



Executive Education Ranking 2016

KEY: CUSTOMISED PROGRAMMES

The first 10 criteria, up to “Future use”, are rated by the companies that commissioned executive courses; the last five are based on data reported by business schools. These criteria are presented in rank form, with the leading school in each column ranked number one. The final two criteria are for information only, and do not inform the ranking.

Figures in brackets show the weight each criterion contributes to the overall ranking. The weighting accorded to the first nine criteria, from preparation to value for money, accounts for 72 per cent of the total ranking’s weight. It is determined by the level of importance that clients attach to each.

Preparation (8.3): level of interaction between client and school, the extent to which clients’ ideas were integrated into the programme, and the effectiveness of the school in integrating its latest research.

Programme design (8.5): flexibility of the course and the willingness of schools to complement their faculty with external experts.

Teaching methods and materials (7.9): extent to which teaching methods and materials were contemporary and appropriate, and included a suitable mix of academic rigour and practical relevance.

Faculty (8.4): quality of teaching and the extent to which teaching staff worked together to present a coherent programme.

New skills and learning (8.3): relevance of skills gained to the workplace, the ease with which they were implemented, and the extent to which the course encouraged new ways of thinking.

Follow-up (7.3): extent and effectiveness of follow-up offered after the course participants returned to their workplaces.

Aims achieved (8.4): extent to which academic and business expectations were met, and the quality of feedback from individual participants to course commissioners.

Facilities (7.2): rating of the learning environment’s quality and convenience, and of supporting resources and facilities.

Value for money (7.8): clients’ rating of the programme’s design, teaching and materials in terms of value for money.

Future use (8.0): likelihood that clients would reuse the same school for other customised programmes in the future, and whether they would recommission the same programme.

International clients (5.0): percentage of clients with headquarters outside the business school's base country and region.

International participants (3.0): extent to which customised programmes have participants from more than one country.

Overseas programmes (4.0): international reach of the school's customised programme teaching.

Partner schools (3.0): quantity and quality of programmes developed or taught in conjunction with other business schools.

Faculty diversity (5.0): diversity of school faculty according to nationality and gender.

Total responses: number of individual surveys completed by the school's clients. Figures in brackets indicate the number of years of survey data counted towards the ranking.

Custom revenues: income from customised programmes in 2015 in \$m, provided optionally by schools. Revenues are converted into US\$ using the average dollar currency exchange rates for 2015.