越南教育分類指標：相關研究與建議

阮玉錦 [1a]、翁福元 [a]、**Thanh-Thao T. Nguyen[b]**

[a] 國立暨南國際大學 教育政策與行政學系

[1a] E-mail：s104407911@mail1.ncnu.edu.tw

摘 要

　　大學教育的分層是越南教育學者與管理者所關注的議題之一。而目前越南的大學教育則朝向這個方向來執行。根據過去對這個問題的相關研究結果，筆者進行建構一些指標分類，來釐清教育分層並排序各大學。本研究的主要目的是發展一套參考指標來服務學校管理以及排序大學，同時促進未來的越南教育機構的分層指標。因此，本研究主要琢磨在建構分類越南大學的指標爲主。筆者使用量化研究法做爲主要研究方法。運用問卷調查了五所大學共 250 位教職員。研究結果得出了四大面相與 29 個指標。

關鍵字：各指標、標準、大學教育、分層、越南

Indicators to Serve Classifying Higher Education in Vietnam: Research and Proposal

Ngoc-Cam T. Nguyen[1a], Fu-Yuan Weng[a] and Thanh-Thao T. Nguyen[b]

[a]Department of Educational Policy and Administration National Chi Nan University, Nantou, Taiwan;
[b]Department of English, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam.

[1a] E-mail：s104407911@mail1.ncnu.edu.tw

Abstract

Stratification of higher education is one of the issues that has received considerable attention from Vietnamese educators and managers. This process is highly expected to be implemented in the Vietnamese higher education. Based on results of previous research relating to this issue and the context of higher education in Vietnam, the research was conducted on building classification indicators to contribute to concretising the stratification and ranking of universities. This research aims to develop indicators to serve management and ranking universities, while advancing stratification of higher education institutions in Vietnam in the future. Therefore, this study focused on the research question of how the construction of indicators for classifying tertiary education in Vietnam is built. The study used the quantitative method by surveying over 250 staff members from 5 universities. The research results in identification of 4 criteria with 29 indicators.

Key words: Indicators, Criteria, Higher Education, Stratification, Vietnam

1. Introduction

In the strategy of economic and social development of 2011-2020 period, the Communist Party of Vietnam (2011) has asserted that "developing education is the national priority. Basic and comprehensive reform of the Vietnamese educational system is in the direction of standardization, modernization, socialization, democratization and global integration, etc." Consequently, responding educational terms have been successively issued and implemented.

The Higher Education Law (2012) also addresses the issue of stratification and ranking in higher education. The Law puts forth 4 criteria for ranking and stratifying institutions of higher education into 3 layers. Besides, on 19 July 2005, the Prime Minister issued the Decision No. 181/2005/QĐ-TTG about stratification and ranking of public service delivery agencies and public services. This Decision also prescribes stratification and ranking of public service delivery agencies and public services based on 3 groups of stratifying criteria and 4 groups of ranking criteria. Among these, stratification and ranking of education have been concerned and directed by the Party and State, and consequently executed by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET).

Being aware of current trends of higher educational development, educational researchers and managers have been concerned to address stratification and ranking of educational institutions. Profuse conferences have been held to discuss this issue, such as "Reforming the Vietnamese higher education: current situation and solutions" on 08 February 2012 at Hanoi National University and "Stratification criteria and ranking framework for higher education" on 09 November 2012, held by the Ministry of Education and Training at Ho Chi Minh City. These conferences have received many constructive opinions from scientists; for example, specialist Mai Trong Nhan claimed that "stratification will trigger sustainable development of the Vietnamese education system" while specialist Tran Van Nam believed that "it is necessary to improve terms about stratification of higher education", and according to Mr. Nguyen Van Nha, "stratification of higher education is one technical solution".

Nowadays, the Vietnamese higher educational system consists of 23 institutions which have been chosen to be developed into major national institutions. They include 2 national universities, 3 regional universities, 18 universities, and institutions of major disciplines such as pedagogy, medicine-pharmacy, economy, agriculture-forestry-fishery, technology, and military engineering (The Prime Minister of Government, 2001, 2007, 2013; The Government, 2004). However, there have not been any specific criteria and performance indicators for stratification of higher education set up by the MOET. Meanwhile, in the world, there have been researches on constructing such indicators from a very early stage. Many universities have applied various different indicator sets to assess universities. Many other organizations have also established and based on indicator sets to rank different institutions. Therefore, building a recommendation on indicators for stratifying higher education in Vietnam is certainly a requisite.

The purpose of this study is to contribute indicators to serve management and stratification progress of higher education institutions in Vietnam in the future. In order to address the aforementioned issue - the construction of indicators to classify higher education in Vietnam -

this study focuses on this research question - How is the construction of indicators to classify higher education in Vietnam built?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Groups of performance indicators in universities

Many universities in the United Kingdom, United States, Spain, and so forth have used performance indicators to evaluate the quality of higher education institutions, which is the results of researches by scientists, educational researchers. As shown in Table 1, different factors/criteria have been studied so far.

Table 1 Summarize the previous research about performance indicators

	Factors/ Criteria	Performance indicators
Johnes & Taylor (1990)	Input	15
	Process	
	Output	
Cave et al (1991)	Research activity	18
	Training	
	Contributing to the society	
Ruppert (1995)	Management	12
	Teaching – Learning	
	Leaner	
	Effectiveness	
Mora, and Vidal (1998)	Students	14
	Teaching	
	Researching	
	Managing	

Overall, these studies have indicators related to common problems of teaching, learning, and research in universities. Available literature shows that identification and utilization of performance indicators are significant, urgent and have been carried out in different disciplines.

2.2. Groups of indicators in ranking worldwide institutions

Nowadays, around the world, there are relatively numerous independent research organizations which work on ranking worldwide institutions of higher education, namely the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) by Shanghai University of Traffic, the QS University Rankings: Asia by Quacquarelli Symonds, the Ranking of Universities by Webometrics, and the World-Universities Ranking by the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE). Each ranking is conducted based on its own criteria.

According to the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) conducted by Shanghai University of Traffic, there are 4 criteria, including quality of education, quality of faculty, research output, and per capita performance; and six indicators, including the number of alumni and staff winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals, number of highly cited researchers selected by Clarivate Analytics, number of articles published in journals of Nature and Science, number of articles indexed in Science Citation Index - Expanded and Social Sciences Citation Index, and number of per capita performance of an institution. ARWU mainly relies on peer-reviewed journals published in English to index indexes for scientific research. Thus, ARWU focuses on the ability, products, and achievements of scientific research institutions to rank (Nguyen, 2014)

Regarding the QS University Rankings: Asia (QS Asia) by Quacquarelli Symonds, 10 indicators are used to rank universities in Asia. These indicators are number of academic reputation, number of employer reputation, number of faculty/ student ration, number of citations per paper and papers per faculty, number of staff having Ph.D. titles, number of proportion of international faculty, and proportion of international students. According to scientists, QS Asia has certain limitation in its criteria for university assessment while assessment of employers is not objective and lack scientific base. By two criteria based on the opinion survey of scholars and employers. However, the QS Asia is more diverse than the ARWU because the ARWU is based solely on scientific research. Despite its limitation, the QS Asia has the advantage of spreading the image and reputation of the university. Therefore, the QS Asia is the choice of many universities in the world (Nguyen, 2014).

For Webometrics Ranking of World Universities (Webometrics), 4 indicators are used to rank universities, including the number of presence, number of visibility, number of openness, and number of excellence. The advantage of the Webometrics is that the metrics are automatically calculated to provide ranking results and indicators that reflect the scientific performance of the ranked schools. (Vu, 2011). To rank universities, the Webometrics employs the measure of site impact index (WIF). Therefore, universities expecting to improve their rankings should have specific solutions to clarify the site presence of the institution.

For World-Universities Ranking by the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE), there are 5 criteria including teaching (the learning environment), research (volume, income and reputation), citations (research influence), international outlook (staff, students, research), and industry income (knowledge transfer) with 13 objective indicators, namely the number of reputation survey in teaching staff-to-student ratio, doctorate-to-bachelor's ratio, doctorates-awarded-to-academic-staff ratio, number of institutional income, number of reputation survey in research, number of research income, number of research productivity, number of citation, international-to-domestic-student ratio, international-to-domestic-staff ratio, number of international collaboration, and number of industry income. However, an advantage of the THE is that faculty and student indexes are ranked by the universities. These are the criteria that should be added to the ARWU.