

**STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT
INSTITUTE-WIDE STUDENT POPULATION
Students' Satisfaction with the Institute's Activities in 2026**

I. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology (PTIT) conducted this survey to obtain students' views on the quality and effectiveness of institutional activities that directly affect their learning, personal development and overall student experience. The findings help the Institute and the relevant academic units assess how well services and educational provision meet students' needs, identify areas requiring attention, and monitor the implementation of quality improvement measures.

The dataset contains 19,331 student records, of which 10,786 are marked as completed (55.8%). The report analyses responses across the survey items available in the source dataset. The overall mean score is 3.81 out of 5. The completion percentage is calculated against the records in the dataset and should not be interpreted as an official response rate until PTIT confirms the eligible student population and the invitation list.

The number of records does not necessarily equal the number of unique students unless duplicate student IDs have been identified and removed. Likewise, the proportion of completed records should not be treated as the official response rate without a verified denominator showing the number of students invited to participate. PTIT should validate the source data and confirm the eligible population before publishing the findings externally.

The report presents mean scores and, where available in the source report, the proportions of ratings 4–5 and 1–2. The mean score indicates the general direction of responses but does not, by itself, explain the causes of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Grouping of survey items is intended to support reporting and follow-up; the responsible unit should check each item against the original questionnaire before using the group-level results for formal comparisons or assigning accountability.

II. OVERALL SURVEY RESULTS

The overall mean score recorded for institution-wide student population is 3.81/5. This provides a summary of the valid ratings in the dataset, but it does not mean that every institutional activity received a similar assessment. PTIT should examine differences across survey areas and individual items, together with student comments and

relevant management information, before deciding which practices to maintain and which issues to address.

Indicator	Result
Programme / population	Institution-wide student population
Records included	19,331
Survey items	39
Valid ratings	420,501
Overall mean score	3.81/5
Scale	1–5

1. Results by survey area

Survey area	Mean score	Ratings 4–5	Ratings 1–2	Valid ratings
Academic Advising	3.86	63.0%	6.7%	21,565
Publication of Academic Results	3.84	62.5%	7.5%	32,346
Phổ biến quy định, thực hiện chính sách và thủ tục	3.84	61.7%	6.1%	32,347
Phương pháp giảng dạy và kiểm tra, đánh giá	3.84	61.9%	6.5%	32,342
Thông báo kết quả rèn luyện	3.82	61.3%	7.2%	32,347
Thiết kế và nội dung chương trình đào tạo	3.81	60.9%	6.8%	32,341
Community Engagement	3.81	60.1%	6.7%	21,565
Phục vụ hành chính và học liệu	3.80	59.4%	7.0%	32,345
Monitoring of Academic Progress and Study Planning	3.79	59.3%	8.3%	32,349
Hoạt động của các đơn vị chức năng	3.79	58.8%	7.0%	53,905
Hoạt động ngoại khóa và phát triển kỹ năng	3.78	58.8%	7.5%	21,565
Classrooms, Equipment and IT Infrastructure	3.78	59.7%	8.5%	32,348
Career Guidance and Employer Engagement	3.77	58.0%	7.3%	21,566
Research Information and Opportunities	3.77	58.4%	8.1%	10,785
Các dịch vụ hỗ trợ khác	3.77	57.2%	6.9%	10,785

The area-level summary helps identify differences in students' perceptions across institutional activities. Where grouping has been derived from question labels, the responsible quality assurance unit should validate the classification against the original questionnaire. The Institute should not compare programmes or years unless the survey items, scoring rules and respondent groups are sufficiently comparable.

2. Individual items with relatively high and low ratings

The following items received relatively high mean scores in the source report. PTIT should preserve the practices that support these results and examine whether they can be applied appropriately in other areas.

Survey item	Mean score	Satisfied / other indicator
Information Technology Việt - Nhật	175	3.95
Business Administration	422	3.93
Công nghệ vi mạch bán dẫn	196	3.92
Thương mại điện tử	287	3.90
Công nghệ kỹ thuật Điện, điện tử	514	3.90

III. QUALITY ASSURANCE FINDINGS

First, the survey provides one source of evidence for monitoring how well PTIT's educational provision and support services respond to students' needs. Student feedback should be considered alongside learning outcomes, programme delivery records, assessment information, staff feedback and other management data. Triangulating these sources reduces the risk of drawing conclusions from a single indicator and supports more reliable decisions about improvement priorities.

Second, PTIT should link survey findings to documented improvement decisions. For each issue requiring action, the responsible unit should define the problem, verify its causes, select a proportionate response, identify the lead and supporting units, set a completion date and specify the evidence that will demonstrate the outcome. This approach ensures that the survey contributes to actual improvement rather than ending with the collection and reporting of opinions.

Third, the Institute should close the feedback loop by informing students how their views have been considered. PTIT and the relevant units should communicate the issues identified, the actions planned, the expected timeframe and any matters that cannot be resolved immediately. Clear follow-up helps sustain student participation and demonstrates that feedback is used in institutional decision-making.

Fourth, PTIT should apply consistent survey and analysis procedures across reporting cycles. The responsible unit should document the rules for valid responses, score calculation, item grouping and duplicate handling. Before comparing results across programmes or years, it should check whether the questionnaire, respondent population and survey period are comparable. Any methodological changes should be disclosed so that differences in scores are not misinterpreted as changes in quality.

Fifth, the Institute should assess the representativeness of the data before generalising findings to the whole student population. A count of completed records alone is not sufficient to establish the response rate. PTIT should verify the eligible population,

identify unique respondents and review the distribution of responses across cohorts or classes. Where participation is limited or uneven, the report should state this limitation and avoid conclusions that extend beyond the available evidence.

IV. IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS AND FOLLOW-UP

The Centre for Testing and Educational Quality Assurance should work with the relevant programme management unit and service departments to validate the source data, check duplicate records, identify missing responses and confirm the classification of survey items. The validation record should be retained with the report so that the analysis can be reviewed, explained and reproduced when necessary.

For items with lower ratings or a comparatively high proportion of ratings 1–2, the responsible unit should review relevant records, service procedures and student feedback to establish the underlying causes. If the quantitative results do not explain the issue, the unit may gather additional feedback through focused discussions or a follow-up survey. Proposed actions should address verified causes, fall within the unit’s authority and take account of available resources.

For teaching and learning, the programme team should review alignment among programme objectives, intended learning outcomes, course content, learning activities and assessment methods. Assessment criteria and grading procedures should be communicated clearly, and students should receive useful feedback that helps them understand their performance and improve. Any curriculum or course changes should draw on survey evidence, learning-outcome data and stakeholder feedback, with records retained to document the decision and its effects.

For administration and student support, the relevant units should review the clarity and timeliness of information, the channels used to receive requests, published processing times and cases that remain unresolved. For facilities, learning resources and IT infrastructure, the Institute should prioritise issues according to their effect on learning, feasibility of remedy and resource requirements.

Each improvement action should have a named lead, a deadline, a measurable completion criterion and supporting evidence. After implementation, the responsible unit should compare the situation before and after the action and determine whether the measure addressed the identified problem. If the outcome falls short of expectations, the unit should revise the action or propose further measures. This process supports a continuing cycle of planning, implementation, review and improvement within PTIT’s internal quality assurance system.

When communicating the findings, PTIT should state the scope of the dataset, the number of records, the scoring approach and the limitations of interpretation. Survey results should not be used to assign responsibility to a unit until relevant contextual

factors have been examined, and they should not be presented as representative of all students unless the data support that conclusion.

V. CONCLUSION

The 2026 student satisfaction survey for institution-wide student population recorded an overall mean score of 3.81/5. The results provide an initial evidence base for reviewing students' experiences of the Institute's activities and identifying practices to maintain and areas to improve. Their value for management depends on accurate data validation, appropriate interpretation and clear follow-up.

PTIT should confirm the number of unique respondents and the official response rate, validate the grouping of survey items, and use the findings to develop improvement actions with clear responsibilities, deadlines and evidence requirements. The responsible units should monitor implementation, review the effectiveness of completed actions and report back to students where appropriate. Conclusions about the quality of individual activities should take account of quantitative results, student comments and relevant operational evidence.