

*Materials of Conferences***WORLD UNIVERSITY RANKINGS 2011/2012  
(CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL QUALITY)**

Bodrov V.

*Institute of Economics and Business,  
The Orechovo-Zuevo branch, Orechovo-Zuevo,  
e-mail: v-bodrov@list.ru*

Educational quality is the urgent and extensively discussed problem. The current Russian educational state standard based on ISO 9000 doesn't include any management system requirements. However, a lot of it's articles can be used at universities. One of the most important exponents of educational quality at the university is a spot it assumes in the authoritative world rankings. Various aspects taken into account in them have an influence upon developing of university's strategy. Accreditation agencies that work out flexible performance criteria of educational quality are of inestimable value in this process. Reasonable aims, resources and developmental potency of university are appreciated. It's very prestigious for a university to fall in an authoritative rating, such as the QS World University Ranking and the THE World University Rankings. There are six US and four British universities in the top 10 in 2011.

**Table 1**

The QS World University  
Ranking 2011/2012 Top 10 Universities

Rank	Institution	Country	Score
1	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	100,0
2	Harvard University	United States	99,3
3	Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)	United States	99,2
4	Yale University	United States	98,8
5	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	98,0
6	Imperial College London	United Kingdom	97,6
7	UCL (University College London)	United Kingdom	97,3
8	University of Chicago	United States	96,1
9	University of Pennsylvania	United States	95,7
10	Columbia University	United States	95,3

Two leading Russian universities Lomonosov Moscow State University and St. Petersburg State

University didn't fall in the top 100 and assume № 112 and 251 spots respectively.

**Table 2**

Point scale

Number	Indicator	Points (%)
1	ACADEMIC REPUTATION	40
2	EMPLOYER REPUTATION	10
3	CITATIONS PER FACULTY	20
4	FACULTY STUDENT Ratio	20
5	Proportion of INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS	5
6	Proportion of INTERNATIONAL FACULTY	5
7	Total	100

According to this table it is possible to contest the statement of the rector of Moscow State University Victor Sadovnichiy that educational quality isn't taken into account in world university ratings.

Asian universities assumed high spots in the QS World University Ranking 2011/2012: 17 of them fell in the top 100.

**Table 3**

Asia in the 2011/2012 QS World University  
Ranking Top 100

Rank	Institution	Country	Score
22	University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	87,0
25	The University of Tokyo	Japan	85,9
28	National University of Singapore (NUS)	Singapore	84,1
32	Kyoto University	Japan	82,9
37	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	79,5
40	The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Hong Kong	79,1
42	Seoul National University	Korea, South	78,7
45	Osaka University	Japan	77,5
46	Peking University	China	77,4
47	Tsinghua University	China	76,3
57	Tokyo Institute of Technology	Japan	72,7
58	Nanyang Technological University (NTU)	Singapore	72,5
70	Tohoku University	Japan	69,7
80	Nagoya University	Japan	68,0
90	KAIST – Korea Advanced Institute of Science & Technology	Korea, South	66,0
91	Fudan University	China	65,7
98	Pohang University of Science And Technology (POSTECH)	Korea, South	65,1

**Table 4**  
Regions in the 2011/2012 QS World University Ranking Top 100

Number	Region	Number of Universities
1	Europe	38
2	North America	36
3	Asia	17
4	Australia and New Zealand	9

English-speaking countries have an advantage because most of research papers that catch the eye of experts are published in English.

**Table 5**  
Countries in the 2011/2012 QS World University Ranking Top 100

Number	Country	Number of Universities
1	United States	32
2	United Kingdom	19
3	Australia	8
4	Japan	6
5	Canada, Germany	4 each
6	China, Hong Kong, Netherlands, South Korea, Switzerland	3 each
7	Denmark, France, Singapore, Sweden	2 each
8	Belgium, Finland, Ireland, New Zealand	1 each

Another authoritative rating the THE World University Rankings is compiled by Thomson Reuters jointly with Times Higher Education that is hairy in the educational scope. All the indicators are combined into 5 groups there. These indicators are: academic reputation (worth 40% of the point score used to determine a university's rank), employer reputation (10%), faculty student ratio (20%), citations per faculty (20%), the number of international faculty members (5%), and the number of international students (5%).

**Table 6**  
The THE World University Rankings 2011/2012 Top 10 Universities

World Rank	Institution	Country/Region	Overall Score
1	California Institute of Technology	United States	94,8
2	Harvard University	United States	93,9
3	Stanford University	United States	93,9
4	University of Oxford	United Kingdom	93,6

World Rank	Institution	Country/Region	Overall Score
5	Princeton University	United States	92,9
6	University of Cambridge	United Kingdom	92,4
7	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	United States	92,3
8	Imperial College London	United Kingdom	90,7
9	University of Chicago	United States	90,2
10	University of California Berkeley	United States	89,8

There are 7 US universities in the Top 10. American universities also prevail in the Top 100.

**Table 7**  
Regions in the 2011/2012 THE World University Rankings Top 100

Number	Region	Number of Universities
1	North America	56
2	Europe	31
3	Asia	9
4	Australia and New Zealand	4

**Table 8**  
Countries in the 2011/2012 THE World University Rankings Top 100

Number	Country	Number of Universities
1	United States	51
2	United Kingdom	12
3	Canada	5
4	Australia, Germany, Netherlands	4 each
5	France, Sweden, Switzerland	3 each
6	China, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea	2 each
7	Belgium, Singapore, Finland	1 each

There are no Russian universities in the top 100 again, although Lomonosov Moscow State University assumed №35 spot in this ranking last year. In some analysts' judgment, one of the main reasons of this is the lack of prerequisites to the development and use of human capital, especially in the economy.

Language barrier traditionally remains the weak point of Russian university, consequently most of research works are ignored by the foreign experts. However, it concerns the universities of some non-English speaking countries, for example, France. Another reasons are the low percentage of foreign students and disadvantages of point system.

In the authoritative world university rankings Russia is inferior to not only such leaders as the UK and the US, but also to the Asian countries that were not regarded as competitors a couple of decades ago, for example, China, Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan.

The experts think that Russian universities will unlikely assume higher positions in World University Rankings in the near future.

Although some people complain of the imperfection of rankings, in practice Russian graduates enjoy the employers' confidence. It's very important because this problem concerns not only the respect for any university, but also national prestige.

---

The work was submitted to international scientific conference «Topical issues of Science and Education», Russia (Moscow), May, 21-23, 2012, came to the editorial office 23.04.2012.

### **HISTORICAL ASPECT OF PROCESS OF INTEGRATION OF SUBJECTS AT MODERN SCHOOL**

Kuralbaeva A.A.

*H.A. Yasawi International Kazakh-Turkish University,  
Turkestan, e-mail: kural-aliya84@mail.ru*

Development of pedagogical idea of process of integration is influenced essentially by progress of scientific knowledge. Integration is close, connected with differentiation. These processes are reflected in construction of system of subjects and search of ways of generalization of knowledge of pupils. «Integration – is process of rapprochement and communication of the sciences, occurring along with differentiation processes. Integration process represents the high form of an embodiment of inter-subject communications at qualitatively new step of training».

Proceeding from the aforesaid, it is possible to notice that roots of process of integration lie far back in the past classical pedagogies and are connected with idea of inter subject communications. At the heart of the idea of inter-subject communications was born during search of ways of reflection of integrity of the nature in the teaching material maintenance. Great didactic Jan Amos Komensky underlined: «Everything that is in an interconnection, should be taught in the same communication». To idea of inter-subject communications many teachers address later, developing and generalizing it. So, at D. Lock the idea is interfaced to definition of the maintenance of formation in which one subject should be filled with elements and the facts of another. I.G. Pestalotcii on the big didactic material has opened variety of interrelations of subjects. It started with the requirement: «Result in the consciousness connected subjects all in essence among themselves in that communication in which they really are in the nature». Pestalotcii marked special

danger of a separation of one subject from another. In classical pedagogies the fullest psychology-pedagogical substantiation about the didactic importance of inter-subject communications was given by Konstantin Dmitrievich Ushinsky. He considered that «knowledge and ideas informed, any, sciences should be under construction integrally in light and whenever possible, an extensive sight at the world and his life».

On a boundary XIX and XX centuries the idea of integration gets leading character The outstanding reformer of formation of J. Dewey, having proclaimed the child the Sun, the center of the pedagogical Universe, has put forward also a new principle of construction of curriculums: «From the child – to the world and from the world – to the child». The Kazakhstan scientist A.A. Bejsenbaeva proves a complex of signs and functions of inter-subject communications:

- \* the basic signs of inter-subject communications as major means of formation of informative interest at schoolboys are integrative, selectivity, variability;

- \* inter-subject communications is rather steady pedagogical phenomenon of the organization and interaction of elements in which result new qualities are shown, such personal quality, as informative interest is born certain new whole, in particular;

- \* as a part of whole inter-subject communications carry out set of functions, such, as: educational, developing, bringing up, constructive.

Educational function of inter-subject communications consists that with their help of the teacher-subjects such qualities of knowledge of pupils, as systems, depth, sensibleness and flexibility form. Inter-subject communications here act as means of development of the general scientific concepts, promoting mastering of communications between the general natural-science and humanitarian concepts. In the Kazakhstan pedagogics the special importance from positions of our research get think of M. Zhumabaeva, concerning problems of inter-subject communications. The scientist in the textbook «Pedagogics» for the first time published in the Kazakh language in 1923 puts forward a principle of inter-subject communications on which, in M. Zhumabaeva's fair opinion, any teacher should lean at giving of new knowledge by the pupil. Now the great attention in the course of the training and formation organization again is given to an integration problem. However, judging by the aforesaid, integration as the phenomenon has appeared, first of all, in the Big science, in fundamental and its applied branches. And now integration at modern school is understood as one of directions of active searches of the new pedagogical decisions promoting improvement of affairs in it, to development of creative potentials of pedagogical collectives and separate teachers for the purpose of more effective and reasonable influence on pupils.