WIKIPEDIA
The Free Encyclopedia

QS World University Rankings

(Redirected from QS Top 50 under 50)

QS World University Rankings is a portfolio of comparative university rankings compiled by global higher education analyst Quacquarelli Symonds (QS). Its first and earliest edition was published in collaboration with *Times Higher Education* (*THE*) magazine as Times Higher Education–QS World University Rankings, inaugurated in 2004 to provide an independent source of comparative data about university performance. In 2009, the two organizations parted ways to produce independent university rankings, the QS World University Rankings and THE World University Rankings.

Since then, QS' rankings portfolio has expanded to consist of the QS World University Rankings, the QS World University Rankings by Subject, four regional rankings tables including: Asia, Latin America, Europe, Central Asia, the Arab Region, several MBA rankings, and the QS Best Student Cities rankings. In 2022, QS launched the QS World University Rankings: Sustainability.[1]

The rankings are regarded as one of the most-widely read university rankings in the world, along with *Academic Ranking of World Universities* and *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*.[2] According to Alexa Internet, it is the most widely viewed university ranking worldwide.[3] However, it has been criticized for its overreliance on subjective indicators and reputation surveys, which tend to fluctuate over time and form a feedback loop.[4][5][6][7][8] Concern also exists regarding the global consistency and integrity of the data QS uses to generate its rankings.[5][9][10][11]

The development and production of the rankings is overseen by QS Senior Vice President Ben Sowter, who in 2016 was ranked in 40th position in Wonkhe's 2016 "Higher Education Power List", a list of what the organisation believed to be the 50 most influential figures in UK (United Kingdom) higher education.[12]

QS World University Rankings

Editor	Ben Sowter (Head of Research)
Staff writers	Craig O'Callaghan
Categories	Higher education
Frequency	Annual
Publisher	Quacquarelli Symonds Limited
First issue	2004 (in partnership with *THE*) 2010 (on its own)
Country	United Kingdom
Language	English
Website	topuniversities.com (https://www.topuniversities.com) qs.com (https://www.qs.com)

History

QS was founded by Nunzio Quacquarelli in 1990 to provide information and advice to students looking to study abroad.

Over time, the company expanded to include a wider range of higher education-focused products and services before partnering with THE in 2004 to create the THE-QS World University Rankings.

A perceived need for an international ranking of universities for UK purposes was highlighted in December 2003 in Richard Lambert's review of university-industry collaboration in Britain[13] for HM Treasury, the finance ministry of the United Kingdom. Amongst its recommendations were world university rankings, which Lambert said would help the UK to gauge the global standing of its universities.

The idea for the rankings was credited in Ben Wildavsky's book,*The Great Brain Race: How Global Universities are Reshaping the World*,[14] to then-editor of *THE*, John O'Leary. *THE* chose to partner with educational and careers advice company Quacquarelli Symonds (QS) to supply the data, appointing Martin Ince,[15] formerly deputy editor and later a contractor to *THE*, to manage the project.

Between 2004 and 2009, QS produced the rankings in partnership with *THE*. In 2009, *THE* announced they would produce their own rankings, the *Times Higher Education World University Rankings*, in partnership with Thomson Reuters. *THE* cited an asserted weakness in the methodology of the original rankings,[16] as well as a perceived favoritism in the existing methodology for science over the humanities,[17] as two of the key reasons for the decision to split with QS.

QS retained intellectual property in the prior rankings and the methodology used to compile them, which it continued to develop and refine over subsequent iterations.[18]

THE created a new methodology with Thomson Reuters, and published the first *Times Higher Education World University Rankings* in September 2010.

QS publishes the rankings results in the world's media and has entered into partnerships with a number of outlets, including *The Guardian* in the United Kingdom, and *Chosun Ilbo* in Korea. The first rankings produced by QS independently of *THE*, and using QS's methodology, were released on September 8, 2010, with the second appearing on September 6, 2011.

QS designed its rankings to assess performance according to what it believes to be key aspects of a university's mission: teaching, research, nurturing employability, and internationalisation.[19]

Today, QS has a global presence, with offices in Europe, Asia and the Americas and provides products and services in areas such as student recruitment, events and consulting services. In 2022, Nunzio Quacquarelli became president of the company while Jessica Turner was appointed CEO to oversee operations and strategy.[20]

Rankings

QS World University Rankings

The QS World University Rankings are released annually, typically in June. The 2023 edition featured 1418 institutions across 100 locations. The rankings are based on a methodology that considers a range of factors, including academic reputation, employer reputation, research impact, and internationalization. The methodology is reviewed annually to ensure that it remains relevant and up-to-date. The most recent methodology used by QS to calculate the rankings includes the following indicators:[21]

Academic Reputation (40%)[22][23]

Accounting for 40% of the overall score, academic reputation relates to academic excellence and the scholarly esteem in which the world's universities are held. It collates more than 150,000 responses from academics in more than 140 countries and locations. QS has previously published the job titles and geographical distribution of the participants in this survey.[23]

Faculty/student ratio (20%)

This indicator accounts for 20% of a university's score in the rankings. It is a classic measure used in various ranking systems as an indication of staff resources afforded to students, including teaching capacity, class size, curriculum development, lab and seminar delivery, pastoral care, teaching capacity and class size. QS has admitted that it is a limited metric, particularly in the face of modern enhancements in online teaching methods and content distribution.[24]

Citations/faculty (20%)

Citations of published research are among the most widely used inputs to national and global university rankings. The QS World University Rankings used citation data from Thomson (now Thomson Reuters) from 2004 to 2007, and since then has used data fromScopus, part of Elsevier. The total number of citations for a five-year period is divided by the number of academics in a university to yield the score for this measure, which accounts for 20% of a university's score in the rankings.

QS has explained that it uses this approach, rather than the citations per paper preferred for in other rankings systems because it reduces the impact of biomedical science on the overall picture – biomedicine has a ferocious "publish or perish" culture. Instead, QS attempts to measure the density of research-active staff at each institution, but issues remain about the use of citations in ranking systems, especially the fact that the arts and humanities generate comparatively few citations.[25]

However, since 2015, QS has made methodological enhancements designed to remove the advantage institutions specializing in the Natural Sciences or Medicine previously received. This enhancement is termed faculty area normalization and ensures that an institution's citations

count in each of QS's five key Faculty Areas is weighted to account for 20% of the final citations score.[26]

QS has conceded the presence of some data-collection errors regarding citations per faculty in previous years' rankings.[27]

One issue that has been raised concerns the difference between the Scopus and Thomson Reuters databases. For major world universities, the two systems capture largely the same publications and citations. For less prominent institutions, Scopus has more non-English language and smaller-circulation journals in its database leading some critics to suggest that citation averages are skewed towards English-speaking universities.[25] This area has been criticized for undermining universities that do not use English as their primary language.[28]

Employer Reputation (10%)

QS' Employer Reputation indicator is obtained using another survey, like Academic Reputation, and accounts for 10% of an institution's overall score. The most recent edition surveyed some 99,000 employers at companies and organisations that hire graduates on a significant or global scale.

This survey was introduced in 2005 in the belief that employers track graduate quality, making this a barometer of teaching quality and the level of work readiness acquired by students, a famously problematic factor to measure. University standing here is of special interest to potential students, and acknowledging this was the impetus behind the inaugural QS Graduate Employability Rankings, published in November 2015.[29][30] However, these rankings were subsequently discontinued in 2021, with its data rolled into the QS World University Rankings methodology.

Internationalization (10%)

The final 10% of a university's score is derived from measures intended to capture their internationalization: half from their percentage of international students, and the other half from their percentage of international staff. This is of interest partly because it shows whether a university is putting effort into global collaboration and diversity, but also because it indicates global appeal for students and researchers around the world.[31]

QS World University Rankings: Top 10

Institution	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
🇺🇸Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)	1	1	1	1	1	1
🇬🇧University of Cambridge	2	3	7	7	6	5
🇺🇸Stanford University	3	3	2	2	2	2
🇬🇧University of Oxford	4	1	5	4	5	6
🇺🇸Harvard University	5	5	3	3	3	3
🇺🇸California Institute of Technology	6	6	4	5	4	4
🇬🇧Imperial College London	6	7	8	9	8	8
🇬🇧UCL	8	8	10	8	10	7
ETH Zurich	9	8	6	6	7	10
🇺🇸University of Chicago	10	10	9	10	9	9

QS World University Rankings: Regional Rankings

In addition to the World University Rankings, QS produces four regional rankings, including the Arab Region, Asia, Emerging Europe and Central Asia (discontinued), and Latin America. In 2023, QS will launch the QS World University Rankings: Europe. These editions include an expanded roster of ranked universities for each region than those featured in the QS World University Rankings which only feature the very best in location.

While the same methodological indicators tend to be used for the regional rankings, the weightings are modified and additional lenses are included to account for the unique characteristics of each region. Additional metrics include incoming and outgoing exchange students, academic staff with a PhD, and web visibility. Accordingly, the performance of institutions within their respective regional rankings can differ significantly from theQS World University Rankings released in the same academic year.[32]

Arab Region

First published in 2014, the annual *QS Arab Region University Rankings* (https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/arab-region-university-rankings/2020) highlights 199 leading universities across 18 countries in the Arab Region. The methodology for this ranking has been developed with the aim of reflecting specific challenges and priorities for institutions in the region, drawing on 10 indicators.

QS World University Rankings: Arab Region: Top 10

Institution	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
King Abdulaziz University (KAU)	1	1	1	1	3	4
Qatar University	2	2	3	4	6	7
King Fahd University of Petroleum & Minerals	3	3	4	3	1	2
King Saud University	4	6	6	6	4	3
American University of Beirut (AUB)	5	4	2	2	2	1
United Arab Emirates University	6	5	5	5	5	5
Khalifa University	7	9	9	12	15	=21
Sultan Qaboos University	8	7	8	8	10	10
American University of Sharjah	9	15	16	7	7	=21
University of Jordan	10	10	10	10	9	9

Asia

In 2009, QS launched the QS World University Rankings: Asia in partnership with The Chosun Ilbo newspaper in Korea to rank universities in Asia independently. The 15th edition, released in 2022, ranked 760 universities, with inclusion based on the United Nations' M49 Standard (https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49).

QS World University Rankings: Asia: Top 10

Institution	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
Peking University	1	2	7	5	5	9
National University of Singapore (NUS)	2	1	1	1	1	2
Tsinghua University	3	5	2	4	3	6
The University of Hong Kong	4	3	4	3	2	5
Nanyang Technological University Singapore (NTU)	5	3	3	2	3	1
Fudan University	6	7	6	7	6	7
Zhejiang University	7	6	5	6	13	21
KAIST - Korea Advanced Institute of Science & Technology	8	14	12	9	8	4
Universiti Malaya (UM)	9	8	9	13	19	24
Shanghai Jiao Tong University	10	10	10	17	19	22

Emerging Europe and Central Asia (discontinued)

First published in 2015, QS Emerging Europe and Central Asia Rankings included universities from mostly Eastern Europe and Central Asia, with Russia'sLomonosov Moscow State Universityin the top spot since its first publication. These rankings were discontinued in 2022.

Latin America

TheQS World University Rankings: Latin America were launched in 2011. The 2023 edition of the rankings features the top 428 universities in the region, accounting for 20 countries. The 2024 edition will expand these rankings to include Caribbean universities.

QS World University Rankings: Latin America: Top 10

Institution	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (UC)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Universidade de São Paulo	2	2	2	2	2	3
Universidad de Chile	3	3	4	7	7	6
Tecnológico de Monterrey	4	4	3	3	6	5
Universidade Estadual de Campinas (Unicamp)	5	7	5	4	2	2
Universidad de los Andes	6	5	6	4	5	8
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)	7	6	7	6	4	4
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro	8	9	9	9	9	7
Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA)	9	8	8	8	8	9
Universidad Nacional de Colombia	10	10	10	10	10	=11

QS World University Rankings by Subject

Typically, QS' first rankings release of the year is the QS World University Rankings by Subject which are usually published in March or April.

The rankings provide a detailed evaluation of universities based on their performance in more than 50 specific academic disciplines (Business, Mathematics, Medicine, Law, among others), as well as their performance in five broad faculty areas (Arts & Humanities, Engineering & Technology, Life Sciences, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences).

The QS World University Rankings by Subject was first introduced in 2011 and initially covered only five subject areas. Since then, the number of subjects has increased more than tenfold and is now considered one of the most comprehensive subject-focused rankings.

Alongside three of the core indicators used in the World University Rankings (Academic Reputation, Employer Reputation and Citations/paper), the QS World University Rankings by Subject adds H-Index, which assesses research productivity and impact, and International Research Network, which assesses cross-border research collaboration.

Categories of QS World University Rankings by Faculty and Subject

Arts & Humanities	Engineering & Technology	Life Sciences & Medicine	Natural Sciences	Social Sciences
Art & Design	Computer Science	Agriculture & Forestry	Biological Sciences	Accounting
Architecture	Data Science	Anatomy	Chemistry	Business
Archaeology	Engineering - Chemical	Anthropology	Earth & Marine Sciences	Communication
Classics	Engineering - Civil	Dentistry	Environmental Sciences	Development Studies
English Language	Engineering - Electrical	Medicine	Geography	Economics & Econometrics
History	Engineering - Mechanical	Nursing	Geology	Education
Performing Arts	Engineering - Mineral	Pharmacy	Geophysics	Hospitality & Leisure Management
History of Art	Petroleum Engineering	Veterinary Science	Mathematics	Law
Linguistics			Materials Science	Library Management
Modern Languages			Physics	Marketing
Philosophy				Politics
Theology				Psychology
				Social Policy
				Sociology
				Sports-related Subjects
				Statistics

QS Best Student Cities

The QS Best Student Cities rankings are an annual comparison of cities around the world based on their appeal and benefits to students who study there.

Launched in 2012, the rankings are based on a range of indicators that are designed to capture the experience of students living and studying in a particular city.

The methodology for QS Best Student Cities is based on five indicators:[33]

- University Rankings – based on the performance of universities in a particular city, as measured by the QS World University Rankings.
- Student Mix – looking at the student population's diversity as well as social and cultural activities.

- Desirability – concerning factors such as safety, pollution and infrastructure.
- Employer Activity – assessing employment opportunities for students in a particular city and the number of international companies based there.
- Affordability – based on factors such as the cost of living, tuition fees and the availability of scholarships and financial support.

QS Best Student Cities: Top 10

City	2023	2022	NA	NA	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
🇬🇧London	1	1			1	1	3	5	3	2
Munich	=2	2			4	6	9	11	14	10
🇰🇷Seoul	=2	=3			10	10	4	10	10	14
Zurich	4	7			8	8	15	12	11	=5
Melbourne	5	6			3	3	5	2	2	=5
Berlin	6	5			5	7	6	9	16	11
🇯🇵Tokyo	7	=3			2	2	7	3	7	17
Paris	8	=9			7	5	2	1	1	1
Sydney	9	8			9	9	13	4	4	4
🇬🇧Edinburgh	10	12			15	16	18	33	26	32

QS World University Rankings: Sustainability

In 2022, QS launched the QS World University Rankings: Sustainability in response to the growing importance of sustainability in higher education and society at large.

The rankings are compiled using data collected through surveys as well as external sources such as the World Bank and the United Nations to provide a resource for students, academics and policymakers to assess universities' sustainability performance and identify best practices for achieving sustainability goals.

The rank of the universities featured is determined by the sum of their scores in two categories: Environmental Impact and Social Impact, which are subdivided into eight indicators. These include:

Environmental Impact (50%)

- Sustainable Institutions (17.5% overall) - Concerns institutional strategy and operations directed towards an environmentally sustainable future.
- Sustainable Education (20% overall) - This indicator assesses the extent to which institutions are educating students to both understand and make a difference to the environment.
- Sustainable Research (12.5% overall) - Analyses the impact of an institution's research in

areas aligned to specific United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Social Impact (50%)

- Equality (15% overall) - Focuses on research output aligned to SDGs 5 and 10 (gender equality and reducing inequalities) as well as a range of diversity and measurable inclusivity elements.
- Knowledge Exchange (10% overall) - Measures domestic and international collaboration in research to advance worldwide knowledge and academic standards.
- Impact of Education (10% overall) - Concerns research output aligned to SDG 4, QS Academic and Alumni surveys, Academic Freedom Index (https://academic-freedom-index.net/) and the net flow of internationally mobile students and gross graduation ratio.
- Employability and Opportunities (10% overall) - Assesses alumni outcomes and graduate employability.
- Quality of Life (5% overall) - This indicator considers data pertaining to - among others - research output in specific SDGs (1,2,3, and 6), health options on campus, Air Quality Index (https://waqi.info/), and Subjective Wellbeing Score, according to the OECD.

QS World University Rankings: Sustainability: Top 10

University	2023
University of California, Berkeley	1
University of Toronto	2
University of British Columbia	3
The University of Edinburgh	4
The University of New South Wales (UNSW Sydney)	=5
The University of Sydney	=5
The University of Tokyo	7
University of Pennsylvania	8
Yale University	9
The University of Auckland	10

QS MBA and Business Master's Rankings

Over the last three decades, QS has expanded its rankings portfolio to include business schools, MBAs and business master's degrees. It launched QS Global MBA Rankings (https://www.topuniversities.com/mba-rankings/2023) to provide students with a comprehensive list of the best MBA programmes worldwide, based on factors such as reputation, employability, and course content.

The QS Global MBA Rankings is now an annual publication released alongside its sister rankings, the QS Business Master's Rankings (https://www.topmba.com/business-masters-rankings/2023) and until 2023 the QS MBA by Career Specialisation Rankings (https://www.topmba.com/mba-rankings/specialization/2023) (discontinued) These lists the world's best master's programmes for business-related subjects and MBAs for specific career options including Finance, Business Management, Business Analytics, Marketing and Supply Chain Management.

Currently, QS' methodology for ranking MBAs and business master's degrees is based on six indicators:

- Employability (35% - 30% in Finance and Business Analytics)
- Alumni Outcomes (15% - 20% in Finance and Business Analytics)
- Return on Investment (20%)
- Thought Leadership (15%)
- Class and Faculty Diversity (10%)

In addition, QS produces two other annual MBA comparisons, the Online MBA Rankings and the Executive MBA Rankings.

Reception

In September 2015, *The Guardian* referred to the QS World University Rankings as "the most authoritative of their kind".[34][35]

Several universities in the UK and the Asia-Pacific region have commented on the rankings positively. Vice-chancellor of New Zealand's Massey University, Professor Judith Kinnear, says that the *THE*-QS ranking is a "wonderful external acknowledgement of several university attributes, including the quality of its research, research training, teaching, and employability." She said the rankings are a true measure of a university's ability to fly high internationally: "The Times Higher Education ranking provides a rather more and more sophisticated, robust, and well rounded measure of international and national ranking than either New Zealand's Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) measure or the Shanghai rankings."[36]

In September 2012, *The Independent* described the QS World University Rankings as being "widely recognised throughout higher education as the most trusted international tables".[37]

Angel Calderon, Principal Advisor for Planning and Research at RMIT University and member of the QS Advisory Board, spoke positively of the QS University Rankings for Latin America, saying that the "QS Latin American University Rankings has [sic] become the annual international benchmark universities use to ascertain their relative standing in the region". He further stated that the 2016/17 edition of this ranking demonstrated improved stability.[38]

Criticisms

The reputation surveys have received severe criticism. QS do not reveal the response rates for the survey, but statements from QS indicate that they are very low (2-8 %),[39] which would make the results highly unreliable. Other commentators have pointed at the low validity of the survey, since few people know much about the quality of teaching and research at other institutions but their own.[40][41][42][43][44]

The QS World University Rankings have been criticised by many for placing too much emphasis on reputation, which receives 50% of the overall score. Some people have expressed concern about the manner in which the academic reputation survey has been carried out.[45] In a report,[46] Peter Wills from the University of Auckland wrote of the *THE*-QS World University Rankings:

> But we note also that this survey establishes its rankings by appealing to university staff, even offering financial enticements to participate (see Appendix II). Staff are likely to feel it is in their greatest interest to rank their own institution more highly than others. This means the results of the survey and any apparent change in ranking are highly questionable, and that a high ranking has no real intrinsic value in any case. We are vehemently opposed to the evaluation of the University according to the outcome of such PR competitions.

Like many other international university rankings, QS uses a citation database to calculate some of its indicators. The use of these citations databases have been criticised, since they do not include research output from the humanities and social sciences to the same degree as the natural sciences, engineering and medicine.[40]

It has also been pointed out that the indicator 'faculty/student ratio' does not measure commitment to teaching, but rather research intensity, since a large share of the faculty typically spends most or all of their time doing research rather than teaching.[9]

Since the split from *Times Higher Education* in 2009, further concerns about the methodology QS uses for its rankings have been brought up by several experts.

In October 2010, criticism of the old system came from Fred L. Bookstein, Horst Seidler, Martin Fieder, and Georg Winckler in the journal *Scientomentrics* for the unreliability of QS's methods:

> Several individual indicators from the Times Higher Education Survey (THES) data base—the overall score, the reported staff-to-student ratio, and the peer ratings—demonstrate unacceptably high fluctuation from year to year. The inappropriateness of the summary tabulations for assessing the majority of the "top 200" universities would be apparent purely for reason of this obvious statistical instability regardless of other grounds of criticism. There are far too many anomalies in the change scores of the various indices for them to be of use in the course of university management.[6]

In an article for the *New Statesman* entitled "The QS World University Rankings are a load of old baloney", David Blanchflower, a leading labour economist, said: "This ranking is complete rubbish and nobody should place any credence in it. The results are based on an entirely flawed methodology that underweights the quality of research and overweights fluff... The QS is a flawed index and should be ignored."[47]

The QS Subject Rankings have been dismissed as unreliable by Brian Leiter, who points out that programmes that are known to be high quality, and which rank highly in the Blackwell rankings (e.g., the University of Pittsburgh) fare poorly in the QS ranking for reasons that are not at all clear.[48]

In an article titled *The Globalisation of College and University Rankings* and appearing in the January/February 2012 issue of *Change*, Philip Altbach, professor of higher education at Boston College and also a member of the THE editorial board, said: "The QS World University Rankings are the most problematical. From the beginning, the QS has relied on reputational indicators for half of its analysis ... it probably accounts for the significant variability in the QS rankings over the years. In addition, QS queries employers, introducing even more variability and unreliability into the mix. Whether the QS rankings should be taken seriously by the higher education community is questionable."[49]

Simon Marginson, professor of higher education at the University of Melbourne and a member of the THE editorial board, in the article "Improving Latin American universities' global ranking" for University World News on 10 June 2012, said: "I will not discuss the QS ranking because the methodology is not sufficiently robust to provide data valid as social science".[50] QS's Intelligence Unit counter these criticisms by stating that "Independent academic reviews have confirmed these results to be more than 99% reliable".[51]

In 2021, research published by the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley raised the possibility that institutions that employ QS's consulting services are rewarded with improved rankings. QS denied the possibility and stated that it had firm policies and practices to minimize potential conflicts of interest.[52]

Events

QS Quacquarelli Symonds organizes a range of international student recruitment events throughout the year. These are generally oriented towards introducing prospective students to university admissions staff, while also facilitating access to admissions advice and scholarships. In 2019, over 360 events were hosted, attended by 265,000 candidates, in 100 cities across 50 countries. Separated into 'tours', QS' event offerings typically comprise a series of university and business school fairs.

World MBA Tour

The QS World MBA Tour is the world's largest series of international business school fairs, attended by more than 60,000 candidates in 100 cities across 50 countries.

World MBA Tour Premium

QS World MBA Premium also focuses on MBA student recruitment, but invites only business schools ranked in the top 200 internationally, according to the QS World University Rankings. The event aims to provide a more holistic overview of an MBA degree, with enhanced focus on pre- and post-study processes and insights.

World Grad School Tour

The QS World Grad School Tour focuses on international postgraduate programs, particularly specialised master's degrees and PhDs in FAME (Finance, Accounting, Management and Economics) and STEM disciplines.

World University Tour

The QS World University Tour has an emphasis on undergraduate student recruitment, inviting undergraduate programs only.

Connect Events

QS Connect MBA and QS Connect Masters differ from other event series' in that an open fair format is not followed. Instead, candidates take part in pre-arranged 1-to-1 interviews with admissions staff, based on pre-submitted CVs and academic profiles.

QS Stars

QS also offers universities an auditing service that provides in-depth information about institutional strengths and weaknesses. Called QS Stars, this service is separate from the QS World University Rankings. It involves a detailed look at a range of functions which mark out a modern, global university. The minimum result that a university can receive is zero Stars, while truly exceptional, world-leading universities can receive '5*+', or 'Five Star Plus', status. The QS Stars audit process evaluates universities according to about 50 different indicators. By 2018, about 20 different universities worldwide had been awarded the maximum possible Five Star Plus rating.[53]

QS Stars[54] ratings are derived from scores on in eight out of 12 categories. Four categories are mandatory, while institutions must choose the remaining four optional categories.[55] They are:

- Teaching
- Employability
- Research
- Internationalization
- Facilities
- Online/Distance Learning

- Arts & Culture
- Innovation
- Inclusiveness
- Social Responsibility
- Subject Ranking
- Program Strength[56]

Stars is an evaluation system, not a ranking. About 400 institutions had opted for the Stars evaluation as of early 2018. In 2012, fees to participate in this program were $9,850 for the initial audit and an annual license fee of $6,850.[57]

Notes

References

1. "Asian University Rankings - QS Asian University Rankings vs. QS World University Rankings™" (http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/qs-ur-asia/). Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20130606123045/http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/qs-ur-asia/) from the original on 2013-06-06. Retrieved 2013-06-10. "The methodology differs somewhat from that used for the QS World University Rankings..."

2. "University rankings: which world university rankings should we trust?" (https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/universityeducation/9584155/University-rankings-which-world-university-rankings-should-we-trust.html). *The Telegraph*. 2015. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20150126122001/http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/universityeducation/9584155/University-rankings-which-world-university-rankings-should-we-trust.html) from the original on 2015-01-26. Retrieved 27 January 2015. "It is a remarkably stable list, relying on long-term factors such as the number of Nobel Prize-winners a university has produced, and number of articles published in Nature and Science journals. But with this narrow focus comes drawbacks. China's priority was for its universities to "catch up" on hard scientific research. So if you're looking for raw research power, it's the list for you. If you're a humanities student, or more interested in teaching quality? Not so much."

3. "topuniversities.com Competitive Analysis, Marketing Mix and Traffic - Alexa" (https://web.archive.org/web/20200728174448/https://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/topuniversities.com). Archived from the original (https://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/topuniversities.com) on 2020-07-28. Retrieved 2020-04-01.

4. "Strength and weakness of varsity rankings" (https://www.nst.com.my/news/2016/09/172958/strength-and-weakness-varsity-rankings). *NST Online*. 2016-09-14. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20180330143722/https://www.nst.com.my/news/2016/09/172958/strength-and-weakness-varsity-rankings) from the original on 2018-03-30. Retrieved 2018-03-29.

5. "The State of the Rankings | Inside Higher Ed" (https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/11/11/state-rankings). Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20180711021948/https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/11/11/state-rankings) from the original on 2018-07-11. Retrieved 2018-03-29.

6. Bookstein, F. L.; Seidler, H.; Fieder, M.; Winckler, G. (2010). "Scientometrics, Volume 85, Number 1" (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2927316). *Scientometrics*. SpringerLink. **85** (1): 295–299. doi:10.1007/s11192-010-0189-5 (https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs11192-010-0189-5). PMC 2927316 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC292731

311102-010-0103-8). PMC 2627310 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC262731 6). PMID 20802837 (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20802837).

7. "Methodology of QS rankings comes under scrutiny" (https://www.insidehighered.com/news/ 2013/05/29/methodology-qs-rankings-comes-under-scrutiny). *www.insidehighered.com*. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160701190517/https://www.insidehighered.com/ne ws/2013/05/29/methodology-qs-rankings-comes-under-scrutiny) from the original on 2016-07-01. Retrieved 2016-04-29.

8. "Competition and controversy in global rankings - University World News" (http://www.univer sityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130626160718267). *www.universityworldnews.com*. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160505020907/http://www.universityworldnews.co m/article.php?story=20130626160718267) from the original on 2016-05-05. Retrieved 2016-04-29.

9. Bekhradnia, Bahram. "International university rankings: For good or ill?" (http://www.hepi.ac. uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Hepi_International-university-rankings-For-good-or-for-ill-RE PORT-89-10_12_16_Screen.pdf) (PDF). *Higher Education Policy Institute*. Archived (https:// web.archive.org/web/20170215055236/http://www.hepi.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/H epi_International-university-rankings-For-good-or-for-ill-REPORT-89-10_12_16_Screen.pdf) (PDF) from the original on 2017-02-15.

10. "Academic Ethics: To Rank or Not to Rank?" (https://www.chronicle.com/article/Academic-Et hics-To-Rank-or/240619). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 2017-07-12. Archived (https:// web.archive.org/web/20180330143429/https://www.chronicle.com/article/Academic-Ethics-T o-Rank-or/240619) from the original on 2018-03-30. Retrieved 2018-03-29.

11. "QS ranking downright shady and unethical" (https://www.theonlinecitizen.com/2017/06/09/q s-ranking-downright-shady-and-unethical/). *The Online Citizen*. 2017-06-09. Archived (https: //web.archive.org/web/20180330143657/https://www.theonlinecitizen.com/2017/06/09/qs-ra nking-downright-shady-and-unethical/) from the original on 2018-03-30. Retrieved 2018-03-29.

12. Leach, Mark. "Higher Education Power List - 2016" (http://wonkhe.com/2016-higher-educati on-powerlist/?mc_cid=27307da84d&mc_eid=7a7d83a8aa). *WonkHe*. WonkHe. Archived (htt ps://web.archive.org/web/20160924134716/http://wonkhe.com/2016-higher-education-powe rlist/?mc_cid=27307da84d&mc_eid=7a7d83a8aa) from the original on 2016-09-24. Retrieved 19 September 2016.

13. Lambert Review of Business-University Collaboration (http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/lamber t_review_business_university_collab.htm) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/201110191 30440/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/lambert_review_business_university_collab.htm) October 19, 2011, at the Wayback Machine (since archived (http://webarchive.nationalarchiv es.gov.uk/20130129110402/http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/lambert_review_business_univer sity_collab.htm))

14. Princeton University Press, 2010

15. "Martin Ince Communications" (http://www.martinince.eu). Archived (https://web.archive.org/ web/20141220114549/http://www.martinince.eu/) from the original on 2014-12-20. Retrieved 31 May 2015.

16. Mroz, Ann. "Leader: Only the best for the best" (http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story .asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=408968&c=1). *Times Higher Education*. Archived (https:// web.archive.org/web/20100807065437/http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?se ctioncode=26&storycode=408968&c=1) from the original on 2010-08-07. Retrieved 2010-09-16.

17. Baty, Phil (2010-09-10). "Views: Ranking Confession" (http://www.insidehighered.com/views /2010/03/15/baty). *Inside Higher Ed*. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/2010071514122

3/http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/03/15/baty) from the original on 2010-07-15. Retrieved 2010-09-16.

18. Labi, Aisha (2010-09-15). "Times Higher Education Releases New Rankings, but Will They Appease Skeptics?" (http://chronicle.com/article/Times-Higher-Education/124455/?sid=at). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. London, UK. Retrieved 2010-09-16.

19. "MS and MBA in USA" (http://www.msmbainusa.com/articles/life-in-usa/5-parameters-related-to-global-university-ranking/). *MS MBA in USA*. 2015-01-17. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20150418142816/http://www.msmbainusa.com/articles/life-in-usa/5-parameters-related-to-global-university-ranking/) from the original on 2015-04-18. Retrieved 31 May 2015.

20. "Introducing our new CEO" (https://www.qs.com/introducing-our-new-ceo/). *QS.com*. QS.

21. "QS World University Rankings: Methodology" (https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings-articles/world-university-rankings/qs-world-university-rankings-methodology?page=1). QS (Quacquarelli Symonds). 2014. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20150429184540/https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings-articles/world-university-rankings/qs-world-university-rankings-methodology?page=1) from the original on 2015-04-29. Retrieved 29 April 2015.

22. "QS Intelligence Unit - 2018 Academic Survey Responses" (http://www.iu.qs.com/academic-survey-responses/). *www.iu.qs.com*. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20170715122214/http://www.iu.qs.com/academic-survey-responses/) from the original on 2017-07-15. Retrieved 29 June 2017.

23. "2011 Academic Survey Responses" (https://web.archive.org/web/20120206024212/http://www.iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/world-university-rankings/2011-academic-survey-responses/). Archived from the original (http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/world-university-rankings/2011-academic-survey-responses/) on February 6, 2012. Retrieved 12 September 2013.

24. QS Intelligence Unit | Faculty Student Ratio (http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/rankings-indicators/methodology-faculty-student/) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20111012150310/http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/rankings-indicators/methodology-faculty-student/) October 12, 2011, at the Wayback Machine. Iu.qs.com. Retrieved on 2013-08-12.

25. QS Intelligence Unit | Citations per Faculty (http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/rankings-indicators/methodology-citations-per-faculty/) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20111028174836/http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/rankings-indicators/methodology-citations-per-faculty/) October 28, 2011, at the Wayback Machine. Iu.qs.com. Retrieved on 2013-08-12.

26. "Archived copy" (https://web.archive.org/web/20150911063143/http://content.qs.com/qsiu/Faculty_Area_Normalization_-_Technical_Explanation.pdf) (PDF). Archived from the original on 2015-09-11. Retrieved 2016-09-09.

27. Richard Holmes. "University Ranking Watch" (http://rankingwatch.blogspot.com/2007/11/another-kenan-flagler-case-of.html). Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20150316031626/http://rankingwatch.blogspot.com/2007/11/another-kenan-flagler-case-of.html) from the original on 2015-03-16. Retrieved 31 May 2015.

28. "Global university rankings and their impact (http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/Global_University_Rankings_and_Their_Impact.sflb.ashx) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20120826181934/http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/Global_University_Rankings_and_Their_Impact.sflb.ashx) 2012-08-26 at the Wayback Machine,". "European University Association". Retrieved 3, September, 2012

29. QS Intelligence Unit | Employer Reputation (http://www.iu.qs.com/employer-survey-responses/) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160824072517/http://www.iu.qs.com/employer-survey-responses/) August 24, 2016, at the Wayback Machine. Retrieved on 2018-05-03.

survey-responses/) August 24, 2016, at the Wayback Machine. Retrieved on 2018-03-03.

30. "QS Intelligence Unit - QS Graduate Employability Rankings" (http://www.iu.qs.com/universit y-rankings/ger/). *www.iu.qs.com*. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20170712065115/htt p://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/ger/) from the original on 2017-07-12. Retrieved 29 June 2017.

31. QS Intelligence Unit | International Indicators (http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/ranking s-indicators/methodology-international/) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20111024033 150/http://iu.qs.com/projects-and-services/rankings-indicators/methodology-international/) October 24, 2011, at the Wayback Machine. Iu.qs.com. Retrieved on 2013-08-12.

32. "QS.com" (https://support.qs.com/hc/en-gb/sections/4403445575442-List-of-current-ranking s). *QS.com*. QS.

33. *QS Support*. QS https://support.qs.com/hc/en-gb/articles/4407875519506-Best-Student-Cities-Ranking (https://support.qs.com/hc/en-gb/articles/4407875519506-Best-Student-Citie s-Ranking). `{{cite web}}`: Missing or empty |title= (help)

34. Weale, Sally (2015-09-14). "British universities slip down in global rankings" (https://www.the guardian.com/education/2015/sep/15/british-universities-slip-downing-global-rankings). *The Guardian*. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160910151235/https://www.theguardian. com/education/2015/sep/15/british-universities-slip-downing-global-rankings) from the original on 2016-09-10. Retrieved 15 September 2016.

35. Kich, Martin (2015-09-17). "U.S. Higher Education News for September 15, 2015" (https://ac ademeblog.org/2015/09/17/u-s-higher-education-news-for-september-15-2015/). *Academe Blog*. Martin Kich. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160222183953/https://academeb log.org/2015/09/17/u-s-higher-education-news-for-september-15-2015/) from the original on 2016-02-22. Retrieved 15 September 2016.

36. Flying high internationally (http://masseynews.massey.ac.nz/2004/Press_Releases/11_11_0 4.html) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20071211121732/http://masseynews.massey. ac.nz/2004/Press_Releases/11_11_04.html) December 11, 2007, at the Wayback Machine

37. "Cambridge loses top spot to Massachusetts Institute of Technology" (https://www.independ ent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/cambridge-loses-top-spot-to-massachusetts-instit ute-of-technology-8122436.html). *The Independent*. 11 September 2012. Archived (https://w eb.archive.org/web/20120915010853/http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/educati on-news/cambridge-loses-top-spot-to-massachusetts-institute-of-technology-8122436.html) from the original on 2012-09-15. Retrieved 11 September 2012.

38. Calderon, Angel. "How to boost your university's ranking position" (http://www.universityworl dnews.com/article.php?story=2016062113365585). *University World News*. University World News. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160915010535/http://www.universityworldne ws.com/article.php?story=2016062113365585) from the original on 2016-09-15. Retrieved 14 September 2016.

39. Redden, Elizabeth. "Scrutiny of QS Rankings" (https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/ 05/29/methodology-qs-rankings-comes-under-scrutiny). *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved 2023-04-17.

40. Boulton, Geoffrey (2011-01-01). "University Rankings: Diversity, Excellence and the European Initiative" (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811001765). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Position and Advice Papers as published by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) in 2010. **13**: 74–82. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.006 (https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.sbspro.2011.03.006). ISSN 1877-0428 (https://www.worldcat.org/issn/1877-0428).

41. Marginson, Simon (2009-02-17). "The knowledge economy and higher education: Rankings

and classifications, research metrics and learning outcomes measures as a system for regulating the value of knowledge" (https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/the-knowledge-e conomy-and-higher-education-rankings-and-classifications-research-metrics-and-learning-o utcomes-measures-as-a-system-for-regulating-the-value-of-knowledge_hemp-v21-art3-en). *Higher Education Management and Policy*. **21** (1): 1–15. doi:10.1787/hemp-v21-art3-en (htt ps://doi.org/10.1787%2Fhemp-v21-art3-en).

42. Marginson, Simon; van der Wende, Marijk (September 2007). "To Rank or To Be Ranked: The Impact of Global Rankings in Higher Education" (http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.11 77/1028315307303544). *Journal of Studies in International Education*. **11** (3–4): 306–329. doi:10.1177/1028315307303544 (https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1028315307303544). ISSN 1028-3153 (https://www.worldcat.org/issn/1028-3153).

43. Hazelkorn, Ellen (2019-03-13). "University Rankings: there is room for error and "malpractice" " (https://elephantinthelab.org/the-accuracy-of-university-rankings-in-a-internati onal-perspective/). doi:10.5281/zenodo.2592196 (https://doi.org/10.5281%2Fzenodo.25921 96).

44. Hillman, Nick (2016-12-15). "International university rankings: For good or ill?" (https://www. hepi.ac.uk/2016/12/15/3734/). *HEPI*. Retrieved 2023-04-17.

45. Holmes, Richard (2006-09-05). "So That's how They Did It" (http://rankingwatch.blogspot.co m/2006/09/so-thats-how-they-did-it-for-some-time.html). Rankingwatch.blogspot.com. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20100808023918/http://rankingwatch.blogspot.com/2 006/09/so-thats-how-they-did-it-for-some-time.html) from the original on 2010-08-08. Retrieved 2010-09-16.

46. "Response to Review of Strategic Plan by Peter Wills" (https://wayback.archive-it.org/all/200 80406192737/http://www.aus.ac.nz/branches/auckland/akld06/AUS-SP.pdf) (PDF). Archived from the original (http://www.aus.ac.nz/branches/auckland/akld06/AUS-SP.pdf) (PDF) on 6 April 2008. Retrieved 29 June 2017.

47. "The QS World University Rankings are a load of old baloney" (http://www.newstatesman.co m/blogs/david-blanchflower/2011/09/world-university-faculty). 5 September 2011. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20131016175355/http://www.newstatesman.com/blogs/david-bl anchflower/2011/09/world-university-faculty) from the original on 2013-10-16. Retrieved 31 May 2015.

48. Leiter Reports: A Philosophy Blog: Guardian and "QS Rankings" Definitively Prove the Existence of the "Halo Effect" (http://leiterreports.typepad.com/blog/2011/06/guardian-and-q s-rankings-definitively-prove-the-existence-of-the-halo-effect.html) Archived (https://web.arc hive.org/web/20120801024604/http://leiterreports.typepad.com/blog/2011/06/guardian-and-qs-rankings-definitively-prove-the-existence-of-the-halo-effect.html) 2012-08-01 at the Wayback Machine. Leiterreports.typepad.com (2011-06-05). Retrieved on 2013-08-12.

49. Change Magazine - Taylor & Francis (13 January 2012). "Change Magazine - January-February 2012" (http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2012/January-Februa ry%202012/Globalization-abstract.html). Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/2015051223 5327/http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2012/January-February%202012 /Globalization-abstract.html) from the original on 2015-05-12. Retrieved 31 May 2015.

50. "Improving Latin American universities' global ranking - University World News" (http://www. universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120606174803978). Archived (https://web.arc hive.org/web/20130615005657/http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2012 0606174803978) from the original on 2013-06-15. Retrieved 31 May 2015.

51. "Academic Reputation" (http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/indicator-academic/). *QS Intelligence Unit*. QS Quacquarelli Symonds. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/201609 20132319/http://www.iu.qs.com/university-rankings/indicator-academic/) from the original on

2016-09-20. Retrieved 14 September 2016.

52. Jaschik, Scott (April 27, 2021). "Buying Progress in Rankings?" (https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/article/2021/04/27/study-charges-qs-conflicts-interest-international-rankings). Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved April 27, 2021.

53. "QS Stars University Ratings" (https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-stars#sorting=overall+country=+rating=6+order=desc+orderby=uni+search=). *Top Universities*. QS Quacquarelli Symonds. 2014-05-08. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20160914092702/https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-stars#sorting=overall+country=+rating=6+order=desc+orderby=uni+search=) from the original on 2016-09-14. Retrieved 2016-09-14.

54. "QS Stars Methodology" (https://www.qs.com/portfolio-items/qs-stars-what-does-it-take-to-get-5-stars/).

55. "What is QS Stars?" (https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-stars/what-qs-stars). 2016-10-12. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20170704120008/https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-stars/what-qs-stars) from the original on 2017-07-04.

56. "QS Stars Methodology" (https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-stars/qs-stars-methodology). 2012-11-04. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20170704211824/https://www.topuniversities.com/qs-stars/qs-stars-methodology) from the original on 2017-07-04.

57. "Ratings at a Price for Smaller Universities" (https://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/31/world/europe/31iht-educlede31.html?pagewanted=all). *The New York Times*. 30 December 2012. Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20130415004317/http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/31/world/europe/31iht-educlede31.html?pagewanted=all) from the original on 2013-04-15. Retrieved 10 September 2013.

External links

- Official website (https://www.topuniversities.com)
- QS Intelligence Unit Blog (http://iu.qs.com), a blog on rankings and higher education from the team that compiles *QS World University Rankings*
- Interactive maps comparing *QS World University Rankings* with the academic ranking of World Universities and Times Higher Education rankings (http://www.statsilk.com/maps/where-are-worlds-top-universities-interactive-maps-comparing-three-rankings-arwu-the-qs)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=QS_World_University_Rankings&oldid=1156333711#QS_Top_50_under_50"