

Hanoi, 9 October 2026

REPORT
RESULTS OF THE 2026 GRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY
(Regarding employment status, job-programme relevance, and training programme quality)

I. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND AGGREGATION METHOD

The Institute conducted an alumni survey to collect information on employment after graduation, time taken to find a job, the relevance of current employment to the field of study, the application of acquired knowledge and skills, and satisfaction with the training programme and learning conditions. The results help the Institute assess how well its training activities meet occupational requirements, obtain feedback from graduates after they enter the labour market, and identify areas for review and improvement of training programmes.

The dataset contains 969 responses: 901 from undergraduate learners, 67 from master's learners and 1 from a doctoral learner. Of these, 937 studied full-time, 31 studied in a work-and-study format, and 1 studied by distance learning. Responses were concentrated in Business Administration (169), Marketing (164), Accounting (124), Multimedia Communications (114), the Information Technology/Information Systems/Computer Science group (102), E-commerce (98), and Financial Technology (Fintech) (65); the remaining disciplines had fewer responses.

The data show that 891 respondents had graduated less than one year earlier, 50 had graduated one to three years earlier, and 28 had graduated more than three years earlier. Therefore, although the survey concerns graduates, the dataset is not limited to those who graduated approximately three months earlier. This report uses all 969 responses as recorded in the dataset and notes the limitation arising from differences in time since graduation when interpreting the results. If the Institute reports an employment indicator specifically for three months after graduation, it should filter the relevant cohort and apply a consistent reference date.

Responses on employment, income and job relevance are summarised as frequencies and percentages of the 969 responses, unless another denominator is explicitly stated. Items rated on a 1–5 scale are summarised using mean scores; higher scores indicate more positive evaluations. No personally identifying information is used in the analysis. Some

response options concerning current employment status, job relevance and time to find employment are not fully aligned. The Institute should therefore treat these as separate indicators rather than combine or substitute them for one another.

II. SURVEY RESULTS

1. Employment Status and Time to Find a Job

Of the 969 respondents, 838 reported being employed (86.5%), 113 were unemployed (11.7%), and 18 were pursuing further study (1.9%). The results indicate that most respondents had entered the labour market. However, this percentage reflects employment status at the time of response across the full sample, including people who graduated one to more than three years earlier. The Institute should therefore not use the 86.5% figure directly as the employment rate exactly three months after graduation without first filtering and defining the relevant cohort.

Employment status at the time of the survey	Number of respondents	Percentage
Employed	838	86,5%
Unemployed	113	11,7%
Pursuing further study	18	1,9%

Regarding time to find employment after graduation, 740 respondents selected less than 3 months (76.4%); 169 selected 3–6 months (17.4%); 35 selected 6–12 months (3.6%); and 25 selected more than 12 months (2.6%). Thus, 909 respondents, or 93.8% of all responses, reported finding a job within six months of graduation. This is a positive indication of the transition from education to employment among respondents. Nevertheless, the item records self-reported time to find a job and does not necessarily confirm that respondents were still employed at the time of the survey or working in their field of study.

The Institute should monitor time to find a job separately from current employment status. When reporting graduate outcome indicators, units should clearly define the denominator— all graduates, respondents, or employed respondents—and state the survey date and how those pursuing further study, not yet seeking work, or not responding are treated. Consistent calculations will enable comparisons between cohorts and provide more reliable evidence for programme review.

2. Relevance of Employment to the Field of Study

For the question on the relevance of employment to the field of study, 726 respondents selected “employed in the field of study” (74.9% of all responses); 178 reported working in jobs unrelated to their field (18.4%); 53 selected “unemployed” and 12 selected “pursuing further study”. Most respondents therefore indicated that their current work directly matched their field of study. However, fewer respondents selected

“unemployed” for this item than reported being unemployed in the current employment-status question. This discrepancy suggests that the two questions may have been interpreted or answered differently. The Institute should review the response options and instructions in the next survey.

Regarding the usefulness of the knowledge and skills acquired, 450 respondents rated them useful (46.4%) and 160 rated them very useful (16.5%). A further 297 selected average (30.7%), 42 selected slightly useful (4.3%), and 20 selected not useful (2.1%). Overall, 63.0% considered their acquired knowledge and skills useful or very useful in their current work. The 30.7% who selected average indicates that the Institute should investigate further which competencies graduates do not use regularly or whose value at work is not yet clear to them.

These results should be compared with the programme learning outcomes and actual requirements of employers. Faculties should examine whether specialist courses, practical activities, internships and projects/theses help learners perform occupational tasks. Programme adjustments should be evidence-based, drawing on alumni surveys, employer feedback, learning-outcome assessment results and changes in the relevant professions, rather than relying on a single aggregate indicator.

3. Job-search Channels and Types of Employers

Regarding job-search channels, 494 respondents selected “other” (51.0%); 262 found work through friends or acquaintances (27.0%); 81 through their internship host organisation (8.4%); 74 through an employment centre (7.6%); 43 through self-employment or entrepreneurship (4.4%); and 15 through an Institute referral (1.5%). The high proportion selecting “other” means the current data do not fully identify the most common job-search channels. The low proportion reporting an Institute referral also suggests that the Institute should review the reach and effectiveness of its job-placement links, career-opportunity referrals and cooperation with employers.

By employer type, 633 respondents worked for domestic enterprises (65.3%); 194 selected other organisations (20.0%); 59 worked for foreign-invested enterprises (6.1%); 43 for joint ventures (4.4%); and 40 for government agencies (4.1%). Domestic enterprises therefore employed the largest share of respondents who were working. However, “other organisations” is a broad category. The Institute should classify employer types more precisely in the next questionnaire to support analysis by sector and working environment.

Responses on work location were concentrated in Hanoi, but the data contain multiple variants, such as “Hà Nội”, “Hà nội”, “TP Hà Nội” and “HN”. The Institute should standardise the list of provinces and cities and ask respondents to select from a consistent list. This will improve analysis of graduates’ employment distribution by geographical area.

4. Respondents' Income

Reported average monthly income was concentrated in the VND 6–10 million range, with 475 respondents (49.0%). A total of 226 reported income below VND 6 million (23.3%); 169 reported VND 10–15 million (17.4%); 49 reported VND 15–20 million (5.1%); and 50 reported more than VND 20 million (5.2%). The VND 6–10 million band was therefore the largest income group in the survey sample.

Average monthly income	Number of respondents	Percentage
Below VND 6 million	226	23,3%
VND 6–10 million	475	49,0%
VND 10–15 million	169	17,4%
VND 15–20 million	49	5,1%
Above VND 20 million	50	5,2%

Income should be interpreted cautiously because the dataset covers different disciplines, qualification levels, periods since graduation and types of employment. Income also depends on work location, working hours, experience and job characteristics. To use this indicator for programme management, the Institute should analyse it by discipline, graduating cohort, time since graduation and job–field relevance. The questionnaire should also specify whether income is before or after tax and whether additional income is included.

5. Evaluation of Training Programmes and Professional Competencies

The overall mean for the evaluation items on a five-point scale was approximately 4.22. In general, respondents evaluated the Institute's training programmes and support conditions positively. The teaching staff category received a mean of 4.35, the highest among the aggregated categories. Internships, projects and final-year activities scored 4.27; professional and general skills, 4.26; overall satisfaction and willingness to recommend, 4.23. Programme orientation and content scored 4.15, while career and employer engagement scored approximately 4.19.

Evaluation category	Mean score / 5
Teaching staff	4,34
Internships, projects and final-year activities	4,27
Professional and general skills	4,26
Overall satisfaction and willingness to recommend	4,23
Vision, mission and core values	4,22
Occupational relevance and learning outcomes	4,19
Learning conditions and support services	4,19
Career and employer engagement	4,19

Programme orientation and content	4,15
-----------------------------------	------

Within the teaching staff category, high mean scores were recorded for enthusiasm and willingness to support students, subject expertise and teaching methods, and fairness and transparency in assessment. This indicates that learners recognise the role of lecturers in their learning. The Institute should sustain these strengths through professional development, teaching-method innovation and reviews of the implementation of assessment regulations.

Items related to internships, projects/theses and final-year activities were also rated relatively highly. The results suggest that learners consider these activities helpful in understanding workplace environments and developing professional competencies. To strengthen this impact, faculties should clearly define the intended outcomes of internships and projects, increase the involvement of host organisations, and collect feedback from workplace supervisors. The Institute should also assess the alignment of internship tasks and final-year outputs with programme learning outcomes.

Programme orientation and content had the lowest mean among the aggregated categories, although the score remained above 4.0. This suggests a need to continue reviewing alignment between programme objectives, course content, the balance of theory and practice, the applicability of specialist courses and occupational requirements. The Institute should combine alumni feedback with employer views, job-position analysis and learning-outcome assessment results to identify content requiring updates. Adjustments should increase opportunities for practical work, real-world problem-solving and application of knowledge in workplace settings.

Career and employer engagement scored approximately 4.19. Items on career information, counselling and employer relations should be monitored alongside the proportion of respondents who found jobs through Institute referrals. The Institute should assess the actual effectiveness of job fairs, career counselling, job databases and internship partnerships. The objective should be not merely to increase the number of activities, but to improve students' access to suitable career opportunities before and after graduation.

6. Overall Satisfaction and Intentions for Further Study

The three items on satisfaction with the Institute's training quality, satisfaction with the learning environment, and willingness to recommend the Institute/programme had an overall mean of approximately 4.23. This is a positive indication of respondents' learning experience. However, satisfaction scores do not replace outcome measurement. The Institute should also consider employment status, job relevance, application of knowledge and employer feedback.

Regarding intentions to pursue a higher qualification, 449 respondents had no current intention to study further (46.3%); 322 planned to study after gaining work experience

(33.2%); 74 planned to continue immediately after graduation (7.6%); and 124 reported insufficient information (12.8%). A total of 566 believed further study would improve their professional qualifications (58.4%), while 218 lacked sufficient information (22.5%) and 120 felt further study would not benefit them (12.4%). These figures indicate varied demand for further study and a need for more information on its benefits, requirements and pathways.

For their preferred field of further study, 512 respondents selected a different but complementary field (52.8%), while 457 selected the same field studied at undergraduate level (47.2%). Regarding desired support, 296 proposed scholarships (30.5%); 245 requested flexible study schedules (25.3%); 224 wanted career guidance after study (23.1%); and 204 proposed recruitment or paid-study support linked to remaining at the Institute for employment (21.1%). The Institute may use these findings to consider demand for progression pathways, postgraduate education, flexible study modes and appropriate support policies.

III. OPEN-ENDED FEEDBACK AND ISSUES FOR FURTHER REVIEW

The open-ended responses vary in specificity; many respondents wrote “no”, “none” or left the fields blank. The report therefore does not interpret brief responses as representative views of all alumni. Substantive responses should be classified into themes such as strengths and limitations of the vision and core values; how programme content supports work; missing knowledge or skills; and proposals for programme improvement.

To make open-ended feedback more useful, the Institute should provide concise but specific response guidance and encourage graduates to give examples of work tasks, applied knowledge and skills that need to be developed. Faculties may code responses by theme, record their frequency and compare them with quantitative ratings. When there are enough responses, the responsible unit should select prominent issues for validation through discussions with alumni and employers.

IV. IMPROVEMENT DIRECTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

First, the Institute should standardise the monitoring of graduate employment. The responsible unit should agree on the survey reference date, the definition of an employed graduate, how employment in or relevant to the field of study is identified, and the denominator used for each rate. To monitor outcomes three months after graduation, the Institute should isolate the relevant cohort and should not combine graduates from less than one year, one to three years and more than three years earlier into a single indicator. Inconsistent answers across questions should also be reviewed.

Second, faculties should use the survey results to review programmes and align learning outcomes with occupational requirements. Each faculty should identify courses or practical activities to retain, content to update and competencies to add, while documenting

the supporting data, responsible unit, deadline and method for evaluating results. Adjustments should incorporate feedback from alumni, employers, lecturers and current students, as well as learning-outcome assessment results and changes in the relevant professions.

The Institute should strengthen career guidance and employment links by deepening employer relationships, expanding internships with relevant specialist content, providing timely vacancy information and improving career counselling. It should monitor the number of internship and job opportunities referred, the number of people reached, the number hired through each channel, and the relevance of jobs to fields of study. These indicators will support outcome-based evaluation rather than relying solely on the number of events held.

For future surveys, the Institute should standardise categories for disciplines, provinces/cities, employer types, job-search channels and income, and limit the use of “other” where a more complete list can be developed. The questionnaire should clearly distinguish current employment status, time taken to find a job and job–field relevance. The Institute should also protect personal information and use identifiable data only when genuinely necessary to verify and manage responses.

Finally, the Centre for Testing and Educational Quality Assurance should work with faculties and functional units to consolidate survey findings, monitor improvement actions and report completion status. Each action should have a lead unit, deadline, monitoring indicator and evidence of results. In the next survey cycle, the Institute should retain core questions to enable trend comparisons while revising questions that cause confusion. This approach will make survey findings practical evidence for planning, implementation, review and adjustment within the quality assurance system.

V. CONCLUSION

The survey of 969 responses found that 86.5% of participants reported being employed at the time of the survey; 76.4% reported finding a job within three months of graduation; and 74.9% selected the option indicating employment in their field of study. The overall mean rating was approximately 4.22/5, with teaching staff receiving the highest evaluation. Respondents also recognised the role of internships, projects/theses and professional skills in the transition to the workplace.

Alongside these positive findings, the Institute should improve the consistency of employment data, strengthen analysis by discipline and time since graduation, review the practical relevance of programme content, reinforce career guidance and improve employer engagement. Because the sample includes graduates from different periods, the reported percentages must be interpreted within their actual scope and must not automatically be treated as indicators specifically for the three-month post-graduation

cohort. The Institute should continue to use survey results alongside other evidence to prioritise improvements, monitor outcomes and strengthen the responsiveness of training programmes to occupational requirements.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRE

Recipients:

- Institute Board of Directors;
- Functional units;
- Faculties;
- Filed: Administration;

Nguyen Quy Sy