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To ENABLE motivated people around the world to achieve their POTENTIAL by fostering international MOBILITY, educational ACHIEVEMENT and career DEVELOPMENT.
I imagine that all university heads broadly share my own view of these [league] tables.

They are terrific and unquestioned when you score well and better than last time.

They are fatally flawed and fundamentally unfair when you move in the opposite direction.

Howard Davies
Former Director, London School of Economics
RANKINGS CHALLENGES

- Having a clear purpose
- Starting with a good list
- Identifying relevant indicators
- Defining a strong, yet practical methodology
- Clear and transparent explanation of methodology
- Specifying data definitions
- Collecting complete and accurate data
- Clear and transparent publication of results
- Recognizing diversity
## Comparing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARWU</th>
<th>QS</th>
<th>Webometrics</th>
<th>HEEACT</th>
<th>THE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>MIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>U Penn</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>U Penn</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 August 2011 | 5 September 2011 | July 2011 | 15 September 2010 | 16 September 2010
Though of course we recognize limitations of all league table methodologies, we greatly value QS for the clarity and quality of the data you use and for the stability which enables us to see and understand trends over time.

This, we think, gives your rankings a comparative advantage and considerable authority.

David Eastwood
Vice-Chancellor, University of Birmingham
2011 HIGHLIGHTS

- **33,744** academic respondents
- **16,785** employer respondents
- **712** institutions ranked
- **61** countries overall
- **32** countries in top **200**
- **18m** students at ranked institutions
- **7m** self-citations excluded

- Avg change in position:
  - Top 100 – **5.9** places
  - Top 200 – **11.0** places
  - Top **100** an average of **7** years younger

- **5.8%** growth in international students at top **200**
- Fees information collected from over **560** institutions
QS World University Rankings 2011/12 now include university fee information, making them a vital resource when it comes to choosing your university

Toby Bailey
Director of Teaching (Mathematics)
University of Edinburgh
2011 OVERALL RESULTS

1. University of Cambridge
2. Harvard University
3. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
4. Yale University
5. University of Oxford
6. Imperial College London
7. UCL – University College London
8. University of Chicago
9. University of Pennsylvania
10. Columbia University
11. Stanford University
12. California Institute of Technology (Caltech)
13. Princeton University
14. University of Michigan
15. Cornell University
16. Johns Hopkins University
17. McGill University
18. ETH Zurich
19. Duke University
20. University of Edinburgh
BENEFITS TO THE RANKED

- High profile validation and recognition
- Independent assessment
- Use in international marketing
- Raises awareness
- Rudimentary benchmarking
- Recognize excellence
- Partnership identification
“MASSIFICATION” OF HE

Tertiary enrolment as a percentage of total enrolment

Source: World Bank
Bombarded with increasing volumes of information via an increasing range of channels. The decisions facing prospective international students are as challenging and frustrating as ever.
Which universities have good reputations with employers?

Which university offers the best e-learning environment?

Can I fit a degree around existing commitments?

Which university is best for the degree/course I want to do?

Where...?

How many...?

Which are the most trusted online institutions?

Can an online degree deliver the same value as a traditional residential one?

Which.....?
ONLINE GROWTH

Total and Online Enrollment in Degree-granting Postsecondary Institutions – Fall 2002 through Fall 2009

Impact of Economic Conditions on Demand for Face-to-face Courses - Fall 2010

Impact of Economic Conditions on Demand for Online Courses - Fall 2010

Learning Outcomes in Online Education Compared to Face-to-face: 2003 - 2010

Online Enrollment as a Percent of Total Enrollment - Fall 2002 through Fall 2009

Source: Sloan Consortium – Class Differences: Online Education in the United States 2010
UNCERTAIN REPUTATION
### Current Ranking Profile

Ranking Web of World Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Open University (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td>Universitat Oberta de Catalunya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,44</td>
<td>Athabasca University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,767</td>
<td>DeVry University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>University of Phoenix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[www.webometrics.info](http://www.webometrics.info)
LACK OF FOCUS ON RESEARCH
POTENTIAL ONLINE INDICATORS

- Reputation surveys difficult
- Research generally negligible
- Completion rates
- Student diversity
- Length of establishment
- Number/proportion of programs offered online
- Flexibility
- Cost – relative to full time programs in the city
- Employment rates
WHAT IS QS STARS?

- A broad based rating system, designed to identify, evaluate and recognize universities for their diverse and specialists strengths.
- Once evaluated, universities are awarded with a star rating, based on their performance.
- Can include all universities—including those not in the rankings or low ranked
- Benefits institutions looking to increase international presence
• Ratings are not dependent on the performance of other institutions
  • Performance measured against pre-set thresholds, facilitating independent performance tracking over time
  • The evaluation of each participating institution can be more thorough (32 indicators)
• Ratings can be more adaptive
  • Highlights the institutions specialties “Shining a light on Excellence”
• Ratings can include components not included in rankings
SCORING THRESHOLDS

- 1 star – 100 / 1000

- 2 stars – 250 / 1000

- 3 stars – 400 / 1000

- 4 stars – 550 / 1000

- 5 stars – 700 / 1000
Points Available – 1000

Core Criteria
- Research: 150
- Employability: 150
- Teaching: 150
- Facilities: 100

Total Core Criteria: 550

Advanced Criteria
- Internationalization: 150
- Innovation: 50
- Engagement: 50

Total Advanced Criteria: 250

Specialist Criteria
- Specialization: 200

Total Specialist Criteria: 200

Total Points Available: 1000
The Development Roadmap is a detailed report outlining the institution’s performance in the audit.
- **Category Ratings**
  - Universities can receive individual badges of their performance in various categories. This is designed to highlight different strengths:
Typically an indicator will have the following attributes:

- **Points available**
  The total number of points available for the indicator

- **Minimum Threshold**
  The level institutions must reach to begin scoring

- **Maximum Threshold**
  The level institutions must equal or exceed to be awarded maximum points for the indicator

**EXAMPLE: International students**
- An institution with 12% international students is 60% through the scoring range and therefore earns 12 points for the indicator.
- If the minimum were lifted to 5% the institution would be only 46% through the scoring range and would score only 9 points.
ONLINE

Completion
Proportion of enrolled students completing their studies

Online programs
Proportion of all programs offered wholly online

Flexibility
Measure based on absence of requirement to be in one place at one time
Latest technology

Points awarded for application of latest technology

Length of establishment

Length of time online programs have been established for

Domestic accreditation

Programs recognized and accredited nationally
### Patents/Copyright

Registered patents/copyright relating to e-learning technology or methodology

### Corporate Take Up

Number of external organisations using the institution for executive and professional training needs

### Licencing

Number of external organizations adopting e-learning software or other materials developed
Points Available – 1000

Core Criteria
550

- Research
  4 indicators
  150

- Employability
  3 indicators
  150

- Teaching
  4 indicators
  150

- Facilities
  6 indicators
  100

- Online
  6 indicators

Advanced Criteria
250

- Internationalization
  7 indicators
  150

- Innovation
  3 indicators
  50

- Engagement
  2 indicators
  50

Specialist Criteria
200

- Specialization
  3 indicators
  200
Results: [www.topuniversities.com](http://www.topuniversities.com)
Blog: [iu.qs.com](http://iu.qs.com)
Email: [ben@qs.com](mailto:ben@qs.com) / [intelligenceunit@qs.com](mailto:intelligenceunit@qs.com)
Twitter: [@bensowter, @worlduniranking](https://twitter.com/bensowter)
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/universityrankings](https://www.facebook.com/universityrankings)

**THANK YOU**