



This review method
is ESG-compliant

International Quality Accreditation

Industrial University
of Ho Chi Minh City

Review Report

March 2026

Contents

About this review	1
Key findings	2
Executive summary	2
QAA's conclusions about Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City	3
European Standards and Guidelines	3
Conditions	3
Good practice.....	3
Recommendations	3
Explanation of the findings about Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City	5
Standard 1.1: Policy for quality assurance.....	6
Standard 1.2: Design and approval of programmes	9
Standard 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment	12
Standard 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification	15
Standard 1.5: Teaching staff	17
Standard 1.6: Learning resources and student support.....	20
Standard 1.7: Information management	23
Standard 1.8: Public information	25
Standard 1.9: Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes	26
Standard 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance	28
Glossary	31

About this review

This is a report of an International Quality Accreditation conducted by The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) at Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH). The review took place from 24 to 26 March 2026 and was conducted by a team of three reviewers, as follows:

- Professor Mark Hunt
- Doctor Ngepathimo Kadhila
- Mr Matthew Kitching (student reviewer).

International Quality Accreditation (IQA) offers institutions outside the UK the opportunity to have a review by the UK's The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The review benchmarks the institutions' quality assurance processes against international quality assurance standards set out in Part 1 of the [Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area \(ESG\)](#).

In International Quality Accreditation, the QAA accreditation team:

- makes conclusion against each of the 10 standards set out in Part 1 of the ESG
- makes conditions (if relevant)
- makes recommendations
- identifies features of good practice
- comes to an overall conclusion as to whether the institution meets the standards for International Quality Accreditation.

A summary of the findings can be found in the section: [Key findings](#). The section [Explanations of the findings](#) provides the detailed commentary.

The QAA website gives more information [about QAA](#) and its mission. A dedicated section explains the method for [International Quality Accreditation](#) and has links to other informative documents. For an explanation of terms see the [Glossary](#) at the end of this report.

Key findings

Executive summary

The Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH) was originally founded as Go Vap Vocational School by Don Bosco priests in 1956. Officially recognised as a university in 2004 under Decision No. 214/2004/QĐ-TTg issued by the Prime Minister of Vietnam. IUH has since undergone significant development and transformation across all aspects of its operations. Although its university-level history is shorter than that of many other institutions in Vietnam, IUH has grown into one of the largest education and training institutions in the country. It has long-standing experience in vocational education.

The IUH main campus is in Ho Chi Minh City. At the main campus, IUH currently has 16 training units (academic departments) and 18 functional departments and centres providing services and support for lecturers, staff, and learners. The University has three other satellite campuses. These are: an additional Ho Chi Minh City Campus; the Quang Ngai campus in Quang Ngai Province; and the Thanh Hoa Campus in Thanh Hoa Province.

IUH has 39,033 undergraduate students, 619 master's students, and 235 doctoral students. The University has 1,590 staff members, including 1,182 faculty members, among whom are 22 professors and 78 associate professors. IUH currently offers 38 undergraduate programmes, 16 master's programmes, and 11 doctoral programmes.

IUH developed a new vision, mission, and objective statements for the period (2020-2025), and has visualised its path to 2030 under the slogan "Transforming Minds, Enriching Knowledge - Lives". The IUH vision is to be nationally recognised as a leading applied university for excellence in education, research, technology transfer, innovation, and creativity. The statement of educational philosophy of IUH is summarised as "CARE" which is to develop graduates who are Compassionate leaders, Avid Lifelong Learners, Rational Thinkers and Enterprising Innovators.

In the realm of research, the University collaborates with 10 key partners. It has established strong ties with 15 institutions for exchange programmes and international collaborations. Additionally, IUH has formed strategic partnerships with five organisations for quality assurance initiatives.

In reaching conclusions about the extent to which Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City meets the 10 ESG Standards, the QAA review team followed the evidence-based review procedure as outlined in the handbook for International Quality Accreditation (IQA). The University provided the review team with a self-evaluation document (SED) and supporting evidence. During the review visit, which took place on 24-27 March 2026, the review team held a total of nine meetings with the President, senior management team, academic staff, professional support staff, students, alumni, and external stakeholders. The review team also had the opportunity to observe the University's facilities and learning resources at the Main Ho Chi Minh campus.

In summary, the review team found six examples of good practice and was able to make some recommendations for improvement/enhancement. The recommendations are of a desirable rather than essential nature and are proposed to enable the University to build on existing practice which is operating satisfactorily but which could be improved or enhanced. The team did not set any conditions.

Overall, the review team concluded that Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City **meets** all standards for International Quality Accreditation.

QAA's conclusions about Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City

The QAA review team reached the following conclusions about the higher education provision at Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City.

European Standards and Guidelines

Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City meets all 10 ESG Standards and Guidelines.

Conditions

The team did not set any conditions.

Good practice

The QAA review team identified the following features of **good practice** at Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City:

- The institutionally integrated approach to outcomes-based programme design, stakeholder-informed curriculum development, systematic benchmarking, and formal academic governance processes, all within a single, coherent, and highly effective framework (ESG Standard 1.2).
- The institutionally embedded student-centred learning framework that integrates outcomes-based education, student engagement mechanisms, stakeholder input, digital learning infrastructure, and academic support systems within a coherent, consistently applied approach (ESG Standard 1.3).
- The highly effective, institutionally embedded academic workforce framework, which enables consistent management of staff competence and provides a strong foundation for maintaining academic standards (ESG Standard 1.5).
- The extensive range of high-quality learning resources that support active learning strategies (ESG Standard 1.6).
- The Key Performance Indicator Dashboard and its effective use as a dynamic decision support tool and data driven management instrument (ESG Standard 1.7).
- The strategically integrated, institutionally embedded approach to cyclical external quality assurance that goes beyond baseline expectations, enabling the systematic translation of external review outcomes into measurable programme enhancements and institutional learning (Standard 1.10).

Recommendations

The QAA review team makes the following **recommendations** to Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City:

- Develop and implement a systematic approach to documenting stakeholder feedback and its impact on programme approval and reapproval decisions for postgraduate and doctoral programmes (ESG Standard 1.2).
- Strengthen the approach to recording systematically evidence of teaching enhancement across the institution to effectively demonstrate how student feedback and other evaluation sources inform curriculum development and teaching practices (ESG Standard 1.3).
- Engage with the new Vietnamese National Qualifications Framework to develop a comprehensive policy on accreditation of prior learning (ESG Standard 1.4).
- Enhance the systematic use and demonstration of feedback and performance data within the academic workforce framework by clearly showing how information from

staff evaluations, student feedback, and professional development activities is used to foster continuous improvement and inform institutional decision-making (ESG Standard 1.5).

- Strengthen support arrangements for students with learning disabilities (ESG Standard 1.6).
- Strengthen English translation on the University website to support the institution's strategic approach to internationalisation (ESG Standard 1.8).
- More clearly articulate and formalise, within its institutional documentation, the distinction between ongoing monitoring and periodic review processes (ESG Standard 1.9).

Explanation of the findings about Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City

This section explains the review findings in more detail.

Terms that may be unfamiliar to some readers have been included in a [brief glossary](#) at the end of this report. A fuller [glossary of terms](#) is available on the QAA website, and formal definitions of certain terms may be found in the operational description and handbook for the [review method](#), also on the QAA website.

Standard 1.1: Policy for quality assurance

Institutions should have a policy for quality assurance that is made public and forms part of their strategic management. Internal stakeholders should develop and implement this policy through appropriate structures and processes, while involving external stakeholders.

Findings

1.1 IUH has a comprehensive, publicly accessible quality assurance (QA) policy that is coherently aligned with the University's strategic direction, its graduate attributes framework, CARE (Compassionate Leader, Avid Lifelong Learner, Rational Thinker, Enterprising Innovator), and its overarching vision to become a nationally recognised leading applied university. The policy articulates four dimensions: market-oriented planning and curriculum development; continuous stakeholder-engaged improvement; the development of competent staff and effective teaching systems; and the implementation of QA management systems meeting national, regional, and international standards.

1.2 The IUH Quality Assurance Handbook translates policy into operational guidance for all units. The alignment of the QA policy with the University's Vision and Mission and with the QA Regulations ensures coherence across strategic and operational levels.

1.3 The review team investigated whether the policy translated into observable quality behaviours in daily practice. The site visit confirmed that it does. Academic staff described QA as integral to their professional identity, noting that outcome-based learning underpins all teaching activities and that all staff have received relevant training. Senior Staff emphasised that quality assurance is pursued as a long-term institutional journey, with evidence of genuine improvement including increased numbers of international students and measurable gains arising from feedback data. The connection between QA principles and daily professional practice was affirmed independently by academic staff, professional support staff, and research supervisors across the site visit programme.

1.4 IUH operates a well-designed multi-tiered QA governance structure: the QA Steering Committee at strategic level; the Testing and Quality Assurance Office (TQA) coordinating management functions; faculty and unit-level QA divisions implementing operational activities; and QA secretaries embedded within individual departments. This structure is formally defined in the QA Regulations and the Regulations on the Roles and Duties of Units. As set out in the Self Evaluation Document (SED), quality is improved in education, research, and service using the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) approach, which establishes a QA strategic plan and management document system (regulations, procedures, long- and short-term action plans) based on vision, purpose, and strategic plan.

1.5 The review team sought confirmation about how consistency of implementation is managed across IUH's four geographically dispersed campuses. Senior Staff confirmed during the site visit that QA is administered centrally from the main campus, that at least one trained QA lead (quality secretary) is embedded in every office and section across all campuses, and that academic staff deliver across campuses using the same frameworks and regulations. The review team were reassured that such arrangements allowed for QA to be administered consistently across the whole of IUH.

1.6 IUH has issued a mandatory staff QA awareness assessment requiring 100% correct responses on questions relating to vision, mission, and QA principles. This initiative was confirmed as operational by professional support staff during the site visit, several of whom cited it as an effective mechanism for embedding institutional values. The annual Year-End

Achievements and Proposed Missions Report create a regular institutional rhythm of reflection and forward planning across all units.

1.7 The review team were interested in how QA was experienced by staff and professional support staff provided concrete examples of bottom-up quality improvements originating from staff suggestions: a proposal for additional payment for part-time internal work was acted upon by leadership following staff feedback through the twice-yearly E-Office survey; library staff successfully raised a request to adjust shift timings. These examples, corroborated independently by professional support staff, demonstrate that the feedback loop articulated in the Regulations on Collecting Opinions of Relevant Parties operates in practice.

1.8 Research students confirmed that surveys are numerous and cover a broad range of experience dimensions, including all aspects of the research student experience. Whilst some students indicated a degree of survey fatigue, they cited tangible outcomes including improved facilities as evidence that feedback is acted upon. Supervisors confirmed that concerns about supervision progress are addressed through a clear escalation pathway: reminders to students, followed by reporting to the Head of Department and further action as appropriate, including in one confirmed case the reassignment of a supervisor. This reflects the operational functioning of the Academic Advisory Regulations and the processes described in the Student Handbook.

1.9 IUH maintains systematic mechanisms for external stakeholder engagement, documented in the Stakeholder Survey Plan, Stakeholder Consultation Activities, Business Workshops to Gather Input for Programme Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and Minutes of Meetings of the Quality Assurance Units in Training Units. These mechanisms are supplemented by official social media channels and direct consultation with employers, alumni, and experts.

1.10 Academic staff confirmed during the site visit that employer and alumni feedback concretely influences curriculum decisions. A specific example was provided: communication skills were strengthened across programmes in response to feedback from employers and community partners about graduates' performance in professional settings. This illustrates the translation of external stakeholder input into curriculum change, consistent with the evidence of changes in PLOs or curriculum and the Minutes of Meetings to Change Training Programmes.

1.11 External Stakeholders themselves confirmed substantive and valued engagement with IUH. Employers noted the IUH's practical training orientation and the strength of its industry relationships. Alumni valued the development of soft skills and highlighted English language proficiency as an area for continued attention, a point acknowledged by Senior Staff as informing ongoing development priorities. Research students indicated that programme accreditation is a visible factor in students' choice of university, reflecting awareness of the University's QA achievements. The Activities to Disseminate Quality Assurance Policies to Stakeholders, the QA Implementation Meetings, and the Minutes of the Quality Assurance Board Meeting provide documentary evidence of the mechanisms supporting this engagement.

1.12 The QA policy is published on the University's website and through multiple additional channels including the E-Office system, briefing meetings, and QA training workshops. Public disclosure of information, including programme-level data such as student recruitment criteria, learning outcomes, graduate employment rates, and accreditation status, is updated annually. The Mechanism for Communicating QA Documents to Relevant Stakeholders, which includes hard copy, digital files, IUH website, social media, oral

communication, press release, and email channels, ensures that all stakeholder groups have appropriate access.

1.13 IUH has a robust, publicly accessible QA policy that is strategically integrated, operationally embedded across all campuses and staff groups, supported by the continuous development model PDCA and the KPI Dashboard, and demonstrably responsive to internal and external stakeholder feedback. The review team therefore concludes ESG Standard 1.1, Policy for quality assurance is **met**.

Standard 1.2: Design and approval of programmes

Institutions should have processes for the design and approval of their programmes. The programmes should be designed so that they meet the objectives set for them, including the intended learning outcomes. The qualification resulting from a programme should be clearly specified and communicated, and refer to the correct level of the national qualifications framework for higher education and, consequently, to the Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area.

Findings

2.1 IUH follows structured, institutionally governed procedures for designing, approving, monitoring, and reviewing academic programmes at all levels, including undergraduate (BA/BSc), postgraduate taught (MA/MSc), and doctoral (PhD) programmes. These procedures are set out in the Quality Assurance Handbook, institutional QA regulations, and academic governance arrangements involving the Science and Academic Council and relevant committees. Programme design is supported by formal documentation, benchmarking activities, and documented processes for curriculum review and updates.

2.2 Programme development is grounded in an outcomes-based education framework, with Programme Educational Objectives and Expected Learning Outcomes aligned to the institutional strategy and mapped to the Vietnamese National Qualifications Framework. This alignment is evident across undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, with increasing levels of complexity, autonomy, and research focus at higher qualification levels.

2.3 At the undergraduate level, programmes aim to develop foundational disciplinary knowledge, practical skills, and employability qualities, aligned with the CARE Graduate Attributes framework. At the postgraduate taught level (MA/MSc), programme design emphasises critical thinking, advanced subject understanding, and independent learning, with greater integration of research-informed teaching. At the doctoral level (PhD), programmes focus on developing original research skills, independent inquiry, and contributions to knowledge, supported by structured supervision and institutional research frameworks.

2.4 Feedback from students, alumni, and employers helps shape and review programmes at all levels, supported by institutional data and feedback mechanisms. In doctoral programmes, additional input is gathered from research communities, supervisors, and external academic networks, though this is less formally documented.

2.5 Taken together, these arrangements aim to ensure that programmes are clearly defined, properly aligned with qualification frameworks, and responsive to stakeholders' expectations, labour market demands, and institutional priorities at undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral levels.

2.6 In practice, IUH's procedures for programme design and approval are consistently applied and provide a reliable basis for maintaining academic standards across undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programmes.

2.7 The institutional framework is clearly defined and effectively implemented, with responsibilities for programme development, scrutiny, and approval specified in QA regulations and governance structures. Programme teams demonstrate a strong understanding of outcomes-based design, as evidenced by the alignment of learning outcomes, curriculum structure, and assessment methods. This alignment is consistent

across all levels of provision, with appropriate differentiation among undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral expectations.

2.8 At the undergraduate level, programme design fosters structured knowledge, practical skills, and progression pathways. At the postgraduate level, programmes demonstrate a higher standard of academic rigour, including critical analysis, autonomous learning, and research-informed teaching. At the doctoral level, programme structures emphasise independent research, supervision, and contributions to knowledge, although the formal presentation of doctoral programme design frameworks is less consistently documented.

2.9 Programme approval involves formal academic review through established governance processes, including the Science and Academic Council. Staff discussions indicated that proposals receive appropriate consideration and challenge. Nonetheless, the use and documentation of external academic and professional input within programme approval processes are not consistently demonstrated, particularly for postgraduate and doctoral programmes, where such input is intended to strengthen assurance of academic standards.

2.10 Curriculum review processes are ongoing and cyclical at all levels, with programme modifications driven by stakeholder feedback and performance data. Programme teams use student feedback, graduate outcomes, and stakeholder consultation to guide updates. Both staff and students shared examples of curriculum changes in meetings. This integration promotes consistent programme development and ensures robust, reliable assurance of academic standards across both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. The review team considered the institutionally integrated approach to outcomes-based programme design, stakeholder-informed curriculum development, systematic benchmarking, and formal academic governance processes, all within a single, coherent, and highly effective framework to be a feature of **good practice**.

2.11 At doctoral levels, there is evidence of programme development, including changes to curriculum structure, research components, and supervision arrangements. However, documentation on how feedback and review outcomes influence formal approval or re-approval decisions is less consistent at the institutional level, particularly for research programmes. Consequently, although the feedback loop operates in practice, its transparency and traceability could be improved. While feedback mechanisms are clearly established and functioning in practice, the University has yet to consistently demonstrate, through systematic documentation, how stakeholder feedback directly informs programme approval decisions and subsequent improvements, limiting transparency and institutional traceability. The review team **recommends** IUH to develop and implement a systematic approach to documenting stakeholder feedback and its impact on programme approval and reapproval decisions for doctoral programmes.

2.12 Benchmarking is effectively used to support academic standards, drawing on both national and international comparators. This is most evident at the undergraduate and taught postgraduate levels. Programme specifications explicitly define learning outcomes, curriculum structure, and progression requirements, and students report that expectations are clearly communicated.

2.13 Alignment with the Vietnamese National Qualifications Framework is clear and consistently applied, ensuring appropriate differentiation between qualification levels. Qualification documentation further enhances transparency regarding achieved outcomes. Institutional QA documentation references international frameworks such as the QF-EHEA, although this alignment is not always explicitly articulated in programme-level

documentation, particularly at postgraduate and doctoral levels. This lack of explicit articulation limits external transparency and comparability.

2.14 Institutional systems support programme monitoring and reporting, providing access to performance data at all levels of provision. However, data use is more advanced at the programme level than at the institutional level. Evidence of systematic, longitudinal analysis demonstrating how programme changes affect student outcomes, learning gains, or programme effectiveness over time is limited. There is limited evidence of a systematic, institutionally integrated approach to longitudinal analysis that shows how curriculum changes lead to measurable improvements in student outcomes, learning gains, or programme effectiveness over time.

2.15 This limitation is particularly significant for postgraduate and doctoral programmes, where expectations for monitoring outcomes, research outputs, and progression are higher. Although monitoring occurs, the analytical integration and institutional oversight of long-term programme performance remain underdeveloped.

2.16 Overall, IUH's arrangements effectively secure programme design and approval for undergraduate and taught postgraduate provision, with suitable structures also in place for doctoral programmes. The main areas for improvement relate to consistency across the institution, documentation, external engagement, and the strategic use of data at all levels of provision. These areas do not undermine the framework's effectiveness but highlight where institutional practices could be strengthened to improve transparency, comparability, and strategic oversight across all levels of provision. The review team therefore concludes ESG Standard 1.2, Student centred teaching learning and assessment is **met**.

Standard 1.3: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment

Institutions should ensure that the programmes are delivered in a way that encourages students to take an active role in creating the learning process, and that the assessment of students reflects this approach.

Findings

3.1 Student-centred learning is embedded in the institutional strategy and supported by digital learning infrastructure, academic resources, and library services, and regulations governing online and blended learning. Academic advisory systems provide structured support, including monitoring and personalised guidance, complemented by broader student support services focused on academic progress and wellbeing. These arrangements operate at all levels of provision, with additional supervisory structures for doctoral students.

3.2 IUH's student-centred learning framework is consistently applied across the institution and provides a solid foundation for fostering student engagement and learning at all levels of provision. Student-centred approaches are evident at both strategic and operational levels, with alignment between institutional philosophy, graduate attributes, and programme delivery. Teaching methods exemplify this approach through project-based learning, practical activities, and applied learning. Students and staff confirmed that these methodologies are widely used at the undergraduate level and continue to be employed, with greater independence, at the postgraduate level. The institutionally embedded student-centred learning framework that integrates outcomes-based education, student engagement mechanisms, stakeholder input, digital learning infrastructure, and academic support systems within a coherent, consistently applied approach is identified by the review team as a feature of **good practice**. This provides a robust, sustainable foundation for delivering high-quality student-centred learning and supporting the student experience across undergraduate and postgraduate programmes.

3.3 At the taught postgraduate level, students emphasised a stronger focus on critical thinking, independent study, and engagement with research-informed teaching. At the doctoral level, the learning experience centres on independent research supported by supervision, and students affirm that supervisory relationships are central to their academic development. Expectations regarding research training, supervision, and progression are also reflected in programme documentation and in QA regulations governing postgraduate and doctoral provision. While the articulation of a distinct doctoral pedagogical framework is less explicit in institutional documentation, the review team found that doctoral learning, supervision, and academic development are clearly defined and consistently implemented in practice, as evidenced by programme documentation and confirmed by staff and students in meetings. This reflects a matter of documentary clarity rather than a weakness in the effectiveness of doctoral teaching and learning.

3.4 Student engagement occurs through various channels, including course evaluations, institutional surveys, dialogue events, and formal representation structures. Input from alumni and employers also informs programme development and review. Students at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels have reported that they can share their opinions and that programme teams consider these. This fosters a coherent, well-integrated student-centred learning environment, supported by multiple feedback and engagement mechanisms that operate consistently across the institution.

3.5 Although these mechanisms are clearly embedded, the link between feedback, subsequent changes to teaching or curriculum, and the assessment of those changes is not always thoroughly documented at the institutional level. This hampers the ability to demonstrate the full impact of student engagement on improvements, particularly across

faculties and programme levels. While student feedback is actively collected and utilised at the programme level, the University has not yet consistently shown, through systematic documentation, how this feedback leads to specific improvements and measurable progress in student learning outcomes across the institution, thereby reducing evidential transparency and impact. The review team therefore **recommend** IUH strengthen the approach to recording systematically evidence of teaching enhancement across the institution to effectively demonstrate how student feedback and other evaluation sources inform curriculum development and teaching practices.

3.6 Teaching effectiveness is assessed using various data sources, including student feedback, learning outcomes, progression data, and institutional KPIs. Improvement activities following programme review and external evaluation are documented. At the undergraduate and postgraduate taught levels, this provides a solid basis for monitoring teaching effectiveness.

3.7 However, there is limited evidence from systematic longitudinal analysis showing how improvements in teaching and learning lead to sustained progress in student outcomes over time. This gap is even more evident at postgraduate and doctoral levels, where expectations for monitoring research outcomes, progression, and academic development are higher. This indicates that, although enhancement activities are underway, the university has not yet adopted a consistently applied, institution-wide approach to analysing and demonstrating the long-term impact of teaching and learning improvements, particularly at postgraduate and doctoral levels.

3.8 Assessment practices are clearly defined and aligned with intended learning outcomes and are supported by institutional regulations and programme documentation. Students confirmed that assessment requirements are transparent and that feedback enhances their learning. At postgraduate level, assessments include more complex analytical and research-based tasks, while doctoral assessments are based on thesis examination and research outputs.

3.9 Procedures for appeals and complaints serve as safeguards to ensure fairness and consistency, and students demonstrate awareness of these processes.

3.10 The learning environment is enhanced through digital systems and academic resources, including Learning Management Systems (LMS) platforms, student portals, and library services. Arrangements for international students and individuals with additional needs are in place, fostering an inclusive learning environment. Students at all levels have reported that these resources are accessible and support independent learning. These arrangements, together with institutional support systems, further strengthen a comprehensive and integrated framework for student-centred learning across undergraduate and postgraduate provision.

3.11 Academic advisory systems and student support structures are vital for promoting engagement and progression, including the early identification of academic challenges. At the doctoral level, supervision arrangements serve a similar purpose, supporting academic progress and research development. Students and staff consistently regarded these arrangements as effective. Collectively, these features provide a strong and sustainable institutional basis for supporting student learning and engagement across all levels of provision.

3.12 Oversight of teaching quality is managed through programme and faculty-level QA processes, advisory meetings, and programme review mechanisms. Staff participation in QA and enhancement activities is evident. However, structured peer observation and peer-supported development of teaching practice are not yet consistently implemented at the

institutional level, limiting opportunities for systematic pedagogical development and the wider dissemination of effective teaching practices across the University.

3.13 Overall, IUH demonstrates a coherent and effective approach to student-centred learning across undergraduate and postgraduate provision, with suitable arrangements also in place for doctoral programmes. Areas for improvement relate to evidential consistency, longitudinal analysis, and institutional integration, rather than to weaknesses in teaching practice itself. While there are opportunities to improve evidential consistency, particularly in documenting the impact of enhancements and in conducting longitudinal analyses of teaching effectiveness, these do not undermine the framework's overall effectiveness. Instead, they point to areas where institutional practices could be further refined. The review team therefore concludes that ESG Standard 1.3, Student centred teaching learning and assessment is **met**.

Standard 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification

Institutions should consistently apply pre-defined and published regulations covering all phases of the student "life cycle", e.g. student admission, progression, recognition and certification.

Findings

4.1 IUH considers that it has pre-defined, published, and consistently applied regulations on all phases of the student life cycle. This includes Admissions Regulations, published by the Office of Academic Affairs, which govern the institution's approach to recruiting and enrolling students, which must comply with the requirements set out by the Ministry for Education and Training (MOET). IUH has established an Admissions Committee to oversee the entire admission process, from determining enrolment quotas and approving admission plans to validating admission results. For transparency, the admission criteria and minimum quality thresholds (cut-off scores) are announced on the university website and through official communication channels prior to each admission period. Students confirmed that information about entry criteria and the admissions process are clear and accessible. They also informed the review team that any queries during the application process are responded to promptly.

4.2 To inform monitoring processes, periodic evaluation reports are produced at the end of each admission cycle, IUH informed the review team that these reports compare actual enrolment with planned targets, analyse input quality (entry scores), and evaluate the effectiveness of different admission methods. The panel found that staff have a clear understanding of the regulations and their responsibilities pertaining to admissions and that the Admissions Committee discharges its responsibilities effectively. For example, scrutiny of the evaluation reports has led to demonstrable action including, re-evaluating quotas for the Quang Ngai and Thanh Hoa campuses to better align with local demand, increasing support for high-scoring students admitted via the National Exam to further boost input quality and action to enhance digital recruitment strategies for under-performing majors identified in evaluation reports.

4.3 IUH informed the review team that it has a policy and procedure in place to recognise prior academic qualifications and experiential learning. However, the review team found that staff understanding about the institution's policy and approach varied. For example, professional support staff stated that recognition of prior learning was not possible. Whereas IUH also stated in evidence that cases of student transfer or course exemption are reviewed by academic committees in accordance with established regulations on recognition of prior learning (RPL). The review team found that Admission Regulations address arrangements for transfer students with intermediate level, associate degree level or university level qualification who wish to continue studies at a different level or in a different major, but there is no reference to experiential learning. To ensure consistent understanding among staff, provide clarity for stakeholders, including prospective students, and accord with its stated internationalisation objectives the review team **recommends** that the university engage with the new Vietnamese National Qualifications Framework to develop a comprehensive policy on accreditation of prior learning.

4.4 To support progression, the institution has a range of suitable support services in place. These include academic and pastoral tutoring arrangements, careers support, extra-curricular activities provided through clubs and the Youth Union and health services. IUH makes use of PMT-IUH software to ensure progression information is accessible to staff and students. Through the online platform, staff and students can view assessment grades, credit accumulation and the percentage of the programme completed to date. Students

receive notifications where their performance has the potential to lead to withdrawal. Academic warnings are issued where students fail more than 50% of the registered credits in a semester, have an accumulated number of failed credits exceeding 24, have a semester Grade Point Average (GPA) below a certain threshold, which varies depending on the year of study, or where they have a cumulative GPA below a specific threshold. The institution also produces course reports for academic staff and departments that enable them to review student progress. The review team found that course reports are detailed and thorough, providing evaluation based on learning outcomes and grade distribution data for cohorts, as well as suggested actions for improvement. Therefore, the review team found that the institution has a clear, supportive, and considered interventionist approach to assisting student progression.

4.5 Recognition and certification of university degrees is approved in a two-stage process. First, student records, including credit accumulation, and required certificates (IT, foreign language, national defence education) are verified by the Faculty Graduation Committee before being approved by the University Graduation Committee. IUH informed the review team that all the curricula are designed based on a credit system, which allows students to shorten their time to a degree if they wish to. Students' workload for each semester includes between 14 to 25 regulatory credits, and students can be flexible in accumulating the number of credits within this range, or students can choose to study during the summer semester to earn more credits earlier, which shortens the time to graduation. The review team viewed sample graduation diplomas that clearly reference the awarding body, award, and classification. These are supplemented with detailed transcripts, as part of a documentation package that detail the modules studied, their credit value and the grade acquired.

4.6 The review team found that, notwithstanding the arrangements for accreditation of prior and experiential learning, staff understand their responsibilities for admission, progression, recognition and certification. Students also verified that information about different stages of the student lifecycle is clear, accessible and the processes are applied fairly and consistently. The review team therefore concludes Standard 1.4: Student admission, progression, recognition and certification is **met**.

Standard 1.5: Teaching staff

Institutions should assure themselves of the competence of their teachers. They should apply fair and transparent processes for the recruitment and development of the staff.

Findings

5.1 IUH maintains the competence, relevance, and continuous development of its teaching staff through a regulation-based, systematically implemented framework covering workforce planning, recruitment, induction, performance reviews, and ongoing professional development. This framework aligns with the institution's strategic priorities, is integrated into the Quality Assurance framework, and is implemented through formal regulations on recruitment, workload distribution, staff evaluation, professional development, and institutional performance monitoring.

5.2 Arrangements for staff competence are further integrated into institutional QA regulations and supported by structured training plans, including institution-wide QA and pedagogical development initiatives. These arrangements are reinforced by improvement actions arising from programme reviews, accreditation activities, and external evaluations. Institutional QA governance structures, such as committees and coordinated working groups, oversee staff-related quality processes.

5.3 The framework applies to undergraduate (BA/BSc), postgraduate taught (MA/MSc), and doctoral (PhD) provision. At the undergraduate level, staffing arrangements focus on delivering structured teaching and supporting student progression. At the postgraduate level, greater emphasis is placed on research-informed teaching and advanced disciplinary expertise. At the doctoral level, staff roles include supervision, research mentoring, and academic development, all supported by institutional regulations and QA oversight.

5.4 In practice, the University relies on multiple sources of evidence, including student feedback, achievement of learning outcomes, KPI monitoring, and institutional training activity, within a coordinated governance framework overseen by QA committees and senior leadership. Collectively, these arrangements aim to ensure that staff are properly qualified, supported, and developed to deliver programmes aligned with intended learning outcomes and academic standards at all levels of provision.

5.5 IUH's procedures for maintaining teaching staff competence are consistently applied across the institution, establishing a strong foundation for upholding academic standards at all levels of provision. The overall framework is clearly established and integrated into practice, aligning institutional strategy, governance structures, and operational processes. Teaching quality is monitored through a combination of student feedback, learning outcome data, and KPI dashboards. These inputs are used to evaluate staff performance, promote professional development, and enhance programmes, thereby creating a coherent link between teaching activities and educational outcomes. Collectively, these arrangements demonstrate a highly effective, institutionally embedded academic workforce framework that incorporates recruitment, workload planning, performance assessment, professional development, quality assurance processes, and institutional monitoring within a cohesive system. The review team concluded that the highly effective, institutionally embedded academic workforce framework, which enables consistent management of staff competence and provides a strong foundation for maintaining academic standards, to be a feature of **good practice**.

5.6 At the undergraduate level, this framework supports structured teaching delivery and the monitoring of teaching effectiveness. At the postgraduate level, staff are expected

to demonstrate higher levels of subject expertise and engagement in research-informed teaching. At the doctoral level, supervisory arrangements are the primary mechanism for maintaining academic quality, with supervisors assisting with research design, progression, and academic development. Students confirmed that supervision is accessible and supportive, although formal documentation of supervisory development and evaluation is less consistently recorded at the institutional level.

5.7 Workforce planning depends on enrolment trends, curriculum requirements, workload regulations, and Full Time Equivalent (FTE) models. Oversight by Human Resources, faculty leadership, and institutional governance bodies helps align staffing capacity with programme delivery. Although this works well, discussions with staff reveal variation in workload management across faculties, suggesting that greater institutional consistency could improve oversight.

5.8 Recruitment and appointment processes are transparent and consistently applied, with clear expectations for academic qualifications, subject expertise, and teaching ability. At postgraduate and doctoral levels, staff qualifications and research experience are particularly important and are considered in recruitment decisions. Probation arrangements provide an appropriate means of verifying staff competence in practice. These features further support the coherence and effectiveness of the institutional workforce framework, ensuring consistent alignment of staff recruitment, development, and QA processes across undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programmes.

5.9 Induction is comprehensive and aligns with institutional standards, covering pedagogical methods, assessment procedures, and QA requirements. This is particularly crucial for staff teaching at undergraduate level and for those transitioning into postgraduate or supervisory roles. Staff noted that induction or orientation effectively supports their integration into teaching and QA processes.

5.10 Continuing professional development (CPD) is actively supported and aligned with institutional priorities through formal regulations, structured training plans, and targeted initiatives, including AI-supported teaching and assessment development. CPD activities are guided by student feedback, course evaluations, and learning outcome data, and they contribute to both pedagogical and disciplinary growth. Staff engagement in CPD is evident across faculties and programme levels. These features further strengthen the coherence and effectiveness of the institutional workforce framework, ensuring consistent alignment between staff recruitment, development, and quality assurance processes across undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programmes.

5.11 However, evidence at the institutional level is less consistent on whether CPD activities lead to measurable improvements in teaching quality or student outcomes. Although participation is clearly recorded, the impact of CPD has not yet been systematically analysed or reported across the university. This suggests that, while suitable processes and activities are in place, IUH is not yet able to consistently demonstrate how professional development leads to tangible improvements in teaching quality and student outcomes, thereby limiting the institutional evidence of impact. The review team therefore **recommends** that IUH enhance the systematic use and demonstration of feedback and performance data within the academic workforce framework by clearly showing how information from staff evaluations, student feedback, and professional development activities is used to foster continuous improvement and inform institutional decision-making.

5.12 Processes for identifying development draw on multiple inputs, including staff evaluations, capacity assessments, student feedback, and programme review data. Support is then provided through training, mentoring, and capacity-building initiatives, complemented by actions arising from review and accreditation processes. Staff confirmed that these

mechanisms are accessible and responsive to development needs. Although these processes function effectively, documentation and long-term monitoring of staff development planning and its outcomes are not yet consistently visible at the institutional level, which hampers transparency and the capacity to demonstrate sustained improvements over time.

5.13 Performance evaluation is effectively integrated into institutional QA arrangements, drawing on staff classification systems, KPI monitoring, student feedback, and learning outcome data. Evaluation outcomes inform appraisal, promotion, and development planning and directly contribute to programme review and improvement, establishing a clear link between staff performance and academic quality.

5.14 Governance and oversight arrangements function effectively, involving QA committees, coordinated structures, and senior leadership through KPI monitoring. These arrangements improve transparency on teaching quality and workforce issues. However, reporting is not always fully integrated across the institution, particularly on staffing sufficiency, workload balance, and academic workforce capacity, which diminishes the effectiveness of strategic oversight and institution-wide decision-making. This limitation reflects an issue of institutional-level integration and evidencing rather than a weakness in the underlying governance framework or operational control, as workforce planning, monitoring and intervention processes are in place and were confirmed to be functioning effectively at faculty and programme levels. As such, while this reduces the efficiency and transparency of strategic oversight, it does not undermine the effectiveness of the University's ability to manage staffing capacity or maintain teaching quality and is therefore appropriately addressed as an area for enhancement rather than requiring a separate recommendation.

5.15 Although there is evidence of informal sharing of teaching practices across faculties and programme areas, structured peer observation and peer-supported approaches to teaching enhancement are not consistently applied at institutional level. However, teaching quality is effectively managed through established mechanisms, including student feedback, performance evaluation, learning outcome monitoring, and quality assurance processes, which together provide a sound basis for identifying and addressing areas for improvement in teaching practice. These arrangements were evidenced to be operating consistently across undergraduate and postgraduate provision and are supported by institutional oversight and staff development processes. In this context, the absence of a fully formalised peer observation framework does not represent a weakness in the assurance of teaching quality but indicates an area where the University could further enhance the systematic sharing and development of pedagogical practice at institutional level.

5.16 Overall, the review team finds that IUH has established a well-structured, effectively implemented framework to ensure the competence, development, and performance of teaching staff across undergraduate, postgraduate, and doctoral programmes. The approach is coherent, supported by appropriate governance and quality assurance processes, and consistently applied in practice, as evidenced by documentation and meetings. The framework works well at both institutional and programme levels, particularly in recruitment, performance evaluation, and integrating staff development into quality assurance processes. However, some aspects of institutional consistency, such as systematically assessing CPD impact, formalising peer-supported teaching improvement, and using workforce data for strategic oversight, are less fully developed. These issues do not undermine the framework's overall effectiveness but indicate areas where institutional practices could be further enhanced to improve transparency, consistency, and the strategic management of teaching quality across all levels of provision. The review team therefore concludes that ESG Standard 1.5, Teaching staff is **met**.

Standard 1.6: Learning resources and student support

Institutions should have appropriate funding for learning and teaching activities and ensure that adequate and readily accessible learning resources and student support are provided.

Findings

6.1 IUH informed the review team that they follow systematic procedures to plan, develop, and review learning resources and support services, which ensure the continuous adequacy and relevance of resources to support students' academic, personal, and professional growth. The university also confirmed that funding for learning resources and student support is managed strategically under both annual and 5-year PDCA cycles to ensure allocations are aligned with the university's strategic goals and documented for audit purposes.

6.2 IUH's academic advising system forms the cornerstone of student support. The university informed the review team that the assignment of Academic Advisers is a mandatory institutional process governed by IUH internal regulations and national education laws. The decision regarding allocation is issued annually by the President based on the proposal of the Deans of Faculties and the Head of the Office of Academic Affairs. IUH consider that this ensures that every student cohort is matched with a qualified mentor from the beginning of their academic journey. The primary objective of the adviser system is to support students in achieving the IUH CARE educational philosophy, which helps students to become Compassionate, Avid, Rational and Enterprising. The university seeks to achieve this by assisting students in registering for courses, helping them to understand credit-based training regulations, and by developing personalised study plans. Advisers also achieve this by tracking student progress and providing early intervention for those at risk of academic warning or dropout, as well as advising on career orientations and the development of necessary soft skills for the labour market. The role of academic advisers is governed by a regulation that sets out the scope and general principles of the system, organisational structure, duties, standards, and processes for evaluation of the scheme. Students reported to the review team that allocation of advisers is effective and that they are integral to providing comprehensive support and aiding student progression.

6.3 In addition to academic advising, the Office of Political Affairs and Student Support (OPASS) at IUH provides psychological counselling, health consultations, and personal development services. Students can access these provisions through multiple channels, including in-person meetings, phone consultations, and social media platforms. Additionally, IUH collaborates with medical centres to ensure that students have easy access to health care and emergency services.

6.4 IUH states that mature, part-time, employed, and international students, and students with disabilities are provided with tailored services to accommodate the varied needs of these groups through flexible class schedules, online courses, and special support programmes. In particular, the university stated that accessibility for students with disabilities is ensured through specialised facilities and support services. The review team confirmed that such additional support is available for students with physical disabilities, including assistance at reception, elevators, disabled toilets, and a dedicated scholarship. However, staff were unable to articulate a robust understanding of the needs of students with learning disabilities. The review team therefore **recommends** that IUH strengthen support arrangements for students with learning disabilities.

6.5 IUH also has a Regulation on Admission and Management of Foreigners Studying at IUH. The Office of Postgraduate Management is responsible for implementation of the

regulation, which covers admission requirements, arrangements for international scholarships, visa support, residence registration, the obligations of international students and their rights, including to accommodation. International students are provided with a bespoke induction programme and are encouraged to engage in cultural activities that help to foster a sense of belonging in Vietnam and Ho Chi Minh City more specifically. Considering the small cohort of international students at IUH, the review team determined that the institution has appropriate support in place.

6.6 IUH considers that facilities such as the library, laboratories, and reading rooms are contemporary and equipped with up-to-date technology. IUH also asserts that virtual learning platforms, including its LMS, provide flexible learning options with access to e-content, video lectures, and forums. During the review visit the review team confirmed that modern facilities and learning resources designed to promote flexibility are used effectively. These include food technology, science and language laboratories, bank teller and stock exchange simulation suites, a yoga studio, and hotel and bar simulation areas for student-centred learning tasks related hospitality management. The library also features study spaces dedicated to encouraging language exchange between international students. The review team found clear evidence that learning resources were being deployed strategically in accordance with the institution's teaching and learning strategy to facilitate student-centred learning and the review team therefore considers that the extensive range of high-quality learning resources that support active learning strategies is a feature of **good practice**.

6.7 IUH has an extensive extracurricular programme in place that comprises, among others, social work, pioneer, skills, English, music, performing arts and basketball clubs. IUH also has a football team, cheerleading squad and a student media and events club. Students and alumni confirmed that these and other groups contribute to a vibrant campus culture designed to foster belonging and aid the acquisition of transferable skills.

6.8 The review team found that IUH has a comprehensive and integrated approach to career support. The university delivers activities such as job fairs, CV writing workshops, and internships. Students are also provided with soft skill training, including teamwork, communication and planning skills that is embedded within the curriculum. Students are provided with contact information for a Job Recruitment Hotline, Overseas Job Opportunities Hotline and Internships and Apprenticeship Support Hotline, all of which are housed in the Business Connection and Job Support Centre. The centre also maintains the IUH Job Portal, connecting students with vacancies and potential employers [<https://htsv.iuh.edu.vn/vieclam/home.html>]. Further to this, students are provided with opportunities to participate in international academic competitions as well as IUH organised language classes to support work, study, and involvement in competitions abroad. Students and alumni cited the close connection with industry and integrated approach to skills development as a strength of their programmes.

6.9 IUH makes an extensive range of financial support available to its students. This funding is governed by the Regulation on Considering and Granting Scholarships for Full-Time University Students at IUH. The institution has scholarships focussed on study encouragement, admissions, incubation, student support, and sponsorship. Students were particularly positive about the range and impact of financial support provided by the institution.

6.10 Information about student support, including scholarships, student advising, extracurricular activities, the LMS, international exchanges and other support services are clearly signposted to students through the student handbook, website, and other tailored communications. The Office of Testing and Quality Assurance conducts surveys to assess student satisfaction with learning resources and student support. The University also

considers usage statistics from the library and LMS (e.g., digital resource access frequency, login patterns) to provide evidence of resource relevance and utilisation. In addition, feedback is gathered through suggestion boxes and student representatives. The review team was provided with evidence of changes made in response to student feedback, including expanded library spaces, and improved fitness and medical services. The review team concluded that the institution actively seeks student views on the sufficiency and quality of learning resources and support services to improve provision.

6.11 Overall, the review team found that the institution has comprehensive learning resources and student services that are appropriately funded and provide effective support for learners throughout their programmes of study. IUH has a wide range of academic and pastoral support, financial assistance and innovative learning resources that support student-centred approaches to learning. Consequently, and notwithstanding the potential to strengthen support for students with learning disabilities, the review team concludes that ESG Standard 1.6, Learning resources and student support is **met**.

Standard 1.7: Information management

Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes and other activities.

Findings

7.1 IUH has invested in integrated information management infrastructure covering all key institutional functions. The IQA Information Management Plan governs this activity, aligned with the QA Regulations and the institutional Strategic Plan. The TQA Office serves as the central coordination point whilst the Centre for System Management (CSM) oversees technical operations, a division of responsibilities that appropriately separates QA coordination from systems management.

7.2 The portfolio of integrated systems is extensive, as documented in the Information Management Systems of IUH. PMT Education manages teaching schedules, scores, and graduation considerations; School-wide human resource management software (SECHUIHRM) manages human resource records and staff profiles; the Learning Management System (LMS) supports blended and online delivery; Turnitin provides academic integrity checking; the Scientific Management System tracks research activities; and the Student Portal and Staff Portal provide personalised access to relevant data.

7.3 Professional support staff confirmed during the site visit that two categories of data are maintained: open data accessible to all through the E-Office system, and internal data accessible only to specifically authorised individuals. Faculty leaders use internal data to develop strategic plans. Academic staff confirmed that all relevant systems; including the LMS, E-Office, and the curriculum management system, are accessible to teaching staff for the purpose of their roles, including updating course syllabi, and entering student grades.

7.4 The establishment of a KPI Dashboard system enables real-time monitoring by institutional leadership and represents a significant investment in quality management infrastructure. However, the review team confirmed during the tour of facilities, when the dashboard was demonstrated to the review team, that it is still new and over time the university will need to validate its effectiveness. The University has also implemented a two-step verification process of data integrity, with initial validation by data providers through standardised checklists and random checks, followed by final review by TQA office before publication. The systems are interconnected through a centralised database and Application Programming Interface (API) portals developed by the University, with data synthesised and presented through the TQA-developed Dashboard covering five key areas: Education-Research, Community Service Connection, Facilities, People, and Finance. Professional support staff confirmed that training is provided on data access, data analysis, and data protection obligations.

7.5 Student satisfaction data is made available to every lecturer, and where feedback is negative over time, institutional intervention is initiated. This supported the claim that the KPI Dashboard functions as a dynamic decision-support tool rather than a retrospective reporting mechanism and is consistent with the description of the IQA system in the SED. Senior Staff also acknowledged that quantitative data is used alongside qualitative follow-up, where data identifies an issue, further dialogue with students and stakeholders is used to understand causation. This reflects the analytical approach described in the IQA Information Management Plan and the IQA Information Management System Structure.

7.6 Academic staff described a traceable course-level data management process. Each semester, a course report is produced, any proposed amendments are discussed between

the lecturer and the Head of Department, and the Head of Department approves and records changes in the curriculum management system. This ensures a documented, auditable link between course-level quality data and institutional records. The Minutes of Regular Meetings to Improve Teaching Methods of Faculties provide further evidence of collective data-informed improvement activity.

7.7 Research supervisors confirmed that data on postgraduate student enrolments, progression, and graduation outcomes is used to inform decisions and improvements at faculty level, with dedicated staff responsible for monitoring postgraduate student cohorts in each faculty. This reflects the operation of the Staff Portal and Information Management System of IUH for KPI monitoring, and the Student Portal for progression tracking.

7.8 Undergraduate Students indicated that whilst they were not certain they had direct access to aggregate programme performance data, they were well informed about their own academic records and available services through the Student Portal, the Student Handbook, and the University's website. This reflects appropriate tiering of data access, institutional performance monitoring is a management function, whilst student-facing academic and support information is readily and widely accessible.

7.9 IUH has implemented comprehensive security measures, including daily and weekly data backups, antivirus software, security system deployment, intrusion prevention systems, web filtering, and a domain model to monitor intranet access. These measures are governed by the Decision on Data Backup and Recovery Regulations, the Decision on Regulations for Managing System Accounts and Using the Internal E-Office System, and the Decision on Regulations for Managing the Email System.

7.10 Professional support staff confirmed during the site visit that training is provided covering data access procedures, data analysis, and data protection obligations. The Plan for Implementing a Centralised Internal Network Management Model and the Internet System Contract confirm the technical infrastructure underpinning information security.

7.11 The Minutes of Annual Dialogue Meetings with Students, Staff, Employee Conferences, and Enterprise Engagement Activities confirm that a systematic stakeholder engagement framework is operational, involving students and other key stakeholders in discussing findings from survey and performance data and monitoring the impact of resulting actions. The Stakeholder Survey Report documents outcomes from feedback collection, and the Stakeholder Survey Plan demonstrates systematic annual planning of these activities.

7.12 IUH's information management systems are comprehensive, technically robust, and actively used for evidence-based decision-making at institutional, faculty, and course levels. Data security measures are appropriate, and staff are trained in their obligations. The KPI Dashboard is proactively used as a real-time management instrument by leadership to drive quality improvement. The review team concludes ESG Standard 1.7, Information management is **met**.

Standard 1.8: Public information

Institutions should publish information about their activities, including programmes, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible.

Findings

8.1 The institution's approach to public information is governed by the Regulation on the Implementation of Clerical Work at IUH. The regulation's stated purpose is to standardise the management of outgoing and incoming documents, ensuring timeliness, accuracy, safety, convenience, and compliance with other regulations. The regulation is also designed to ensure that tasks within the University are handled promptly, accurately, efficiently, and in accordance with established procedures; that all work is resolved on a daily basis; and that the requirements set by the Board of Rectors are proactively and fully met, including public information. To help ensure this, the regulation sets out responsibilities from the drafting unit through to the Board of Rectors and outlines the process in relation to establishing the format, reviewing content, issuing the document, and maintaining version control where relevant. The Website for Public Disclosure of Information and the Annual IUH Reports confirm the transparency of IUH's public information.

8.2 The regulation is supported by a further Regulation on Issuing Roles and Duties of Units 2022, which details what forms of public information individual departments are responsible for drafting. The review team found that staff and departments understood their respective responsibilities for the production and approval of public information. Following the approval of information by the Rector, the Centre for Information Technology are responsible for publication of materials. The institution also has established Regulations on Speaking and Providing Information to the Press.

8.3 The review team scrutinised the institution's website, social media accounts, and promotional and news videos [<https://iuh.edu.vn/vi/>]. The review team found that the Centre for Information Technology has a significant role in the creation and maintenance of high-quality digital assets designed to keep university stakeholders informed and promote the institution's brand. Employers and alumni referenced the effectiveness of these assets in helping to ensure they are aware of IUH's work, impact in society and opportunities to collaborate.

8.4 The review team confirmed that IUH publishes information about their activities, which is clear, accurate, objective, up-to date and readily accessible. This includes information about academic programmes, entry criteria, research, partnerships, and the institution's educational philosophy. Students, alumni, employers, and other stakeholders confirm that they can find the information they require and that it is reliable. Despite this, the review team did find some challenges in accessing information when using the translation function on the IUH website. In some instances, the application failed to translate pages or information was incomplete. Although comprehensive information is available in Vietnamese, the review team considered it would benefit the University's internationalisation objectives if the translation application functioned more seamlessly. The review team therefore **recommends** that the University strengthen English translation on the University website to support the institution's strategic approach to internationalisation.

8.5 Overall, the review team concluded that because of the explicit regulatory framework, assigned responsibilities for the production, approval and monitoring of public information and high-quality media production of digital assets that Standard 1.8 Public information is **met**.

Standard 1.9: Ongoing monitoring and periodic review of programmes

Institutions should monitor and periodically review their programmes to ensure that they achieve the objectives set for them and respond to the needs of students and society. These reviews should lead to continuous improvement of the programme. Any action planned or taken as a result should be communicated to all those concerned.

Findings

9.1 IUH has established policies for programme development, management, monitoring, and review based on MoET regulations and internal procedures, specifically the Regulations on Developing, Appraising, Reviewing and Updating Training Programmes. The University implements both ongoing monitoring and periodic review, governed by the PDCA cycle as set out in the SED and support evidence.

9.2 During discussions with Senior Staff, it became clear that ongoing monitoring takes the form of annual course reports produced each semester by every lecturer and submitted to the Dean. These course reports constitute the primary ongoing monitoring mechanism, enabling issues to be identified and addressed continuously within each academic cycle without waiting for a formal review point. The Plan for Measuring Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs) and ELO Measurement Results and the Course Reports for Graduation Thesis, Project, and Internship are integral to this monitoring activity.

9.3 The review team clarified with Senior Management and academic staff that periodic review operates on two separate cycles. Minor programme amendments, such as changes to course order, addition or removal of elective courses, or adjustments to course specifications, may be made at two-year intervals, provided the total number of credits is maintained. Major amendments, including revisions to PLOs), significant changes to credit structures, and wholesale curriculum redesign, take place every four years, at which point a comprehensive review drawing on accumulated PLO measurement data, stakeholder feedback, and external benchmarking is conducted. This is consistent with the Outcome Measurement Results and Course Report for Some Training Programmes and the Samples of the Changes in PLOs or Curriculum. While this distinction is clearly understood and effectively implemented in practice, as confirmed by discussions with staff and a review of programme-level documentation, it is not sufficiently explicit in the SED and supporting QA documentation. To enhance transparency, ensure consistent understanding across the institution, and clarify its quality assurance framework for internal and external stakeholders the review panel **recommends** IUH to more clearly articulate and formalise, within its institutional documentation, the distinction between ongoing monitoring and periodic review processes.

9.4 It was further confirmed that programme performance concerns are identified through feedback from alumni and students, followed by systematic programme review examining outcomes and credit structures, with targeted staff development deployed where teaching quality is identified as the root cause. The IUH Quality Improvement Plan for Educational Institutions and Training Programmes. provides the institutional framework within which improvement actions arising from both monitoring and review are recorded and tracked.

9.5 IUH implements a seven-step PDCA process for PLO formulation and revision, explicitly using Bloom's Revised Taxonomy as the pedagogical reference. PLO achievement is measured through direct assessment of key courses, particularly Graduation Thesis and Internship, and through indirect methods including stakeholder surveys. The PLO mapping

matrix, linking each PLO to courses at Introducing, Reinforcing, and Emphasising levels, is embedded in programme design and formally documented in the Detailed Description of the Programme Specification 2024.

9.6 The Regulations on Developing, Appraising, Reviewing and Updating Training Programmes, the Guidelines on Selecting and Using Teaching and Assessment Methods, and the Guidelines on Converting Core Faculty and the Faculty-to-Student FTE Ratio collectively provide the regulatory basis for curriculum alignment. The Comparison of Training Programmes with Domestic and International Programmes ensures that benchmarking informs PLO design.

9.7 Undergraduate Students confirmed during the site visit that improvements driven by the review cycle are visible and tangible to them: facilities and laboratories have improved significantly over recent years; teaching quality in some faculties has improved; and assessment has become more rigorous and challenging. Research students confirmed that they had been formally involved in at least one review of the research programme, with their views on supervision quality, research training, and the research environment considered.

9.8 Academic staff confirmed that their own research and professional experience is the primary driver of curriculum decisions, supplemented by feedback from external stakeholders. This creates an organic link between academic practice and programme development consistent with the student-centred learning approach described in the Guidelines on Selecting and Using Teaching and Assessment Methods. The Minutes of Regular Meetings to Improve Teaching Methods of Faculties and the Minutes of Meetings to Change Training Programmes document collective staff engagement in programme review.

9.9 Research supervisors confirmed that formal programme reviews take place across all faculty areas and provided a specific example from Environmental Engineering where a programme review conducted three years ago resulted in documented improvements. They made the point that this was a standard not exceptional example.

9.10 External Stakeholders confirmed substantive engagement with IUH in programme development. Employers noted the University's practical training orientation as direct evidence that employer input is integrated into curriculum design. The Business Workshops to Gather Input for Developing Programme Learning Outcomes and the Stakeholder Consultation Activities provide the formal mechanisms for this engagement. The Comparison of Training Programmes with Domestic and International Programmes ensures external reference points inform curriculum decisions.

9.11 Programme review outcomes are communicated to students and staff through faculty websites, student handbooks, the Brochure 2025, and orientation events. Revised programme specifications are documented in the programme management software and, from 2024, are electronically signed and stored. The IUH Action Plan to Overcome Problems After External Assessment ensures that improvement actions arising from both internal and external review are formally recorded and monitored.

9.12 Notwithstanding the recommendation to clarify the processes of monitoring and periodic review, the review team concluded that IUH has a multi-cycle approach to programme quality: semester-level course reports constitute ongoing monitoring; two-year minor and four-year major revision cycles constitute periodic review. All three cycles are governed by a PDCA PLO development and revision process, and students, staff, employers, and alumni are meaningfully engaged at each stage. Improvements arising from review are visible to students and documented in PLO measurement reports and improvement plans. The review team concludes Standard 1.9, On-going monitoring and review of programmes is **met**.

Standard 1.10: Cyclical external quality assurance

Institutions should undergo external quality assurance in line with the ESG on a cyclical basis.

Findings

10.1 IUH demonstrates substantial and strategically diversified engagement with external quality assurance at both institutional and programme levels. At institutional level, the University has been an Associate Member of the AUN-QA Network since 2017 and completed second-cycle institutional accreditation under MoET Circular 12/2017/TT-BGDDT in 2022. At programme level, the Results of the Accreditation of Educational Institutions and Training Programmes confirm that 55 training programmes have received external recognition.

10.2 Senior Staff confirmed during the site visit that no significant conflicts have been encountered between the various frameworks with which they have engaged, and that each framework contributes a complementary perspective on institutional quality. The Decision to Establish a Steering Committee for Implementing the Self-Assessment Report, the Decision to Promulgate the IUH Strategic Plan for 2025 and the 2035 Vision, and the Results of Accreditation document together confirm that external quality assurance is pursued systematically as part of the institutional strategic plan rather than opportunistically.

10.3 Research students noted that programme accreditation is a visible factor in students' choice of IUH and that participation in accreditation events has been part of their experience. This reflects the embedding of external QA within the institutional culture, not merely in management processes. Academic staff confirmed that achieving external accreditation has enhanced professional practice, specifically that following accreditation their team operates more professionally, a reflection of the behavioural embedding that quality frameworks are intended to produce.

10.4 IUH has established Self-Assessment Councils, Secretariats, and specialised working groups for each evaluation phase, with structured training on standards, data collection, analysis, and report writing. Three staff members hold international assessor certifications, two AUN-QA assessors (one of whom is a Lead Assessor) and one Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation assessor, and eight staff hold certification as national higher education and vocational education quality assurance evaluators. This in-house expertise, confirmed by Senior Staff during the site visit, ensures that self-assessment is informed by deep working knowledge of external standards rather than superficial compliance mapping.

10.5 The quality and analytical candour of the SED submitted for this review reflects the critical self-awareness expected of effective institutional self-assessment. The SED explicitly acknowledges areas for development, including the need for a more systematic quality review framework for learning resources and for more advanced learning analytics, demonstrating that self-assessment at IUH is not limited to celebrating achievements.

10.6 IUH has promulgated educational quality benchmarking regulations, specifying internal benchmarking processes of six steps and external benchmarking processes of eight steps at institutional level and six steps at programme level. Responsible units for benchmarking across different content areas (training programmes, educational activities, research, community service, and outcomes) are set out in the SED. The Benchmarking Report between IUH and Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology and Education documents the primary external benchmarking exercise, and the IUH Benchmarking Plan

confirms the intention to expand benchmarking activities with national and international institutions.

10.7 Senior Staff confirmed that both internal and external benchmarking is conducted, operating at department, college/school, and institutional levels as illustrated in the SED. The IUH Benchmarking Framework draws on international ranking systems at the institutional level, ensuring that aspirational as well as peer comparisons inform institutional development.

10.8 The SED describes a robust five-stage process for utilising external review feedback: reviewing findings and clarifying discrepancies with the evaluation team (Stage 1); developing action plans, creating working groups, and assigning tasks (Stage 2); TQA consolidation of the University-wide improvement plan (Stage 3); Board of Rectors approval and annual unit reporting (Stage 4); and mid-cycle (2.5-year) progress review by all relevant units (Stage 5). The IUH Quality Assurance Plan and the Quality Improvement Plan for Educational Institutions and Training Programmes confirm that this process is operationalised.

10.9 The evidence of improved scores across successive assessment cycles, presented in the SED for Chemical Engineering, Environmental Engineering Technology, Electrical and Electronics Engineering Technology, Electronic Engineering Technology, Communications, Bachelor in English Language, and Automotive Engineering Technology, provides documented evidence that external review feedback is translated into genuine quality enhancement. The Implementation of Learning Outcome Assessment confirms that these improvements are grounded in enhanced OBE practices and stronger PLO measurement systems.

10.10 Undergraduate Students confirmed during the site visit that changes linked to external review are visible and meaningful to them: laboratories and facilities have improved significantly over four years; teaching quality in specific faculties has increased; and assessment has become more challenging and rigorous. This independent corroboration by students of improvements evidenced in the SED strengthens confidence in the authenticity of the quality enhancement trajectory.

10.11 IUH systematically prepares for subsequent external reviews by drawing on the learning of previous cycles. The Quality Assurance Training Activities of IUH document the dissemination model through which successfully assessed programmes share experience with those approaching review, including Master Teacher Training Workshops, OBE Workshops, and SAR compilation guidance. The Training Plan to Ensure Quality of Human Resources confirms the University's long-term commitment to developing staff capability in QA.

10.12 The continuous improvement timeline presented in the SED, spanning 2018 to 2025 across internal and external cycles, demonstrates systematic institutional progression: strengthened OBE and Master Teacher Training/PBL training (2018-2019); expanded rubric training and digital teaching methods (2019-2021); finalised KPI management software and enhanced PLO measurement (2023-2024). This trajectory was confirmed as authentic by Academic staff and research degree supervisors during the site visit.

10.13 The Plan for Enhancing Capacity in the Application of AI in Education 2025-2026 and the revised KPI system incorporating Sustainable Development Goals reflect a forward-looking quality culture that goes beyond compliance with current standards to anticipate emerging expectations. Research students raised the role of AI in their studies during the site visit and Senior Management confirmed that institutional guidance on AI usage is being developed in response, demonstrating that emerging needs identified through stakeholder dialogue are absorbed into the QA cycle.

10.14 IUH undertakes cyclical external quality assurance through a diversified, strategically coherent portfolio of national, regional, and international frameworks. Self-assessment processes are systematic, informed by in-house expertise, and supported by formal QA regulations and institutional review procedures. Benchmarking is conducted at multiple levels, drawing on national standards and international comparators, with evidence of plans to further extend international engagement. Feedback from external reviews is systematically translated into structured improvement actions, which are monitored through formal institutional processes and quality-assurance reporting mechanisms. Evidence of impact is shown by improved programme-level assessment outcomes across successive review cycles and is corroborated by student feedback and stakeholder accounts collected during the review visit. These arrangements demonstrate a strategically integrated, institutionally embedded approach to cyclical external quality assurance that goes beyond baseline expectations, enabling the systematic translation of external review outcomes into measurable programme enhancements and institutional learning. The review panel therefore identifies the strategically integrated, institutionally embedded approach to cyclical external quality assurance that goes beyond baseline expectations, enabling the systematic translation of external review outcomes into measurable programme enhancements and institutional learning as a feature of **good practice**.

10.15 The comprehensive framework for engaging in and learning from external cyclical review is well established and there is a strong base of evidence to support the fact that IUH is a reflective learning organisation taking every opportunity to improve and enhance its provision through engagement with a wide range of external cyclical review activities. The review team therefore concludes that Standard 1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance is **met**.

Glossary

Action plan

A plan developed by the institution after the QAA review report has been published, which is signed off by the head of the institution. It responds to the recommendations in the report and gives any plans to capitalise on the identified good practice.

Annual monitoring

Checking a process or activity every year to see whether it meets expectations for standards and quality. Annual reports normally include information about student achievements and may comment on the evaluation of courses and modules.

Collaborative arrangement

A formal arrangement between a degree-awarding body and another higher education provider. These may be degree-awarding bodies with which the institution collaborates to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of the degree-awarding bodies. Alternatively, they may be other delivery organisations who deliver part or all of a proportion of the institution's higher education programmes.

Condition

Conditions set out action that is required. Conditions are only used with unsatisfactory judgements where the quality cannot be approved. Conditions may be used where quality or standards are at risk/continuing risk if action is not taken or if a required standard is not met and action is needed for it to be met.

Degree-awarding body

Institutions that have authority, for example from a national agency, to issue their own awards. Institutions applying to IQA may be degree-awarding bodies themselves, or may collaborate to deliver higher education qualifications on behalf of degree-awarding bodies.

Desk-based analysis

An analysis by the review team of evidence, submitted by the institution, that enables the review team to identify its initial findings and subsequently supports the review team as it develops its review findings.

Enhancement

See **quality enhancement**.

European Standards and Guidelines

For details, including the full text on each standard, see www.enqa.eu/index.php/home/esg.

Examples of practice

A list of policies and practices that a review team may use when considering the extent to which an institution meets the standards for review. The examples should be considered as a guide only, in acknowledgment that not all of them will be appropriate for all institutions.

Externality

The use of experts from outside a higher education provider, such as external examiners or external advisers, to assist in quality assurance procedures.

Facilitator

The member of staff identified by the institution to act as the principal point of contact for the QAA officer and who will be available during the review visit, to assist with any questions or requests for additional documentation.

Good practice

A feature of good practice is a process or way of working that, in the view of a QAA review team, makes a particularly positive contribution to the institution's higher education provision.

Lead student representative

An optional voluntary role that is designed to allow students at the institution applying for IQA to play a central part in the organisation of the review.

Oversight

Objective scrutiny, monitoring and quality assurance of educational provision.

Peer reviewers

Members of the review team who make the decisions in relation to the review of the institution. Peer reviewers have experience of managing quality and academic standards in higher education or have recent experience of being a student in higher education.

Periodic review

An internal review of one or more programmes of study, undertaken by institutions periodically (typically once every five years), using nationally agreed reference points, to confirm that the programmes are of an appropriate academic standard and quality. The process typically involves experts from other higher education providers. It covers areas such as the continuing relevance of the programme, the currency of the curriculum and reference materials, the employability of graduates and the overall performance of students. Periodic review is one of the main processes whereby institutions can continue to assure themselves about the academic quality and standards of their awards.

Programme of study

An approved course of study that provides a coherent learning experience and normally leads to a qualification. UK higher education programmes must be approved and validated by UK degree-awarding bodies.

Quality enhancement

The process by which higher education providers systematically improve the quality of provision and the ways in which students' learning is supported.

QAA officer

The person appointed by QAA to manage the review programme and to act as the liaison between the review team and the institution.

Quality assurance

The systematic monitoring and evaluation of learning and teaching, and the processes that support them, to make sure that the standards of academic awards meet the necessary standards, and that the quality of the student learning experience is being safeguarded and improved.

Recognition of prior learning

Assessing previous learning that has occurred in any of a range of contexts including school, college and university, and/or through life and work experiences.

Recommendation

Review teams make recommendations where they agree that an institution should consider developing or changing a process or a procedure in order to improve the institution's higher education provision.

Reference points

Statements and other publications that establish criteria against which performance can be measured.

Self-evaluation document

A self-evaluation report by an institution. The submission should include information about the institution as well as an assessment of the effectiveness of its quality systems.

Student submission

A document representing student views that describes what it is like to be a student at the institution, and how students' views are considered in the institution's decision-making and quality assurance processes.

Validation

The process by which an institution ensures that its academic programmes meet expected academic standards and that students will be provided with appropriate learning opportunities. It may also be applied to circumstances where a degree-awarding institution gives approval for its awards to be offered by a partner institution or organisation.

QAA3083 - R14932 - June 26

© The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2026
Southgate House, Southgate Street, Gloucester GL1 1UB
Registered charity numbers 1062746 and SC037786

Email: accreditation@qaa.ac.uk

Website: www.qaa.ac.uk