

AN INDICATIVE STUDY CONDUCTED BY THE BRITISH COUNCIL

INTERNATIONAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE TEACHING EXCELLENCE AND STUDENT OUTCOMES FRAMEWORK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study draws on the expertise of leaders and policy makers in higher education contexts around the globe, and the British Council would like to extend considerable gratitude to the individuals who gave their time and shared their thoughts to this study.

Furthermore, the interviews and discussions which form the basis of this work would not have been possible without the network of support from British Council colleagues in the study countries. Particular thanks go to Xiaoxiao Liu (British Council, China), Andrew Chadwick (British Council, France), Ailsa Kienberger (British Council Germany), Shrikant Wad (British Council, India), Prabha Sundram (British Council, Malaysia).

Report author: Michael Peak, Head Higher Education Systems Research, British Council.

29 March 2019

Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Executive summary	4
Introduction	5
Research objectives	5
British Council's approach to the study	6
Beyond the scope of this study	7
Challenges and limitations of this study	8
Diversity of national higher education systems and priorities	8
Themes emerging from the interviews	9
Components of teaching excellence and student outcomes	9
Existing national systems for benchmarking institutions	11
International awareness of TEF	13
Perspectives on TEF	13
Concluding Remarks	14
Reflections on the research objectives	14
Opportunities and risks presented	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The British Council undertook a small research study on behalf of the Department for Education, in order to gather international perceptions of UK higher education especially in the context of the “Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework” (TEF).
 - The findings of this study are to inform the independent review of TEF led by Dame Shirley Pearce.
 - A total of 15 semi-structured interviews were conducted across five countries (China, France, Germany, India and Malaysia).
 - The interviews were with a range of influential and experienced leaders and policy makers in the higher education arena. The majority of the interviewees hold roles within their domestic HE systems which require extensive knowledge and understanding of the international higher education environment.
 - This series of interviews cannot claim to represent generalisable findings across international higher education, but do reflect the thoughts and understanding of respected, influential HE experts in the respective study countries.
 - Summary of findings:
 - There are some systematic national approaches to assessing teaching excellence within the countries studied
 - China, Malaysia and India pointed to systems in use, part use or in development
 - measuring teaching excellence and student outcome can be challenging and can mean different things to different groups in different contexts
 - Judging the excellence of an institution (or programme) depends on the perspective of the potential partner/student, and depends on the motivation for seeking out excellence (ie long-term study, or short term study; teaching partnership; research partnership etc.).
 - There is very little international awareness of TEF - Only one of the 15 interviewees indicated any substantial prior knowledge
 - Although, when informed of TEF, all respondents showed an interest.
 - Interviewees responded positively to the description of TEF, but also raised some interesting questions and signalled potential risks
 - Some interest in adopting a similar approach, or drawing from the learnings of TEF; positivity that TEF gives an opportunity to non-research focussed institutions to shine; and raises the profile of teaching within HE
 - But some concerns raised: is it capturing teaching excellence? Does it speak to international students? (does it capture their experience and outcomes?) Does it promote competition in what international partners see as a collaborative sector?
- A challenge is that for TEF to be relevant to an international audience it must
- a. reflect the needs, experiences and outcomes of international students;
 - b. reflect the needs, and respect the context of potential international partners.

INTRODUCTION

1. In November 2018, Dame Shirley Pearce was appointed to conduct an independent review of the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF). The review was a commitment made during the passage of the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. A work-stream within the review focuses on international perceptions of TEF.
2. In February 2019, the Department for Education asked the British Council to develop the scope of a piece of research to capture some perceptions of senior Higher Education policy makers and influencers in a selection of significant countries.
3. This paper sets out the scope and objectives, limitations and challenges of this study, and summarises the British Council's approach. The paper then presents an analysis of the overarching cross-cutting themes emerging from the research.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

4. The overall objective of this study was to develop an early understanding of TEF's international reputation.
5. Additional sub-objectives of the study aim to understand:
 - a. Ways in which TEF may factor into international perceptions alongside/in contrast to other international measures;
 - b. Any impact of TEF's rating names ('Bronze', 'Silver', 'Gold');
 - c. The extent to which TEF ratings could influence national perceptions of UK higher education;
 - d. The extent to which other national systems are interested in assessing excellence in HE teaching, and the potential influence of TEF;
 - e. The extent to which TEF is filling a gap not filled by other sources of information, and how TEF might better inform about UK HE;
 - f. What UK can learn from other countries' assessments of the educational experience of students and student outcomes.
6. Following the direction of DfE and the independent review panel, the British Council was asked to focus the study on the five countries listed in Table 1.
These countries were determined after consideration of factors including:
 - a. Number of students coming to UK to study
 - b. Geographical spread
 - c. Strategic priority country for the UK

BRITISH COUNCIL'S APPROACH TO THE STUDY

7. In order to meet the objectives the British Council conducted a series of 15 semi-structured interviews with influential and insightful individuals working in higher education in the study countries. The interviews were all conducted between 13 March and 29 March 2019.
8. All interviews followed the same interview guide which had been designed to ensure that conversations covered key areas, but allowed the interviewees to independently raise the issues of importance to them, and describe them in their own words.
9. Through discussions with DFE, it was established that one desired objective of this study would be to gather international perceptions on 'the image of TEF as a whole', although this further exploration of perceptions would depend on a certain level of awareness and prior knowledge of TEF amongst the interviewees. With this consideration, the interview guide was designed so as to gain an understanding of the importance of the various component parts which constitute 'teaching excellence and student outcomes.'
10. Note that interviews were conducted in English by the same researcher, with the exception of interviews in China which were conducted in Mandarin with China-based British Council staff.
11. Table 1 indicates the range of interviewees in each country – a cross section of policy makers, regulators and institution decision makers, experienced in leading roles in higher education, many of whom occupy an international-facing role.
12. (Note that individual interviewees have not been named in this report. Some quotes have been attributed to "Interviewee #", but this numbering bears no reference to the presentation of interviewees in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of countries and interviewees included in study

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS	SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWEES
China	4	Provincial education department; Public university of Science and technology (international manager); Policy maker; HE Evaluation expert
France	3	HE expert with 30 years' experience of international-facing roles in French HE institutions; President of top public HEI; Representative of international HE agency.
Germany	2	Director International Affairs, top public HE institution; Representative of international HE agency.
India	3	Academic advisory committee member – accreditation organisation; Chair of national regulatory organisation; Public policy maker in higher education sector
Malaysia	3	Rector of large public university; Public policy maker in higher education sector; Representative of national regulatory body
Total	15	

BEYOND THE SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

13. The extent to which perceptions of TEF may influence international scholarship funders is not considered in this study. British Council analysis of HESA data, together with reports from Universities UK¹ and others show that international students to the UK from certain countries (particularly countries in the Gulf region) receive significant support from national scholarship schemes. However, as the majority of such scholarships are for postgraduate study, DfE advised that they would not be influenced by TEF and should not be part of this study.
14. The decision making of individual students is not tackled by this study. Many studies² exist which consider the factors which influence the decisions of individual students considering

¹ “UK higher education engagement with the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf” Universities UK & Education Insight.
<https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/International/Documents/Gulf%20Mapping%20Report%202017.pdf>

² Including British Council’s Student Insight survey: <https://education-services.britishcouncil.org/>

international study, and a multi-country, longitudinal study may be the most robust approach to understanding the influence of TEF on student decision making.

15. There continues to be growth in international teaching partnerships (for delivery of “transnational education” and “international programme and provider mobility” – ie access to a UK higher education programme outside the UK). Whether or not TEF ratings play any role in the decision making around forming and maintaining international teaching partnerships is an area which British Council was advised not included in the scope of this study.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

16. This study captures information from 15 experts across 5 countries. It provides an indication of perceptions from some parts of the world of approaches to measuring and benchmarking teaching excellence, and of TEF. The interviewees are all to be considered to hold leading, influential, insightful views. But further research would be required to generate globally generalisable findings on these topics.
17. The approach taken for this study has not focussed on one specific group of experts, but has captured a range of views including from institution leaders, policy makers and regulators.
18. The primary research objective was to develop an early understanding of TEF’s international reputation. However, the vast majority of interviews conducted revealed that there was no prior knowledge or awareness of TEF amongst international experts.
19. The interviews did proceed to explore initial thoughts and impressions of TEF, but many opinions shared were purely suppositional.

Diversity of national higher education systems and priorities

20. It should be noted that the national higher education systems in each of the five study countries are quite different, and complex in their own ways. Very briefly:
 - a. China – Mass higher education system, Provincial authorities (and municipalities) have jurisdiction for higher education
 - b. France – Public and private institutes of higher education: Grandes Ecoles and Technical Institutes (highly selective institutions); and Universities (higher student numbers and lower funding per head). Tuition fees are low for public institutions.
 - c. Germany – Managed (in the main part) at state level (Länder), universities and universities of applied sciences (which don’t offer doctorates). Tuition fees are mainly low/free.
 - d. India – Mass higher education system. Ministry of Human Resource Development sets the policy for HE and University Grants Commission (UGC) is the main regulatory body for universities at a national level, with AICTE (All India Council for Technical Education) the parallel body for technical education. 17 professional regulatory bodies in for India. Higher learning is also managed at state-level, and accreditation bodies set standards. Institution include central universities, state universities, deemed universities, private universities, ‘institutes of national importance’ and degree colleges.
 - e. Malaysia – Large private sector. Categories of higher learning institutions including mature universities, emerging universities, university colleges, polytechnics. An international education hub, Malaysia is home to several international branch campuses. MQA is the single regulatory body for assuring quality standards of HE provision.
21. In addition to the different approaches to managing and regulating higher education, there is

also a range of national drivers and priorities for the development and internationalisation of higher education.³

THEMES EMERGING FROM THE INTERVIEWS

Components of teaching excellence and student outcomes

22. Interviewees were asked their opinion of the factors that ensure a quality delivery of a HE experience.
23. Interview participants in France, Germany and India made reference to a cycle of student feedback managed by individual institutions, as a process for capturing some measures of teaching excellence (and student experience).
24. Several participants noted that feedback from alumni was also an important gauge of teaching, programme, or institution quality.
25. But overall, the interviews revealed that measuring teaching excellence and student outcome can be challenging and can mean different things to different people:
 - a. “Student outcome in some ways is what they achieve afterwards. It would be nice to track alumni, to see what they go on to achieve, but we are hampered by [lack of] resource/budget. And what would the institution get out of that anyway?, there is no incentive” – Interviewee 1, Germany
 - b. “to make a judgement of teaching quality we need to look at the outcomes of the whole student experience. Education is not just passing exams, it is more than just the classroom experience” – Interviewee 7, Malaysia.
 - c. “to assess teaching excellence is very difficult – surveys are flawed. It requires inspections of a sample of classes – its not possible or practical to look at all teachers in a programme, just 2-3 faculty members” Interviewee 3, India.
 - d. “the route to excellence is through passion-based learning. I do think that flexible courses are more attractive...and create graduates more able to adapt in the future. Graduates with the ability to adapt to change are what the country needs” – Interviewee 14, Malaysia.
 - e. “we need to be measuring how undergraduate students overcome challenges – devising ways to assess the creative, innovative potential of students” – interviewee 6, India.
 - f. “Graduate employment outcomes can be an interesting measure, but this needs to be done over the longer term, not immediate or short term” Interviewee 15, Germany.
 - g. “includes facilities, pedagogies...innovative, interactive, inspiring teaching activities...for the outcomes, its not just employability, but if the graduates are playing roles in society” Interviewee 10, China.
26. Judging the excellence of an institution (or programme) depends on the perspective of the potential partner/student, and depends on the motivation for seeking out excellence (ie long-term study, or short term study; teaching partnership; research partnership etc.).

³ Further details on the diversity of national higher education systems and priorities can be found in “The shape of global higher education” research series. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/education/ihe/knowledge-centre/global-landscape/report-shape-global-higher-education>

27. For instance students (or parents) look to one or many of the following when making a judgement of the best institution to apply to:
- World university rankings (Most interviewees talked about the influence of rankings including Times Higher, QS and Shanghai Jiao Tong);
 - Compatibility – whether the course content meets their needs;
 - Recognition and credit bearing status – whether the programme or qualification would be recognised by employers, or carry credit recognised by their ‘home’ institution;
 - The views and experience of existing (international) student (often via social media)
 - The views, experience and outcomes of recent (international) graduates.
28. “In this business you’re only as good as your partners” (Interviewee 2, France). Institutions looking to develop partnerships (including for student exchange) look to one or many of the following criteria:
- Published strategies and the programmes they are offering
 - Graduate outcomes/salaries
 - Internship opportunities offered
 - “Their record of developing entrepreneurial skills in students, and the number of startups they generate” (interviewee 6, India)
 - Research output (is a measure of the quality of the institution overall)
 - World rankings (Times Higher, QS, Shanghai Jiao Tong, Leiden – note that Leiden was only mentioned by one interviewee and specifically in reference to institution decision making, not student decision making)
 - “We do our own research and run our own focus groups” (Interviewee 2, France)
 - Existing contacts and institution reputation - “through good contacts and existing exchanges....our connections are based on a legacy...I could name the best institutions without hesitation” Interviewee 4, France.
 - “When selecting our partners, a crucial factor to us is interactions with the community – this is an obligatory part of our student experience. We’d need to see community interaction from our partners, and see ‘what is the impact of this interaction?’” Interviewee 7, Malaysia.
29. When asked about the tools used to assess and compare excellence in different institutions, all but two interviewees cited ranking systems (both domestic and global, including THE, QS and Shanghai Jiao Tong).

Existing national systems for benchmarking institutions

30. Many study participants (across all countries) referred to accreditation and quality assurance processes as frameworks ensure that all institutions deliver teaching excellence.
31. Furthermore, the national mechanisms to develop teaching practice (and innovative teaching approaches) were often described as national systems for developing teaching excellence.
32. The interviews explored more specifically awareness of existing national systems for benchmarking institutions based on their teaching excellence and learning outcomes.
33. Three of the five study countries (China, India and Malaysia) have some form of system in place already (or currently being trialled).
34. Several interviewees detailed what they termed “accreditation processes”. In the case of NIRF and NAAC systems in India, these also serve to provide comparable information on public platforms to allow for benchmarking of institutions (see links in Table 2).
35. Interviewee 6 noted how (for some institutions in India) a survey was being developed by Stanford University “piloting an approach to assess learning gain across institutions - tracking progress of individual students”

Table 2: Existing national tools for benchmarking institutions identified in the British Council interviews

	NAME	DESCRIPTION	FURTHER DETAILS
China	Evaluation Scheme for Undergraduate Teaching in the General Institutions of Higher Learning (Interviewee 8)	This is a system currently under trial. Includes 7 “primary indexes” and 19 “secondary indexes”	Primary indexes include: School positioning Number/structure of teaching staff Teaching facilities and expenses Specialities and teaching reform Management and quality Teacher style/learning climate Teaching effects (includes sports, reputation, employment)
France	No formal, national system for measuring teaching excellence	Institutions run their own assessments (of courses)	(Accreditation process for some disciplines ie Engineering Schools presents comparable data for institutions: http://www.cdefi.fr) Mention of information on “L’Etudiant” website – used by prospective students (www.letudiant.fr)
Germany	No system to measure student gain and teaching excellence	Institutions gather feedback from student surveys	“CHE ranking is used by students, and one of the few tools available” (interviewee 1) https://ranking.zeit.de/che/en/ Interviewee 15 went further by identifying CHE Multirank (which has international benchmarking) http://www.che-ranking.de/cms/?getObject=1176&getLang=

	NAME	DESCRIPTION	FURTHER DETAILS
India	National Institution Ranking Framework (NIRF)	Launched in 2015 Ranks institutions across India. Large institutions given institutional rank and discipline rank	Parameters include “Teaching, Learning and Resources”, “Graduate Outcomes” and more. Results are publicly accessible and can be explored by institution type, discipline area, region etc. https://www.nirfindia.org/Parameter
	NAAC rating of universities	to assess institutional performance	7 criteria for basis of assessment include “Teaching-Learning and Evaluation” and “Student Support and Progression” Institutions are graded for each Key Aspect – 8 grades from A++ to D (not accredited) http://naac.gov.in/index.php/assessment-accreditation#criteria
	AICTE Survey	“Rigorously monitor.....a big form to fill out each year” (Interviewee 6)	“includes stats on graduation rates, progression rates, industry interactions, internship opportunities Alumni engagement, progress of students” http://www.aicte-india.org/cii-survey
Malaysia	MyQUEST	Malaysian Quality Evaluation System for Private Colleges	The system generates three different evaluation reports: a) College-based evaluation report b) Cluster-based evaluation report c) International student evaluation report http://jpt.mohe.gov.my/index.php/myquest-2016-2017
	SETARA	Assessment and evaluation of teaching research and services in public and private institutions	3 categories of institutions each rated from 2 Star to 6 Star Criteria include student satisfaction, quality of graduates and internationalisation of academic programmes http://www.mohe.gov.my/en/latest/pengumuman/790-setara-2017
	(MyRA)	<i>Malaysia Research Assessment Instrument</i>	<i>This was mentioned by interviewee 14 as a tool for benchmarking HE providers and ascribing ratings to institutions. However, on further investigation, this is focused entirely on research capacity and output.</i>

International awareness of TEF

36. When asked about such systems in other countries, only one interviewee volunteered awareness of TEF.
37. From a total of 15 interviews, just three participants expressed prior knowledge of TEF, although it should be noted that only one had a robust knowledge and understanding:
- One participant had been informed in advance that the interview would be about TEF (and the discussion suggested that they had taken their information verbatim from the DfE website);
 - Another proceeded to describe a system for professional development of teaching staff;
 - The third is primarily based in the UK and works closely with UK HE institutions – this was the sole study participant with demonstrable awareness and understanding of TEF.
38. The majority of interview participants had no awareness of TEF, even those who have worked, and continue to work in or with UK HE institutions.

Perspectives on TEF

39. As awareness of TEF amongst study participants is low, the views and opinions of TEF are mainly suppositional.
40. There is a general sense amongst interviewees of the importance of measuring teaching excellence, student experience and learning progress, but it appears that there are many diverging approaches to what ‘teaching excellence’ means, and how to measure it (see above).
41. Immediate reactions to TEF included both positive and cautious views, summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Summary of immediate international opinions of TEF from international interviewees

POSITIVE VIEWS	QUESTIONS RAISED
<p>Having such a system can raise the profile of the UK HE system</p> <p>TEF will raise the profile of teaching as a function of universities (where many measures have hitherto focused on research output and impact)</p> <p>TEF could raise the profile of “less well known institutions” (those which may not appear in the top world rankings).</p> <p>Could possibly support employers too</p>	<p>Not clear that it provides more information than the existing rankings (comments from China, France, Germany, Malaysia)</p> <p>Does it measure what I want to see measured? (namely the rounded student experience; the long term outcomes; the facilities and resources in place)</p> <p>Is it an internal tool? Does it reflect the needs and experiences of international students?</p> <p>Measuring teaching excellence is complex.</p>

“This has the potential to set the UK HE apart – to show it is leading the way” Interviewee 2, France

“This is very interesting, we would like to have it here and learn from it” interviewee 5, India.

"If I was a young man this would be extremely valuable...it would help with answering the question "would you want to join a UK university?"” Interviewee 3, India

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Reflections on the research objectives

42. The principal objective of this study was to assess the international reputation of TEF, but through these interviews with experts and influencers in various parts of the international higher education landscape, it would seem that there is very little international awareness of TEF.

43. Addressing the sub-objectives of the research:

- a. *Ways in which TEF may factor into international perceptions alongside/in contrast to other international measures;*
 - i. Most interviews suggested that established and globally recognized rankings are currently much more well used and well known than any other benchmarking tools.
 - ii. There was a clear sense (especially from interviewees in Europe) that students (and parents) are always looking for additional information to inform their choice of where to study. In this sense, the TEF could be a supplementary information source to support student decision making.
 - iii. It was acknowledged that existing global rankings do draw heavily on the research metrics of institutions, and not the teaching excellence and student experience.
- b. *Any impact of TEF's rating names ('Bronze', 'Silver', 'Gold');*
 - i. Some interviewees highlighted how a 'Gold' rating could raise the profile of smaller, or less well-known institutions, and those institutions which may not place highly in global rankings. This may be of interest to students, but would also be useful for potential international partners (who would “be able to take this rating alongside other data when presenting information to our senior leadership team” Interviewee 1)
 - ii. There was confusion amongst some of the international voices as to “what is lower than a bronze medal?” (Interviewee 3), and what it meant if an institution wasn't rated.
 - iii. Some interviewees thought the ratings were ‘too simplistic’, and unable to highlight all areas of strength of an institution. “we need to be able to recognise strengths: ‘this institution is good in this area, but struggling in other areas’.... everyone must have a chance to be good. Don't dismiss or marginalize institutions. Education is not a dishonest race” (Interviewee 7)
 - iv. “What is the incentive for institutions to strive for gold medals? Do they get more funding?” Interviewee 13.
- c. *The extent to which TEF ratings could influence national perceptions of UK higher education;*
 - i. Several interviewees made very positive comments regarding how a well structured, independent system for measuring and benchmarking teaching excellence could place UK HE in a positive light.
 - ii. Comments include: “We would be envious of this”; “This has the potential to set the UK HE apart – to show it is leading the way”; “we would welcome this approach - its a breath of fresh air to focus on teaching, not research, research, research”

- iii. Some interviewees expressed the opinion that a rating system could reflect or create a more competitive and commercial HE environment – an environment quite different to that in their country. (“HE is not a question of competition, but of collaborating – don’t pit us against each other!” (Interviewee 7); “this type of system might be useful for marketing, but that’s not our main driver”
- iv. Others commented that TEF adds little to the overall picture (“TEF would make no difference to French students - UK is always attractive to French students (English language, good academic level, close to home, cheaper than US)” – Interviewee 4
- d. *The extent to which other national systems are interested in assessing excellence in HE teaching, and the potential influence of TEF;*
 - i. As shown above, India, Malaysia and China have (or are developing) systems for assessing and rating institutional excellence.
 - ii. For these countries, interviewees expressed interest in learning more about TEF and exploring how, or whether, learnings could be taken from TEF and applied in their contexts.
- e. *The extent to which TEF is filling a gap not filled by other sources of information, and how TEF might better inform about UK HE;*
 - i. Interviewees from all countries commented on how data-hungry students are when making decisions about where to study, and for this reason, TEF would be of some interest
 - ii. But, overwhelmingly, interviewees were of the opinion that global rankings currently carry more weight, and that students gather data from many other sources too (including current students, and recent graduates via social media).
- f. *What UK can learn from other countries’ assessments of the educational experience of students and student outcomes.*
 - i. Interviewees spoke of the importance of embedding support for teaching excellence, and the importance of adopting innovative teaching styles.
 - ii. Interviewee 14 outlined the “MyE-portfolio” which was developed in Malaysia (by the previous government) as a way to record all skills and knowledge development on an individual level.
 - iii. Rating systems in India and Malaysia are presented in ways which identify different areas of relative strength and weakness.
 - iv. As an international hub, the “MyQuest” system in Malaysia includes metrics to reflect internationalization.
 - v. Interviewees in China and Malaysia spoke of the need to reflect the community interaction and community impact of students and graduates.

Challenges and risks presented

44. In addition to addressing the specific objectives, several other observations or questions were raised through these interviews with international HE experts which are important to feed back to the independent panel.
45. Across all interviews it became clear that there are many different views as to what needs to be considered when making an assessment of teaching excellence:
- a. “But of course the research metrics are easier in some ways as they are ALL output driven, whereas teaching has 2 parts. Its important also to measure the 'knowledge transfer'. Not just the outputs but also the process. (Teaching is NOT just about outputs!)” Interviewee 3, India
 - b. “Teaching is a very broad concept. It entails pedagogies, content and knowledge. Does the TEF capture all of this?” Interviewee 15, Germany.

46. Related to the challenge of measuring teaching excellence is the challenge of rating this:
- “I see 2 problems with a rating: measuring the quality of teaching is a very difficult job; and surveys are flawed (depends on teacher personality, teaching style)” – Interviewee 3
 - “Ratings could become problematic if it became possible to rank individual teachers in their subject area” – Interviewee 3
 - “Ratings could lead to pitching universities against each other” – Interviewee 7.
47. The interviews also highlighted the challenge of measuring student and graduate outcomes:
- “Part of TEF is the success after graduating, but certain subjects don’t pay as much as others (teachers, nurses, social scientists). If too much weight is put on financial return, then automatically there would be less focus on subjects which students are intrinsically motivated to study....if professional success is measured just by income this may have a negative effect” Interviewee 15.
48. A further challenge is that for TEF to be useful to an international audience it must
- reflect the needs, experiences and outcomes of international students; and
 - reflect the needs of potential international partners.
49. Several interviewees raised questions as to whether TEF captured data from international students and graduates:
- “We know that in some countries international students have very different student experiences to domestic students” - Interviewee 12
 - “Of course, international students are students – I’m not arguing that they should be viewed differently, but they may have different needs or experiences. Is it possible to distinguish these?” – Interviewee 1.
 - “if it looks at graduate outcomes and salaries does it include international graduates? Our students may only go for 1 year or less on exchange – would it capture their experience and salaries?” – Interviewee 2.
50. The international experts who participated in this study often operate in a very different context to UK institutions. Each interview presented a different opinion of the important component parts of teaching excellence, high quality student experience and graduate outcomes. TEF reflects some priorities in some contexts, but doesn’t speak directly to all potential international partners.