

**POSTS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
CENTRE FOR TESTING AND EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE LECTURER SURVEY
ON TRAINING PROGRAMMES AND TEACHING AND LEARNING CONDITIONS ACROSS THE
INSTITUTE**

No. 137_10/TTr-KT&DBCLGD | Hanoi, 15 August 2026

I. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHOD

The lecturer survey is an information channel supporting the Institute's internal quality assurance (IQA). Lecturers' views help the Institute review the appropriateness of programme learning outcomes, programme structure and content, teaching methods, assessment of student learning, teaching and learning conditions, and staff support mechanisms. The results also provide information for reviewing how the Institute's vision, mission and core values are reflected in teaching, research and community service.

The questionnaire uses a five-point rating scale, from 1 (lowest level of appropriateness) to 5 (highest level). This report calculates mean scores for 34 quantitative items and considers open-ended comments on the vision, mission, core values, academic strengths of programmes and improvement proposals. Open-ended comments reflect respondents' views; they are not representative of all lecturers and should be cross-checked against management data, programme performance and actual conditions in the units.

II. OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

Of the 279 completed questionnaires, 225 respondents identified their role as course lecturers, 36 as members of programme development or improvement committees, and 18 as course coordinators. Regarding teaching experience, 127 respondents had more than 10 years of experience; 79 had 1–5 years; 39 had 5–10 years; and 34 had less than one year. The survey therefore includes perspectives from both experienced lecturers and those at an early career stage. Respondents selected 13 programme groups. Information Technology received the largest number of responses (66), followed by Electronics and Telecommunications Engineering (35), Electrical and Electronic Engineering (29), Marketing (27), Business Administration (24) and Information Security (23). The remaining programmes received between 4 and 18 responses. Because response numbers vary across programmes, direct comparisons should be made cautiously; units with fewer responses should combine survey results with document reviews and professional discussions.

The dataset contained 9,486 valid ratings across the quantitative items. The overall mean was 4.29/5; 89.94% of ratings were at Levels 4 or 5, and 41.35% were at Level 5. There were 815 ratings at Level 3 and 139 ratings at Levels 1 or 2. Overall, lecturers expressed positive views of the training programmes and teaching support. However, the overall mean does not replace item-level analysis; lower-scoring areas should receive priority for further analysis and improvement.

Table 1. Mean scores by survey domain

Survey domain	Mean (/5)	Interpretation
Vision, mission and core values	4.44	Highest-rated domain
Programme learning outcomes	4.38	Positive rating
Overall programme evaluation	4.34	Positive rating

Survey domain	Mean (/5)	Interpretation
Assessment of student learning	4.31	Further consolidation needed
Programme structure and content	4.31	Review progression and balance
Teaching methods	4.27	Improve conditions for innovation
Staff support and development	4.18	Strengthen encouragement mechanisms
Teaching and learning conditions	4.09	Lowest-rated domain

III. ANALYSIS BY DOMAIN

1. Programme learning outcomes and programme structure

Programme learning outcomes received a mean score of 4.38/5. Lecturers rated the extent to which outcomes reflect academic and professional requirements at 4.42, clarity and comprehensibility at 4.41, and measurability and assessability at 4.39. Alignment between course learning outcomes and their contribution to programme learning outcomes scored 4.34, lower than several other items. The Institute should continue guiding faculties and subject groups to clarify the links between programme learning outcomes, course learning outcomes, teaching content and assessment methods, and check consistency between course specifications and actual teaching.

Programme structure and content received 4.31. Currency of programme content in relation to developments in the discipline scored 4.36, while course allocation across stages of study, avoidance of overlap between courses, and balance between theory, practice and experience each scored 4.28. This suggests that updating knowledge is viewed positively, but the Institute should review total workload, course sequencing, overlapping content and opportunities for students to apply knowledge in practical situations. Programme changes should be based on learning outcomes, lecturer feedback, student achievement and professional requirements, rather than adjusting individual courses without considering programme-wide effects.

2. Teaching methods and assessment of student learning

Teaching methods received a mean score of 4.27. Appropriateness of teaching methods to objectives and learning outcomes scored 4.33, as did their capacity to encourage active and independent learning. Conditions enabling active-learning methods scored 4.26, while whether lecturers have sufficient time and resources to innovate scored 4.17—the lowest item in this domain. This indicates a need to examine not only lecturers' professional capabilities but also implementation conditions, including preparation time for learning materials, class size, equipment, support tools and mechanisms for recognising innovation.

Assessment of student learning received 4.31. Timely and effective feedback to students and clear, transparent and consistent assessment criteria each scored 4.32; alignment between assessment methods and course learning outcomes scored 4.31. The extent to which assessment formats accurately measure student capabilities scored 4.28. The Institute should guide lecturers in designing assessment tools aligned with learning outcomes, publishing criteria before assessment and providing feedback that helps students understand strengths, limitations and ways to improve. For courses involving practical work or professional competencies, faculties should review the appropriateness of written examinations, assignments, products, projects and practical assessments.

3. Teaching conditions and staff development

Teaching and learning conditions were the lowest-rated domain, at 4.09/5. IT infrastructure and the learning management system (LMS) scored 4.04; the availability and currency of learning materials scored 4.07; teaching facilities scored 4.08; and appropriateness of teaching workload to maintaining quality scored 4.16. Although all means were above the midpoint of the scale, this domain should receive priority. The Institute should consolidate needs from faculties and subject groups by type of classroom, equipment, software, learning resources and digital infrastructure; assess their impact on teaching; and prioritise responses according to urgency, frequency of use and the number of learners benefiting.

Staff support and development received 4.18. Opportunities for professional development scored 4.24; support for teaching innovation scored 4.22; academic management support scored 4.13; and mechanisms for recognising and encouraging teaching improvement scored 4.12. The Institute should clarify how lecturers submit proposals, which unit is responsible for handling them and how improvement results are recognised. Professional development should be needs-based, focusing on outcome-based course design, assessment tools, active learning, and effective use of learning materials and equipment. Following training, academic units should review classroom application and share effective practices.

4. Overall evaluation and institutional direction

Overall programme evaluation received 4.34. Willingness to continue teaching and contributing to programme improvement scored 4.38; the view that programmes meet their objectives scored 4.34; feasibility of programme delivery scored 4.33; and satisfaction with academic quality scored 4.29. These results indicate relatively strong lecturer support for training, while suggesting that satisfaction should be strengthened through targeted improvement rather than relying on overall perceptions alone.

Vision, mission and core values received 4.44, the highest domain score. The mission's reflection of the Institute's role and social responsibility scored 4.46; the reflection of core values in day-to-day activities scored 4.44; and the clarity and inspirational quality of the vision scored 4.43. Open-ended comments highlighted directions related to information technology, telecommunications, digital transformation, innovation and enterprise needs. Some respondents suggested translating the vision and mission into measurable objectives, clarifying the Institute's distinctive identity and strengthening the connection between strategic direction and activities at unit level. These views should be considered during strategic review and internal communication, but should not be treated as representative conclusions about all staff.

IV. OPEN-ENDED FEEDBACK AND PRIORITY ISSUES

There were 53 comments on strengths and weaknesses of the vision, mission and core values; 56 comments on academic strengths of programmes; 52 comments on content or policies requiring adjustment; and 48 programme-improvement proposals. The number of open-ended comments was lower than the number of completed questionnaires. The themes below therefore describe issues appearing in submitted comments and do not represent proportions of all survey participants.

Comments on academic strengths commonly referred to up-to-date content, connections between theory and practice, opportunities to complete capstone projects or projects, application of knowledge to work, and links with enterprises. Some respondents valued specialisations in emerging technologies and the practical nature of student outputs. The Institute should sustain

these strengths and verify them using evidence such as course specifications, student work, internship outcomes, employer feedback and programme-learning-outcome attainment.

Improvement proposals focused on updating content in line with disciplinary developments and labour-market needs; increasing practical work, capstone projects, real-life cases and enterprise-linked projects; reviewing programme structure and the distribution of knowledge across courses; strengthening foreign-language skills, soft skills and digital competence; improving teaching and assessment to emphasise application; upgrading facilities and learning resources; and improving training-management, assessment and lecturer-support processes. Some respondents also proposed greater internationalisation and expanded cooperation opportunities.

When considering proposals, the Institute should distinguish issues that can be resolved at course or unit level from those requiring programme-level or Institute-level changes. Each proposal should be verified against data, its cause identified, a lead unit assigned, a deadline set and an expected result specified. This converts survey comments into traceable improvement actions rather than merely compiling feedback without follow-up.

V. IMPROVEMENT TASKS AND MEASURES

Based on quantitative results and open-ended feedback, the Institute should prioritise lower-scoring areas while sustaining those viewed positively by lecturers. Academic units should review programme learning outcomes and mapping matrices linking programme and course learning outcomes; check consistency among course specifications, teaching content and assessment; and identify courses with duplicated content, unbalanced workload or insufficient balance between theory and practice. Review outcomes should specify the changes, their rationale and their expected impact on learning outcomes.

For teaching conditions, units should compile needs for classrooms, equipment, software, IT infrastructure and learning resources, classify them by urgency, and identify difficulties that directly affect teaching quality. Relevant service units should coordinate with faculties and subject groups to determine responses and communicate the outcomes. The Institute should also consider lecturer workload and the time available for lesson preparation, student guidance and teaching innovation.

For staff development, the Institute should provide needs-based training and opportunities for lecturers to exchange experience and trial appropriate teaching methods. Units should recognise initiatives with demonstrable results and encourage sharing of tested learning materials and assessment tools. The Institute should also define clearly the contact point for feedback, issue-classification procedures, response deadlines and responsibilities for post-improvement monitoring. To ensure evidence-based improvement, the Institute should maintain a regular cycle: collect and validate data; analyse results; agree improvement tasks; implement actions; evaluate completion; and assess impact. Evidence should be retained, including review minutes, decisions or improvement plans, updated course specifications, staff-development records, records of actions addressing teaching conditions and subsequent survey results. In the next survey cycle, the Institute should compare consistent domains and scales while taking response numbers into account and interpreting trends cautiously.

Table 2. Improvement directions following the survey

Priority	Actions	Lead / coordinating units	Evidence to monitor
Teaching conditions	Review classroom, digital infrastructure and learning-	Facilities and IT units; faculties	Needs register, actions taken and

Priority	Actions	Lead / coordinating units	Evidence to monitor
	resource needs; classify and address them by urgency.		lecturer feedback
Teaching innovation	Review time, resources and implementation conditions; provide needs-based development and share effective practices.	Faculties and subject groups; training and staff-development units	Support activities, application rates and follow-up survey results
Programme review	Check course allocation, duplication, theory–practice balance and outcome alignment.	Academic management unit; faculties and programme committees	Review records, changes made and evidence of outcome attainment
Assessment and feedback	Clarify criteria, select appropriate assessment formats and improve feedback to students.	Faculties and subject groups; assessment unit	Course specifications, assessment tools and feedback evidence
Recognition of improvement	Define proposal intake, response timelines and ways to recognise teaching improvements.	Institute leadership and relevant units	Proposal register, action progress, results and impact

VI. CONCLUSION

The survey of 279 lecturers who completed the questionnaire indicates generally positive perceptions, with an overall mean of 4.29/5 and nearly 90% of ratings at Levels 4 or 5. Lecturers rated the Institute's vision, mission and core values and the appropriateness of programme learning outcomes positively. The results also identify priorities for improvement: teaching facilities, IT infrastructure and learning resources; time and resources for teaching innovation; mechanisms for recognising initiatives; and review of course allocation, duplication and the balance between theory and practice.

The Institute should use the survey as one source of management and quality-enhancement evidence, alongside student learning data, programme records, learner feedback and stakeholder feedback. Units assigned responsibilities should specify deadlines and evidence of completion, report periodically on actions taken and assess impact. These steps will make survey use more substantive, strengthen accountability and progressively improve teaching conditions and programme quality.

Recipients: Institute Board of Directors; functional units; academic faculties; archived at the Centre.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRE
Nguyen Quy Sy