

# The KIOSK FOR DOCTORAL STUDIES IN US

## [1986-2017]

- A. 1996 NRC Assessment
- B. 2010 NRC Assessment
- C. US News Graduate Programs Ranking

### <Words of Reference to the Kiosk>

- The range numbers in this kiosk replicated the sum of R-Rank and S-Rank from 2010 NRC report. The left ranking is highest possible ranking and the right is lowest possible one, which is in terms of statistically 5% rule. The average of both numbers is used to yield a comparison and final definite ranking among the institutions for 2010 NRC report, which rests with parenthesis.
- Ranking for each program finally has been yielded by average number of 1996, 2010, and USNW ranking for the graduate programs. Hence the coverage in period is longitudinal possibly 1986 (the first year from last 1985 NRC) through 2020 (the last year for ten year interval of NRC practice, but not surely for every turn). The ranking of USNW graduate programs are mostly yearly, or changed with the interval of about three years for Natural and Social Sciences. The USNW ranking mostly was based on 2017-2018 version (eventually to determine the period of effect for this KIOSK), but in rare case, might be adjusted to avoid a sharp precariousness or in consideration of promotional equity.
- The Kiosk is designed to reveal the compiled rankings of leading institution that is not exhaustive to include all of doctoral programs. I have, nevertheless, list the major follow-up institutions from the 2010 NRC report.
- As we see, the global rankings produce a scope of subject rankings beside the overall university rankings, which is variable to the schema of each ranking agency. The scope was tabulated above, and the basic characteristics of those ranking has drawn on the publication and citations or awards and teaching competence from the faculty. It also differs from USNW college ranking that resides squarely with the quality of both faculty and student largely being purported to rank the overall strength of undergraduate element within the institution. The global rankings are closer to assess the graduate strengths of institution than the USNWCR, but is less rigorous because the subject may be too broad, or neither comprehensive nor inaccurate to cover the specific programs. According to Moase, USNW chief data strategist, the subject is neither college, department, or program meaning that it mainly relates with the academic journals, Clarairvarite or Scopus and books or articles produced within the period of each ranking purpose by the institutions. Instead, USNW uses the name of program, of course more specifically graduate program, for their ranking purpose and Deans or Department chairs are specifically made to contact to survey the quality and competence of each graduate institutions. While 1996 NRC was conducted with the 41 areas, they played within the title of area or field. 2010 NRC reported each doctoral programs as titled by each institution along with 62 fields classified with NRC in advance and abstraction. Therefore, 2010 NRC should be most corporate while 1996 NRC and USNW are medium corporal while the global rankings are more paper based than substantial or corporal.
- The information is best to the knowledge and conscience of this KIOSK designer, but may include inaccurate or false information as humanly. Please do not hesitate to contact me if error is found or like to suggest.

- / may appear two or three times at the cell within the rank box. It denotes the rank of 1996 NRC, 2010 NRC and USNW ranking of graduate programs in order. The two with / often denotes the rank of 1996 and 2010 NRC ranking in order. Nevertheless, in some cases, one may be either of NRC reports and the other was that of USNW graduate ranking
- The red number is the ranking yielded from the average of three sources.
- I believe that the collective ranking for the graduate or doctoral programs, such as Gourman, is less contributive or create controversy and criticism than the general university or college ranking. The graduate degree, especially Phd degrees, would be some kind of lifetime asset for the degree recipients that may capitalize on their career life. Hence, it can be more specific and destined as similar with the property rights. In some cases, the element of degree, for example, damages for the loss of degree recipient, may matter that court use typically the words, “degree or license.” Therefore, it can be realistically the kind of economic item although its major characteristics would be intellectual or social. It is thought that the collective ranking for the graduate program- more than unpleasant with research doctorates-would not be acclaim practice for the IREG or quasi-IREG professionals (other main job and interested work in the meantime). In this context, the schools’ practice to count the number of each higher ranking (top, fifth or tenth, and rated) in the NRC report could be understandable even if eager statisticians might strive to yield more refined picture. Nevertheless, the kind of hut to enshroud the humble elements could help the audience to begin their reference in need so that I provided the overall ranking with the “breadth (50%) and top (first and second ranks for each institution)” principles inferred from the presentation by Dr. Newton surrounding the 1996 studies. I hope that that could be helpful to the journey through this Kiosk, the kind of fiasco blaring many of good hands to build the marvelous civilization over history and space. I have produced another piece that assessed the quality of graduate schools in US, which can complement the traditional Gourman report in the aim to address its vicissitude or criticisms. I considered that ranking partially as a variable to yield the final ranking, and presented others to imply the overall strengths of graduate studies.
- As you see in Linguistic case with the college of Social Science, the categorization can variegates the outcome of ranking which is due to the wisdom of rankers on one hand, but also the transformation of science on the other. Therefore, the rankers need to take a care, and could support as a reason that the collective ranking can potentially mislead or crumble with the mind of each doctoral degree holder. Then, some readers might criticize that I am also opaque between the graduate and doctoral programs. Does the title, graduate programs, include the masters along with doctors? That may be seen as a psychiatric question, too sensitive and unpersuasive. However, the rankers do not pass or even keen to sift and winnow on their job of classification. For example, the methodology of US graduate programs ranking specifically denote that this is for masters only or graduate degree as a whole, and JDs or MBAs. This faith can foreclose at the ranking stage that there is no department for the name on the list or so. This problem needs to be distinguished from the ranking source of subject rankings, mostly global as I commented earlier that it is wholly from the journal or book categories, not directed to specific colleges and departments or programs. So the professors of psychology may contribute to the law journals in terms of journal classification that was traced often automatically and with the system (needs to be clear so as to not to be lost with his affiliated institutions) and considered to generate the law subject according to the five year principle to aid with the scholarly competition. One more example needs to be remarked surrounding the classifications that the nomenclature is not the thread only for rankers, and vastly represent the transformation of scientific and intelligent world. As you see in the face page of USNW, the main category of graduate ranking shingles out the five or six professional schools along with Social and Natural Sciences at the corner of page. Other space was spent to life and health disciplines as well as other disciplines on less public highlight, such as library science or fine arts and so. This corroborates our secular knowledge that the philosophy began to phase into a number of branches as a node of thinking in the early of 20 century. This would be common within the two leading continents at that time, but more salient in the new one. I have once benchmarked the various sections of NY Times Science page in which experts in their field pen on their interested topic shared with the newspaper subscribers.

Now and these days, the science governs the behavior and thought of civilians. Food is publicly regulated, and tobacco is sanctioned to frustrate the avid smokers as a law. The Constitutional shield is not available for the smokers that implanted an imagery of criminality. A past imagery of social groove on the wealth and prestige became quite opposite for them, and even miserable with no support from the right to happiness argument, say, final, philanthropic or philosophical, but least shelter for the marginal people, what we often know, discrete and insular minority. The tendency is more than transformative in US, and titles of notable graduate schools, taught based than research based, other than research doctorates embarked their business that have attained the public attention and preference or loving. In this thought, the streamlines on the first page of US News on graduate ranking is not surprising, but accurately reflect the reality of science and knowledge world. It is therefore natural that the US only publishes the title of report around the world, only country of sexy and colored bones. The Academy and IREG or Quasi-IREG are mutual and symbiotic although the criticisms are no less echoing with the accusation that the Academy should remain sacred and quasi-religious with their earnest commission to educate through universal needs. A small school or colleges, under-disclosed for their greatness may be taunted to that context. In other cases, undergraduates or alumni of small colleges around the same range of SAT scores with big research or global universities may outrightly spells out the schema of global or research ranking, rejects its presence, and may be afraid if his or her reputation could be spoiled.

- Despite criticisms against 2010 NRC, it disposed the strengths that no definite ranking is persuasive to explain each doctoral programs in terms of quality. It is also very informative that the real programs within each college and universities were incorporated into the rankings of program with their real title along with the title of broad field, abstract and academic in general. The practice differs from other rankings, such as 1996 NRC report and USNW GPR. I once pointed out that the global ranking entails the elements of graduate ranking, but is neither perfect nor exhaustive other than specific graduate rankings. Without such perfect or exhaustive ranking, the foreign students need to consult them when they decide to choose which school they should go. Notably, QS world university ranking provides a good guide for both graduate and undergraduate students planned with the foreign destinations for their study. I like statistics, but, in fact, am fairly ignorant of its deep knowledge. Additionally, my propensity is fatal with human subject in the end that prefer to envision with them about the identity of various ranking projects. Therefore, we have types of those desiderata to be wanted by students or investors. The undergraduate, master and doctors would stand in the first type while the masters or doctors would stand in second type. The research doctors, excluded from professional doctors in terms of designation, would stand in third type, in each slot of their fields before NRC 2010 report. The 2010 NRC report enabled that they can stand in the specific programs of his or her university. Therefore, we can verify if I should stand in the social policy program of Harvard or sociology program of Harvard in the slot of abstract category within "Sociology" title. That is the same about the economics discipline that Stanford is ranked with two programs, economic statistics and analysis program and general economics program. This is noted most extensively in the ranking slot entitled Public Health. Harvard reported seven or eight programs in this slot as if it were to be implied that the final goal of researchers or science would be the public health in this contemporary world of oxymoron. It may diminish the easiness of comparison, but should be no less imperative that we need to include the Nutrition program of UW-Madison in the Agricultural Sciences while the same name program is more inclined to the character of Public Health. Therefore, the nomenclature is not purely the problem of shingling, but can have implications of program content or characteristics although individual degree awardee may be more pleasant if it is ranked in other slots. Of course, the non-existing programs cannot be incorporated as a matter of methodological approach so that schools with no research doctoral programs cannot appear within the ranking slots, so that UW-Madison or UC Berkeley may have no ranks in the public policy and administration while U-Michigan will be placed at eighth. That came in comparison with the ranking of USNW public policy graduate program since the latter incorporates the graduate programs of public policy as a whole. Between the USNW graduate and NRC report, we may head if masters can refer to them because a person of researcher can learn in one institution and another through his five to ten years of graduate study. We do not reject that litany with the perfect evidence since the Ipsos questionnaires is not available. According to the USNW methodology, the two set of questionnaires are sent to the department head or

director of graduate studies and college deans. One seems like to serve the whole of graduate programs and others would be specific for doctoral programs. In any way, we humbly have no cause to suppress the wishes of master student for his or her personal use. In this viewpoint, it is true as generally assumed that NRC reports are more exhaustive and specific in terms of three sources of reference studied to generate this report. Other characteristics of USNW is that it is a yearly fare while NRC is planned with ten years interval. The controversy or disagreement would be more intense and data collection process might require a more extended years than expected. In any case, it can well procrastinate as if you see the bridge years between two last reports. This report is given a weight to NRC reports if the category arises from that model, and some adjustment may be made with the USNW ranks although the ranks mostly replicate those of 2017-2018 USNW report. In the event, I used all of three sources as combined to produce a final ranking because my intention is to trace the doctoral programs not only historically, but rigorously. Although NRC is more traumatic with method and inter-relational struggle to argue their strength of doctoral programs, the reference to USNW also reinforces the history of departments or programs that would support the rigor of this research scheme. The elaboration fuels the findings that the existing structure about the issues of leading institutions in each program and faculty can be more durable and reinforced to shade the short time amenities or pass time of ranking manias. Therefore, I suggest that it is caveat emptor and the KIOSK can well be read in the cause and stance of each reader. For example, the researchers may waive the USNW if he likes to know a specific or destined profile of research doctoral programs in the future.

- Most importantly, the KIOSK is intended to develop into the book or article form, hence, the publication at this time is aimed to draw on the report of possibly numerous errors, comments and suggestions to improve this product. The kind of notice and comment period is my purpose that I am seriously waiting for the kind of assistance and even criticism. The KIOSK is not comprehensive to cover all institutions, rather focused on the profile of leading institutions, but could help to locate the status of other institutions with the links at the end of this KIOSK for extended reference. Additional links with my previous studies will be found about the background for this project.

**<Average Table from the Two Exercises Below>**

Ranks	Institution	First Table	Second Table	Average Table
1 <sup>st</sup>	UW-Madison	2	1	1.5
2 <sup>nd</sup>	Stanford	1	3	2
3 <sup>rd</sup>	Harvard	6	2	3
4 <sup>th</sup>	U of Michigan	4	5	4.5
5 <sup>th</sup>	MIT	3	8	5.5
6 <sup>th</sup>	Princeton	8	4	6
6 <sup>th</sup>	UC-Berkeley	6	6	6
6 <sup>th</sup>	Yale	7	5	6

**<1996 NRC + US News Education>**

Ranks	Institution	Rated Programs	Top Grade 1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup>
1	Stanford	40 (50)	7/2 (1/0 USNW) (50)
2	Wisconsin	38 (45)	3/4 (3/2 USNW) (45)
3	MIT	36 ( raw 25) (40)	4/7 (49)
4	Michigan	38 (45)	2/4 (1/3 USNW) (43)
5	Yale	30 (38)	6/1 (48)
6	Harvard	30 (38)	5/2 (0/1) (47)
6	UC Berkeley (6 <sup>th</sup> )	36 (40)	2/6 (0/1) (45)
8	Princeton	29 (37)	2/4 (43)
Unranked	Minnesota	37	1/0
Unranked	Penn State	36	1/0

Unranked	Columbia	34	1/1
Unranked	Pittsburg	34	0/1
Unranked	Duke	33	0/1
Unranked	Chicago	30	2/2
Unranked	Northwestern	30	0/1
Unranked	UC San Diego	29	2/0
Unranked	NYU	25	0/1
Unranked	Georgia Tech		1/0
Unranked	Rockefeller		0/1
Unranked	Cal Tech		3/1
Unranked	Cal San Francisco		1/1

**<2010 NRC + US News Education>**

Ranks	Institution	Rated Programs (Breadth)	Number of programs marked 1 <sup>st</sup> in both S/R rank + US News Education (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> ) + Other uncovered ranking (1 <sup>st</sup> /2 <sup>nd</sup> )*
1	UW-Madison	78 (50 points)	9 (3 + 4 + 2) (40 points)*
2	Harvard	52 (36 points)	14 (13 + 1) (50 points)
3	Stanford	49 (35 points)	9 (8 + 1) (44 points)
4	Princeton	48 (34: adjusted) (34 points)	6 (41 points)
5	Michigan	65 (41 points)	4 (33 points)
6	Berkeley	52 (35 points)	5 (4 + 1) (35 points)
7	Yale	48 (34 adjusted) (33 points)	4 (33 points)
8	MIT	52 (29 adjusted) (35 points)	3 (30 points)

- If same number at total, a priority is given to NRC than USNW Education or Other.
- I included 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> spot in the USNW because the programs marked 1<sup>st</sup> in both ranks of NRC often, if not always, fall within 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> for each specific ranking at the sum comparison among another. The sum comparison, in case of 2010 report, through this report is conducted with the comparison of mean score, if not perfect statistically, but with the assumption along a most generality.
- Other covers Rehabilitation Psychology and Nuclear Engineering in UW-Madison. For Berkeley, Clinical Psychology in USNW had been added.

**[A] [Social and Behavioral Sciences]**

Rank (1996 category: Lingu	Rank(2010 category: Lingui	Institu	Agric	Anthro	Econ	Geog	Ling	Poli	Psych	Public	Soci
ity	ty	tion	ultura	pology	omics	raphy	uistic	tical	ology	Policy	ology
			& Resource				s	Science		& Administration	

istics-art and humanities)	istics-Social Sciences		Economics								
7(sum/5 (progrms) [1])	16 (sum)/6 (progrms) [1]	Harvard		5/4-11 (1) [2]	1/4-11 (2)/1 [1]		21/14-62 (15) [9]	1/3-6 (1)/1 [1]	6/2-10 (1)/3 [2]	11-31 (6)	7/2-3 (1)/1 [1]
39/5 [6]	39/5 [6]	Princeton		27/64-138 (29) [21]	5/7-16 (4)/1 [3]			7/14-30 (9)/3 [7]	13/2-14 (2)/8 [5]	2-8 (1)	13/2-14 (2)/1 [3]
19/5 [2]	22/6 [2]	Stanford		7/19-40 (7) [5]	4/11-26 (6)/1 [4]		2/1-33 (6) [3]	5/3-6 (1)/1 [2]	1/3-19 (3)/1 [1]		8/17-57 (11)/5 [7]
36/5 [5]	41/6 [5]	Chicago		2/19-40 (7) [4]	2/5-11 (3)/7 [5]		6/10-28 (5) [5]	6/13-33 (9)/12 [6]	18/14-60 (12)/17 [15]	14-34 (8)	1/17-58 (12)/8 [6]
23/5 [3]	36/6 [4]	Michigan		1/9-25 (2) [1]	13/34-58 (20)/12 [14]		31/28-66 (21) [13]	4/3-7 (3)/4 [3]	2/7-31 (6)/3 [3]	11-35 (7)	4/12-33 (5)/1 [2]
43/5 [8]	58/6 [9]	Yale		8/32-71 (14) [8]	6/18-34 (9)/1 [7]		30/42-72 (25) [15]	3/10-24 (5)/4 [4]	3/7-25 (5)/3 [3]		19/73-123 (35)/22 [21]
36/6 [4]	40/7 [3]	Berkeley	1	3/11-31 (4) [3]	7/10-18 (5)/1 [6]	7/13-41 (7) [6]	4/9-34 (6) [4]	2/15-36 (10)/4 [5]	9/25-129 (27)/1 [12]		3/36-18 (16)/1 [4]
58/7 [7]	65/8 [8]	Wisconsin	5	18/27-75 (13) [13]	15/(20-40(12)/12) [12]	2/4-14 (1) [1]	32/24-55 (14) [12]	10/33-57 (15)/15 [13]	15/7-37 (7)/13 [8]		2/24-57 (13)/6 [6]
Unranked	Unranked	MIT			3/4-7 (1)/1 [2]		1/NA	12/16-41 (11)/9 [11]	5-44 (8)/8 [6]		
52/6 [9]	53/7 [7]	UCLA		9/15-38 (6)	11/52-93	8/4-15 (2)	3/5-21	8/34-68	4/10-41		5/43-84

				[6]	(26)/ 12 [15]	[2]	(2) [1]	(16) /12 [12]	(9)/3 [6]		(20)/ 8 [11]
61/5 [11]	63/6 [10]	Penn		6/19-49 (12) [7]	8/17- 34 (8)/1 0 [8]		5/7- 23 (3) [2]	42/7 3- 134 (33) /19 [29]	8/18- 82 (15)/8 [8]	20-42 (13)	11/8- 27 (3)/1 1 [9]
58/5 [10]	58/5 [11]	Columbia		16/67- 102 (24) [14]	12/23 -45 (14)/ 9 [11]			16/7 -20 (4)/ 7 [9]	17/15 -63 (12)/1 7 [14]		15/1 1-35 (6)/1 1 [10]
79/5 [17]	79/5 [17]	Northwestern		34/15- 52 (11) [16]	9/22- 36 (11)/ 7 [9]		NA/1 1-38 (10)	22/5 1- 83 (22) /23 [19]	24/65 -147 (35)/1 7 [22]		9/37- 97 (23)/ 10 [13]
73/5 [13]	79/6 [12]	UC-San Diego		10/32 [15]	16/32 -55 (21)/ 12 [15]		14/27 -46 (12) [6]	9/11 -30 (8)/ 9 [8]	10/22 -98 (19)/1 3 [13]		22/1 05- 167 (44)/ 13 [22]
70/5 [12]	70/5 [13]	Duke		19/11- 42 (6) [9]	22/38 -61 (23)/ 16 [18]			14/1 9- 47 (12) /7 [10]	33/24 -78 (16)/1 7 [19]		20/1 8-55 (9)/1 5 [14]
106/5 [21]	113/6 [20]	Cornell	6	31/58- 111 (24) [19]	18/37 -59 (19)/ 16 [17]		9/30- 72 (22) [7]	15/3 9- 66 (17) /19 [15]	14/12 5-234 (60)/2 4 [32]		35/4 5- 117 (30)/ 17 [23]
92/5 [20]	106/6 [19]	NYU		13/22- 58 (13) [10]	17/14 -28 (7)/1 0 [10]		36/30 -61 (18) [14]	56/1 0- 19 (6)/ 12 [22]	34/50 -132 (34)/3 6 [33]		21/4 6-96 (24)/ 11 [17]
94/6 [16]	94/6 [16]	UNC		29/75- 119 (26) [19]	25/90 -137 (36)/ 29 [20]	22/28 -67 (15) [16]		18/2 1- 45 (12) /11 [14]	25/56 -127 (35)/1 3 [21]	13-38 (10)	6/19- 44 (8)/6 [4]
107/6 [19]	123/7 [18]	UW-Seattle		28/40- 81 (17) [16]	26/89 -133 (35)/ 35 [23]	10/20 -53 (11) [8]	17/73 -99 (39) [16]	23/2 6- 56 (14) /33 [20]	12/59 - 141(3 9)/26 [24]		10/5 0-99 (26)/ 17 [16]

89/6 [15]	100/7 [14]	Texas		12/30-84 (16) [10]	31/73-125 (32)/27 [20]	14/27-64 (14) [11]	11/42-86 (31) [11]	19/6-9-102 (26)/19 [18]	16/57-141 (38)/8 [18]	29-53 (16)	16/1-6-44 (7)/11 [12]
102/6 [18]	198/7 [22]	Illinois	8	14/31-78 (15) [12]	28/83-129 (34)/29 [22]	16/11-40 (6) [9]	18/21-51 (13) [7]	30/3-4-71 (17)/24 [21]	5/35-110 (23)/7 [8]		29/4-8-109 (27)/47 [30]
110/5 [22]	110/5 [21]	Johns Hopkins		21/60-117 (25) [18]	32/57-111 (28)/23 [19]	23/NA A	NA/2-15(1)	21/1-09-157 (44)/49 [33]	35/14-58 (11)/3 6 [25]		17/7-31 (4)/27 [15]
88/6 [14]	88/6 [15]	Minnesota	7	50/150-162 (49) [22]	10/28-52 (17)/16 [13]	3/46-80 (19) [9]	NA/5-3-78 (32)	13/4-5-74 (20)/24 [16]	7/30-98 (20)/8 [8]		24/5-4-117 (32)/17 [20]

- Anthropology: Penn State 7-20 (3) U of Arizona 11-31 (4) UC-Irvine 13-46 (7) Emory 17-45 (10) Indiana U at Bloomington 36-81 U (16) Georgia 34-91 (18) UC-Santa Barbara 34-91 (18) SUNY (Binghamton) 32-96 (20). \*U Michigan UC-Berkeley/San Francisco Duke two programs (higher ranks included & the other excluded from total ranks)
- Economics : Cal Tech 20-35 (10) Brown 26-44 (13) U Maryland 23-48 (15) Washington U (St Louis) 34-53 (17) Carnegie Mellon 47-85 (20) Penn State 51-84 (24) 54-90 U Pittsburg (25) U Rochester 54-90 (27) \* Stanford 2 programs Harvard 3 programs (higher ranks included & the others excluded from total ranks)
- Geography : Boston U 4-25 (3) Clark U 8-29 (4) [5] U Maryland 9-44 (5) University of Illinois-UC 11-40 (6) Ohio State 12-40 (7 tied) [4] Penn State 14-45 (9) [2] U of Oregon 14-56 (10) U Kentucky 15-58 (11) U of Washington 20-53 (12)
- Linguistics : Johns Hopkins 2-15 (1) San Diego State & U San Diego 6-31 (4) University of Massachusetts 10-36 (8) U Maryland 11-36 (9) USC 18-50 (11) Indiana U at Bloomington 23-57 (16) U of Delaware 22-61 (17) U Colorado at Boulder 22-69 (18) University of Arizona 32-61 (20) UCLA other program (potentially 20 not included for ranking purpose)
- Psychology : Carnegie Mellon 7-56 (10) U Colorado at Boulder 14-66 (13) U Rochester 13-74 (14) Brown 17-86 (17) Indiana U at Bloomington (18) Vanderbilt University 32-100 (21) Washington U at St Louis 35-98 (22) Syracuse University 33-113 (24) SUNY at stony Brook 36-116 (25) U of Iowa 34-119 (26) Dartmouth 38-125 (28) U of Florida 37-127 (29) Penn State 35-130 (30) Ohio State 39-150 (31) U of Arizona 52-126 (32) Michigan State 50-129 (33) Arizona State 53-134 (36) Florida State U 45-151 (37) Temple University 77-152 (46) \* A considerable numbers of universities have two or more than two programs on the list (As same with other cases, higher ranked program included and others excluded for ranking purpose)
- Sociology: U Arizona 27-54 (14) Penn State 20-65 (15) U Miami 21-84 (17) Rutgers 33-74 (18) Ohio State 31-77 19 (19) Indiana U at Bloomington 42-85 (20) U Iowa 38-92 (22) UCSF 24-115 (25) U Nebraska 41-102 (27) Brown University 42-116 (29) U Maryland 55-111 (31) UC-Santa Barbara 56-114 (31)



- Public Affairs: Indiana U at Bloomington 5-17 (2) Carnegie Mellon 5-19 (3) Syracuse 8-25 (4) USC 12-25 (5) U Kentucky 16-37 (9) Georgia Institute of Technology 16-41 (10) Johns Hopkins 15-46 (12) U Georgia 22-49 (14) SUNY at Albany 33-58 (17)

**[B] [Engineering]**

		Aerospace	Biomedical	Chemical	Civil & Environmental	Electrical & Computer	Material Science	Mechanical	Industrial	Total
<b>1</b>	MIT	2/9-24 (6)/1 [2]	1/4-18 (4)/1 [1]	2/4-14 (4)/1 [1]	1/9-40 (3)/7 [3]	2/11-31(7)/1 [2]	1/5-20 (3)/1 [1]	2/8-22(5)/1 [2]	5/3-9(2)/NA [3]	15(sum)/8(programs)
<b>2</b>	Stanford	3/3-6 (2)/2 [1]	8/NA/3 [2]	7/11-35 (7)/4 [3]	3/6-26 (2)/4 [2]	1/2-4(1)/2 [1]	6/10-33 (8)/4 [5]	1/4-11(1)/1 [1]	NA/2-8 (1)/7 [4]	19/8
<b>3</b>	Berkeley	NA/NA/NA	12/5-12 (3)/6 [3]	3/5-12 (3)/2 [2]	2/4-16(1)/1 [1]	4/9-28 (6)/3 [3]	4/8-23 (5)/5 [4]	3/6-17(4)/3 [3]	3/4-19(4)/2 [2]	18/7

- Aerospace Engineering : Cal Tech 2-4 (1) University of Michigan 5-14 (3) U of Colorado at Boulder 9-19 (4) University of Minnesota-Twin Cities 8-23 (5) Georgia Institute of Technology 13-35 (7)
- Biomedical Engineering : Cal Tech 2-9 (1) UC-San Diego 3-11 (2) U of Washington 4-22 (5) Duke 7-38 (6) U of Michigan (6) Yale (8) Rice (9) Johns Hopkins 13-47
- Chemical Engineering : Cal Tech 2-5 (1) UT-Austin 3-12 (2) UC-Santa Barbara 5-13 (4) U of Minnesota-Twin Cities 8-29 (6<sup>th</sup>) U of Wisconsin-Madison 11-42 (8<sup>th</sup>) U of Illinois-UC 14-43 (9) Northwestern 12-46 (10) Carnegie Melon 13-45 (10)
- Civil & Environmental Engineering : Yale R-rank 23-91/S-rank 1-2 (Corrected R-rank 7-43 /S-rank 1-1)
- Electrical & Computer Engineering: Princeton 3-10 (2) Harvard 3-15 (3) Cal Tech 7-21 (4) U of Illinois-UC 8-26 (5) U of Michigan 12-32 (8) UCLA 12-37 (9) Georgia Institute of Technology (10)
- Material Sciences : UC-Santa Barbara 2-3 (1) Cal Tech 4-11 (2) U of Massachusetts 6-21 (4) Northwestern 8-30 (6) Penn State 8-36 (7) Stanford University 10-33 (8) University of Illinois-UC 9-34 (8) U of Florida 10-41 (10)
- Material Sciences (Combined) : Northwestern 2+5+2 (1) Cal Tech ND/2/5 (2)
- Mechanical Engineering : Northwestern 5-11 (2) U of Michigan 5-17 (3) Brown 6-28 (6) UC-Santa Barbara 12-30 (7)
- Industrial Engineering : Georgia Institute of Technology 2-10 (2) Northwestern 5-21 (5) Carnegie Mellon 7-27 (6) Cornell 10-31 (7) U of Michigan 13-35 (8) Purdue 14-46 (9) Penn State (9) U of Iowa (11) UW-Madison (12) U of Penn 22-56 (13) Ohio State 18-64 (14) Virginia Polytech 23-65 (15)
- Industrial Engineering: GIT 1/2/1 (total 1st)
- Material Science : Northwestern 2/5/2 (total 2<sup>nd</sup>) Cal Tech 6/2/1 (total 3<sup>rd</sup>)

**[C] [Art & Humanities]**

		A S	Clas sics	Com Lit	Eng lish	Fren ch	Ger man	His tory	Art - His tory	Mu sic	Philo soph y	Reli gion	Spa nish	The atre	Total
1	Prin ceto n		4/4- 20 (3) [2]	5/2- 27(4) [1]	13/3 - 17( 3)/8 [8]	2/5 - 17( 3) [1]	2/1 2- 42 (11) [4]	3/2 -10 (1)/ [1]	6/3 [3]	6/8 - 28 (9) [4]	1/3- 14(2) [1]	3/7- 26 (6) [2]	4/13 -64 (11) [4]		29 (sum )/11 (prog rams)
2	Harv ard	2	1/3- 17 (2) [1]	4/8- 26(5) [1]	2/2- 15 (1)/ 8 [2]	17/ 10- 34( 6) [9]	4/7- 34 (5) [2]	4/2 -12 (2)/ 4/ [2]	4/5 [3]	1/4 -11 (2) [1]	3/27- 67 (17) [11]	2/9- 27 (8) [5]	10/ NA		39/11
3	Berk eley		2/7- 25 (5) [2]	10/3 -22 (2)/ [4]	3/24 - 63( 13)/ 1 [6]	7/2 1- 45( 14) [8]	1/5- 21 (2) [1]	2/1 5- 38 (10) [4]	3/2 [1]	3/1 7- 51 (1 4) [5]	4/5- 21 (5) [2]	ND/ ND	9/9- 40(6 )[4]	7	45/11
4	Stan ford		16/ 2- 10 (1) [4]	9/3- 22(2) [3]	5/3- 12 (2)/ 3 [2]	6/6 -28 (5) [2]	6/1 3- 39 (10) [5]	7/1 3- 28 (6)/ 1 [3]	14/ ND [4]		6/15- 42 (9) [5]	19/ ND	17/2 1-66 (14) /[11 ]	2	39/9

- Classics : Columbia 2-19 (2)/U Penn 6-26 (5)
- Comparative Literature : U of Maryland 3-15 (1) Yale 7/37 (5 tied) U of Penn 8-37 (7) Duke 9-31 (8)
- English Language : Columbia 6-22 (4) Yale 7-33 (5) Cornell 10-42 (6) U of Michigan 12-43 (7) U of Chicago 12-48 (8) U of Pennsylvania 14-50 (9) Vanderbilt 13-53 (10) Duke 14-58 (11) UW-Madison 17-61 (12) CUNY 22-67 (14) Brown 22-69 (15)
- English Language (Combined) : Yale 1/5/8 (4) Columbia 9/3/3 (5) Cornell 7/5/6 (7) U Penn 8-8-3 (8)
- English :Stanford 5/3/3 (2), Yale 1/5/8 (4), Penn 8/6/8 Col 9/5/3
- French Language : Duke 2-13 (1) U Penn 5-16 (2) U Michigan 6-21 (4) Vanderbilt 9-36 (7) Yale 13-31 (8) U of Wisconsin 13-35 (9) Johns Hopkins 13-40 (10) Indiana U at Bloomington 20-42 (11) Penn State 15-48 (12) Cornell 18-47 (13) NYU 21-48 (15) Brown 25-52 (16) Columbia 24-54 (17)
- French Language (Combined): Duke 3+1 (1) U Penn 5+2 (2) Yale 1+ 8 (5) U of Michigan 9+ 4 (6) U Wisconsin 11 + 9 (7) Cornell 8+13 (8)
- German Language : U of Minnesota 4-24 (1) U of Chicago 5-21 (2) Indiana University at Bloomington 6-33 (4) Harvard 7-34 (5) Washington University in St Louis 10-35 (6) NYU 11-35 (7) UT-Austin 10-39 (8) UNC 12-38 (9) Stanford 13-39 (10) Princeton 12-42 (11) Ohio State 12-44 (12) Cornell 18-38 (12) U of Michigan 14-43 (14) UCLA 15-42 (14) U Wisconsin-Madison (18) Yale 22-46 (17)
- German Language (Combined) : U of Minnesota 11+1 (2) Washington University in St. Louis 7+6 (4 tied)
- History : Princeton 2-10 (1) Harvard 2-12 (2) U of Chicago 4-17 (3) Princeton (History of Science) 4-20 (4) Johns Hopkins 7-22 (5) Stanford 11-28 (6) Columbia 11-31 (7) Yale (Medieval studies) 11-32 (8) U Penn 13-31 (9) UC-Berkeley 15-38 (10) UNC 19-37 (11) Harvard (History of Science) 18-38

(11) U Michigan 18-40 (13) Yale 19-40 (14) Rutgers 22-45 (15)

- Music : Indiana University at Bloomington 2-12 (1) 6-22 (5) Harvard 4-11 (2) UCLA 4-11 (3) 7-23 (6) U of Chicago 5-16 (4) Yale 8-25 (7) Princeton 8-28 (8) Columbia 15-26 (9) NYU 10-40 (10) Cornell 14-45 (11) U of Rochester 18-43 (12) UC-Berkeley 17-51 (14) U Penn 20-49 (14)
- Music (Combined) : U of Chicago 2+4 (2) Yale 5+7 (3)
- Philosophy: Rutgers: U Chicago 2-12 (1) Princeton 3-14 (2) Rutgers 3-16 (3) U Michigan 3-17 (4) UC-Berkeley 5-21 (5) NYU 7-23 (6) MIT 10-31 (7) U Pittsburg 15-41 (8) 19-47 (11) Stanford 15-42 (9) Carnegie Mellon 15-49 (10) Columbia 17-51 (12) UC-San Diego 24-48 (13) U Notre Dame 20-53 (14) Brown 21-54 (15) UNC 25-59 (16) Harvard 27-67 (17)
- Philosophy (combined) : Princeton 1+3 (1) UC-Berkeley 4+5 (2) U of Pittsburg 2+8 (4) 2+11 (7) U of Michigan 7+4 (5) U Chicago 1+11 (6) Rutgers 12+3 (8) Stanford 6+9 (8) MIT 9+7 (10) Harvard 3+17 (11)
- Religion :Duke 2-11 (1) U Chicago 2-11 (1) U Notre Dame 5-17 (3) Emory 7-21 (4) UNC 5-23 (4) Princeton 7-26 (6) Yale 9-24 Harvard 9-27 (8)
- Religion (combined): U Chicago 1+1 (1) Duke 1+4 (2) Princeton 3+6 (3) Emory 4+5 (3) Harvard 2+8 (5)
- Spanish : Yale 2-11 (1) Brown 3-26 (2) NYU 6-25 (3) Penn state 6-38 (4) Vanderbilt 7-39 (5) UC-Berkeley 9-40 (6) Columbia 12-46 (7) UC-Davis 18-50 (8) U Virginia 17-54 (9) U Illinois-UC 23-52 (11) Princeton 13-64 (11) Purdue 17-63 (12) UT-Austin 21-63 (13) Stanford 21-66 (14) UC-Santa Barbara 18-70 (15)
- Spanish (combined): Brown 3+2 (1) Columbia 1+7 (2) U Virginia 9+5 (3) Princeton 4+11 (4) UC-Berkeley 9+6 (4)
- History: Stanford 7/1, Yale 12/1 Columbia 7/6

[D] [Health Sciences]

	Immunology & Infectious Disease	Kinesiology	Microbiology	Nursing	Pharmacology & Toxicology	Public Health	Total
1	Yale 2-3/4	PSU 2-9	Stanford 2-5/2	UCSF 2-7	Yale 3-28	Harvard (Epidemiology) 2-10 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	
2	Stanford 4-11/4	U of Connecticut 2-17	Harvard 2-17/1	U Penn 3-12	UNC 3-37	Harvard (Occupational Health) 2-16	
3	Washington U. (St Louis) 4-11/outside 6	U of Georgia 4-22	Washington U –St Louis 4-26	Yale 3-13	U Penn 2-41	Harvard (Nutrition) 4-21	
4	Harvard 4-26/3	U of Massachusetts 3-27	U of California-Berkeley 5-34/3	Johns Hopkins 4-20	Stanford 3-49 (4 tied)	U. of Michigan 3-40	
5	U Penn 5-36/8	U of Minnesota-Twin Cities 7-23	Columbia 5-37	U of Washington 6-22	Vanderbilt 4-48 (4 tied)	Harvard (Health Policy) 5-46	

6	UCLA 7-36/outside 6	U of Illinois-Chicago 2-33	NYU 9-43	U of Michigan 9-32	MIT 6-49	U. of California-Berkeley 8-47	
7	U. of California-Berkeley 5-41/outside 6	Washington U-St Louis 9-36	Duke 9-45	Case Western Reserve 8-34		Yale 9-51	
8	Emory 8-44/outside 6	UNC 12-34	U of Washington 10-50	U of Illinois-Chicago 11-35			
9	U of Chicago 7-46/outside 6	U. of Delaware 13-35	U Penn 11-53	Emory 9-37			
10	U Michigan 14-55/outside 6	U of Florida 10-42	U Virginia 11-54	U of Iowa 9-38			
11		ASU 13-39	Tufts 12-55	U of Kentucky 12-36			
12		U of Maryland 13-42	Yale 14-53	NYU 15-50			
13		U of Wisconsin-Madison 18-48	UW-Madison 12-56/4	UW-Madison 19-49			
14		U of Illinois-UC 15-53	Case Western Reserve 13-58				
15		UT-Austin 17-52	U of Pittsburg 20-57				
16		U of Virginia 18-61					

[E] [Life Sciences]

Rank	Biochemistry, Biophysics, and Structural Biology	Biology / Integrated Biology / Integrated Biomedical Sciences	Cell and Developmental Biology	Ecology and Evolutionary Biology	Genetics and Genomics	Neuroscience and Neurobiology	Physiology	Total
1	Stanford 3/3-24 (3)/1	Cal Tech	MIT 1/2-5 (1)/outside 6 or 4	Stanford 1/ND/4	MIT 1/2-7 (1)/6	Harvard 3/2-14 (1)/5 4/4-24 (5)/5		
2	MIT 2/2-14 (1)/5	UCSD	Harvard 5/3-13 (2)/3 or 1	Harvard ND/4-19 (3)/6	Harvard 3/ND/1	Stanford 5/2-19 (3)/1		

<b>3</b>	Harvard 5/4-27 (4)/1	Yale	UCSF (tied) 3/5-31 (4)/3 or 7  Stanford (tied) 6/5-21 (3)/2 or 4		Stanford 5/3-10 (3)/1	UCSF 4/4-24 (5)/5		
<b>4</b>	Berkeley 4/3-19 (2)/5	UCSF			Berkeley 10/2-9 (2)/3	MIT 14/3-15 (2)/5		
<b>5</b>	UCSF 1/9-32 (5)/7				UCSF 2/23/7		5 (1996 NRC)	

- Biology/Integrated Biology (2010 only): Cal Tech (2-7) UCSD (Biomedical Sciences 4-20, 3-19 Biological Sciences) Yale 6-25 UCSF (9-35)
- Cell Developmental Biology : Berkeley 12/6-34 (5)/outside 6 or 1
- Ecology and Evolutionary Ecology : Berkeley 8/12-49 (8)/1
- Neuroscience and Neurobiology : Berkeley 9/8-38 (8)/outside 8
- Ecology and Evolution 2010 : Princeton 3-15 (1) Duke 4-18 (2) Indiana-Bloomington 4-25 (4) Washington U. (ST /Louis) 4-25 (4) UC-Davis 9-38 (6<sup>th</sup>) U of Chicago 9-34 (7<sup>th</sup>)
- Neuroscience : UC-San Diego 4-19 (4) Johns Hopkins 6-29 (6) Yale 9-35 (7)
- No Data from Five universities in 2010 NRC Physiology/Two universities in 1996 NRC physiology (UCSF 5<sup>th</sup> Stanford 8<sup>th</sup>)

**[F] [Natural Sciences]**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Applied Mathematics</b>	<b>Astrophysics and Astronomy</b>	<b>Chemistry</b>	<b>Computer Sciences</b>	<b>Earth Sciences</b>	<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>Oceanography, Atmospheric Sciences, and Meteorology</b>	<b>Physics</b>	<b>Statistics and Probability</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1</b>	Berkeley	[8] (US News)	3/4-17 (3)/5 [3]	1/4-11 (3)/1 [1]	3/2-4 (1)/1 [2]	3/3-39 (7)/3 [2]	2/2-11 (3)/3 [2]		4/3-16 (2)/2 [2]	2/4-11 (3)/2 [2]	22/8
<b>2</b>	MIT	9-27 (5)/4 [3]	8/9-29 (8)/7 [5]	5/11-34 (8)/1 [4]	2/5-14 (3)/1 [3]	2/13-44 (10)/1 [2]	3/10-23 (7)/1 [3]	2/8-35 (7)	3/6-32 (5)/1 [4]		24/7
<b>3</b>	Princeton	1-1 [1]	2/3-8 (2)/1 [2]	20/26-80 (17)/15 [13]	6/7-23 (4)/8 [4]	13/12-44 (9)/11	1/2-9 (1)/1 [1]		2/6-21 (4)/2 [2]		23/6
<b>4</b>	Harvard	9-29 [6]	4/8-27 (6)/4 [4]	4/2-11 (1)/4 [3]	11/14-63 (10)/18 [8]	8/3-18 (1)/8 [5]	4/6-15 (5)/3 [4]		1/2-5 (1)/2	6/4-7 (2)/3 [3]	34/8

									[1]		
5	Cal Tech	7-30 (7)/ 3 (US news) [2]	1/2-5 (1)/2 [1]	2/4-10(2)/ 1 [1]	12/72-153 (35)/1 1 [14]	1/5-18 (3)/1 [1]	11/12-37 (10)/7 [6]		5/15 -65 (12) /2 [5]		30/7
6	Stanford	[8] (US news)	22/ND/ 5 [8]	3/10-34 (7)/4 [4]	1/2-4 (1)/1 [1]	5/6-26 (5)/3 [2]	6/4-12 (4)/5 [5]	18/ND	9/14 -55 (10) 1/2 [6]	1/2-2 (1)/1 [1]	35/8

- Astrophysics : PSU 7-24 (4) Johns Hopkins 7-29 (5) U Chicago 9-28 (7) OSU 10-33 (9)
- Math 2010 NRC : NYU 2-9 (1) U Michigan 8-21 (6) PSU 9-26 (8) UW-Madison 14-34 (9) Cal Tech 12-37 (10) Yale 16-43 (11)
- Applied Math : UCLA 4-18 (4) U of Washington 6-20 (5) Cornell 5-24 (7) Northwestern 8-28 (6<sup>th</sup>) NYU 9-31 UC Davis 9-32 (7<sup>th</sup> tied) U of Arizona 12-35 (8<sup>th</sup>) UT-Austin 10-33 (9<sup>th</sup>) Cal Tech 7-30 (10<sup>th</sup>) U of Colorado at Boulder 13-36 (11<sup>th</sup>) SUNY at Stony Brook 16-40 (12<sup>th</sup>)
- Computer Sciences: UC Santa Barbara 8-33 (5) Cornell 10-44 (6) U Penn 13-44 (7) UC San Diego 7-65 (8) University of Illinois-UC (9) Michigan State 14-69 (11) UCLA 13-68 (11) Duke 24-71 (13) UW-Madison 20-78 (14) \* Carnegie Melon 1<sup>st</sup> in US news Computer Sciences
- Earth Sciences: UC-Irvine 3-18 (1) Four more Cal Tech programs within top ten (3)(4)(6) (8) PSU 21-54 (11) U of Chicago 27-64 (12)
- Oceanography : UCSD 2-12 (1<sup>st</sup>) UCLA 3-19 (2<sup>nd</sup>) Colorado State University 4-27 (3<sup>rd</sup>) U of Maryland 4-27 (4<sup>th</sup>) UW-Madison 7-30 (5<sup>th</sup>) UC Santa Barbara 6-37 (6<sup>th</sup>) University of Washington 9-33 (7<sup>th</sup>) MIT 8-35 (7<sup>th</sup>) U of Michigan 9-43 (8<sup>th</sup>)
- Physics: Harvard DEA program 3-17 (3) UC Santa Barbara 7-32 (6)
- Statistics 2010 NRC : U of Michigan 8-26 (4) U of Chicago 9-26 (5) Duke 9-32 (6) Penn State 11-36 (7) UNC 13-35 (8) Iowa State University 13-38 (9) U of Washington 14-39 (10) UW-Madison 11-45 (11) Columbia 18-49 (12) North Carolina State 21-46 (12) U Penn 21-46 (12 three tied)

[G] [Communication]

Rank	Institution	Range (S-Rank + R-Rank)
1 <sup>st</sup>	U of Penn	3-52
2 <sup>nd</sup>	PSU	6-58
3 <sup>rd</sup>	MSU	7-62
4 <sup>th</sup>	Stanford	2-70
5 <sup>th</sup>	Cornell	4-70
6 <sup>th</sup>	UW-Madison	6-81
7 <sup>th</sup>	U of Michigan	6-88
8 <sup>th</sup>	Indiana at Bloomington	8-86
9 <sup>th</sup>	OSU	14-89

[H] [Education]

R	Instit	Curri	Educational	Educ	Educ	Elem	Higher	Seco	Speci	Stude	Tech	to
an	ution	culu	onal	ation	ationa	entar	Educati	ndar	al	nt	nical	ta
k		mand	Admini	Polic	l	y	on	y	Educ	Coun	/	l

		Instruction	and Supervision	y	Psychology	Teacher Education	Administration	Teacher Education	ation	Selling and Personnel Services	Vocational	
1	UW-Madison	1	2	4	1	4		3	7	4		26/8
2	MSU	2	4	9	5	1		1				22/6
3	Vanderbilt	3	1	3	4	5	5	8	1			30/8
4	U of Michigan	6	11	5	2	2	1	2				29/7
5	Columbia	3	5	6		3		4				21/5
6	Stanford	5	7	1	3	11		4				31/6
7	Harvard		3	2			11					16/3

[I] [Agricultural Sciences]

Rank	Institution	Animal Sciences	Entomology	Food Science	Forestry and Forest Sciences	Nutrition	Plant Sciences	Total
1	UW-Madison	4-38 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	6-30 (7 <sup>th</sup> )	5-26 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	2-5 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	2-19 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	5-29 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	22/6
2	Cornell	3-18 (2 <sup>nd</sup> )	5-30 (6 <sup>th</sup> )	2-14 (2 <sup>nd</sup> )		15-36 (10 <sup>th</sup> )	5-34 (4 <sup>th</sup> )	24/5
3	UC-Davis		3-20 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	7-30 (6 <sup>th</sup> )			6-34 (6 <sup>th</sup> )	15/3
4	University of Georgia		6-28 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	4-22 (4 <sup>th</sup> )	(5 <sup>th</sup> )		8-38 (7 <sup>th</sup> )	21/4
5	U of Washington	4-38 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )			5-23 (3 <sup>rd</sup> )	12-48 (12 <sup>th</sup> )		18/3
6	PSU		7-31 (8 <sup>th</sup> )	15-43 (10 <sup>th</sup> )	12-49 (8 <sup>th</sup> )	5-26 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	2-17 (2 <sup>nd</sup> )	33/5
7	U of Illinois-UC	2-15 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	2-12 (1 <sup>st</sup> )	12-45 (10 <sup>th</sup> )		5-32 (8 <sup>th</sup> )	15-85 (Around 20 <sup>th</sup> )	40/5
8	U of Minnesota		3-26 (4 <sup>th</sup> )		11-30 (7 <sup>th</sup> )	11-38 (9 <sup>th</sup> )	43-138 (Around 28 <sup>th</sup> )	48/4
9	Kansas State		5-29 (5 <sup>th</sup> )	12-44 (9 <sup>th</sup> )		38-60 (20 <sup>th</sup> )	18-85 (Around 21 <sup>st</sup> )	55/4
10	U of Kentucky		16-41 (9 <sup>th</sup> )			13-39 (11 <sup>th</sup> )	40-146 (Around 29 <sup>th</sup> )	49/3
11	UC-Riverside		2-15 (2 <sup>nd</sup> )				19-84 (Around	23/2

							<b>21<sup>st</sup></b>	
<b>12</b>	Oklahoma State	10-59 <b>(4<sup>th</sup>)</b>					103-196 <b>(Around 33<sup>th</sup>)</b>	37/2

- Oklahoma State University 10-59 in animal Science
- Food Science: U of Massachusetts 2-10 (1<sup>st</sup>) Purdue 3-18 (3<sup>rd</sup>) U of Arkansas 8-35 (7<sup>th</sup>) Rutgers 14-40 (8<sup>th</sup>) U of Maryland 19-47 (11<sup>th</sup>)
- Forestry: Yale 4-15 (2<sup>nd</sup>) Oregon State 6-22 (3<sup>rd</sup>) Purdue 8-30 (5<sup>th</sup>)
- Nutrition: Tufts 2-16 (1<sup>st</sup>) UNC 2-15 (2<sup>nd</sup>) PSU 5-26 (4<sup>th</sup>) University of California-Berkeley 5-30 (6<sup>th</sup>) University of California-Davis 6-26 (5<sup>th</sup>) Ohio State University 13-49 (12<sup>th</sup>) University of Florida 16-48 (13<sup>th</sup>)
- Plant Sciences : University of California-Berkeley 2-13 (1<sup>st</sup>) Washington State University 5-35 (5<sup>th</sup>)

**[J] [Other 1: Relevant to Research Doctorates and independent from NRC]**

Rank	Nuclear Engineering	Clinical Psychology	Rehabilitation Counselling
<b>1</b>	University of Michigan	UCLA	UW-Madison
<b>2</b>	UW-Madison	UC-Berkeley	Michigan State University

- Based from the Data 2012-2017]

**[K] [Other 2: Master or other Graduate Programs covered comprehensively by NRC]\***

Rank	Occupational Therapy	Physician Assistant	Health Care Management	Social Work	Physical Therapy	Speech Language Pathology
1	Boston U.	Duke	U of Michigan	U of Michigan	U of Delaware/U of	U of Iowa
2	Washington University in St. Louis	U of Iowa	U of Alabama-Birmingham	Washington University in St. Louis	Pittsburg/U of Southern California/Washington University in St. Louis	Vanderbilt

- Since this study is based on the classification of NRC field category, Other 2 was not included for ranking consideration while Other 1 was accounted.

**[L] [Typology of Global Rankings]**

University Wide + Subject						University Wide Only
US News	THE	QS	ARWU	CWUR	NTU Ranking of Scientific Papers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● G-factor</li> <li>● Leiden Ranking</li> <li>● Nature Index</li> <li>● Round University Ranking</li> <li>● Webometrics</li> <li>● Others : uniRank:</li> </ul>



Overall 1 + 22 subjects	Overall + 6 categories	Overall 1 + 5 fields + 46 subjects	Overall ( & Alternative) + 5 Fields + 5 Specific Subjects	Overall 1 + 227 subjects (largest)	Overall + 6 fields + 14 subjects	<a href="https://www.4icu.org/about/index.htm">https://www.4icu.org/about/index.htm</a> Eduroute <a href="http://www.eduroute.info/">http://www.eduroute.info/</a> Etc. ● Scholarly papers (ex)
-------------------------------	------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---

### Useful Links & Reference

<http://www.phds.org/> (2010 NRC)

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/NRC-Rankings-Overview-/124743> (2010 NRC before revision)

[https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc\\_rankings/nrc41indiv.html](https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc_rankings/nrc41indiv.html) (1996 NRC-1 41 specific areas)

[https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc\\_rankings/nrc1.html](https://www.stat.tamu.edu/~jnewton/nrc_rankings/nrc1.html) (1996-NRC-2 Brief)

Kim, Kiyong and Ju, Hyun-Meong and Khatun, Marium, A Reflection on the Research Method and Exemplary Application to the College and University Rankings (October 23, 2015). Kiyong Kim, Hyun-Meong Ju, Marium Khatun. A Reflection on the Research Method and Exemplary Application to the College and University Rankings. Education Journal. Vol. 4, No. 5, 2015, pp. 250-262. doi: 10.11648/j.edu.20150405.23. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2686045>

Kim, K., Borhanian, S., Chung, K.-T., Park, Y.-H., Lee, W.-S., & Kim, J.-H. (2016). The Graduate Law Degree Holders in the Legal Education Market: Evidence from the US, Rankings and Implications. Beijing Law Review, 7, 371-399. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/blr.2016.74031>

Kim, Kiyong and Ju, Hyun-Meong and Khatun, Marium, A Teacher and Researcher: A Scratch on the Science Community and Meaning of Evaluation with the Research Doctoral Programs Ranking (September 7, 2015). International Journal of Philosophy, 3(4): 34-46, 2015, DOI: 10.11648/j.ijp.20150304.11. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2668450>