

Hanoi, 15 August 2026

**REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE STUDENT SURVEY ON TEACHING
AND LEARNING OF COURSES**

Semester II, Academic Year 2025–2026

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE SURVEY

The Center for Testing and Educational Quality Assurance conducted a student survey on the teaching and learning of common courses in Semester II of the 2025–2026 academic year. The survey aimed to collect student feedback on course objectives and learning outcomes, course content and structure, teaching methods, assessment and feedback, learning conditions and student support, and overall satisfaction.

The Institute uses the survey results as a source of information within its Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) System. The results support academic management units and faculty members in identifying strengths, areas requiring improvement, and appropriate corrective actions. Survey findings should be considered alongside student learning outcomes and other relevant evidence to support continuous improvement.

II. OVERALL SURVEY RESULTS

The survey covered **17,528 students, 111,745 responses, 2,810 course sections, and 380 faculty members**. The total number of responses to the 22 quantitative survey items was 2,228,091.

Indicator	Result
Unique participating students	17,528
Number of responses	111,745
Course sections	2,810
Faculty members	380
Responses to quantitative items	2,228,091
Overall mean score	4.81/5.00
Responses rated 4 or 5	96.1%
Responses rated 5	85.6%
Range of mean scores across 22 items	4.79–4.84

The results indicate that students generally assessed the teaching and learning of common courses positively. All 22 survey items received high mean scores, ranging from 4.79 to 4.84 out of 5.00. The high ratings reflect positive student perceptions but do not, by themselves, demonstrate that all intended learning outcomes have been achieved or that no further improvement is needed.

The Institute should therefore focus not only on maintaining student satisfaction but also on improving learning effectiveness, practical application, and students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

III. RESULTS BY SURVEY CRITERION GROUP

Criterion group	Mean score
1. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes	4.82
2. Course Content and Structure	4.81
3. Teaching Methods	4.80
4. Assessment and Feedback	4.81
5. Learning Conditions and Student Support	4.80
6. Overall Assessment	4.82

1. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes

This group received a mean score of **4.82/5.00**, the highest among the six groups. The item concerning the clear communication of course objectives at the beginning of the semester received **4.84/5.00**, the highest score among all 22 items. The alignment between Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs), the coverage of professional knowledge, skills and attitudes, and students' understanding of expected competencies each received 4.81/5.00.

These results indicate that course objectives and expected learning outcomes are generally communicated effectively. Programme management units should continue reviewing the alignment between PLOs and CLOs and ensure that course objectives, learning activities, and assessment methods are clearly connected.

2. Course Content and Structure

This group received a mean score of **4.81/5.00**. The logical and systematic organization of course content received 4.82/5.00, while the appropriateness of the knowledge workload, the currency and professional relevance of the content, and the connection between theory and practice each received 4.80/5.00.

The results indicate positive perceptions of course organization. However, student feedback highlights the need for more practical exercises, real-world examples, and application-oriented learning tasks. Faculties and academic departments should

periodically review course content to ensure its relevance to programme objectives and professional requirements.

3. Teaching Methods

This group received a mean score of **4.80/5.00**. Encouragement of active student participation received 4.82/5.00, while the use of varied teaching methods and clear communication of key content each received 4.80/5.00. The item concerning the development of critical thinking and self-directed learning received **4.79/5.00**, the lowest score among the 22 survey items.

Although the ratings remain high, this result identifies an area for further development. Faculty members should increase appropriate activities involving discussion, problem-solving, case analysis, independent study, and the explanation and defence of ideas. Teaching methods should be selected according to course objectives and expected learning outcomes rather than simply increasing the number of methods used.

4. Assessment and Feedback

This group received a mean score of **4.81/5.00**. Alignment between assessment methods and CLOs received 4.82/5.00; transparency of assessment criteria and grading scales received 4.81/5.00; and the extent to which assessment reflects learning outcomes and feedback is timely and useful each received 4.80/5.00.

The results suggest that students generally have positive perceptions of assessment practices. Nevertheless, faculty members should continue to ensure consistency among CLOs, teaching content, and assessment methods. Assessment criteria should be communicated clearly, and feedback should help students understand their results, identify areas for improvement, and improve subsequent performance. Assessment should serve both to measure achievement and to support learning.

5. Learning Conditions and Student Support

This group received a mean score of **4.80/5.00**. Learning materials received 4.82/5.00; facilities, classrooms and equipment, and timely student support each received 4.80/5.00. The digital learning platform received **4.79/5.00**, identifying it as another priority for improvement.

The Institute should continue improving the organization and accessibility of digital learning resources. Faculty members should provide clear learning materials, assignments, self-study guidance, and feedback through appropriate digital platforms. Faculties and academic departments should also review the adequacy of learning resources and support arrangements for individual courses.

6. Overall Assessment

This group received a mean score of **4.82/5.00**. The item concerning the contribution of courses to the achievement of necessary competencies received 4.83/5.00, while satisfaction with course organization and teaching received 4.80/5.00.

Students generally recognize the value of their courses. However, the Institute should compare student perceptions with academic performance and learning outcomes assessment results. Satisfaction scores should be treated as an important source of feedback, rather than as the sole measure of educational effectiveness.

IV. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

1. Key achievements

The survey results indicate several strengths:

- **High student ratings:** The overall mean score reached 4.81/5.00, with 96.1% of responses rated 4 or 5.
- **Clear learning requirements:** Course objectives, CLOs, and assessment requirements received consistently high ratings.
- **Positive teaching practices:** Students generally appreciated faculty members' communication, organization of learning activities, and support.
- **Perceived contribution to competency development:** The item concerning the contribution of courses to necessary competencies received 4.83/5.00.
- **Useful qualitative feedback:** Students' open-ended comments identified positive practices, including clear explanations, useful knowledge, enthusiastic faculty members, and content relevant to practical application.

These strengths should be maintained and shared where appropriate. Units should continue analyzing student comments at course level to identify effective practices and areas requiring specific action.

2. Areas requiring further improvement

Despite the high quantitative scores, the survey identifies several priorities.

Practical activities and application-oriented assignments. Among 33,526 comments on areas for improvement, many referred to practical activities, exercises, major assignments, assignment review, and computer laboratory work. Courses should provide more opportunities for students to apply knowledge through tasks aligned with CLOs.

Practical relevance of course content. Students expressed interest in real-world examples, professional situations, practical problems, and application-oriented assignments. Faculties and academic departments should review course content and incorporate relevant professional contexts where appropriate.

Learning materials and digital learning. Students requested additional presentation materials, reference resources, videos, instructional materials, and self-study support.

The digital learning platform's score of 4.79/5.00 reinforces the need to improve access to and organization of learning resources.

Critical thinking and self-directed learning. This area received 4.79/5.00, the lowest score among the 22 items. Faculty members should provide more opportunities for students to analyze information, ask questions, compare alternatives, justify conclusions, solve problems, and evaluate their own learning.

Feedback and assessment for learning. Feedback should go beyond communicating grades. It should help students understand what they have achieved, what remains insufficient, and how they can improve their subsequent performance.

V. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS

No.	Priority area	Proposed action	Responsible unit
1	Practical activities and application	Review courses and add practical tasks and application-oriented assignments aligned with CLOs.	Faculties, academic departments and faculty members
2	Practical relevance	Incorporate relevant real-world examples, professional situations and applied problems.	Faculties, academic departments and faculty members
3	Critical thinking	Increase analytical tasks, discussions, open-ended questions and activities requiring students to justify their views.	Academic departments and faculty members
4	Self-directed learning	Provide self-study guidance, structured learning tasks and resources for independent learning.	Academic departments and faculty members
5	Digital learning	Improve the organization and accessibility of digital learning materials, assignments and feedback.	Faculties and relevant management units
6	Assessment and feedback	Ensure alignment between CLOs and assessment; provide timely, actionable feedback after assessment.	Faculty members and academic departments
7	Learning materials	Review and update course materials periodically and clarify how students should use them.	Faculties and academic departments
8	Evaluation of improvement	Compare survey results across semesters and verify whether implemented actions produce improvement.	Units responsible for quality assurance and relevant academic units

VI. PRIORITIES FOR THE NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR

In the next academic year, the Institute should shift its focus from simply maintaining high satisfaction scores towards improving learning effectiveness and students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

The main priorities are to:

1. Increase practical activities and application-oriented assignments in line with the requirements of individual courses.
2. Strengthen critical thinking, problem-solving, and self-directed learning through appropriate learning tasks.
3. Improve the quality, accessibility, and organization of learning materials and digital learning resources.
4. Enhance the practical relevance of course content through suitable examples, professional situations, and applied tasks.
5. Improve assessment feedback so that students can use it to adjust their learning and improve subsequent performance.
6. Establish clear improvement plans specifying the responsible unit, completion deadline, expected results, and method of evaluating effectiveness.

Units should use student survey results together with learning outcomes assessment and other relevant evidence to identify issues, implement corrective actions, and evaluate their effectiveness as part of the Institute's continuous improvement process.

VII. CONCLUSION

The student survey on the teaching and learning of common courses in Semester II of the 2025–2026 academic year shows that students generally assessed teaching quality positively. The overall mean score across the 22 survey items was **4.81/5.00**; 96.1% of responses were rated 4 or 5, including 85.6% rated 5. The survey covered 17,528 students, 111,745 responses, 2,810 course sections, and 380 faculty members.

The results indicate strengths in communicating course objectives, organizing course content, conducting teaching activities, and supporting students. At the same time, further improvement is needed in practical application, the development of critical thinking and self-directed learning, digital learning resources, and the quality of feedback.

The Institute should use the survey findings as a basis for specific, measurable improvement actions. Faculties, academic departments, and relevant management units should assign responsibilities, set deadlines, monitor implementation, and evaluate results. The effectiveness of the survey should ultimately be reflected not only in student satisfaction but also in improvements to the learning process and students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

Recipients:

- Institute Management Board;
- Relevant functional units and academic faculties;
- Archive: Center for Testing and Educational Quality Assurance.

**DIRECTOR OF THE CENTER FOR TESTING AND EDUCATIONAL
QUALITY ASSURANCE**

Nguyen Quy Sy