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The QS international rankings have gained unprecedented attention over the last few years. The rigour and authority of the QS World University Rankings® have been underlined by the official approval of their methodology and data collection processes from the IREG Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence. Furthermore, the QS World University Rankings® are being widely used by trusted organisations throughout the world, feeding publications compiled by the Economist Intelligence Unit for their Sea Turtles Index, and INSEAD, Cornell and WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organization) for their Global Innovation Index.

In 2013, the QS World University Rankings® were published for the tenth consecutive year, with over 3,000 institutions considered and more than 800 institutions evaluated on a global level.

The biggest development in the 2013 QS World University Rankings results has been the inclusion of over 100 new institutions, adding more variety and regional balance to the mix. Additionally, the reputational surveys used for the rankings have achieved record results, with over 62,000 academics and 28,000 employers contributing their opinions on the best universities in the world. The results were widely covered by the global media including Forbes, People’s Daily, The New York Times, The Guardian News, BBC News, Times Higher Education, India, and The Australian.

The institutional ranking grows more stable every year, with only one university dropping out of the top 100. The volatility of some international rankings has been a frequent source of criticism, but the average movement in the top 100 is less than 3.5 places, down from 4.6 last year.

Continuing the trend of previous years, science and technology focused universities have made their presence felt in the top 50 of the 2013 QS World University Rankings®. With almost all such institutions either maintaining their position or advancing in the QS World University Rankings®, it is clear that universities focusing on the so-called STEM subjects – science, technology, engineering and mathematics – are on the rise.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) remained as the top-ranked university, having taken the lead for the first time in 2013. It also heads the faculty-level ranking for engineering and technology, is second in the natural sciences. Other science and technology oriented universities have strengthened their positions, including Imperial College London, which advanced from 6th to 5th place this year, California Institute of Technology (CALTECH) ranking at tenth place, ETH Zurich shifting up to 12th place, and the Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), progressing to 12th place, and the Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) shifting up to 12th place, and the Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) ranking at tenth place, ETH Zurich shifting up to 12th place, and the Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), progressing from 12th to 10th place, ETH Zurich shifting up to 12th place, and the Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) ranking at tenth place, ETH Zurich shifting up to 12th place, and the Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL)

In 2013, 21 Country A universities were included in the QS World University Rankings®. Country A institutions tend to perform well above the global average in the Faculty Student indicator and perform similarly to the global mean in the Employer Reputation index. However, they also perform well below the global mean in the important Reputation indicator and in Faculty Student Ratio, although the gap is less marked in these cases. Nonetheless, it should be considered that Country A peers are displaying good performance in the international indicator, led by Delphos National University (Delphos), Athena University, and Athena (Athena University), for example.

This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
To acquire a quick feel for an institution, reviewing this module is the easiest way to obtain a visual read of its key strengths and performance over time. A more detailed schematic of how these reports are structured can be found at the start of the module.

Of key interest is the large amount of ranking data that is not available in the public domain, and which is protected under the terms of the Non-Disclosure Agreement referenced on the inside front cover of this report. This includes rankings by indicator and faculty area outside the top 300, which are not generally published, and overall rankings outside the top 400, where the results are generally published in ranges.

In addition, included in Module 1 is information on other rankings for each institution. The latest results, if applicable, from the following exercises are included:

- ARWU (Shanghai Jiao Tong)
- University Ranking by Academic Performance (URAP)
- Ranking Web of World Universities (Webometrics)
- Times Higher Education Rankings
- 4icu University Web Ranking
- Alexa Web Rankings.

QSII has endeavoured to present the most current institutional data; however, this may not always be possible. The interests of providing the most up-to-date figures available, data in the sector, and self-reported by institutions such as Personnel, Exchanges, Financial, Additional Information may not be validated at the point at which this report was compiled.

Each institution report includes a dated snapshot of the university website and its current logo, providing a quick, if basic, impression of the university’s brand position.

**MODULE 2: Comparative Analysis**

Module 2 provides a detailed summary of the current position of each selected institution in comparison with Client across all indicators used in the 2013 QS World University Rankings®. It is important to note that the charts in this module are not adjusted for the weightings used in the rankings.

Key observations from this module include:

- A common pattern for the majority of the selected peers is a strong performance in the Faculty Student and Employer Reputation indicators, counterbalanced by weaker results in the international indicators and in the Citations per Faculty index. This trend can be seen in the shapes of Hermes, Poseidon, Atlantis, Apollo and even Demeter.
- Client’s shape has shown some significant changes from the previous results, particularly in the Academic Reputation (AR) indicator, which witnessed a drop from 261 in 2012 to 420 in 2013. Conversely, the International Students (IS) index has seen an improvement of 39 places. Currently, this is the institution’s second strongest indicator at 291.
- It is worth noting that the peer group is very competitive in the Faculty Student indicator. Therefore, despite Client’s relatively strong rank in this indicator (227), it is outperformed by all peers. Inversely, the selected Country A institutions are not strong performers outperformed by Client in all indicators but the Employer Reputation and Faculty Student indexes.
- When it comes to the international indicators, Apollo’s performance is very similar to that of Client. Following the latter institution’s fall in the Academic Reputation index, Apollo took the lead in this indicator. However, Client is ranked ahead of Apollo in the Citations per Faculty indicator (521 versus 585).
- Despite top 200 ranks in the reputational indicators, Hermes underperforms Client in both international indicators.
- Client is performing slightly better than Poseidon in the international indicators, but it displays much lower results in all the remaining areas.

**MODULE 3: Rankings Performance**

If Module 2 provides an institution-by-institution snapshot, Module 3 provides a deeper analysis on an indicator-by-indicator basis. For each indicator, a chart shows the performance of each institution over the past five years (2009-2013). This clearly indicates fluctuations in performance over time, but also highlights advancements to QS Rankings methodology, such as the switch from Essential Science Indicators (ESI) to Scopus™ (Elsevier). It is important to refer to the accompanying text in Appendix II prior to drawing conclusions.

Overall, the selected peer group can be divided into several performance tiers. Delphos is clearly the leader amongst the selected peers, with a stellar rank of 35. The second tier consists of Poseidon, Atlantis and Hermes, which are placed in the 100-200 range. Athena and Apollo both hover around the 250 rank. Client is placed at 362, while Demeter ranks at 405 and Zeus at 507.

It is worth noting that the selected peer group has demonstrated a relatively high stability since 2012, aside from Zeus, which has moved up 50 places. This stability is particularly true for the highest-ranked institutions.
The following section contains an individual report for each of the institutions. This page shows an annotated schematic of an institution report with some guidance notes to assist in their interpretation.

QSIU has endeavoured to present the most current institutional data, however, this may not always be possible. In the interests of providing the most up-to-date figures possible, data in the sections self-reported by institutions such as the Personnel, Exchanges, Financial, and Additional Information may not have been validated at the point at which this report was compiled.

### Personnel Data
Full Time Equivalent (FTE) or extrapolated alternative data is used for the QS World University Rankings®. Here, only data accurately verified is shown resulting in some blanks most commonly shown in the FTE column.

### Exchanges
Exchanges are a potential future addition as a rankings indicator but the data completion levels are not yet sufficiently high. There will be some blanks here.

### Financial
Financial data are not the most universally completed so more blanks will appear here than in other areas. There may also be exchange rate related anomalies. The amounts appear in US dollars.

### Scopus Data
Scopus results for Papers, Citations, and Impact appear in this section with overall results as well as in five faculty areas: Arts & Humanities, Engineering & Technology, Life Sciences & Medicine, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences & Management.

### Web Capture
A screen capture of the home page of each institution’s website reveals a quick insight into its branding and priorities.

### Indicator and Faculty Area Scores
Institutional performance in each indicator and Faculty Area is presented here along with global averages. The figures presented here have been through a rigorous validation process.

### Additional Information
If available, additional information, including patents, staff with PhDs, teaching and student satisfaction, student graduation rate, students pursuing further study, and average entry requirements are included.
### QS Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Research Intensity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XL</td>
<td>Fully Comprehensive</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Historic 50+</td>
<td>A Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>B Private - Non profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>C Private - For profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Limited or none</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>2 Young 10-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 or 2 faculty areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
<td>1 New Less than 10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rankings at a Glance

Grey lines on these charts reflect the performance of the institution on behalf of whom the report has been compiled.

#### Rankings by Faculty Area

Please note that in 2013 the methodology for the Rankings by Faculty Area has been improved, leading to sudden rank changes for certain institutions.

#### QS Stars

The opt-in Ratings System from QS. It is designed to reflect the nuanced mission of universities, and the needs of students who may be interested in things other than those to which traditional rankings are necessarily limited.

#### Other Rankings

Latest results, if applicable, for the various major ranking systems are listed. Previous results are in parentheses. Alexa web traffic results are dynamic.
### Personnel Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>International Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>International Students</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>International Undergraduates</th>
<th>Postgraduates</th>
<th>International Postgraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>3,069</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>21,913</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>15,452</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>6,461</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>17,998</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>12,823</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exchange Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Undergraduates Inbound</th>
<th>Undergraduates Outbound</th>
<th>Postgraduates Inbound</th>
<th>Postgraduates Outbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Undergraduate Fees</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Undergraduate Fees</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Postgraduate Fees</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Postgraduate Fees</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Library Spending</td>
<td>9,010,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Funding</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Investment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Investment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Donations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scopus Data (2008-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5,875</td>
<td>24,297</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences &amp; Medicine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

- Staff with PhD: 1,045
- Patents: 23
- Overall Student Satisfaction Rate: 92%
- Teaching Student Satisfaction Rate: 84%
- PhDs Awarded: 130
- Graduate Employment Rate: 82%
- Students Pursuing Further Study: 34%
- Average Entry Requirements: -

The data presented in this profile are the most up-to-date figures held by the QS Intelligence Unit. In some cases, the information provided could be more recent than the one utilised for rankings calculations.

SAMPLE REPORT
This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
RANKINGS AT A GLANCE | Client

**QS UNIVERSITY RANKINGS**

**352**

2013/14 Overall Rank

**Faculty Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>468</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QS STARS Rating System**

www.iu.qs.com/qs-stars/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Criteria</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
<td>🌟🌟🌟🌟</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QS RANKINGS AT A GLANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Faculty Level Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences &amp; Medicine</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Management</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that the QS World University Rankings by Faculty Area have a new and improved methodology since 2013.

For certain institutions, ranks can vary substantially year to year.

**SAMPLE REPORT**

This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
Athena Institute of Technology

Institution Name: Athena Institute of Technology
Abbreviation: Athena
Location: Country B
Foundation year: 1945

Size: L
Focus: FC
Age: 4
Research: VH
Status: B

The data presented in this profile are the most up-to-date figures held by the QS Intelligence Unit. In some cases, the information provided could be more recent than the one utilised for rankings calculations.
RANKINGS AT A GLANCE | Athena

**QS ROYAL UNIVERSITY RANKINGS**

**290**
2013/14 Overall Rank

**Academic Reputation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employer Reputation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>307</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Citations per Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QS STARS Rating System**

- **Research**: 301-400 (82)
- **Teachability**: 250 (243)
- **Facilities**: 480 (504)
- **Internationalization**: 302 (333)
- **Innovation**: 586
- **Engagement**: NOT YET RATED
- **Specialist Criteria**: NOT YET RATED

**Other Rankings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAMPLE REPORT**

This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.

**Faculty Level Rankings**

- **Arts & Humanities**: 348 506 318 311 426
- **Engineering & Technology**: 349 430 437 387 381
- **Life Sciences & Medicine**: 243 302 242 186 261
- **Natural Sciences**: 227 537 552 539 384
- **Social Sciences & Management**: 298 316 348 359 402

Please note that the QS World University Rankings by Faculty Area have a new and improved methodology since 2013.

For certain institutions, ranks can vary substantially year to year.
Comparative analysis

This section analyses Client’s performance in relation to the selected peer group across all the indicators in the 2013 QS World University Rankings®.

The scatter charts on this page show the results for all the ranked institutions in the Rankings, highlighting Client’s and the selected peers’ positions. Each chart combines two indicators, providing a quick snapshot of the performance in terms of reputation, teaching commitment, research quality and internationalisation.

The following conclusions can be extracted:

- Chart 2.1 combines the results for both reputational indicators (Academic Reputation, Employer Reputation) used for the Rankings calculations. The Academic Reputation score is represented in the horizontal axis and the Employer Reputation in the vertical axis. The chart demonstrates that [SAMPLE CONTENT].
- Although Client is placed in the lower left area, which contains those institutions with a relatively low score in both reputational indexes, it is near the [SAMPLE CONTENT] mark line for Employer Reputation. It performs better than Zeus in both indicators, and better than Demeter in the Academic Reputation index.
- Chart 2.2 combines Faculty Student/Teaching Commitment (horizontal axis) and Citations per Faculty/Research Influence (vertical axis). In this case, [SAMPLE CONTENT].
- Chart 2.3 connects the International Faculty (horizontal axis) and International Students (vertical axis) indicators. In this case, the global results depict a clear polarisation, with a group of institutions performing at a high level in both indexes (top-right), and another tight knit group demonstrating poorer results (bottom-left). This trend is reflected in the selected peer group, as most institutions can be found in the lower-left area, displaying low performances in both indicators. However, a few institutions present interesting results in the International Students indicator. In this indicator, Client is placed very close to the score median.

SAMPLE REPORT
This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
Chart 2.2 - Teaching Commitment & Research Influence Performance - Client and selected peers - Year 2013

Chart 2.3 - Internationalisation performance - Client and selected peers - Year 2013

**SAMPLE REPORT**
This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
The radar charts in this module represent a snapshot of performance. In each case, the area inside the line represents the all-round strength of the institution across the six principal ranking indicators and would correlate perfectly with the overall ranking performance were it not for the influence of weightings; essentially this display approach implies that each indicator carries the same weight. Each of the selected peer institutions’ results are presented in contrast to Client’ performance.

Some insights can be drawn from analysing the results of the peer institutions:

- Typically, the more hexagonal the ‘shape’ of the institution, the better the performance. In this particular selection of peers, Delphos (Chart 2.7) is visibly showing the strongest profile, with its lowest indicator rank at [SAMPLE CONTENT].

- A common pattern for the majority of the selected peers is a strong performance in the International Student indicator, counterbalanced by weaker results in the International Faculty index indicators and the Interindex. This trend can be seen in [SAMPLE CONTENT].

- Client’s shape has shown some significant changes from the previous results, particularly in the Academic Reputation (AR) indicator, where the latter institution leads by 18 places. Athena clearly outperforms Client in all indicators but Citations per Faculty where the latter institution leads by 18 places. Athena outperforms Client in all indicators but Citations per Faculty (291 versus 227) and International Students (177 versus 291).

- Atlantis’ (Chart 2.6) strongest features lie in the International indicators and the Faculty Student indicator.

- It is worth noting that the peer group is very competitive in the Faculty Student indicator. Therefore, despite Client’ relatively strong rank in this indicator (227), it is outperformed by all peers. Conversely, the selected Country A institutions are not strong performers in the International Faculty indicator. With a rank of 407, Client manages to outperform six of the eight chosen peers.

- Client outperforms Zeus (Chart 2.11) in all indicators but the International Students index, where Zeus is ranked at 193 (in 2012, Client outperformed Zeus by 7 places in this indicator). However, in 2013 Client managed to outperform Zeus in the International Students indicator (291 versus 365).

- Athena (Chart 2.5) displays a relatively similar shape to Client; however, Athena outperforms Client in all indicators but Citations per Faculty where the latter institution leads by 18 places. Athena clearly outperforms Client in Faculty Student (53 versus 227) and International Students (177 versus 291).

- Delphos’s International Faculty and International Students indicators perform at 269 and 206 respectively, which are quite strong results in the Country A context. Client performs only 85 positions below Delphos in the International Students index.

- In 2013, Hermes (Chart 2.9) was the second best selected peer in Employer Reputation and in Faculty Student. Hermes underperforms Client in both international indicators (440 versus 407 in International Students and 345 versus 291 in International Faculty).

- Demeter’s shape (Chart 2.10) is quite similar to that of Client. The only areas where Demeter is performing better are the Faculty Student and Citations per Faculty indicators; however, both institutions remain close to each other. In contrast, the difference is visible for the International Students indicator, in which Client outperforms Demeter by 139 positions.

- Poseidon (Chart 2.11) presents an interesting pattern, with three indicators performing between the top 300 and the rank 120 (Academic Reputation, Employer Reputation and Faculty Student) and three indicators performing outside the top 300 (Citations per Faculty, International Students and International Faculty). Once again, Client is performing slightly better than this institution in the international indicators, but it displays much lower results in all the remaining areas.
SAMPLE REPORT
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This module delves deeper into the peer institutions’ overall performance and analyses each indicator used for the QS World University Rankings® from 2009 to 2013. The charts depict the trends for each selected peer, highlighting areas of growth and losses and dissecting their trajectory over time.

**Overall Rankings Performance**

Chart 3.1a displays the overall rank position for the selected peers for the past five years. Key findings include:

- Overall, the selected peer group can be divided into several performance tiers. Delphos is clearly the leader amongst the selected peers, with a stellar rank of SAMPLE. The second tier consists of Poseidon, Atlantis and Hermes, which are placed in the 100-200 range. Client and Apollo both hover around the 250 rank. Client is placed at [SAMPLE], while Demeter ranks at [SAMPLE].

- It is worth noting that the selected peer group has demonstrated a relatively high stability since 2012, aside from Zeus, which has moved up 50 places. This stability is particularly true for the highest-ranked institutions.

- Client’s evolution has been remarkable overall. The institution managed to gain 49 places in 2010, which propelled it to the rank of [SAMPLE]. It moved up a further 4 positions in 2011 and 3 more places in 2012, reaching the rank of [SAMPLE]. However, it could not sustain the positive trend in 2013 and fell back 21 places to rank [SAMPLE]. This position is still higher by 35 places than the one it held in 2009.

- Atlantis also slipped down a few places in 2013. Between 2010 and 2012, the institution managed to climb 74 places to rank [SAMPLE], but, in 2013, it moved down 8 positions to rank [SAMPLE]. Poseidon has displayed a positive trajectory from 2009 to 2012, climbing up 39 places to 112. In 2013 Poseidon remained stable by slipping only 2 places to rank [SAMPLE].

- Zeus, the lowest-performing peer, is displaying the highest increase in rank in 2013 (+50 places). Despite a decrease of 7 places in 2012, the institution has managed to climb 83 positions over the five-year period. However, it is still ranked outside the top 500.
Academic Reputation

The Academic Reputation index is worth 40% of the overall Rankings score. In 2013, QSIU received [SAMPLE] responses from academics, an increase of more than [SAMPLE] over the previous year. Of the respondents, [SAMPLE]% have more than ten year experience in academia. Furthermore, some [SAMPLE]% indicated their job title to be Professor/Associate Professor, Head of Department, or more senior positions such as President and Vice-Chancellor.

Chart 3.2a reveals the following:

- 2013 was rather a negative year for the considered institutions, as all peers but two (Apollo and Zeus) lost places in the Academic Reputation indicator.
- However, Hermes’s performance is to be noted, as the institution managed to climb an impressive [SAMPLE] places over the five-year period.
- Delphos remains the highest-performing peer in this indicator, with a stellar rank of 32. However, the institution has been losing ground since 2009 where it ranked 25. In 2010 and 2011 it ranked 33, before climbing 4 places in 2012. In 2013 it slipped back to rank 32.
- Poseidon was ranked 101 in 2009. For two years in a row (2010 and 2011) it remained at the same position. Poseidon peaked at [SAMPLE] in 2012 before falling back 29 places in 2013. The institution is now placed at [SAMPLE].
- Atlantis’ highest rank was [SAMPLE] in 2012. However, the institution noticed a 35-position drop in 2013 and is now placed at [SAMPLE].
- Hermes’s performance over the five-year period is impressive. Between 2010 and 2012, the institution climbed 295 places to rank [SAMPLE] (its highest rank to date).
- Client is displaying the most worrying trend. The institution showed a positive trajectory from 2010 to 2012 with a combined improvement of 70 places. This performance helped the institution reaching the rank of [SAMPLE]. However, in 2013 it dropped 91 positions to rank outside the top 400 at [SAMPLE].
- As with Client, Demeter is displaying a negative trend. In 2009 the institution was ranked [SAMPLE] but lost 67 places in just one year. It recovered partially in 2011 (+11 places) and 2012 (+17 places) although in 2013 saw a new setback of 122 positions, which placed it at [SAMPLE]. Over the analysed period this is the biggest declining trend amongst the analysed peers.
Employer Reputation

QS is the only major international ranking compiler that takes into account the views of graduate employers. Over the last three years, the total number of responses to the Employer Reputation survey has increased dramatically from [SAMPLE] in 2011 to [SAMPLE] in 2013. The top five countries which continue to provide the greatest number of responses to the Employer Reputation survey are: Country A, Country B and Country C. Together, these countries account for almost a third of all respondents. Responses are closely scrutinised and weighted to eliminate any bias that may result from disproportionate response levels. However, as response rates grow, so can fluctuations in performance.

Chart 3.3a reveals the following:

- In contrast with the Academic Reputation indicator, the Employer Reputation displays a very positive trend over the analysed period for the majority of selected peers.
- Three institutions can be found in the top 100 (Delphos, Hermes and Poseidon), while two other peers perform in the 100-150 range. Athena and Demeter perform just below the 300 mark, while Client is ranked at around the 350 mark. Zeus lags behind outside the top 400.
- In 2013, the peer group was led by Delphos, which achieved an excellent Employer Reputation rank of [SAMPLE]. This institution has been displaying a striking performance in this area over the five-year period, climbing [SAMPLE] positions to rank [SAMPLE].
- Delphos's performance is somewhat overshadowed by Hermes's impressive trajectory over the analysed period. The institution managed to gain 387 places between 2010 and 2013, climbing by over 100 places each year until 2013. In 2010 it was ranked [SAMPLE] and reached the rank of 71 in 2013. Hermes's performance in this indicator is confirmed by an additional increase of 81 places in 2012 and a further 27-place improvement in 2013 to rank [SAMPLE].
- In 2013, Athena and Demeter are ranked at [SAMPLE] and [SAMPLE] respectively. However, their trajectories have been very different. Demeter is the only institution amongst the selected peers to have lost ground over the analysed period (-67 places), while Athena shows a combined gain of 145 places.
- Client’s trajectory is mostly positive. The institution improves its ranking by 94 places in total, from a rank of 442 in 2009 to a rank of [SAMPLE] in 2013. Performance is very encouraging for the future.
- Zeus has seen peaks and troughs over the analysed period, even dropping 51 places to rank [SAMPLE] in 2012. However, after a 91-place improvement in 2013, the institution has managed to reach the rank of [SAMPLE], its highest rank to date.
- Chart 3.3b demonstrates that the distance between Client and the top performing university in the selected group was the same in 2011 and 2013 (-302 places).
Conclusion

Chart 3.8 shows the current status of Client...

By contrast, Chart 3.9 accounts for all [...] This chart shows that Client’ Faculty Student indicator [...] On the negative side, the Citations per Faculty and the Employer Reputation indexes require [...] It is worth noting that Client’ Academic Reputation relationship to the global average [...] Although Client’ Faculty Student ratio is [...] The analysis hints that it would be advisable for the institution to focus on [...]
This module sets out to provide an overview of the research performance for each selected peer, breaking down the results by broad faculty level. The analysis digs deeper into the Citations per Faculty indicator, highlighting areas of relative weaknesses and strengths. [Sample content]

Papers and Citations: Overall Results

Since 2007, the QS World University Rankings® have utilised information extracted from Scopus™ (www.scopus.com) by Elsevier, the world’s largest abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature, including:

• Over 21,000 titles from 5,000 publishers worldwide
• 50 million records, 84% with abstracts
• 5.3 million conference papers

The QS Intelligence Unit (QSIU) research team works continuously to enhance the accuracy of this indicator by instituting annual mapping exercises which look for institutional name variants, double counting, and validation of affiliate institutes. Identifying name variants is an issue in any database of this size, but is particularly challenging when an institution has affiliated components (such as hospitals or research institutes) that have their own distinct identity. For example, at one point, the SAMPLE INSTITUTION had 1,741 identified name variants in Scopus™, illustrating the complexity of this ongoing work. It is therefore advisable for institutions to notify the QSIU team of any name variants and affiliations.

The Citations per Faculty indicator looks at the total number of papers in the last complete five-year period, which was 2008-2012 for the 2013 results.

SAMPLE REPORT
This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
Research Output Evolution: 2008-2012

Chart 4.2 depicts the development in productivity (total number of papers published) over time.

- Collectively, the selected peer group is dramatically improving its research productivity or, at least, the majority of the selected institutions are doing a better job in getting indexed by Scopus. In 2008, all of the chosen institutions combined generated around [SAMPLE] papers, while this number soared to [SAMPLE] in 2012.

- Apollo showed a remarkable average annual growth of almost 20% over the five-year period in terms of research output. In 2008 it published 1,388 papers, but this amount more than doubled by 2012 to 2,804 papers.

- Zeus’s performance is also positive. In 2008 the institution published 791 papers (37 papers less than Client), but by 2012, this number had reached [SAMPLE] papers, outperforming Client ( [SAMPLE] papers in 2012). However, although impressive, its trajectory, with an average annual growth of 15.5%, has been more moderate than Apollo’s.

- Client’s research output evolution is represented by an average annual growth of 13.1%. In 2008 the institution had 828 papers indexed by Scopus, but


- Hermes’s performance improved steadily from 2010 to 2012. In 2009 it grew a timid 5.5% in terms of research production, but accelerated its publication activities by 12.5% in 2011 and 12.2% in 2012. Hermes is slowly narrowing the gap to Atlantis, with [SAMPLE] papers published in 2012 against [SAMPLE] for Atlantis.

- Poseidon presents a similar pattern to that of Atlantis, displaying a steady and positive evolution over the five-year period. However, although Atlantis produces less research ([SAMPLE] papers against [SAMPLE] for Poseidon), it has grown at a quicker pace (9.1% of annual average growth against 7.2% for Poseidon).

- Chart 4.3 presents Client’s paper output in contrast with the peer group taken as a whole from 2008 to 2012. In 2008, Client was clearly one of the lowest producers, with fewer than 1,000 ([SAMPLE]) publications and below the group average (around 2,500 papers). However, there has been a positive evolution in this area, which can be seen in the chart. Client has witnessed a growth of approximately 67% between 2008 and 2012, more than the group average for the peer group (41%). Its overall output represented 15.2% of the top producer, which is a slight improvement considering that this figure was 11.9% in 2008.

- Chart 4.4 present a similar chart, but for citations. As citation rates for older papers tend to be naturally higher, the results have been standardised to 100 in order to provide meaningful information for a clearer visualisation. Client made progress from 2008 until 2012, narrowing the gap to the group average citation rate year after year. It should be considered, as expected, that 2012 included the lowest citation rate for all the peers. As the 2012 papers are still ‘immature’, no conclusive remarks can be made from them. It is encouraging, however, that the overall trend has been positive for Client over the analysed period.
Charts 4.5 and 4.6 display the distribution of total papers and citations by broad faculty area. They depict the dominance of the Natural Sciences faculty for this peer group.

Key findings include:

- Chart 4.5 demonstrates that [SAMPLE] is Client’s most productive field, accounting for 54.6% of the institution’s research output indexed by Scopus. Natural Sciences is the second best, at 24.2%.

- As shown in Chart 4.6, when citations are considered the Life Sciences & Medicine field slightly decreases its relevance for Client, accounting for almost 47.1% of the institution’s overall results. Inversely, the Natural Sciences demonstrates a slightly higher proportion at 34.1%. The Engineering & Technology faculty area, which represents 17.8% of the institution’s papers, accounts for 14.2% of its citations.

- As is the case for Client, several peers in this group rely mainly on the Life Sciences & Medicine faculty in terms of paper production. This is particularly true for Delphos, Apollo, Zeus, Hermes and Poseidon. In all these cases, this faculty area contributed over 40% of their papers, and around 33.2% and 37.4% of their citation bases.

- Interestingly, for all institutions with the exception of Client, the Life Sciences & Medicine field increases its citation relevance. This field is attracting the highest proportion of citations for Client, Apollo, Hermes, Zeus, Atlantis, Delphos and Poseidon.

- Inversely, the Engineering & Technology decreases its citation relevance in most cases when citations are considered. For example, this faculty area represents 28.7% of Zeus’s papers, and 20.2% of its citations.

- Engineering & Technology is the dominant faculty area for Athena (43.0%) and Demeter (41.5%) in terms of papers output. However, these two institutions display a mostly balanced profile when citations are considered.

- Natural Sciences is also a standout area for both Athena and Demeter, representing 32.1% and 35.4% of their papers, and around 33.2% and 37.4% of their citation bases.

- Atlantis presents a more balanced profile in its research output but Engineering & Technology is still the prevalent area, accounting for 32.1% of papers. However, Life Sciences & Medicine is the dominant faculty when it comes to citations.

- Social Sciences & Management is not a significant area for any of the selected peers, although this field represents 3.5% of Demeter’s research output and 1.9% of Client’s research output but only 1.9% of Client’s citations and 1.7% of Demeter’s citations.

- Arts & Humanities provides only a marginal contribution for all the selected peers.
Research Impact (Citations per Paper)

The charts on this page break down the Citations per Paper indicator into five broad subject areas (those used for the rankings). This ratio provides an average impact of the research efforts conducted by the institutions. It is also a proxy for research quality.

Key findings include:

- Overall (Chart 4.7a), Client displays the highest impact at 4.4 citations per paper. Delphos and Hermes follow closely at 4.1 and 4.2, while Poseidon comes fourth with 4.0 citations per paper produced. Atlantis is fifth with 3.2 citations.

- The remaining peers (Apollo, Athena, Demeter and Zeus) achieved between .3 and 2.5 citations per paper, a relatively low ratio from a global perspective. Zeus and Demeter are clearly the institutions requiring the most improvement in this area.

- Conversely, Client’s performance is remarkably, outperforming big research producers such as Delphos and Poseidon. It demonstrates that institutions do not need to be big research producers to attract citations, when paper quality takes precedence over quantity.

- Arts & Humanities (Chart 4.7b) shows a very low citation impact for the peer group. Interestingly, Athena shows the highest research impact at 2.1, while Poseidon and Client follow at 1.5 and 1.5 respectively. All the other peers display less than one citation per paper in this area.

- The Engineering & Technology field (Chart 4.7c) is clearly led by Client with 5.1 citations per paper. It is worth noting Ewha is producing the lowest number of papers ([SAMPLE]). Its closest follower, Delphos, only achieved a ratio of 3.5. Hermes, Poseidon and Atlantis show comparable performances, averaging around 3 citations per paper (indexed by Scopus from 2008 to 2012).

- Life Sciences & Medicine (Chart 4.7d) delivers a higher average citations count per paper for the selected group. In general, papers in a medical field reach their citation peak much earlier than those in social sciences. Delphos is the stand-out institution in this field, with a rate of 4.7 citations per publication.
Module 5

Academic Reputation

This module seeks to shed light on the Academic Reputation indicator, which draws on responses from the global academic community in order to evaluate institutions. The Academic Reputation Index is the centrepiece of the QS World University Rankings®, carrying a weighting of 40%. It is an approach to international university evaluation that QS pioneered in 2004 and is the component that attracts the greatest interest and scrutiny. Together with the Employer Reputation Index, it sets the QS Ranking most clearly apart from any other.

Arguably, QS carries out the most extensive annual academic survey in the world. In 2013, [SAMPLE] academics contributed their opinion on the top institutions globally, an increase of more than [SAMPLE] over the previous year. Of these respondents, [SAMPLE]% have more than ten years of experience in academia. Furthermore, some [SAMPLE]% indicated their job title to be Professor/Associate Professor, Head of Department, or a more senior position such as President and Vice-Chancellor. Those that considered themselves experts in Country A represented [SAMPLE]% of the total responses received. For a full breakdown of survey respondents, please review Appendix III: Survey Results.

The survey has evolved since 2004 but largely follows the same general principles. It asks each respondent to specify their knowledge at the outset and then adapts the survey format based on their responses. Academics are asked to identify the leading universities for research within their field and region of expertise. After drawing up this basic profile, respondents can make entries, selecting from a comprehensive interactive list. They are asked to identify up to ten domestic and 30 international institutions. Their own institution, if it would otherwise be included, is excluded from the presented list.

To boost the size and stability of the sample, QS combines responses from the last three years; where any respondent has replied more than once in the three-year period, previous responses are discarded in favour of the latest numbers.

Since 2006, institutions have been invited to submit lists of employers for the QS Intelligence Unit (QSIU) to invite to participate in the Employer Survey. In 2010, that invitation was also extended to lists of academics. Since they are not allowed to submit in favour of their own institution, the risk of bias is minimal. Nonetheless, submissions are screened and sampling applied where any institution submits more than 400 records. Wherever sampling is required, respondents are selected randomly with a focus on delivering a balanced sample by discipline and geography. Naturally, all databases carry a certain amount of ‘noise’ and email invitations do get passed on.

The QSIU research continues to expand and diversify its response levels, not only across disciplines but also across countries that have, hitherto, been underrepresented. As response levels grow, so will the playing field for competition.

Academic performance by faculty area

Chart 5.1 shows the percentage of responses received from each faculty area for the 2013 results. It should be noted that respondents can identify multiple faculty areas as an area of specification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences &amp; Medicine</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Management</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAMPLE REPORT

This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
Domestic and International Performance

In 2008, the two survey components of the Rankings evolved slightly with the intention of distinguishing international from domestic responses. The first step was to run analyses of previous years’ responses to understand at what weighting domestic and international responses ought to be recombined. Based on the results of this analysis, combined with some expert input, these weightings have been set at 85/15 for the Academic Reputation review and 70/30 for the Employer Reputation survey—each in favour of the international response levels. This, after all, is a world ranking.

Chart 5.2 shows Client’s total number of nominations broken down by domestic and international peers. These results indicate that Client is very focused on domestic reputation and needs to improve its international reputation.

As shown in Chart 5.3, the top country nominating Client are [SAMPLE].

The charts on the following pages show the results of the nominations. The “a” horizontal bar charts indicate the proportion of the overall faculty score that is attributed to international and domestic responses; the maximum score an institution can receive is 100. These charts reflect the weighting which has been applied to domestic responses. The “b” vertical bar charts highlight performance in the domestic sphere and indicate the percentage of the overall possible domestic response rate achieved in each country.
Arts & Humanities

- Chart 5.4a shows the score in the Academic Reputation indicator broken down by the domestic and international component. Delphos is clearly the leading institution among the selected peers with a strong international profile (almost 70% of its overall score is explained by international nominations). Delphos achieved a score of [SAMPLE] out of a possible 100, 42% more than its closest peer, Atlantis. In 2013, Delphos was ranked [SAMPLE] in the Academic Reputation rankings for Arts & Humanities.

- Atlantis and Poseidon achieved similar international scores (approximately 16.7). However, Atlantis reached a slightly higher domestic score, which enabled the institution to reach a world rank of [SAMPLE] in this field, while Poseidon is placed at [SAMPLE].

- Hermes’s profile is relatively balanced, with 46% of its overall score explained by domestic responses. The institution is ranked [SAMPLE], its best result for all five faculty areas.

- Client is the fifth best performing peer, ranked at [SAMPLE]. Interestingly, this is the best result for Client in all five faculty areas, whereas this is a rather weak area in terms of research output. Also notable is the strong international performance achieved by Client: almost 68% of its score is achieved by international nominations.

- Apollo and Demeter are ranked [SAMPLE] and [SAMPLE] respectively. Apollo’s international score is slightly higher than Demeter’s (8.4 against 8.1).

- The two remaining institutions perform outside the top 400.
Engineering & Technology

- Engineering & Technology is not an area of academic reputation strength for Client. The institution achieved a score of just 4.6/100, the lowest among the selected peers.

- As shown in Chart 5.5a, Delphos easily leads the peer group with a strong international performance which represents over 75% of its overall score. The rest of the peers is clearly lagging behind Delphos’s remarkable overall score. In 2013 it achieved a world rank of [SAMPLE] in Academic Reputation for Engineering & Technology, a rank similar to its overall rank.

- Poseidon, Delphos’s closest follower, achieved an overall score of 17.2/100, over 20 points behind Delphos. Poseidon is ranked [SAMPLE], nine places above Atlantis (SAMPLE).

- Hermes and Athena are both ranked in the 200-300 range. Both institutions display a similar international component at approximately 56%.

- All the remaining peers perform outside the top [SAMPLE].

- Apollo achieved a higher international score than Demeter, but the latter institution has a better domestic reputation, leading to a higher overall score. Apollo is placed at [SAMPLE], ten places below Demeter.

- Zeus is ranked [SAMPLE], with a score of 6.3/100. Client displays the lowest rank at 1218, by far its weakest performance in all five faculty areas. This is in contrast with the relatively high research impact Client achieved in this faculty area (the best ratio amongst the selected peers).

**Chart 5.5a - Academic Reputation - International & Domestic Scores**

**Chart 5.5b - Academic Nominations - Proportion of Domestic Responses**

**SAMPLE REPORT**

This is an abbreviated sample of the full benchmarking report.
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