

PROPOSING AN IQA MODEL FOR GENERAL ENGLISH CURRICULUM AT INDUSTRIAL UNIVERSITY OF HO CHI MINH CITY

QUACH THI TO NU^{1*}, NGUYEN DINH LUAT¹, HOANG THI PHONG LINH¹, NGO THI THUY NHU¹, NGUYEN XUAN HONG²

¹*Faculty of Foreign Languages, Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City*

²*Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City*

**Corresponding author: quachthitonu@iuh.edu.vn*

DOIs: <https://www.doi.org/10.46242/jstiuh.v74i2.5093>

Abstract. The construction of internal quality assurance (IQA) for academic programs is crucial for higher education institutions (HEIs) to achieve internationalization, meet employer requirements, and fulfill social accountability. In Vietnam, the quality of General English programs at HEIs is a significant concern, as many Vietnamese students fail to meet minimum exit level requirements, hindering both educational internationalization and employer satisfaction. Ensuring the quality of General English curriculum and learning is therefore critical. This study aims to develop an IQA model for General English programs, incorporating three key factors: policy and human resources, instruments, and specific criteria. The first two factors are adapted from an existing QA model, while the criteria are based on the National ELT Accreditation Scheme (NEAS) to ensure the quality of General English curriculum for non-English majors. The research uses a quantitative approach, employing survey questionnaires for data collection and analysis, to assess the applicability of NEAS accreditation standards for QA in General English curriculum at Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH). A qualitative method validates the feasibility of the proposed IQA model. The findings indicated that both experts and English lecturers at IUH highly agree the applicability of the NEAS standards at IUH context. They validated the feasibility of the proposed IQA model comprising IQA policy and human resource, IQA instruments, specific criteria for GE curriculum.

Keywords. Quality Assurance, Internal Quality Assurance, Curriculum, General English, NEAS

1. INTRODUCTION

In English language teaching (ELT), quality assurance is crucial, especially where English is not the primary focus. Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH) exemplifies this, offering English as a supplementary skill for non-English majors. Given global demands for English proficiency, institutions like IUH must ensure their programs meet international standards.

The National ELT Accreditation Scheme (NEAS) provides benchmarks for quality assurance in ELT. However, the applicability of NEAS standards at IUH, specifically for non-English majors, requires investigation. This research explores lecturers' and experts' perceptions of NEAS standards' applicability in quality assurance at IUH and evaluates the constructed IQA model for General English instruction.

Two research questions guide this study:

1. What are the experts' and lecturers' perceptions of the applicability of NEAS standards in quality assurance of GE curriculum?
2. How do experts and lecturers evaluate the constructed IQA model for GE curriculum?

This research aims to align international accreditation standards with IUH's context, potentially informing the development of an effective IQA model to enhance English language education in similar settings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Key concepts

2.1.1. Quality assurance in higher education

Quality Assurance (QA) in education is a comprehensive framework aimed at maintaining established standards and enhancing the educational experience for students. It encompasses various methods such as accreditation, certification, licensing, and regulation. (Warren, 1993; SEAMEO, 2003; INQAAHE, 2015, Council for Higher Education Accreditation, 2022; U.S. Department of Education, 2022).

Several frameworks and models have been established to accommodate institutions in implementing an effective quality assurance practice. Notable frameworks namely the Malcolm Baldrige

National Quality Award in the United States, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) in the United Kingdom, and the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG) provide a systematic approach to quality control, addressing governance, curriculum development, evaluation, and student support services.

The ESG offers a comprehensive foundation for quality assurance in European higher education, emphasizing the importance of a student-centered approach and stakeholder involvement in quality control processes (UNESCO, 2015). The Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award promotes performance excellence across various industries, including higher education, by focusing on leadership, strategy, customers, measurement, analysis and knowledge management, workforce, operations, and results. The QAA sets standards and guidelines for higher education institutions in the UK, conducting reviews and audits to ensure compliance (Neave & Van Vught, 1994; Dill & Beerkens, 2010).

These frameworks guide institutions in establishing effective quality assurance systems, covering key aspects such as governance, curriculum design, assessment, and student support services. They also foster a culture of continuous improvement through benchmarking, self-evaluation, and adjustments based on feedback (Carvalho & Amaral, 2018).

Accreditation, in particular, is a widely recognized approach used in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) globally. It involves external evaluation against set criteria to ensure educational quality, achieved through processes like self-assessment, peer review, and external evaluation. In this study, the concept of accreditation is mentioned and applied as external quality assurance agencies drive the adoption of Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) tools and enhance governance structures. International accreditation practices often tailor recommendations to specialized programs, influencing the development of IQA systems within universities.

2.1.2. General English

General English (GE) is considered as a mandatory subject in higher education (HE) programs in Vietnam. This is a special feature of Vietnamese HE as most high school students could not achieve sufficient level of English to a discipline at HE level. Some Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) integrate GE in their undergraduate program, where students might accumulate 4 to 20 credits depending on the English training policy of their own HEI. While some HEIs allow students to study GE by themselves, as long as they submit a B1 certificate of English to be qualified for graduation exit ticket. (VQF)

2.1.3. NEAS Accreditation Scheme

The NEAS (National ELT Accreditation Scheme) is a stringent accreditation program designed specifically for English language teaching institutions operating in Australia. Established in 1990, NEAS accreditation ensures that institutions either meet or surpass the NEAS standards across various critical areas. The NEAS QA Framework is designed to maintain high standards in the English language teaching (ELT) industry. It was developed through extensive consultation with industry professionals, organizations, and government bodies both in Australia and internationally. The framework is reviewed and updated based on changes in the field, with adjustments made only after thorough consultation. Its purpose is to ensure quality in ELT programs, products, and services, support continuous improvement, and promote recognition of quality within the industry. The framework consists of fourteen Quality Areas (A. Teaching, Learning and Assessment B. The Student Experience C. Resources and Facilities D. Administration, Management and Staffing E. Promotion and Student Recruitment F. Welfare of Students Aged Under 18 Years G. Strategy, Risk and Governance H. Online Delivery I. ELT Qualifications J. Education Agents K. Products & Services L. ELT Professionals M. Transnational Delivery N. Foundation Programs), each with specific Quality Principles and Quality Drivers that guide organizations and individuals in demonstrating and improving quality. These Quality Drivers highlight key quality elements but are not mandatory.

Widely acknowledged internationally, this accreditation scheme serves as a hallmark for quality assurance within the realm of English language education, consequently bolstering the reputation of NEAS-accredited institutions among students and industry stakeholders (Crichton & Craven, 2016). Notably, some HEIs in Vietnam, such as RMIT University and Hoa Sen University, have chosen to have their General English training programs accredited by NEAS, highlighting the program's global recognition and appeal.

In this study, authors have selected standards areas relevant to General English curriculum namely (1) teaching, learning, and assessment; (2) the student experience; (3) resource and facilities; (4) administration, management, and staffing; (5) promotion and student recruitment; (6) strategy, risk and

governance; (7) online deliver; and (8) ELT qualification. Each standard is broken down into specific criteria, which were included in the quantitative questionnaire.

2.2. Reviews of Previous Studies

2.2.1. *Quality assurance of English Education*

The rapid expansion of higher education worldwide has increased the demand for accreditation agencies, especially professional accrediting bodies, mainly from Western sources (Eaton, 2015; Knight, 2015; Morse, 2015). This demand is particularly strong in countries focusing on internationalizing education, where accrediting foreign language curricula is crucial.

In the UK, language school accreditation began in the 1930s with the Department of Education and Science. After government inspections ceased, the British Council and the Association of Accredited English Language Schools (now English UK) created the English in Britain, Accreditation UK system. The British Council now oversees school accreditation, inspecting teacher qualifications, teaching methods, accommodation standards, supervision, and public documents (British Council, 2012). Similar accreditation programs exist in Australia, Canada, Malta, New Zealand, Ireland, South Africa, and the U.S. In 1991, EAQUALS was founded to accredit language providers globally. Its framework includes five main sections: management and administration, academic management, learner services, employee matters, and school environment. Ludka (2019) compares six accreditation schemes, including those from the UK, U.S., Canada, Australia, EAQUALS, and Finland. Despite differences, all programs share five core standards in language teaching.

Universities in the US and Europe are increasingly focusing on quality education to attract foreign students, with English as a mandatory subject. Accreditation through external quality assessment is key. In the US, a 2010 law requires all Intensive English Programs (IEPs) to be accredited by recognized agencies, such as the Accrediting Council for Continuing Education and Training (ACCET), to issue documents for F-1 visas (Ludska, 2019).

In Europe, the 1999 Bologna Treaty enabled free movement for students and academics, emphasizing lifelong learning and language proficiency for mobility and employment. Many European universities now use English as the primary medium of instruction. The Council of Europe views enhancing language teaching quality as a human rights issue, promoting learner autonomy and democratic citizenship (David, 2019). The European Language Portfolio aids learners in setting objectives and evaluating outcomes.

In Indonesia, a public-school language center uses a program evaluation system that includes environment, governance, programs, faculty, and materials, with performance indicators like solidarity and cost-effectiveness (Mackey, 1998).

In Turkey, the British Council and the Turkish Council on Higher Education have developed an accreditation scheme to improve intensive English language curricula (Donald, 2019). Several programs are accredited by CEA, EAQUALS, and Pearson-Edexcel.

In Bahrain, private universities established in the early 2000s have seen a growing demand for quality assurance in graduate programs, urged by UNESCO, the World Bank, and the National Development Program. The CEA has conducted inspections outside the US since 2004, focusing on Middle Eastern countries, including successful accreditation in Bahrain's Preparatory Year English Language Program (PYELP) (Abdullah, 2019).

Countries like the UK, USA, Australia, Canada, and many European nations have established accreditation frameworks for English language teaching programs to ensure international students meet proficiency standards. These countries also offer inspection services in regions such as the Middle East and Turkey to attract international students and promote educational internationalization.

In Vietnam, Pham (2006) discusses two main approaches to higher education quality assessment: criteria-based, which involves evaluating institutions against set standards, and outcomes-based, focusing on student success and learning outcomes. Integrating both methods is essential for comprehensive quality assessment.

2.2.2. *Previous studies on internal quality assurance of English curriculum*

Stroupe (2013) proposed a systematic method for managing an English program, emphasizing that using national or international standards can add objectivity to self-evaluation but must be tailored to the

specific context of each institution. He also highlighted the importance of leadership in ensuring transparency, engaging stakeholders, and maintaining flexibility to adapt to changes.

In Vietnam, many authors have researched and written about ways to improve the quality of English teaching in colleges and universities. For example, Vũ (2006) emphasized the effectiveness of the Common European Framework in assessing foreign language proficiency. Hoàng (2010) analyzed the current state of General English teaching in Vietnamese universities, comparing it with nine countries and territories in East and Southeast Asia, and proposes solutions to improve teaching and learning quality. Đỗ & Cái (2010) discussed the challenges of teaching and learning specialized English and offer effective management solutions. Despite many studies, the quality of English teaching and learning still does not meet societal demands. Therefore, it is necessary to build a comprehensive quality management system, involving the participation and commitment of all members of the institution, to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Nguyễn T. B. L. (2021) proposed applying the AUN-QA program-level standards to manage the quality of General English management in Vietnam, covering curriculum, staff, student support, facilities, testing, and outcomes. However, there is a lack of studies on specific standards for General English programs.

Martin's (2018) UNESCO research highlighted that building an internal quality assurance (IQA) culture requires adequate financial incentives and leadership support, which encourage administrative staff and lecturers to engage more effectively in the IQA process. Additionally, teacher engagement in IQA activities and teacher leadership within the IQA committee are crucial for the effectiveness of these activities. To promote IQA in academic programs, institutions must choose appropriate IQA instruments for teaching and learning, such as course and program evaluations, stakeholder satisfaction surveys, in-depth interviews with students, alumni, and employers, and job market analyses.

Pham et al. (2023) studied the IQA system in Vietnamese HEIs and its role in driving continuous improvement in academic programs. Their research examined the existing IQA infrastructure, instruments, and improvement efforts across various HEIs. The findings showed that although Vietnamese HEIs have established basic IQA infrastructure and use indirect tools, they often fail to use IQA results consistently for ongoing quality improvement.

These studies shape the conceptual framework for developing the IQA system for the GE program at IUH, including IQA infrastructure (policies and human resources), IQA tools, and subject-specific standards.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Context and participants of the study

This study took place at Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City (IUH), a public institution with up to 36,000 students. Among these, 90% are enrolled in General English courses, contributing 6 credits out of the 140 required for their programs. Participants included lecturers from the Faculty of Foreign Languages and quality assurance experts.

The General English program at IUH comprises two courses, each offering three credits. The curriculum focuses on A2 level proficiency in listening, reading, speaking, and writing, using the LIFE (Pre-intermediate) textbook. Students are assessed through summative and on-going assessments, preparing them for tests like TOEIC, TOEFL, IELTS, and VSTEP at the B1 level. After completing both courses, students can enroll in a preparation course to achieve B1 proficiency and obtain the necessary English certificate for graduation.

3.2. Methodology

3.2.1. Research Design

A mixed method was used to assess the applicability of NEAS accreditation criteria in enhancing General English instruction quality. The quantitative approach employed a questionnaire to gather data from numerous participants. Expert opinions provided qualitative insights into the constructed IQA system.

3.2.2. Instruments

To answer the first research question: "What are the experts' and lecturers' perceptions of the applicability of NEAS standards in quality assurance of GE curriculum?", a questionnaire based on NEAS criteria was developed and piloted with five participants for clarity of wording and the validity of the questions asked.

The finalized 5-point Likert scale questionnaire had sections on demographics and the applicability of NEAS criteria. The value of each level was calculated as follows: (highest point - lowest point) / number of points = (5-1) / 5 = 0.8. The significance of each point is divided as follows (Likert, 1932):

Scale range	1.00 -1.80	1.81 - 2.60	2.61 - 3.40	3.41 - 4.20	4.21 - 5.00
Agreement level	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

To address the second research question: “How do experts and lecturers evaluate the constructed IQA model for GE curriculum?”, a discussion section was designed to gather feedback on the proposed IQA model. Quality assurance experts were introduced to the IQA model, which includes policies, human resources, instruments, and subject-specific criteria, all adapted from previous studies and the NEAS accreditation scheme. The experts were then asked to evaluate the feasibility of implementing this IQA model at IUH. Additionally, a parallel questionnaire was administered to assess the current IQA situation of the GE curriculum at IUH.

3.2.3. Sampling

Quantitative Data: The study involved 45 lecturers teaching General English and 8 experts or quality assurance (QA) officers responsible for overseeing teaching quality. All lecturers teaching General English were invited to participate (census sampling), while experts were selected using convenience sampling to ensure comprehensive data collection. These QA experts include the Dean, Vice Dean, Division Head, and QA certificate holders responsible for quality assurance within the faculty.

Qualitative Data: Participants for the qualitative data collection were recruited based on their expertise in quality assurance matters. This resulted in expert opinion collection from 8 QA experts, and 4 lecturers. Additionally, data saturation, the point at which no new significant information emerges from further data collection, was achieved with 12 interviews (Creswell, 2014).

For these clusters of sampling, clear instructions were provided regarding participation criteria, informed consent procedures, and data collection protocols.

3.2.4. Data Collection and analysis

Data was collected and analysed in three different stages. In the first stage, a NEAS based questionnaire was distributed to all academic members delivering the General English. The questionnaire was distributed to 45 participants either online or offline, allowing them a two-week for responses. Of the responses received, 40 were collected, and 2 were excluded due to incompleteness. Thus, 38 responses were validated for analysis. The second group was 8 QA experts. SPSS version 26.0 was used to analyze quantitative data through descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics provided means to interpret respondents' perceptions on the significance of NEAS standards at IUH.

In the second stage, twelve informants were asked to give feedback on the proposed IQA model, either in person or virtually via zoom, at their convenience. All interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis, focusing on how informants evaluated the feasibility of the proposed IQA system.

In the third stage, an IQA questionnaire was conducted to 45 lecturers and 8 experts. Percentages on Yes / No / Don't know were calculated to see how lecturers and experts evaluate the presence of IQA for GE curriculum at IUH.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Perception of informants on the applicability of NEAS accreditation standards in quality assurance of General English teaching

Table 4.1. Perception of lecturers and experts on the feasibility of NEAS criteria at IUH context

N0	Descriptions	Mean	Agreement level	Rank
1	Teaching, learning, and assessment	4.16	Agree	4
2	The student experience	4.17	Agree	3

3	Resources and facilities	4.01	Agree	7
4	Administration, management, and staffing	4.17	Agree	3
5	Promotion and student recruitment	4.19	Agree	2
6	Strategy, risk, and governance	4.03	Agree	6
7	Online delivery	4.07	Agree	5
8	ELT Qualifications	4.33	Totally agree	1

Table 4.1 presents the perception of lecturers and experts regarding the feasibility of NEAS criteria within the context of IUH. The table categorizes various criteria and provides mean scores along with their corresponding ranks based on the perceived feasibility.

Qualifications was deemed the most feasible criterion, with the highest average score of 4.33. Promotion and Student Recruitment followed closely, with a score of 4.19. The Student Experience and Administration, Management, and Staffing shared the third position with an average score of 4.17. Teaching, Learning, and Assessment ranked fourth at 4.16, while Online Delivery and Strategy, Risk, and Governance were fifth and sixth, respectively. Resources and Facilities came in last with a score of 4.01. Overall, the data suggests that qualifications and promotion/student recruitment are perceived as the most feasible criteria, while resources and facilities are viewed as less feasible within the context of IUH. Despite slight differences among factors, all of them were highly evaluated as feasible at IUH context.

4.2. The feasibility of the Internal Quality Assurance for General English curriculum

4.2.1 The feasibility of the IQA for GE curriculum

The proposed IQA model for the GE curriculum received unanimous approval from experts and lecturers. Their commendation is due to the model's comprehensive approach, which effectively integrates established criteria from reputable organizations such as NEAS with contemporary research on IQA and accreditation in higher education. This model provides a holistic assessment of GE curriculum quality assurance by encompassing diverse key aspects.

Participants expressed strong support for the adoption of this IQA system, recognizing it as a logical progression in the quality assurance landscape of higher education institutions. This enthusiasm stems from the system's focus on fostering a quality-centered culture, underpinned by three essential components: (1) robust policies and qualified personnel—the model emphasizes the need for clear guidelines and the recruitment of skilled QA personnel to ensure effective implementation and oversight; (2) appropriate instruments—the system incorporates a variety of assessment tools designed to accurately measure and evaluate GE teaching quality; and (3) comprehensive subject-specific criteria—the IQA model provides a detailed set of criteria tailored to the unique requirements and challenges of different GE courses.

Overall, the proposed IQA model has accumulated substantial approval from experts and lecturers, demonstrating its potential to significantly enhance the quality of the GE curriculum and contribute to the overall improvement of higher education institutions.

4.2.2 The current situation of IQA for GE curriculum

Table 4.2. The presence of quality assurance policy and human resource

Quality assurance policy and human resource (n=46)	Yes (%)	No (%)	I do not know (%)
There is a General English policy issued by IUH	87	6.5	6.5
There is a quality assurance team in charge of General English program.	76	10.8	13.2
There is a student handbook for General English.	54	39	7

The General English policy implemented by IUH was recognized by 87% of the respondents, signifying its presence, while only 6.5% of the participants did not know about it. This policy mandates non-English major students to furnish an English certificate validating their proficiency at the B1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). The current General English program adequately equips non-English majors with the requisite skills and confidence to undergo proficiency assessments.

Regarding the quality assurance team responsible for overseeing the General English program, 76% of the respondents indicated awareness of its existence. This team, comprising four members tasked with revising and enhancing the program, was acknowledged by the majority of participants. However, 13.2% of the respondents reported unfamiliarity with the team, attributing this to the absence of an official announcement regarding its composition to the teaching staff within the Faculty of Foreign Languages (FFL).

Furthermore, opinions were divided regarding the existence of the student handbook for the General English program at IUH. While over half of the surveyed lecturers and experts endorsed the idea, citing its alignment with crucial information disseminated during freshman orientation sessions held at the onset of each academic year, a notable minority disagreed. Approximately 39% and 7% of respondents, respectively, expressed reservations, citing non-participation in freshman orientation sessions as a hindrance to the handbook's effectiveness, particularly for non-English majors.

Table 4.3. The presence of IQA Instruments

IQA instruments used (n=46)	Yes (%)	No (%)	I do not know (%)
Course evaluation by students	89	7	4
Program evaluation by students	91	4.5	4.5
Program evaluation by academic staff	83	10	7
Program monitoring based on statistical indicators	86.9	8.6	4.5
Student satisfaction survey	100	0	0
Course learning outcome assessment	84.7	10.8	4.5

The majority of participants confirmed the implementation of self-evaluation for individual English courses and the overall English program for non-English majors at IUH. This process involves completing a comprehensive questionnaire from the Testing and Quality Assurance Office before accessing academic results, assessing both the course and the General English program.

Program evaluation also occurs through end-of-semester meetings led by the Head of the Foundation Division, where academic staff provide feedback on teaching content, assessment methods, and pedagogical insights. Most surveyed lecturers and experts agreed on the presence of these evaluations at IUH.

After students receive their academic outcomes, lecturers compile course reports that include statistical indicators on students' performance in listening, reading, speaking, and writing. These reports help identify areas for improving teaching quality and student learning. Respondents agreed that these statistical indicators are valuable for monitoring the General English program.

All surveyed lecturers and experts confirmed the use of student satisfaction surveys conducted by the Office of Testing and Quality Assurance each term. These surveys help address challenges in the teaching and learning environment. Around 90% of respondents agreed that teaching staff can effectively evaluate the four learning outcomes for each English skill taught in the courses.

Table 4.4. The presence of specific criteria for General English

Specific criteria for General English (n=46)	Yes (%)	No (%)	I do not know (%)
---	----------------	---------------	--------------------------

Teaching, learning, and assessment	87	8.7	4.3
The student experience	45.7	43.5	10.8
Resources and facilities	71.3	19.7	9
Administration, management, and staffing	43.5	43.5	13
Promotion and student recruitment	73.9	19.6	6.5
Strategy, risk, and governance	43.5	45.7	10.8
Online delivery	54.3	43.5	2.2
ELT Qualifications	85.7	10	4.3

Respondents agreed that the Foreign Language Faculty (FFL) lecturers at IUH are well-trained and experienced in delivering and evaluating courses. The General English program is designed to meet students' learning needs and interests, using modern teaching methods and technology. The "Life" coursebook by National Geographic Learning offers up-to-date content and diverse activities to develop language skills, while the MyELT online platform provides additional resources and tracks student progress.

Challenges include the design and grading of progress tests, which are created independently by each lecturer, leading to potential discrepancies in reliability and validity. Additionally, student placement procedures are generally effective, but there are concerns about grouping students with varied competencies together.

About half of the respondents found the enrollment process clear and accessible, though teaching facilities pose issues. Classrooms, despite having essential amenities, have layouts that hinder interactive and communicative teaching methods, with long tables and benches limiting student engagement and collaborative learning.

Regarding qualifications, most respondents affirmed the FFL lecturers' credentials, including master's degrees, TESOL certifications, and C1 level English proficiency. This strong qualification framework, combined with their pedagogical skills, ensures lessons align with course objectives and student needs, promoting a dynamic and student-centered learning environment.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study found that most surveyed lecturers and experts support the applicability of NEAS accreditation standards for ensuring quality English language teaching for non-English major students at IUH. The IQA model was deemed feasible but needs certain criteria adjustments involving providing a student handbook, improving facilities, refining assessment methods, and enhancing the overall student experience. Therefore, recommendations to enhance the IQA model for GE curriculum at IUH must involve around four above-mentioned issues. First and foremost, it is vital to develop a comprehensive student handbook for non-English majors, replacing the insufficient orientation session. This handbook should detail the curriculum, assessment methods, proficiency expectations, and required proficiency tests, allowing students to access necessary information independently. Secondly, the placement policy should be revised to better match students' proficiency levels. Students should be grouped into pre-English 1 for scores 0-4.0, English 1 for 4.0-6.25, English 2 for 6.5-7.75, while those scoring above 8.0 do not have to take English 1 and 2 courses. The third issue is replacement of stationary long tables and benches with mobile furniture to facilitate better engagement in pair and group activities, enhancing instruction in all four language skills. Finally, there should be a centralized bank of progress tests sourced from Cambridge materials to ensure validity, reliability, fairness, and flexibility. Simultaneously, students should be organized alphabetically into exam groups to prevent bias and maintain impartial grading for midterm and final tests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Industrial University of Ho Chi Minh City for sponsoring this institutional project, code 23.1NN03. This article is a part of the project.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A. (2019). Implementation of Curriculum and Assessment Accreditation Standards in an English Language Programme at a Saudi University.
- Alhamad, B. (2019). *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Foreign Language Education*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21421-0_3. Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019 21, 21-36
- British Council (2012). Accreditation UK. www.britishcouncil.org/accreditation.htm.
- Carvalho, T., & Amaral, A. (2018). Quality assurance in higher education: A literature review. In L. Gómez Chova, A. López Martínez, & I. Candel Torres (Eds.), *ICERI2018 Proceedings* (pp. 8927-8936). IATED.
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation. (2022). About Accreditation. <https://www.chea.org/about-accreditation>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (4th ed.). Sage Publications. pp. 290-291
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and valuating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska - Pearson.
- Crichton, J., & Craven, R. (2016). A snapshot of Australian ELT provider accreditation: past, present and future. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 10(3), A1-A13. <https://doi.org/10.21153/jall2016vol10no3art651>
- David, L. (2019). Quality Language Education in a Multilingual World- A human rights perspective on Theory and Practice. *Taylor and Francis Group*.
- Dill, D. D., & Beerkens, M. (2010). Public and private regulation of higher education: A comparative analysis of systems, purposes and possibilities. *Higher Education*, 60(6), 627-643.
- Donald. F.S. (2019). The Increasing Need for Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Foreign Language Education. *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Foreign Language Education*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21421-0_1
- Đỗ T. X. D. và Cái N. D. A. (2010), Dạy và học Tiếng Anh chuyên ngành trong tình huống mới: thách thức và giải pháp, *Tạp chí Khoa học*, đại học Huế, số 60, 31-41.
- Eaton, J. S. (2015). An overview of US accreditation. Revised November 2015. Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
- European University Association. (2015). ESG 2015: Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area. Retrieved from <https://eua.eu/resources/publications/797:ESG%202015.html>
- Hoàng V. V. (2010), Dạy Tiếng Anh không chuyên ở các trường đại học Việt Nam – Những vấn đề lý luận và thực tiễn, Nxb ĐHQG Hà Nội.
- INQAAHE (2015), International Network for QA Agencies in Higher Education, available at: www.inqaahe.org/index.php Jones, J. and de Saram, D.D. (2005).
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1-55.
- Ludka, K. (2019). Accreditation: A Commodity or a Quest for Quality?. *Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Foreign Language Education*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21421-0_1

- Mackay, R., S. Wellesley, D. Tasman & E. Bazerga (1998). Using institutional self-evaluation to promote the quality of language and communication training programs. In P. Rea-Dickins & K. Germaine (eds.), *Managing Evaluation and Innovation in Language Teaching*. London: Longman, 111–132.
- Martin, M. (2018). *Internal quality assurance: Enhancing higher education quality and graduate employability*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000261356/PDF/261356eng.pdf.multi>
- Mills G.E. & Gay L.R. (2016) *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications* (11th edition).
- National ELT Accreditation Scheme. (2021). NEAS Accreditation Scheme Standards and Criteria. <https://www.neas.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/NEAS-Standards-andCriteria-v3.0-2021.pdf>
- Neave, G., & van Vught, F. A. (Eds.). (1994). *Government and higher education relationships across three continents: The winds of change*. Pergamon.
- Nguyen, T. B. L. (2021). Thực trạng công tác quản lý đào tạo tiếng Anh không chuyên tại các trường đại học thành viên đại học quốc gia Tp. Hồ Chí Minh. *Tạp chí khoa học - Đại học Đồng Nai* (18) 2020.
- Pham, N. T. T., Nguyen, C. H., Pham, H. T., & Ta, H. T. T. (2022). Internal Quality Assurance of Academic Programs: A Case Study in Vietnamese Higher Education. *Sage Open*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221144419>
- Pham, X. T. (2006), Xây dựng hệ thống đảm bảo chất lượng bên trong trường đại học, *Tạp chí KHGD* số 14, Tháng 11-2006.
- Pham, X. T. (2006), “Đảm bảo chất lượng giáo dục đại học, sự vận dụng vào thực tiễn của Việt Nam”, *Tạp chí Giáo dục* số 116 (1), Tháng 6 - 2006.
- Prime Minister (2016), Decision on the approval of Vietnamese Quality Framework, Ha Noi.
- SEAMEO (2003), *QA for Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific*. Bangkok: SEAMEO regional Centre for Higher Education and Development.
- Stroupe, R. (2013). Using Standards for Internal Quality Assurance for Management and Program Administration. *Research and Practice in English Language Teaching in Asia*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/10/V1/A1/Stroup>
- UNESCO. (2015). Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2022). Accreditation. <https://www.ed.gov/accreditation>
- Vũ T. P. A. (2006), Khung trình độ chung Châu Âu (Common European Framework) và việc nâng cao hiệu quả đào tạo Tiếng Anh tại Đại học Quốc gia Tp. HCM, *Tạp chí phát triển KH&CN*, Tập 9 (10), 2006.
- Warren P. D. (1993), *Quality management in universities*, AGPS, Canberra.

ĐỀ XUẤT MÔ HÌNH ĐẢM BẢO CHẤT LƯỢNG BÊN TRONG CHO CHƯƠNG TRÌNH GIẢNG DẠY TIẾNG ANH KHÔNG CHUYÊN TẠI TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC CÔNG NGHIỆP THÀNH PHỐ HỒ CHÍ MINH

QUÁCH THỊ TỐ NỮ^{*1}, NGUYỄN ĐÌNH LUẬT¹, HOÀNG THỊ PHONG LINH¹, NGÔ THỊ THÙY NHƯ¹, NGUYỄN XUÂN HỒNG²

¹ Khoa Ngoại ngữ, Trường Đại học Công nghiệp Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh

² Trường Đại học Công nghiệp Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh

Tác giả liên hệ: quachthitonu@iuh.edu.vn

Tóm tắt. Việc xây dựng hệ thống đảm bảo chất lượng bên trong cho các chương trình đào tạo là rất quan trọng để các cơ sở giáo dục đại học đạt được mục tiêu quốc tế hóa, đáp ứng yêu cầu của nhà tuyển dụng và thực hiện trách nhiệm xã hội. Tại Việt Nam, chất lượng các chương trình tiếng Anh tổng quát tại các trường đại học là một vấn đề đáng lo ngại vì nhiều sinh viên Việt Nam không đáp ứng được yêu cầu về trình độ đầu ra tối thiểu, cản trở cả quá trình quốc tế hóa giáo dục và sự hài lòng của nhà tuyển dụng. Do đó, việc đảm bảo chất lượng dạy và học tiếng Anh tổng quát là rất quan trọng. Nghiên cứu này được thực hiện nhằm phát triển mô hình đảm bảo chất lượng nội bộ cho các chương trình tiếng Anh tổng quát, kết hợp ba yếu tố chính: chính sách và nguồn nhân lực, công cụ và tiêu chí cụ thể. Hai yếu tố đầu tiên được xây dựng từ mô hình QA hiện có, trong khi các tiêu chí đặc thù dựa trên bộ kiểm định tiếng Anh NEAS để đảm bảo chất lượng giảng dạy tiếng Anh tổng quát. Nghiên cứu sử dụng phương pháp định lượng, bảng câu hỏi khảo sát để thu thập và phân tích dữ liệu, nhằm đánh giá khả năng áp dụng tiêu chuẩn kiểm định NEAS cho QA trong giảng dạy tiếng Anh tổng quát tại Đại học Công nghiệp Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh. Sau đó phương pháp định tính được dùng để xác nhận tính khả thi của mô hình IQA được đề xuất. Kết quả nghiên cứu chỉ ra rằng cả chuyên gia và giảng viên tiếng Anh tại IUH đều công nhận khả năng áp dụng bộ tiêu chuẩn NEAS vào bối cảnh của trường Đại học Công nghiệp thành phố Hồ Chí Minh. Họ xác nhận tính khả thi của mô hình đảm bảo chất lượng bên trong được đề xuất bao gồm chính sách và nguồn nhân lực, các công cụ, tiêu chí cụ thể cho chương trình giảng dạy tiếng Anh không chuyên.

Từ khóa. Đảm bảo chất lượng, giảng dạy, tiếng Anh không chuyên, NEAS

Ngày nhận bài: 07/6/2024

Ngày chấp nhận đăng: 30/9/2024