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
Chart C3.1. Evolution by region of destination in the number of students enrolled outside their country of citizenship (2000 to 2009)

- **Worldwide**
- **OECD**
- **G20 countries**
- **Europe**
- **North America**

Source: OECD and UNESCO Institute for Statistics for most data on non-OECD countries. Table C3.5.
INFORMATION OVERLOAD?

- Prospective Students
- Social networks
- Fairs
- Email marketing
- Print advertising
- Rankings
- Brochures
- Websites
- Agents
- Blogs
- Forums
- Parents
- Alumni
- Branding
- Scholarships
- Posters & billboards
- CRM
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 METHODOLOGIES

ARWU (2003)

- Alumni Awards
- Faculty Awards
- HiCi
- Nature & Science
- SCI/SSCI Articles
- Size

QS (2004)

- Academic Reputation
- Employer Reputation
- Faculty Student
- International Faculty
- International Students
- Citations per Faculty

WEBOMETRICS (2007)

- Size
- Rich Files
- Scholar
- Visibility

HEEACT (2007)

- Articles (11 yrs)
- Articles (1 yr)
- Citations (11 yrs)
- Citations (2 yrs)
- Citations / Yr
- H-index
- HiCi Papers
- Top Journals
- Subjects

THE (2010)

- Teaching Reputation
- Citations
- International Staff
- PhDs per academic
- Papers per academic
- Undergrads per academic
- Income per academic
- Industry income
- Research reputation
- Research income
- Co-authorship
- PhDs/Bachelors

## 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>Caltech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Caltech</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>MIT</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>

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
IN DETAIL

TOP 400 – 45 COUNTRIES
QSIU BENCHMARKING SERVICE

- **CLEAR** data and performance analysis
- **DEEP** and **PRECISE** insight into performance by comparing peer institutions
- **ANALYTICS** on key indicators to create a to assist in setting realistic and achievable targets
KSU performs above global averages in 3 indicators: Academic Reputation, Faculty Student, and International Students.

Since its participation in the Rankings in 2009, KSU has improved its score year-on-year.

KSU performs well in the Arts & Humanities and Life Sciences & Medicine faculties.
In 2011, KSU saw its biggest decline in the Employer Reputation index of 170 positions.

On an international level, the selected peers have seen the most movement in the Employer Reputation index.

KSU’s domestic peers KAU and KFUPM have all seen their overall performances improve.
On an international level, the selected peers have seen the most movement in the Employer Reputation index.

The International Faculty index is KSU’s best performing indicator, ranking in the top 100 globally.

KSU’s performance in the Faculty Student index has improved year-on-year since 2009. It is the only institution in Saudi Arabia to improve in 2011.
The institutions in Saudi Arabia continue to struggle in terms of productivity. KSU clearly dominates the domestic peer group with over 4,500 papers published.

KFUPM outperforms KSU in the Citations per Faculty indicator.

KSU should focus on improvement in this indicator to not only improve overall but also to maintain its position within the top 200 globally.
This module breaks down academic survey responses both from a global and a domestic perspective.

KSU leads the domestic peers with international responses in the Social Sciences & Mgmt faculty, however it trails KAU and KFUPM in terms of domestic responses received.

KSU achieved 60% of the available domestic responses in the Natural Sciences faculty.
Strengths of rankings

- Simple and accessible
- Over 50 million people have viewed QS’ results in 12 months
- Provides a basis for benchmarking performance across borders

Limitations of rankings

- Performance is relative to others
- Limited data available for rankings globally
- Specialist strength often overlooked
- Difficult to capture the diversity of higher education institutions
DIGGING DEEPER

MORE REGIONS

MORE SUBJECTS

26 subject tables in 2011
More anticipated for 2012

MORE DIMENSIONS
REGIONAL RANKINGS

ASIA

LATIN AMERICA

“EURASIA”

ARAB WORLD
QS REGIONAL UNIVERSITY RANKINGS

- Demand for greater contextual detail
- Regional focus enables inclusion of additional indicators
- Selection of focus countries further enables adaptive selection of indicators
- Asia (published 12/05/09) is just the first of a number of regions we will be developing and releasing rankings
- Like WUR, rankings will evolve in early years
Previously no available global evaluation of institution strength at a specific program/subject level only broad areas

Prospective students often know **WHAT** they want to study before considering **WHERE** they want to study

Institutions need to break performance measures down to practical KPIs for individual departments and units
MEASURABLE BY SUBJECT

Academic Reputation

Employer Reputation

Citations per Paper
A further critique of the ranking systems is that they are designed to say who is better than who, rather than how good you are and whether you have improved or regressed. For example, UCT could be 107 this year and make significant improvements such as recruiting more post-doctoral scholars and leading international scientists, increasing further its research articles and so on.

But if the university at position 110 has improved slightly more than UCT, the UCT will drop though this will not reflect any deterioration. A better system would be to have categories – such as five-star, four star ratings with no limit on how many universities may qualify for five star rating if they meet the top-notch criteria.

“Do university rankings matter”
Dr Max Price, Vice Chancellor, University of Cape Town
Responding to a need in the industry

- Institutions - Many institutions have been searching for a system that shows off all their strengths to potential, not just those shown in the rankings, but one that assesses their university as a whole on a much deeper broader scale.

- Prospective Students – Providing a deeper insight – enabling prospective students to see beyond the headlines and identify excellence that might otherwise remain in shadow.

Recognizing…

- Universities vary from each other, with different levels of strength and different areas of expertise.
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**
- Teaching: 6 indicators (150)
- Employability: 3 indicators (150)
- Research: 5 indicators (150)
- Internationalization: 7 indicators (150)

**Learning Environment**
- Facilities: 6 indicators (100)
- Online/Distance: 6 indicators (100)

**Advanced Criteria**
- Innovation: 3 indicators (50)
- Culture: 3 indicators (50)
- Access: 4 indicators (50)
- Engagement: 4 indicators (50)

**Specialist Criteria**
- Discipline Ranking: 2 indicators (150)
- Accreditation: 2 indicators (50)
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 has the sports facilities I need?

Which institutions offer a strong scholarship program?

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

Which university produces a high volume of good research?

I want to study abroad, how accommodating is the university I would like to go to with its international students?

Where...?

How many...?

Which.....?
BENEFITS TO STUDENTS

- Simple, intuitive, visual notation
- Easy to understand methodology
- Deeper insight into a university
- Covers areas relevant and important to today’s students:
  - Graduate Employability
  - Student Experience (Infrastructure)
  - Teaching Quality (QS Stars looks at what the students are saying through student surveys)
The Development Roadmap is a detailed report outlining the institution’s performance in the audit.
ADOPTED IN 16 COUNTRIES
QS STARS - ONLINE

Nanyang Technological University
Singapore | View Profile

Nanyang Technological University (NTU) was established in 1991. NTU’s strong performance across all areas of the QS Stars evaluation has helped achieve its overall Five Star status. NTU faculty members include over 20 current prolific academic experts and over 25% international faculty members. An excellent student faculty ratio and according to a student survey conducted, NTU received more than 80% student satisfaction with both the teaching quality and overall university experience. NTU is an attractive destination for perspective students and academics from around the globe, with over 20% international students and over 25% international faculty members. NTU has successfully partnered with over 200 companies in the last five years.
Welcome to Kuala University

Registration Candidates Line Invite SNMPTN 2011/2012

ANNOUNCEMENT

NUMBER 1493/H11/TU/2011

Rector Kuala University hereby announces the schedule registration of prospective new students Invitation in Academic Year 2011/2012.

Download Announcement NUMBER 1493/H11/TU/2011

Download Announcement Number 1508/H1/TU/2011

Shutter Mission Scholarship Recipient in 2010

Rector of the University of Shiite kuala hereby announces through the MISSION viewfinder.

To be able to sign the acceptance list of scholarships through the Administration Bureau in each hour of work from 18 until 29 April 2011.

The names of recipients can be seen on the notice board scholarship information...
Category Ratings

Universities can receive individual badges of their performance in various categories. This is designed to highlight different strengths:
FIRST AWARDS PRESENTED
UNSW awarded five stars
June 30, 2011, 1:38 p.m.

UNSW has become the first Australian university to be awarded five stars in the new QS Stars rating system, a performance against international benchmarks.

The star ratings system assesses performance at an unprecedented level of detail. Universities are awarded stars not just for their overall performance, but also receive ratings in 30 assessed areas, giving prospective students a far more comprehensive picture of institutional strengths and weaknesses.

UNSW Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International), Jennie Lang, said the University plans to use the QS Stars, developed under the QS World University Rankings, as a quality mark to enhance its brand internationally.

UNSW has been awarded five stars in the following categories:

- Research quality
- Graduate employability
- Infrastructure
- Internationalisation
QS Stars - 5 star rating

The University of Newcastle commissioned QS Stars to conduct an independent audit of its performance.

The University achieved an overall maximum rating of 5 stars.

QS Stars rates universities across the world against 30 criteria grouped into eight categories: research, employability, teaching, infrastructure, internationalisation, innovation, engagement and the institution's standing in specialist subjects.

The University's ratings for 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>★★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>★★★★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QS Stars was introduced in 2011 by the company that releases the QS World University Rankings each year. The QS Stars ratings are based on the individual institution's performance measured against pre-set thresholds.
The University opened its doors to an independent and very detailed audit of its performance across key areas using international benchmarks.

Addressing more than 30 criteria grouped into eight categories, the findings by the internationally recognised agency are that Newcastle is performing to a very high standard across the board

Professor Nicholas Saunders
Vice-Chancellor, University of Newcastle
NTU is undergoing rapid development and the current ranking from QS is a confirmation that NTU today has a high international standing. NTU is participating in a QS Star audit to establish our strengths as a university across a broader set of criteria than can be measured in any ranking system, to provide valuable information for our many stakeholders: students, employers, fellow academics as well as our local community.

Professor Bertil Andersson, President-Designate, Nanyang Technological University
# QS Stars Pre-Assessment

## QS Stars Pre-assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Percentage of Data Collected</th>
<th>Star Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>TWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>THREE FIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>THREE FIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specializations</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>FOUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL</strong></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on only 77% of the data required, Queensland University of Technology has achieved 4 Stars and is 89 points away from the five-star threshold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Stars</th>
<th>Minimum points required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QS Stars™ – Copyright © 2011 QS Intelligence Unit (a division of QS Quacquarelli Symonds Ltd)
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](https://twitter.com/bensowter), [@worlduniranking](https://twitter.com/worlduniranking)
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/universityrankings](http://www.facebook.com/universityrankings)
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