is caused by the backwardness of education. The government has therefore begun to attach great importance to education and introduced various promotional policies and measures. Besides, in the mid-20th century, the "The War Against Poverty" prompted the focus of the think tanks was transferring to domestic policies, and thus the number of think tanks for education policies rose sharply, especially in 1983, when the report the country was in crisis was released, the United States set off a wave of education reforms. The education has become the focus , think tanks focusing on education policy have also grown substantially. Entering the 21st century, with the rapid development of information and technology, the trend of global integration has intensified, along with the economic, political and cultural environment. In the past more than half a century, educational think tanks have provided countries with programs to formulate educational policies, assess the implementation of educational policies, and promote educational policy debates, which have become an indispensable role in the formulation of educational policies.

3. The Development and Study on China's Educational Think Tanks

China's research on educational think tanks mainly focuses on the following three aspects:

Firstly, researching on the development of history, influence, organizational structure, and functional operation of foreign educational think tanks. Xing Huan (2012) "America's Educational Think Tank Research: Taking the "Education Policy Center" as an Example", through combing the development history of American educational think tanks and American educational politics, he summarizes the functions of educational think tanks in the policy-making process, and thus the necessity of establishing an independent education think tank in China is proved. Gu Xianlin, Xing Huan (2014) "Types, Features and Functions of American Educational Think Tanks" provides a systematic analysis of the characteristics and functions of American educational think tanks, and the development and education of educational think tanks in China. The scientific decision-making provides useful reference and enlightenment; Wang Jianliang, Guo Wanting (2014) "The Construction of Australian Education Think Tank under the Concept of Professional Development: Taking the Case of Australian Council for Educational Research". It introduces the Think tank of Australian Education Research Council's (ACER) which stands for the most influential and the high level, and brings the professional education research on the construction and development of China's educational think tank. Wang Junsheng (2018) "American Think Tank Operation Model and Its Enlightenment to China's Think Tank Construction" proposes to learn the openness of American think tanks, increase the timeliness of think tanks, invite government officials to participate in think tanks, and establish an internship system. Li

Long et al. (2018) proposed to use the Malaysian think tank to establish a government-led public policy and social economy-related think tank.

Second, the operation, development and particularity of educational think tanks. Wang Jianliang, Guo Wanting (2014) "China's Educational Think Tank Construction: Problems and Countermeasures" analyzes the classification and function of China's educational think tanks, puts forward the problems of China's educational think tanks at present, and provides some suggestions for the future development of think tanks. Yan Daguang (2015) "The Particularity of Educational Think Tank Construction" analyzes the particularity of educational think tanks and its comprehension, and puts forward some problems and some reasonable suggestions in the development of educational think tanks in China.

Third, the construction and problems of China's new educational think tanks. First, the study of the connotation of new educational think tanks. Pang Lijuan (2015) pointed out in the "Thoughts on Some Important Issues of China's New Educational Think Tanks" that the new educational think tanks are essentially influencing decision-making and serving decision-making, and the new educational think tanks should have a strong national mission, objective research positions, and professional Consciousness and spirit and open collaborative innovation. Zhang Wusheng (2015) "The Essential Characteristics of New Educational Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics" summarizes the characteristics of China's new educational think tanks.

Second, research on the construction of new educational think tanks. The construction of a new type of educational think tank is a hot issue in the field of educational think tanks. Especially after the Ministry of Education

and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China successively launched policy documents on the construction of new think tanks, scholars have carried out thinking and research. In response to some problems existing in the current construction of new educational think tanks, the Ministry of Education's Education Development Research Center (2015) pointed out that the new educational think tank construction has entered a new stage, pointing out that the new educational think tank needs to accurately lock in and develop and cultivate user needs; Discourse features; improve the reliability and usefulness of think tank services; Zibo (2015) "There must be a new vision for the construction of a new type of educational think tank with Chinese characteristics" points out the direction and goal of the construction of a new type of educational think tank with Chinese characteristics, and explains the "special" and "new" of the new educational think tank with Chinese characteristics.

Based on the above literature review, we can find that the current research on educational think tanks in China is relatively weak, and the research started late, and the content is still at a relatively shallow level. At this stage, China's educational think tank is still in the early stage. The excellent practices of learning advanced foreign education think tanks can provide useful reference for the establishment and development of China's educational think tanks. Through literature review, we can find out the shortcomings of China's educational think tanks. Therefore, as a supplement, we will try to contribute to China's educational think tank.

4. The Background of the Impact on Think Tanks

Since the promulgation of the Opinions on Strengthening the Construction of New Types of Think Tanks with Chinese Characteristics in 2015, the construction of China's think tanks has culminated, and various think tanks have emerged, but the quality is uneven. How to measure the results of think tank construction has become an urgent problem to be solved. For the country, the evaluation of the think tank helps the country to grasp the situation of the think tank development and the targeted policy of supporting the development of the think tank. For the think tank, the think tank evaluation contributes to the establishment of the think tank industry norms and codes of conduct. In the lack of competition and learning among think tanks, it stimulates the motivation of the sustainable development of think tanks; for decision-making departments, foundations, media, academia, and the public, think tank evaluation helps to show the public image of think tank industry and think tank individual.

The difference between policy research and general academic research in think tanks is that their research objectives clearly point to the influence of government decision-making and the corresponding social environment. In general academic research, the research links go beyond the facts-data-information-knowledge-intelligence-results constitutes an information chain that adds the ultimate substantive "solution-policy-measure" link, ultimately Formed an "information-solution" chain. Therefore, the influence of think tanks has become the key goal and development basis of think tank work. Influence is one of the important criteria for evaluating think tanks and the source of the vitality of think tanks. John Thornton, chairman of the Board of Directors of the Brooklyn Institute, a leading think tank in the United States, believes that "quality, independence and influence" are the three core values that a top think tank must adhere to.

At present, the most influential think tank ranking in the world is the "Global Think Tank Report" published annually by the University of Pennsylvania's "TTCSP Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program" project. Since 2006, the report has released a comprehensive ranking of global think tanks year after year. The report classifies global think tanks according to geography and research fields. From the perspective of four levels of indicators: think tank resources, utilization rate, output and impact, the "subjective overall impression evaluation method" is adopted to construct a think tank evaluation system based on expert scoring. This report is groundbreaking and widely spread, and is the most influential think tank evaluation report.

China's think tank evaluation system has started late, but with the rapid development of domestic think tanks in recent years, various types of academic institutions specializing in think tank research have begun to emerge. Many of them have also built their own think tank evaluation systems and launched a unique think tank ranking. The earliest think tank evaluation system in China is the "China Think Tank Report" published by the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences in 2014. The report divides the influence of think tanks into decision-making influence, academic influence, social influence and international influence, and supplements the growth ability of think tanks as a reference indicator to establish an evaluation index system for Chinese think tanks influence. Decision-making impact indicators mainly include leadership instructions, suggestions for adoption, planning drafting and consulting activities; academic influence indicators mainly include paper works and research projects; social impact indicators are divided into media reports and network communication; international influence indicators are divided into international cooperation and International communication; think tank growth ability indicators mainly investigate the attributes of think tanks and the resources of think tanks. Using the Doron subjective evaluation

method, the Chinese active think tanks are scored and ranked according to the four first-level indicators.

The Chinese Social Science Evaluation Center of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences launched a global think tank evaluation project in February 2014, so as to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of 1,781 think tanks worldwide. AMI evaluation system (A, Attractive Power, attractiveness; M, Management Power, management power; I, Impact Power, influence) evaluates global think tanks from three levels of attraction, which includes management and influence. Investigate the reputation, personnel, products and funds of think tanks; management power mainly examines the system, organization, and personnel structure of think tank institutions; influence indicators are divided into policy influence, academic influence, social influence and international influence. In 2017, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences revised the global think tank indicator system and built the "China Comprehensive Evaluation on Think Tank AMI Model" and released a research report.

On January 15, 2015, Horizen International Development Research Institute and China.com jointly released the 2014 China Impact Report on Think Tank. According to the influence of think tanks, four types of influence indicators are used: professional influence, government influence, social influence and international influence. Totally set 3-5 objective indicators for each type of influence. Compared with the evaluation system of the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, the 2014 China's Impact Report on Think Tank has been innovative. The evaluation agencies from private research institutions and media cooperation research are a shining spot, and they also try to improve evaluation. The method creates an evaluation method that combines subjective evaluation with objective evaluation.

The Sichuan Provincial Academy of Social Sciences and the Chinese Literature Research Center of the Chinese Academy of Sciences also launched "the Impact Report on China's Think Tank" from 2014 in order to construct a think tank impact evaluation system from five aspects: decision-making, public opinion, society, professionalism and international influence.

In 2016, the China Think Tank Research and Evaluation Center of Nanjing University and the Guangming Daily Think Tank Research and Publication Center jointly developed the China Think Tank Vertical Search Engine (CTTI) and data management platform, and released the MRPA evaluation report at the end of the year. The MAPA assessment system consists of four primary indicators and 19 secondary indicators, including M (governance structure), R (think tank resources), P (think tank results), and A (think tank activity). The MAPA evaluation system automatically sorts the think tanks according to the data reported by the experts, and makes a detailed evaluation of the university think tanks in China for the first time.

Tsinghua University first released "the Big Data Report on China's Think Tanks" in 2016, which is the first comprehensive evaluation and rating for think tank activities carried by domestic think tanks evaluation institutions through big data evaluation methods and social big data resources. It is mainly evaluated from the three-level indicators of the influence of China's think tank such as WeChat public, the influence of Chinese think tanks Weibo experts and the influence of China's think tank WeChat.

On November 10, 2018, the CETTE China Education Think Tank

Evaluation System jointly developed by Changjiang Education Research Institute, the Education Think Tank and the Education Governance Research and Evaluation Center, and NanJing XiaoZhuang University was announced . It released the "China Education Think Tank Evaluation SFAI Research Report (2018)", and nearly 60 educational think tanks were selected for this Think Tank list . This is the first set of think tank index system that comprehensively describes and collects educational think tank data, and provides users with functions such as data sorting, data retrieval, data analysis and data application. Based on the four elements of Structure, Function, Achievement and Influence , the research team developed the China Education Think Tank Evaluation System (SFAI) analysis model, through the collection and evaluation of relevant SFAI indicator , formed the CETTE core list education think tank and source education think tank . On April 27, 2019, the "China Education Think Tank Evaluation SFAI Research Report (2019)" was released. This is the first Chinese-English bilingual report on the evaluation of educational think tanks in China. After a summary analysis, a total of 40 institutions were selected as core think tanks, 26 institutions were selected as source think tanks. This report puts forward policy recommendations for the construction of China's educational think tank.

5. Theoretical Foundation of Think Tank Evaluation

Influence is the core competency of think tanks and one of the main indexes for evaluating them. The above five reports all consider influence as the most important index. “Influence is a form of power, distinct, however, from control, force, coercion, and interference. It involves affecting the conduct of another through giving reasons for action short of threats; such reasons may refer to his advantage, or to moral or benevolent considerations, but they must have weight for him, so as to affect his decision.” In the marketplace of ideas, the product of a think tank is the idea and the target customer is the policymaker. Its success is not measured by how big profits it creates but by the fact if it wields influence. The core of its influence lies in “through direct or indirect approaches, changing the policy-making processes or the views of policymakers” and ultimately facilitates the process of policy formulation and implementation.

From the perspective of the mechanism of influence, some scholars analyzed the importance of think tanks from the five stages of the policy process (proposition, policy formulation, policy making, policy implementation, policy evaluation).

At the proposition stage, the think tank proposes policies based on government decision-making needs, social issues or policy issues, lead public opinion, or review existing policies to bring up new policy discussion issues. In the policy formulation stage, think tanks define the policy issues of concern to the government and to the public, engage in in-depth research so as to burst the policy games for policy games with vitality and further affecting the policy making process. In the stage of policy making, think tanks provide the government with evidence for policy research and analysis, offer solutions to the policy issue, shed potential

impacts on government decisions and assist decision makers in forming decisions either to adopt or reject. During the policy implementation phase, the think tank conducts in-depth research on relevant issues in policy operations, provides forward-looking guidance for policy adjustment, and then monitors the implementation of policy implementation. Finally, in the policy evaluation phase, the think tank investigates issues existing in the implementation of the policy in the last round, evaluates the existing policy, points out the direction for the further policy adjustments, and provides topics for the next round of policy discussions between the government and the public.

From the aspect of the impact of influence, some scholars use the concept of "social structure" to make an analogy. Johan Galtung divides the social structure into three levels according to the relationship between various social sectors and the policy decision, namely decision-making nuclear (DN), center and periphery. DN refers to decision makers, that is, those who have the power to make policy decisions. Their policy claims play a decisive role in the final decision. Beyond the core level is the center which mainly includes social elites in the media, business, and academia who have policy influence capabilities to some extent. Think tanks belong to the center. Periphery is mainly the general public. Although the public is the real social subject in quantity, as they are far from DN and center of policy formulation and lack the channels and capabilities to obtain policy-related information directly, they are actually at the edge of policy decisions. Researchers in think tanks are themselves elites in society. While dealing with participants from different positions in the social structure, think tanks will adopt various strategies accordingly. It is through the interaction with participants from these three levels that think tanks enter into and exert influence on the various stages of the policy process.

The research team adopts the “social structure” of influence framework as the theoretical basis, regarding the three-layer influence, that is, the decision-making influence (DN), academic influence (center) and public influence (periphery), as the primary evaluation level, to analyze the influence of education think tanks.

6. Global Education Think Tank Influence Evaluation Index System

(1) Political influence

Decision-making influence refers to the ability of think tank experts to participate in making policy guidance, policy formulation, policy implementation or policy evaluation, and to provide expert opinions for decision makers to make up their minds. Through entrusted research, congressional activities, government decision-making consultants and so forth and so on, think tanks establish formal or informal communication channels with government policy decision-making bodies, provide their research results for decision makers in a head-to-head or written form so as to make them willing to spend time listening to the research results and finally adopt the recommendations. This is the most straightforward way in which the think tank attempts to influence policy. However, assessing the decision-making influence of think tanks is quite difficult. The formulation of country or government policy is a complex process that has been discussed by many stakeholders, and very few governments owe a specific policy to a certain think tank, making it difficult to clarify if the recommendations of a think tank played a decisive role in the policy process. The “China Think Tank Index” (CTTI), a source think tank development report published by Nanjing University and Guangming Daily in 2018 used internal reference reports, reports and instructions to measure policy impacts. The statistical results of the data found that the source think tank contributed nearly 7,000 internal reference reports, however, 76% of which failed to get a response after delivery. Among the approved internal reference, only 2% of the internal reference was approved by the subnational or national level. This shows that although the internal reference is the most characteristic and important decision-making consultation result of the Chinese think tanks, since most of them did not receive national approval or feedback, the influence of the think tank policy cannot be fairly reflected.

The research team uses the relationship between think tanks and the government and policy makers as a secondary index to measure the decision-making influence of think tanks. Due to the busy work of senior leaders and the lack of reading time, academic research papers is not an effective method to communicate with them. The best way to do this is to present a concise study of the research result to the leader in a brief meeting, which depends whether the think tank can reach the leader through its connections. Therefore, from this perspective, the network of think tanks is one of the important determinants of its influence in decision-making. The interpersonal network between think tanks and government is particularly important in the political mechanisms of the United States. In the United States, every four years many retired officials go to think tanks for policy research, and think tank researchers also have the opportunity to work for the government. It is called the “Revolving Door” in politics, which allows the think tank to communicate with government leaders directly so as to exert influence on policy decision-making. Take the Brookings Institution as an example. Among its current 200 and more researchers, over half of them worked for the government and 6 of them are ambassadors. During the Obama administration, there were 36 scholars at the Brookings Institution who joined the Obama government. The most direct effect of this network is that the Brookings Institution's policy recommendations can quickly reach the White House, Congress, and government agencies, thus having a direct impact on policy development.

Due to the different political systems and national realities, the “Revolving Door” mechanism is unlikely to be implemented in China, but there is a phenomenon of talent flow between the government and the think tank in China. In China, the official educational think tanks affiliated to the party and government organs because of its unique status have more opportunities to contact with the government and the education authorities and their channel to report the research result is more smooth. Therefore,

they have more opportunities participate in and influence the government's decision-making. In addition, some think tanks in higher education academy and private education think tanks also have social networks in the government. Some of them have years of cooperation with government senior government officials and some are retired government senior officials of the government. Therefore, regarding the interpersonal social networks between think tanks and governments as a secondary index for measuring the influence of think tanks is not only applicable to the status quo of Chinese and foreign think tanks, but also facilitates the collection of relatively objective data in terms of feasibility.

On this basis, the research team refines the three-level indexes. Based on “the rank of core members who have served as national/federal or provincial/state government officials” and “the number of core members who worked part-time at the national/federal or provincial/state levels, in addition to the reports that inserted high influence publicized by the think tanks, especially those that had international influence or impact on policy-making, the team measured the relationship between domestic and foreign educational think tanks and the government and policy makers so as to judge their decision-making influence.

(2) Academic Influence

Academic influence is manifested as think tanks or their experts presenting their research results to peers and other social elites by publishing papers in academic journals, writing books, and holding seminars. Academic influence is an important part of the overall influence of think tanks. Think tanks can develop continuously and sustainably to provide consultations for social issues only if they are based on strong academic ability and knowledge accumulation, can. As some scholars said, “Think tanks are

supposed to provide ideas and wisdom. Only if they have conducted intensive academic research can they provide innovative ideas and wisdom to solve problems. Solving current policy decisions cannot be based solely on current social issues, but also needs to rely on history and experience to make decisions. Through scholars' research, history can manifest reality, thus avoiding mistakes in historical nihilism made by previous policy decision makers." In the practical sense, if think tanks can convince other social elites to agree and support their policy views, and at the same time cooperate with other think tanks and research institutions to advocate their academic ideas, their policy views are more likely to become the mainstream view of people in the center, thus affecting the core decisions of the government.

The research team subdivided the academic influence into three indexes: the educational think tank's total number of papers cited in the past three years, the number of seminars held in the last three years, and whether there are serial publications by the think tank. The higher the number of the total academic citation, the higher the recognition of the think-tank by other scholars and institutions; the higher the degree of recognition, the greater the chance that the message will be presented to the reader, and therefore, the stronger the influence. In addition, due to the fact that most seminars are only open to professionals, therefore its academic recognition is stronger. The number of seminars held in the past three years reflects its academic activity and recognition in the professional field, and thus it is an important index of the academic influence. Finally, the serial publication reflects the quantitative assessment of the think tank while the merit of its publications is not considered.

(3) Public Influence

Public influence refers to the think tank's ability to influence the public's views on a certain policy while interacting with the media and the public,

and its effectiveness in expanding the think tank's role in policy propaganda. In the era of "Internet +", the Internet has become the main medium for information dissemination. Therefore, the best way to improve the public's understanding of think tanks is to spread information on the mass media. Think tanks can hire well-known correspondents to deal with the media frequently. Some scholars have used the Brookings Institution of the United States as a case to explore the reasons for its high social media influence. It turned out that the Brookings paid high attention to communication with the government and the public through social media platforms. The Brookings created an official website, blog page, vlog, and open accounts in main social media such as Facebook, Twitter, and Youtube for information release where content is updated fast. They are good at good at transforming professional research reports into easy-to-understand social media language, so as to realize the professionalization and specialization of social media information release. It can be seen that making full use of the mass media platform is a powerful means for think tanks to exert their own influence and shape the influence of public opinion. It is a valuable tool for think tanks to guide and shape the government and the public's understanding of the issue and to promote the formulation of the policy topic.

According to different network communication platforms, the research team divides the public influence into search engines, social media and website as three secondary indexes. Search engine index is measured by the search volume of the full or short name of an educational think tank on major search engines such as Baidu and Google. Social media index includes two parts, one is the think tanks's follower number in Weibo, WeChat public number, Twitter and Facebook, and the other is the media attention to think tanks, that is, the media's reference to think tank results in newspapers and news websites. Finally, the official website index examines the traffic of the think tank's website page.

Based on the influence propagation route mentioned above with reference to the existing think tank list index system, the research team determined the secondary and tertiary indexes under the three types of influence. The details are shown in the table below.

First level index	Second level index	Third level index (observation)	Data resource
Decision-making influence	Relationship with the government and decision makers (revolving door experience) 、 internal reports, project research, policy impact, etc		Educational think tank website, score graded by experts
Academic Influence	Total number of its citation	The educational think tank's total number of papers cited by other articles/ publications in the past three years	Mcrosoft Academic、CNKI
	Seminars	The total number of seminars hosted by the think tank in the past three years	Official report on the think tank website
	Serial publication	The fact whether the think tank has serial publication	Official report on the think tank website
Public Influence	Search Engines	Search volume of the full/ short name of the education think tanks in Google	Goolge Ads
		Search volume of the full/ short name of the education think tanks in Baidu	Baidu Promotion
	Social Media	Social Media influence	facebook, twitter, Weibo, Wechat
	Official	Website traffic of its official website (independent first-level domain)	Alexa global ranking, regional ranking

7. Global Education Think Tank Impact Evaluation

(1) Think-Tank List in the Study

In this study, the educational think tank list includes international think tank list, foreign think tank list , and domestic think tank list.

International think tank list comes from well-known educational policy research institutions and international organizations, including the UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning, the UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the World Bank Development Research Group, and Economic Cooperation, the Development Organization Education and Skills Bureau.

Foreign think tank list references the 2018 Global Go To Think Tank special ranking - Top Education Policy Think Tanks. Based on the “2017 Tsinghua University think tank big data report” and other international think tank lists, the team selected from major countries 58 educational think tanks that regard education as their major research filed or specialization.

Domestic think tank list is composed by 14 think tanks selected from the rankings of major think tanks in China and research reports (Nanjing University 2015-2016 and 2018, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, Tsinghua University, Zhejiang University, Zhou Hongyu’s “China Education Think Tank Evaluation SFAI Research Report (2019 Edition)”).

(2) Evaluation result

Rank	Think Tanks	Region
1	Urban Institute	Foreign
2	Cato Institute	Foreign
3	Development Research Group, World Bank	International
4	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching	Foreign
5	Brown Center on Education Policy	Foreign
6	RAND Education	Foreign
7	Center for Education Policy Research	Foreign
8	Center for Education Policy, SRI International	Foreign
9	Consortium for Policy Research in Education	Foreign
10	The Hoover Institution	Foreign
11	Directorate for Education and Skills	International
12	National Center for Education Statistics	Foreign
13	UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning	International
14	Australian Council for Educational Research	Foreign
15	UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning	International
16	UNESCO Institute for Statistics	International
17	Institute of Education	Foreign
18	The Institute of Education Sciences	Foreign
19	Center for Education Policy Analysis	Foreign

Rank	Think Tanks	Region
20	Korean Educational Development Institute	Foreign
21	National Institute for Educational Policy Research	Foreign
22	New Zealand Council for Educational Research	Foreign
23	La stratégie nationale de l'enseignement supérieur	Foreign
24	National Assessment of Educational Progress	Foreign
25	National Institute of Education Sciences	Domestic
26	National Center for Education Development Research	Domestic
27	National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration	Foreign
28	Education Trust	Foreign
29	National Education Policy Center	Foreign
30	Education Policy and Data Center	Foreign
31	Center for Educational Policy Analysis	Foreign
32	Finnish Educational Research Association	Foreign
33	National Center on Education and the Economy	Foreign
34	Education Policy Institute	Foreign
35	Centre for Educational Policy Studies	Foreign
36	Education Reform Initiative	Foreign
37	Central Council for Education	Foreign
38	21st Century Education Research Institute	Domestic
39	Finnish Institute for Educational Research	Foreign

Rank	Think Tanks	Region
40	Socires	Foreign
41	Center for International Higher Education	Foreign
42	National Center for Vocational Education and Training Development	Foreign
43	Centre for Education Policy	Foreign
44	The International Institute for Education Policy, Planning and Management	Foreign
45	China Academy Of Social Management,Beijing Normal University	Domestic
46	Center for Educational Research and Development	Foreign
47	Global Education Innovation Initiative	Foreign
48	Center for Research and Teaching in Economics	Foreign
49	China Institute for Educational Finance Research	Domestic
50	Center for Education Innovations	Foreign
51	Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation	Foreign
52	Education Policy Center	Foreign
53	Center for Policy Studies PRAXIS	Foreign
54	Wissenschaftsrat(German Council of Science and Humanities)	Foreign
55	National Institutes of Educational Policy Research	Domestic
56	Center for Educational Policy Studies, Faculty of Educational Management	Foreign
57	National Center for the Improvement of Education Assessment	Foreign
58	Ukrainian Educational Research Association	Foreign

Rank	Think Tanks	Region
59	Changjiang Education Research Institute	Domestic
60	The Education Foundation	Foreign
61	Ukraine National Academy of Sciences	Foreign
62	National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment	Foreign
63	Institute of Education Tsinghua University	Domestic
64	Institute of Education,Xiamen University	Domestic
65	Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University	Foreign
66	The Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media	Foreign
67	IMANI Center for Policy and Education	Foreign
68	UNESCO International Research and Training Centre for Rural Education , Beijing Normal University	Domestic
69	UNESCO Center of Teacher Education,Shanghai Normal University	Domestic
70	Arizona State University Center of Global Education Advanced Research	Foreign
71	Research Institute of Rural Education , Northeast Normal University	Domestic
72	Institute for Innovation in Education	Foreign
73	Center on Education Policy and Workforce Competitiveness	Foreign
74	Beijing Academy Of Educational Sciences	Domestic
75	Education Endowment Foundation	Foreign
76	Shanghai Academy Of Educational Sciences	Domestic

Rank	Think Tanks	Region
77	The International and Comparative Education Research	Foreign

① Decision making influence

Both the international and domestic think tanks have the “Revolving door” mechanism between think tank leaders and government officials. This kind of personnel circulation expands the personal networks of think tanks, enabling them to communicate directly with policy makers. Take the Brookings Institution as an example. Half of the current 200 researchers have a background working in the government, and six of them were ambassadors. Its current chairman, John R. Allen, is a four-star general retired from the US Marine Corps and a former commander of the NATO International Security Assistance Force and the US military. Vice President Stephanie Aaronson was the head of the Fed's macroeconomic analysis department and the deputy assistant minister of macroeconomic policy of the Ministry of Finance. In China, the official education think tanks such as National Institute Of Education Sciences and the National Center for Education Development Research are affiliated with the party and government organs and have a unique status. Many of the responsible principles themselves are senior officials who retired from the government. They have many opportunities to contact the government and the education authorities, and therefore their result can be delivered to upper leaders smoothly.

In addition to the “Revolving door” mechanism, internationally renowned educational think tanks have published many reports with international influence to promote policy formulation and implementation at the national and international levels. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of

Education, published in 1973, classifies colleges and universities that are accredited in the United States to identify and describe the diverse educational institutions in the United States. Its established classification criteria for higher education institutions are widely used in many aspects such as university rankings, education legislation, government decision-making, and the determination of membership fees. It has a profound impact on the classification of higher education institutions in the United States and around the world. In comparison, while most domestic think tanks have actively issued policy reports and published a considerable number of research reports, but they are in general lacking in influence.

② Academic influence

University College London , Institute of Education and the American Urban Institute are the top two international education think tanks that published the highest number of articles in the past three years; the American Urban Institute and the Stanford University Hoover Institution are the two most cited international think tanks in the past three years; the Hoover Institution and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching have the top 2 highest average cited number per paper. Institute of Education at Xiamen University and the National Institute of Education Sciences are the top two published domestic education think tanks; Institute of Education Tsinghua University , Institute of Education at Xiamen University are the top 2 highest cited think tanks in the past three years. Institute of Education Tsinghua University and Peking University China Institute for Educational Finance Research have the top 2 highest average cited number per paper. In terms of the amount of publications, there is little difference between the domestic education think tank and the international education think tank, but there are still big differences in the number of citations. In comparison, there are still gaps in average cited number per paper between the 14 domestic education think tanks listed and the national excellent education think tanks.

③ Public influence

There are significant differences in the performance of international and domestic educational think tanks on social media influence. The international education think tank emphasizes the power of social media. Basically, each think tank has Facebook and Twitter accounts, and the account information can be basically found on its official website. In comparison, domestic education think tanks are more oriented toward the decision-making level. Only a few educational think tanks have their own official Weibo and WeChat accounts. Among the 14 domestic think tanks listed, only Beijing Normal University China Education and The Social Development Institute and the 21st Century Institute of Education opened the official WeChat public account. The two Chinese political science think tanks, the China Academy of Educational Science and the National Education Development Research Center, do not have Weibo accounts, and the number of their Wechat account's follower is also very low. In contrast, the private think tanks pay more attention to expanding social influence, and the opening rate and number of their WeChat or Weibo followers are far greater than other types of domestic education think tanks. For example, in the 21st Century Academy of Education, the scores of the number of followers on WeChat and Weibo are relatively high in the rank among other domestic education think tanks. This shows that the private think tank, as a third force, influences the public through the output of the social media platform, and promotes the emergence and discussion on popular social issues.

(3) Limitations and shortcomings of the evaluation

Based on Calton's social structure model, this report evaluated the influence of 84 educational foreign and domestic think tanks from the

aspects of decision-making influence, academic influence and public opinion influence by the means of literature research, process analysis and statistical analysis. The research team quantifies and ranks the 12 three-level indexes, aiming to quantify the influence of the think tanks, so as to make a relatively objective evaluation of each think tank.

However, as mentioned above, influence is a psychological force that monitors other's mind, it is difficult to quantify by specific indexes. In particular, the influence of decision-making is quite difficult to be clearly measured and quantified due to the diversity of government decision-making suggestions/consulting subjects, the confidentiality of some policy-consulted consulting projects, and the fact that some think tanks exaggerate their influence on policies. The "China Think Tank Index" (CTTI) source think tank development report published by Nanjing University and Guangming Daily in 2018 used internal indicators, reports and instructions to measure policy influence. The statistical results of the data found that the source think tank accumulated nearly 7,000 articles in a single article, but 76% of the internal reference failed to get a response after the report; in the approved internal reference, only 2% of the internal reference was approved by the subnational or national level. This shows that although the internal reference is the most characteristic and important decision-making consultation result of the think tank in China, most of the think tanks have not received the national level internal reference and the feedback result is unknown, therefore it cannot reflect the influence of the think tank policy representatively.

In the reports issued by the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, Nanjing University, and Sichuan Provincial Academy of Sciences, the impact of think tank decision-making influence was evaluated by means of "expert review". Although it is impossible to avoid the subjectivity of

scoring experts, it is relatively intuitive to reflect the influence of various think tanks in the hearts of authorities in the industry. The research team used the experience of rotating doors as an index to understand the influence of think tanks from the perspective of its interpersonal network. This report takes the number of revolving door experiences and internal reference, instructions, and number of subjects as indicators, and is inevitably constrained by problems such as difficulty in quantification, lack of data, and subjective judgment. It is slightly limited in the evaluation of decision-making influence.

Secondly, in the evaluation of academic influence, the research group searched the Microsoft Academic and CNKI platforms for the total number of citations and the total number of papers signed as the educational think tank and published in the past three years. It was used as a set of three-level indicators. Although quantifiable, the exact amount is subject to the completeness of the two databases and may be overlooked. Secondly, this report only counted papers published in English or Chinese, and does not rule out the fact that some of the think-tank papers have been omitted due to language difference. In addition to papers, the number of seminars and serials is based on manual statistics from think tank websites, which is easy to miss. At the level of the secondary indicators, the team has limitation in that they are only concerned with the number as it is difficult to judge the seminars and serials in terms of quality.

Finally, the research team judged the influence of social media on the number of followers on the four platforms of Facebook, Twitter, Weibo and WeChat. However, it is not excluded that the official account of Weibo or WeChat of some think tanks does not exist in its full name or abbreviated

form, and thus there may be omissions in the retrieval of social media accounts. In addition, through the Alexa global and regional ranking statistics website traffic can only be counted to the first-level domain name, not the second-level domain name. Therefore, the official website traffic data of some think tanks may contain omissions.

(4) Conclusion

Since the 18th National Congress, documents on the construction of think tanks have been frequently published, and research on think tanks has flourished. Chinese think tanks have entered the best opportunity period in history. This report selects 77 domestic and foreign think tanks, and comprehensively evaluates influence from three levels: decision-making influence, academic influence and public influence. The evaluation results show that compared with foreign well-known educational think tanks, Chinese think tanks have obvious lack of international influence in reporting, and they pay insufficient attention to the use of mass media platforms. Through systematic and scientific evaluation feedback, domestic think tanks can learn the successful experience of internationally renowned think tanks, reflect on their own shortcomings, and thus promote the construction of think tanks with Chinese characteristics more steadily. In general, the Chinese education think tank is still growing, and there is still much room for improvement. With the rise of China and the advancement of education modernization, Chinese educational think tanks will continue to improve their consulting and service capabilities, and carry out more forward-looking, targeted and reserve policy research around national strategic needs, exert more influence in the formulation process and provide important support for the party and government to make scientific and democratic decisions.

Appendix

Changjiang Educational Research Institute (CERI)

Strongly supported by the Provincial Education Department of Hubei Province, the Changjiang Educational Research Institute (hereafter as CERI), which was sponsored by the Central China Normal University (hereafter as CCNU) and the Changjiang Publishing & Media Group, is one education and research institution founded on 16th December 2006. Zhou Hongyu, member of the standing Committee of National People’ s Congress, vice president of the China Education Society , vice president of the China Society for Educational Development Strategy ,Deputy Director of the Standing Committee of the People’ s Congress of Hubei Province, CCNU professor and doctoral supervisor , holds the post of Dean.

Based on the guiding ideology of “ Global Vision , China’s position , Professional Competence and Practice Orientation ” and the legislative principle of “People’ s Stance, Establishment Attitude, and Professional View ”,the CERI has gathered a group of domestic and foreign high-quality educational experts . A platform has been set up to link relevant education experts and education management departments with the support of publishing enterprise . It has formed a new type of institutional mechanism, which bases on academic research and focuses on policy research, supported by publishing enterprises, supported by government , and supported by social participation , with the complementary advantages of “ learning , research , industry , government , and society ” and coordinated promotion.

For more than 12 years , the CERI has been working hard to create a new type of educational think tank , “ Heavy Apparatus ” , and strive to turn the “ plan ” of the think tank into the policy decisions of the party and the

government , and the “ program ” of the think tank into practical action . The “ speeches ” of think-tanks have been translated into social consensus and better dedicated to reform . For two consecutive years in 2016 and 2017 of CTTI , the social tank MRPA ranked first in the country . In 2017, he was selected by the China Academy of Social Science as the “ China Core Think Tank of the year 2017 ” .In 2018 , the index of social think tanks in the social think tanks in 2018 PAI rating list of the second in the country . In 2018 , the CERI ranked the second in the country in terms of PAI values of social think tanks in CTTI.

SquareStrategics Research Institute (SSRI)

SquareStrategics Research Institute (SSRI) is an independent educational research institute and a think tank. The headquarters of SSRI is located in Beijing, China, and there are sub-stations in many other regions, including the United States, Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong and etc. .

Together with researchers around the world, SSRI performs rigorous research and analysis on topics related to higher education, such as university governance, discipline construction, students cultivation and so on. Our research is based on the paradigms of both positivism and interpretivism, and we produce in-depth reports using quantitative as well as qualitative methods.

Besides performing research, SSRI is also a reliable strategic partner for universities, research institutes, academic and industrial societies, government departments, NPOs, media and companies. By providing data service, information system, consulting, collaborative education as well as marketing solutions, we would like to provide our partners with :

- Research of both conceptual and applied education theories
- Guidance in policy making, from strategy to tactics
- Evaluation and assessment of current education policies
- Increase of management efficiency in research, teaching, and education service
- Cooperation among think tanks based on data and evidence