

Hanoi, 15 August 2026

REPORT 2026 SURVEY RESULTS
FROM THE INSTITUTE’S ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND SPECIALISTS
(On training management and support, and educational quality assurance)

I. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHOD OF DATA AGGREGATION

In 2026, the Institute conducted a survey of administrative officers and specialists to assess the extent to which training management and support meet operational needs, how units coordinate with one another, the conditions under which staff perform their duties, and staff members’ understanding of the Institute’s vision, mission and core values. The survey findings provide information for institutional self-assessment, review of process effectiveness, identification of priority areas for improvement, and monitoring of educational quality assurance activities in the period ahead.

According to the consolidated dataset, 71 administrative officers and specialists completed the survey. Of these, 48 were specialists (67.6%) and 21 were managers (29.6%); the remaining respondents comprised one service employee and one person who selected “Other”. In terms of length of service, 57 respondents had worked for more than 10 years, nine for 3–10 years, and five for fewer than three years. Respondents represented several functional areas, including training (16), other positions (13), testing and educational quality assurance (12), planning and finance (11), student affairs (7), personnel management (5), science and technology (5), and learning resources and library services (2). This composition captures views from several functions related to training management and support. Nevertheless, the findings reflect the views of those who participated in the survey and should not automatically be interpreted as representative of all Institute employees.

This report uses responses marked “Completed”. Ratings on a five-point scale were summarized as mean scores, with higher scores indicating more positive assessments. Seven groups concerning management, support and quality assurance each contained four criteria; the group on vision, mission and core values contained three. Each quantitative criterion received 70 valid responses, while the background information and open-ended questions received 71 responses. The analysis therefore uses the valid data available for each group and treats open-ended comments as supplementary information for interpreting results and identifying issues.

II. SURVEY RESULTS

1. Results by assessment area

The mean scores for the assessment areas ranged from 4.09 to 4.40 out of 5. Overall, administrative officers and specialists assessed training management and support positively. However, differences were observed across areas. Quality assurance arrangements, the use of feedback, and monitoring the effectiveness of improvements received comparatively lower scores and therefore warrant further management attention.

No.	Assessment area	Mean score	Number of ratings
1	Training organization and management	4.24/5	280
2	Student support	4.17/5	280
3	Teaching and learning support	4.12/5	280

4	Quality assurance and improvement	4.09/5	280
5	Coordination and governance	4.13/5	280
6	Capacity development and working conditions	4.22/5	280
7	Overall assessment	4.24/5	280
8	Vision, mission and core values	4.40/5	210

The vision, mission and core values area achieved the highest mean score, at 4.40. This indicates that respondents viewed the Institute's development direction and role relatively positively. The overall assessment scored 4.24. Within this area, the criterion "I am willing to participate in quality improvement activities" scored 4.34, while satisfaction with the unit's work performance scored 4.27. This provides a positive basis for sustaining staff participation in improvement activities, provided that suggestions are acknowledged, responses are communicated, and proposals are translated into specific actions.

Training organization and management scored 4.24. Respondents rated the clarity of training management procedures at 4.29, while the timely updating of regulations and guidance and the provision of academic information each scored 4.26. Coordination among units in training management scored 4.14, lower than the other criteria in this area. The Institute should therefore continue to review handovers between work stages, processing deadlines and designated responsibilities, particularly for tasks requiring contributions from several units.

Capacity development and working conditions scored 4.22. Opportunities for professional development scored 4.30, one of the higher individual scores. Workload appropriateness and mechanisms for encouraging and recognizing contributions each scored 4.20, while working conditions scored 4.19. Although these results are generally positive, they do not establish that all staff have equivalent working conditions. The Institute should review workload in relation to job roles, task requirements and peak periods, and align professional development with the practical needs of different groups of staff.

2. Student support, and teaching and learning support

Student support scored 4.17. Student support services scored 4.24 and academic advising scored 4.21. By comparison, the receipt and handling of student feedback scored 4.11, while timely support for learners experiencing academic difficulties scored 4.10. These results indicate that support activities were assessed favourably overall, but the Institute should clarify the responsible contact points, response deadlines, communication of outcomes and follow-up responsibilities. Academic advising should place greater emphasis on early identification of student difficulties and, where appropriate, consideration of academic counselling and psychological support needs.

Teaching and learning support scored 4.12. The criterion on the serious and transparent conduct of examinations and assessment scored 4.23; teaching facilities scored 4.13; and information technology infrastructure and online learning systems scored 4.10. The adequacy of learning resources and library services for teaching and learning scored 4.04, the lowest in this area. Open-ended comments also referred to infrastructure or equipment that may not perform optimally when user traffic is high, as well as delays in updating programmes and learning resources. The Institute should therefore combine perception survey results with operational data, such as system interruption frequency, incident resolution time, the currency of learning resources and library resource use, to identify causes and set investment priorities.

3. Quality assurance, coordination and governance

Quality assurance and improvement scored 4.09, the lowest among the assessment areas. The criterion on units' understanding of their roles in the internal quality assurance system scored 4.14. Systematic collection of feedback and the substantive use of feedback to drive improvement each scored 4.09, while monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of improvements scored 4.04. These scores do not indicate an overall negative assessment, but they point to a gap between

collecting information and demonstrating the impact of improvement actions. The Institute should shift its emphasis from recording that a survey has been conducted or a plan has been issued to clearly identifying the issue, corrective action, responsible unit, completion deadline, monitoring indicator and evidence of the results achieved.

Coordination and governance scored 4.13. Management decisions based on data and evidence scored 4.16, and coordination among units in delivering training programmes scored 4.19. By contrast, the allocation of responsibilities among units within the quality assurance system and the support provided by the quality assurance portal each scored 4.09. Some respondents proposed establishing a centralized data repository, standardizing cross-unit procedures, issuing consistent operating guidance and applying work-performance indicators. These proposals align with the need to strengthen evidence-informed governance. Implementation should, however, avoid duplicative reporting requirements. Each process should specify its input data, responsible data owner, access rights, processing deadline and expected output.

4. Views on the vision, mission and core values

The three criteria in this area received mean scores ranging from 4.33 to 4.44. The criterion stating that the mission appropriately reflects the Institute's role and social responsibility scored 4.44; a clear, understandable and inspiring vision scored 4.41; and the expression of core values in day-to-day activities scored 4.33. Respondents therefore viewed the Institute's overall direction positively, although the link between core values and everyday practice received a lower score than the other two criteria. The Institute should continue communicating these principles consistently and clearly, linking them to practical situations in work, teaching, learning, research and community service. Some respondents also suggested presenting the information in English to improve accessibility for students and international partners. This may be done while retaining Vietnamese as the authoritative and consistent version.

III. SUMMARY OF OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS AND ISSUES REQUIRING ATTENTION

Open-ended responses focused on four main themes. First, staff acknowledged the Institute's increased use of information technology and digital transformation in training management. Systems supporting teaching plans, course registration, timetables, grades and learning progress have helped organize work more systematically, improve transparency and reduce manual processing time. Second, respondents recognized a development direction linked to digital technology, innovation and stronger connections between training, research management, international cooperation and blended learning. Third, the difficulties raised included heavy workloads, pressure to process tasks within short periods, possible system overload during peak periods, uneven facilities and work tools, delays in updating programmes and learning resources, and academic advising that was not always sufficiently proactive. Fourth, proposals focused on data integration and interoperability, standardizing cross-unit procedures, developing a shared data repository, digitizing operational guidance, strengthening professional and information technology training, and improving mechanisms for monitoring implementation results.

Because fewer respondents provided open-ended comments than completed the survey, and some comments did not specify a substantive issue, these themes should be understood as notable topics in the feedback rather than conclusions about their prevalence throughout the Institute. When developing improvement plans, units should verify the issues against operational data, consult relevant groups and compare the findings with those of subsequent survey cycles.

IV. DIRECTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Based on the survey results, the Institute should prioritize strengthening its quality improvement arrangements so that issues are clearly defined and implementation outcomes can be monitored.

The Center for Testing and Educational Quality Assurance may work with relevant units to guide the preparation of improvement plans using a common structure. Each plan should state the current situation, underlying causes, actions, lead unit, supporting units, completion deadline, monitoring indicators and evidence confirming the results. For issues involving several units, the Institute's leadership should designate a coordinating focal point to reduce disruption between work stages.

For training management and support, functional units should review procedures that involve multiple coordination steps and clearly publish processing deadlines and feedback arrangements. The Institute should prioritize testing the capacity of digital systems during peak periods and improving data interoperability across academic management, examinations, surveys, online learning and student management. It should also identify the unit responsible for updating each data category. Investment in learning resources, library services, facilities and information technology infrastructure should reflect the impact on teaching and learning, the frequency of problems and actual usage data.

For student support, responsible units should strengthen procedures for receiving and resolving concerns and clearly communicate contact channels, response deadlines and outcomes. The Institute should continue improving academic advising and enable responsible staff to identify and assist students experiencing difficulties at an early stage. For administrative officers and specialists, units should review workloads, arrange professional development according to job requirements and recognize improvement contributions based on tangible results.

For monitoring purposes, the Institute should use the 2026 survey results as a baseline for comparison in the next survey cycle. Comparisons should maintain consistent questions, rating scales and calculation methods, while also taking account of the number and composition of respondents to avoid misinterpreting score differences when survey conditions change. Units should report not only which actions have been implemented, but also the results achieved, outstanding actions and reasons for any delay. The Institute's leadership can then assess the degree of improvement and decide whether to maintain, adjust or supplement the measures.

V. CONCLUSION

The 2026 survey indicates that administrative officers and specialists generally assessed the Institute's management, training support and development direction positively. Strengths identified include relatively clear training management procedures, broader use of information technology, the perceived integrity of examination and assessment arrangements, and staff willingness to participate in improvement activities. The findings also identify areas requiring further attention, particularly the substantive use of feedback, monitoring the effectiveness of improvements, coordination across units, handling student concerns, updating learning resources and ensuring that digital systems can meet demand during peak periods.

The Institute should use the survey findings as a management reference and combine them with operational data and feedback from relevant stakeholders when selecting appropriate measures. When each improvement action has a responsible focal point, a clear deadline and evidence of results, survey activities can make a more practical contribution to improving management effectiveness and the quality of education.

Recipients:

- Institute Board of Directors;
- Functional units;
- Faculties;
- Filed at the Office.

HEAD OF THE CENTER

Nguyen Quy Sy