

How to Cite:

Nhung, N. T. H. (2025). Current state of managing English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security in Vietnam: toward standardization. *Macrolinguistics and Microlinguistics*, 6(2), 42–62.
<https://doi.org/10.21744/mami.v6n2.38>

Current State of Managing English Teaching Activities at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security in Vietnam: Toward Standardization

Nguyen Thi Hong Nhung


University of Fire Prevention and Fighting, Hanoi city, Vietnam

Abstract---This study evaluates the current state of managing English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security toward standardization. Using a combination of surveys, in-depth interviews, and statistical analysis, the research highlights strengths in planning and oversight while identifying gaps in execution, motivation, and innovation. The application of the PDCA cycle provides a structured approach to addressing these challenges. Findings underscore the need for resource-aligned curriculum planning, enhanced lecturer and student engagement, improved testing and evaluation practices, and sustainable innovation. The study offers actionable recommendations to align Ministry of Public Security universities with national standards and foster continuous improvement.

Keywords---English teaching management, Standardization, Curriculum implementation, PDCA cycle, Educational innovation.

1. Introduction

The management of English language teaching (ELT) in universities under the Ministry of Public Security plays a pivotal role in enhancing the quality of education and preparing students for international integration. In Vietnam, the importance of

© 2025 by The Author(s). 

This journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Corresponding author: Nhung, N.T.H. | Email: nguyenhongnhung1087@gmail.com

Manuscript submitted: 16 Feb 2025 | Manuscript revised: 28 March 2025 | Accepted for publication: 15 April 2025

English proficiency has been recognized as a key factor in professional development and global cooperation. The Six-Level Foreign Language Proficiency Framework for Vietnam (Ministry of Education and Training, 2014) establishes clear benchmarks for English proficiency, reflecting the nation's commitment to improving foreign language skills. This framework serves as a foundation for the National Foreign Language Project 2020, which emphasizes the need for standardized English education across all levels, including universities under the Ministry of Public Security (Ministry of Education and Training, 2020).

Despite these efforts, the current state of ELT in Ministry of Public Security universities reveals challenges that hinder its effectiveness. According to the Proceedings of the Scientific Workshop (Ministry of Public Security, 2018), inconsistencies in curriculum design, limited access to teaching resources, and insufficient professional development opportunities for lecturers are key barriers. These issues underscore the need for comprehensive reforms in ELT management, aligning with both national standards and the specific needs of law enforcement training.

Effective ELT management requires a systematic approach that integrates planning, execution, evaluation, and adjustment. Shewhart (1939) introduced the concept of iterative quality control, which was later refined by Deming (1986) into the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle. This framework has been widely applied in educational management to ensure continuous improvement. Nguyen (2021) highlights the relevance of this model in Ministry of Public Security universities, emphasizing its potential to address structural and operational challenges in ELT.

Moreover, English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is a critical component of ELT in Ministry of Public Security universities, given the specialized nature of law enforcement training. Lam (2011) and Do & Cai (2010) stress the importance of tailoring teaching content to meet practical and professional requirements. This approach not only enhances the relevance of English education but also aligns with the broader goals of the National Foreign Language Project 2020 (Ministry of Education and Training, 2020).

The lack of alignment between curriculum content and professional demands has been a recurring issue. Dinh, Nguyen, and Ngo (2018) identify significant gaps in the design and implementation of English programs, which often fail to meet the needs of students in specialized fields. Similarly, Dinh (2019) underscores the importance of quality management in ESP teaching, particularly in addressing resource constraints and ensuring standardized assessment methods.

To address these challenges, it is essential to adopt a multi-faceted approach to ELT management. Tran (2018) and Truong (2019, 2020) propose measures such as

incorporating modern teaching techniques, fostering lecturer development, and implementing rigorous evaluation processes. These strategies align with the guidelines provided by the [Ministry of Education and Training \(2018\)](#) for evaluating higher education institutions, emphasizing accountability and continuous improvement.

Furthermore, the integration of technology into ELT has shown promising results in enhancing teaching and learning outcomes. [Zhang \(2007\)](#) highlights the benefits of using IT tools to create interactive and engaging learning environments, which are particularly effective in ESP contexts. This is echoed by the [Ministry of Public Security \(2022\)](#), which advocates for leveraging technology to optimize resource utilization and improve teaching efficiency.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.3.1 Application of the Deming Cycle – PDCA in Managing English Language Teaching Activities

The PDCA Cycle, also referred to as the Deming Cycle or Shewhart Cycle, serves as a foundational framework for managing and continuously improving English language teaching (ELT) activities. Initially conceptualized by [Shewhart \(1939\)](#) and later popularized by [Deming \(1986\)](#), this cycle emphasizes an iterative process of planning, execution, evaluation, and adjustment. The PDCA model is particularly well-suited for standardizing and enhancing teaching processes in universities under the Ministry of Public Security, where adherence to both institutional and national standards is critical.



Figure 1. Deming Cycle – PDCA

The cycle comprises four distinct stages. The Plan stage involves setting objectives and formulating detailed strategies, taking into consideration available resources and timelines. The Do stage focuses on executing plans while documenting any arising challenges. In the Check stage, outcomes are evaluated against initial objectives, with discrepancies analyzed for root causes. Finally, the Act stage emphasizes implementing corrective actions, ensuring lessons learned feed into subsequent cycles for continuous improvement ([Shewhart, 1939](#); [Deming, 1986](#)). This structured approach enables

Ministry of Public Security universities to maintain high-quality ELT through systematic adjustments and strategic interventions.

2.3.2 Key Components in Managing English Language Teaching Toward Standardization

Managing Teaching Objectives. The management of teaching objectives begins with the Plan phase, where objectives are designed based on legal frameworks, institutional capacity, and student needs. These objectives must align with specific training outcomes and the broader goals of the Ministry of Public Security. Faculty and lecturers are tasked with strictly adhering to these objectives during implementation to ensure consistency across teaching activities (Ministry of Public Security, 2020). Regular monitoring identifies deviations, and adjustments are made to align teaching objectives with real-world conditions and institutional goals (Deming, 1986).

Managing Curriculum Content. Curriculum content management requires careful planning to align with common frameworks and the unique requirements of each discipline. Consideration of institutional resource constraints and contingency planning, such as for online teaching, are essential for maintaining flexibility (Ministry of Public Security, 2018). Implementation involves collaboration between faculty and administrators to ensure effective delivery and student motivation. Monitoring evaluates curriculum adherence and incorporates feedback, enabling necessary updates to reflect modern advancements (Shewhart, 1939).

Managing Faculty Activities. Effective faculty management encompasses planning, execution, monitoring, and adjustment. Teaching responsibilities are assigned based on expertise, and faculty activities are aligned with institutional objectives during the planning stage. Faculty members are expected to prepare detailed lesson plans and employ innovative teaching methods to enhance engagement during implementation. Monitoring includes classroom observations and assessment of teaching materials. Adjustments are made to address gaps and improve methodologies (Ministry of Public Security, 2022).

Managing Student Learning. Managing student learning involves assessing student capabilities and designing tailored learning plans. During implementation, students receive comprehensive course outlines and clear expectations for outcomes. Extracurricular activities foster motivation, while regular evaluations ensure alignment with institutional goals. Feedback-driven adjustments enhance learning experiences by revising teaching methods or providing additional resources (Deming, 1986).

Managing Innovation in Teaching Methods. Innovative teaching methods require a commitment to improvement. Planning includes evaluating current practices and setting objectives for adopting modern techniques. Implementation encourages faculty

to integrate technology and engage in professional development. Monitoring assesses the effectiveness of these innovations, and adjustments refine teaching methods to remain effective and relevant (Ministry of Public Security, 2020).

Managing Resources and Technology. Effective resource and technology management supports English language education. Planning involves evaluating existing resources, identifying gaps, and setting long-term goals. Implementation ensures that teaching aids, suitable classroom environments, and IT systems are accessible. Regular monitoring maintains resource functionality, while adjustments incorporate advancements to enhance teaching and learning (Shewhart, 1939).

Managing Assessments. Assessment management starts with comprehensive planning that aligns with program objectives and incorporates standardized testing frameworks. Faculty training on assessment standards and the use of technology streamlines evaluation processes. Monitoring ensures fairness and effectiveness in assessments, while adjustments address feedback to enhance methods and improve the overall learning experience (Deming, 1986).

2.3.3 Decentralization in Managing English Language Teaching

The decentralization of ELT management in the Ministry of Public Security universities ensures a coordinated effort toward standardization. At the macro level, the Ministry oversees curriculum approval and collaborates with the Ministry of Education and Training for academic oversight. Institutional directors and senior administrators manage planning, organizing, directing, and monitoring teaching activities. Specific functional departments handle curriculum development, faculty training, and assessments. This decentralized approach fosters collaboration and accountability, enabling a comprehensive strategy for improving ELT outcomes (Ministry of Public Security, 2022).

This theoretical framework demonstrates how applying structured methodologies like the PDCA Cycle, focusing on key components, and employing a decentralized approach can enhance the management of English teaching activities in alignment with standardization goals.

3 Research Methodology

Research Objective

The objective of this study is to objectively, accurately, and specifically evaluate the current state of managing English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security toward standardization. The research aims to analyze and identify strengths, weaknesses, and underlying causes, serving as a foundation for proposing

measures to enhance the management of English teaching activities at Ministry of Public Security universities in alignment with standardization goals.

Scope of Research

The scope of the study focuses on the management of English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security, specifically in the context of standardization efforts.

Survey Participants and Locations

Survey Locations: Seven universities under the Ministry of Public Security across both the northern and southern regions, including three academies and four universities: People's Security Academy, People's Police Academy, People's Public Security Political Academy, People's Security University, People's Police University, Fire Prevention and Fighting University, and People's Public Security Logistics and Technical University.

Survey Participants: 500 individuals, including 45 administrators at different levels, 7 academy administrators, 118 lecturers, and 330 students. In-depth interviews were conducted with 7 members of the management board, 5 administrators, and 7 lecturers.

Table 1
Survey Participant Statistics

No.	University/Academy	Admin	Academy Admin	Lecturers	Total Admins & Lecturers	Students	Total
1	People's Security Academy	8	1	25	34	50	84
2	People's Police Academy	6	1	25	32	50	82
3	People's Public Security Political Academy	7	1	6	14	50	64
4	People's Security University	6	1	20	27	50	77
5	People's Police University	8	1	18	27	50	77
6	Fire Prevention and Fighting University	5	1	17	23	50	73
7	Logistics and Technical University	5	1	7	13	30	43
	Total	45	7	118	170	330	500

Survey Period: From 2020 to 2023.

Survey Methods

Questionnaire Survey Method: To gather information about the current state of English language teaching management at universities under the Ministry of Public Security, two types of surveys were developed:

Survey for administrators and lecturers at universities under the Ministry of Public Security.

Survey for students at universities under the Ministry of Public Security.

The process for collecting survey data was as follows: Design the questionnaire; Conduct a pilot survey and consult experts; Revise the questionnaire (adjustments and refinements); Finalize the questionnaire (meet requirements); Distribute the survey; Analyze and process the data collected from the survey.

Statistical Data Processing Methods: The data collected was analyzed and evaluated using SPSS software, employing frequency distribution tables. Parametric tests were used to assess differences in specific parameters.

Evaluation Scale

Scoring System: The specific items in the questionnaire were scored on a scale from 1 to 5, corresponding to the choices of administrators and lecturers at the surveyed universities.

Table 2
Evaluation Scale

Score	Level	Relevance	Impact
1	Poor	Not necessary	No impact
2	Weak	Slightly necessary	Slight impact
3	Average	Necessary	Impact
4	Good	Quite necessary	Considerable impact

Scoring Calculation: The scores in the tables represent the average of the component scores from the questionnaire items. The average score is calculated using the following formula: Poor ($1.0 \leq \text{Avg.} \leq 1.8$); Weak ($1.8 < \text{Avg.} \leq 2.6$); Average ($2.6 < \text{Avg.} \leq 3.4$); Good ($3.4 < \text{Avg.} \leq 4.2$); Excellent ($4.2 < \text{Avg.} \leq 5.0$).

4 Research Results

4.1 Current State of Managing the Implementation of English Teaching Curriculum Content at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

Table 3
Management of Implementing English Teaching Curriculum Content at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

No.	Content	Avg. Score	SD	Rank
1	Planning the management of curriculum implementation (P)	2.47	0.54	4

1.1	Developing curriculum content based on a common framework	2.69	0.97	2
1.2	Developing curriculum content based on specific frameworks for each field	2.72	1.04	1
1.3	Developing curriculum content based on the institution's actual resource conditions	2.35	1.20	3
1.4	Planning curriculum development with contingency measures (e.g., switching from face-to-face to online teaching)	2.12	1.07	4
2	Executing the teaching curriculum content (D)	3.24	0.66	3
2.1	The institution has measures to motivate lecturers during teaching	2.66	1.25	3
2.2	The institution has measures to motivate students during learning	3.64	1.11	1
2.3	The institution enforces appropriate disciplinary actions for non-compliance with curriculum content	3.43	1.26	2
3	Checking the teaching curriculum content (C)	3.40	0.89	1
3.1	The institution has clear standards and criteria for checking curriculum content	3.09	1.22	2
3.2	The institution clearly communicates schedules and timelines for checks to relevant units/individuals	3.72	1.27	1
4	Adjusting the teaching curriculum content (A)	3.38	0.63	2
4.1	Timely adjustments to curriculum content after evaluations	3.69	1.25	1
4.2	Adjustments are communicated to department administrators	3.58	1.25	2
4.3	Department leaders instruct lecturers to directly adjust necessary content	2.89	1.38	3
	Overall Avg.	3.13	0.30	

The survey results from Table 3 show that:

The current state of managing the implementation of English teaching curriculum content at universities under the Ministry of Public Security demonstrates both strengths and areas for improvement across the four key stages of management: Planning, Executing, Checking, and Adjusting. Each stage has unique challenges that impact the overall effectiveness of curriculum implementation, as shown in Table 3.

Planning the management of curriculum implementation scored the lowest among the four stages, with an average score of 2.47 and a standard deviation of 0.54, ranking it last. Within this phase, the strongest aspect was the development of curriculum

content based on specific frameworks for each field, which scored 2.72. This indicates an understanding of the importance of tailoring content to the specialized needs of different training disciplines. However, planning efforts were less effective in areas such as developing curriculum content based on the institution's actual resource conditions (2.35), reflecting a disconnect between curriculum planning and the institution's operational capabilities. The weakest element was planning curriculum development with contingency measures, such as shifting from face-to-face to online teaching, which scored only 2.12. This result highlights the institutions' limited readiness to address unexpected disruptions, underscoring the need for proactive and flexible planning strategies to strengthen this critical stage.

The execution of teaching curriculum content performed moderately well, with an average score of 3.24 and a standard deviation of 0.66, ranking it third. Among the execution activities, the institution's measures to motivate students during learning received the highest score (3.64), reflecting successful efforts to engage students and foster a positive learning environment. However, measures to motivate lecturers during teaching scored significantly lower (2.66), revealing insufficient attention to supporting and incentivizing faculty members. Additionally, the enforcement of appropriate disciplinary actions for non-compliance with curriculum content scored 3.43, indicating a structured approach to ensuring adherence to established standards. These findings suggest that while execution efforts are effective in addressing student needs, more emphasis on lecturer support and resources is essential to enhance overall teaching effectiveness.

Checking the teaching curriculum content emerged as the strongest stage, with an average score of 3.40 and a standard deviation of 0.89, ranking it first. The highest-rated element in this phase was the clear communication of schedules and timelines for checks to relevant units and individuals, which scored 3.72. This demonstrates strong procedural transparency and effective communication, ensuring that all stakeholders are well-informed about evaluation processes. However, the score for having clear standards and criteria for checking curriculum content was slightly lower at 3.09, suggesting that the evaluation benchmarks could be more comprehensive and consistent. Strengthening these standards would further enhance the effectiveness of the quality assurance process, enabling more robust and reliable assessments of curriculum content.

The adjustment phase also showed strong performance, with an average score of 3.38 and a standard deviation of 0.63, ranking it second. Timely adjustments to curriculum content after evaluations received the highest score in this phase (3.69), reflecting the institutions' responsiveness to feedback and their ability to implement changes promptly. Similarly, adjustments being communicated to department administrators scored 3.58, highlighting effective dissemination of information. However, the lowest-rated activity in this phase was department leaders instructing lecturers to directly

adjust necessary content, which scored only 2.89. This indicates a gap in departmental leadership and follow-through, suggesting that more structured guidance and support for lecturers are needed to ensure successful implementation of adjustments.

Overall, the management of English teaching curriculum content at Ministry of Public Security universities achieved a slightly above-average performance, with an overall average score of 3.13 and a standard deviation of 0.30. While the institutions excel in the checking and adjusting phases, significant challenges remain in planning, particularly in resource alignment and contingency preparation. Furthermore, the execution phase highlights the need to better support lecturers, as their engagement and motivation are critical to achieving high-quality teaching outcomes. Addressing these challenges and building on the existing strengths in communication and responsiveness will enable Ministry of Public Security universities to enhance their curriculum management practices and align more closely with the goals of standardization and continuous improvement.

4.2 Current State of Managing English Teaching Activities of Lecturers at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

Table 4

Management of English Teaching Activities of Lecturers at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

No.	Content	Avg. Score	SD	Rank
1	Planning English teaching activities (P)	3.32	0.67	3
1.1	Directing departments to develop teaching plans aligning with training fields	3.66	1.25	2
1.2	Developing academic year teaching plans	3.77	1.07	1
1.3	Developing contingency plans for substitute and make-up teaching	2.54	1.06	3
2	Executing English teaching activities (D)	2.98	0.74	4
2.1	Requirements for developing lesson plans and syllabi	3.06	1.40	2
2.2	Guiding lecturers to follow standardized teaching regulations	2.75	1.17	3
2.3	Assigning lecturers in alignment with their professional expertise	3.12	1.31	1
3	Checking English teaching activities (C)	3.38	0.60	2
3.1	Managing class attendance of lecturers	3.24	1.29	3
3.2	Checking lesson plans and teaching materials	3.75	1.26	2
3.3	Establishing qualification standards for English lecturers	3.79	1.19	1
3.4	Evaluating lecturers' English teaching proficiency	2.74	1.06	4

4	Adjusting English teaching activities (A)	3.68	1.02	1
4.1	Gathering feedback from students on teaching activities	3.79	1.19	1
4.2	Using feedback to adjust lecturers' teaching activities	3.60	1.16	3
4.3	Establishing regulations for handling lecturers who fail to meet teaching standards	3.66	1.33	2
	Overall Avg.	3.34	0.49	

The survey results from Table 4 show that:

The current state of managing English teaching activities of lecturers at universities under the Ministry of Public Security shows varied performance across the four stages of management: Planning, Executing, Checking, and Adjusting, as outlined in Table 4. The overall average score of 3.34 indicates a slightly above-average performance, with adjusting activities scoring the highest and executing activities showing the most room for improvement.

Planning English teaching activities received a solid average score of 3.32, reflecting a strong foundation for guiding lecturers. The development of academic year teaching plans (3.77) ranked the highest, demonstrating well-structured and comprehensive planning processes. However, the development of contingency plans for substitute and make-up teaching scored significantly lower (2.54), highlighting a gap in readiness for unexpected disruptions. While planning is relatively strong, it would benefit from more proactive measures to ensure continuity in teaching under various scenarios.

Executing teaching activities was the weakest phase, with an average score of 2.98. Assigning lecturers based on their professional expertise scored the highest in this phase (3.12), indicating an effort to align teaching assignments with individual qualifications. However, guiding lecturers to follow standardized teaching regulations (2.75) and addressing the requirements for developing lesson plans and syllabi (3.06) scored lower, suggesting that clearer guidance and support mechanisms are needed to enhance teaching quality.

Checking teaching activities performed better, with an average score of 3.38. Establishing qualification standards for lecturers scored the highest (3.79), emphasizing the importance placed on setting clear expectations for teaching proficiency. However, evaluating lecturers' English teaching proficiency (2.74) was rated the lowest, indicating a need for more rigorous and comprehensive assessments to ensure high standards.

Adjusting teaching activities emerged as the strongest phase, with an average score of 3.68. Gathering feedback from students on teaching activities (3.79) and using this feedback to adjust teaching practices (3.60) highlight the responsiveness of institutions

to student input. Regulations for addressing underperforming lecturers (3.66) further demonstrate a structured approach to accountability and improvement.

4.3 Current State of Managing English Learning Activities of Students at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

Table 5
Management of English Learning Activities of Students at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

No.	Content	Avg. Score	SD	Rank
1	Planning English learning activities (P)	3.51	0.75	1
1.1	Organizing entry-level proficiency assessments for students	3.82	1.12	1
1.2	Developing student learning plans for different phases	3.20	1.04	2
2	Executing English learning activities (D)	3.22	0.50	4
2.1	Providing detailed syllabi for each English course before teaching	3.97	1.09	2
2.2	Announcing English course learning outcomes at the start of the program	4.01	0.98	1
2.3	Publicizing regulations and evaluation policies for students	3.34	1.28	4
2.4	Educating students on the importance of English learning attitudes	2.98	1.16	5
2.5	Implementing measures to encourage student motivation in English learning	2.65	1.11	8
2.6	Guiding and training students in self-study methods	2.68	1.27	7
2.7	Organizing extracurricular activities to create an English learning environment	2.74	1.27	6
2.8	Establishing channels (e.g., Facebook, Zalo) for students to address learning concerns	3.42	1.28	3
3	Checking English learning activities (C)	3.40	0.77	2
3.1	Monitoring classroom discipline of students	3.71	1.22	1
3.2	Establishing regulations for monitoring student self-study activities	3.10	1.34	2
4	Adjusting English learning activities (A)	3.39	0.69	3
3.3	Collecting feedback from students after course completion	3.61	1.17	1
3.4	Using student feedback to adjust teaching processes	3.18	1.20	3

3.5	Using student feedback to adjust evaluation processes	3.38	1.25	2
	Overall Avg.	3.38	0.30	

The survey results from Table 5 show that:

The analysis of the current state of managing English learning activities for students at universities under the Ministry of Public Security reveals a moderate level of effectiveness, with an overall average score of 3.38 and a standard deviation of 0.30. The four management stages—Planning, Executing, Checking, and Adjusting—exhibit varying levels of performance, with notable strengths in planning and checking, and room for improvement in execution.

Planning English learning activities emerged as the strongest phase, with an average score of 3.51. Within this stage, organizing entry-level proficiency assessments scored the highest (3.82), highlighting effective efforts to evaluate students' baseline capabilities. Developing student learning plans for different phases scored slightly lower (3.20), suggesting that while some attention is given to structuring learning plans, further refinement could enhance their impact.

In contrast, executing English learning activities scored the lowest among the four stages, with an average of 3.22. Despite its overall lower score, some elements performed well, such as announcing English course learning outcomes at the start of the program (4.01) and providing detailed syllabi before teaching (3.97). These activities ensure clarity and set expectations for students. However, weaker areas included implementing measures to encourage student motivation (2.65) and guiding students in self-study methods (2.68), both of which indicate insufficient support for fostering independent learning and engagement. Similarly, organizing extracurricular activities (2.74) scored low, reflecting missed opportunities to create immersive English learning environments.

Checking English learning activities performed relatively well, with an average score of 3.40. The highest-rated item was monitoring classroom discipline (3.71), which indicates effective oversight of student behavior during learning sessions. However, the score for establishing regulations for monitoring student self-study activities (3.10) highlights the need for better-defined frameworks to evaluate independent learning efforts.

Adjusting English learning activities also showed strong performance, with an average score of 3.39. Collecting feedback from students after course completion scored the highest (3.61), demonstrating the institutions' responsiveness to student input. However, using feedback to adjust teaching processes (3.18) scored lower, indicating room for improvement in applying insights to enhance instruction.

4.4 Current State of Managing Innovations in Organization, Methods, and Techniques for English Teaching at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

Table 6

Management of Innovations in Organization, Methods, and Techniques for English Teaching at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

No.	Content	Avg. Score	SD	Rank
1	Planning innovations in organization, methods, and techniques (P)	3.11	0.51	3
1.1	Assessing the current state of organization, methods, and techniques annually	3.06	1.37	3
1.2	Clearly defining goals for innovations in organization, methods, and techniques	3.31	1.35	2
1.3	Defining implementation processes based on actual conditions	2.88	1.14	4
1.4	Identifying roles of stakeholders in the innovation process	3.44	1.30	1
1.5	Developing contingency plans for the innovation process	2.88	1.36	4
2	Executing innovations in organization, methods, and techniques (D)	3.51	0.69	2
2.1	Directing departments to hold professional meetings on innovative teaching methods	3.90	1.10	2
2.2	Inviting experts to train lecturers on active teaching methods	2.72	1.26	3
2.3	Encouraging lecturers to apply modern technology and teaching techniques	3.92	1.17	1
3	Checking innovations in organization, methods, and techniques (C)	3.71	0.88	1
3.1	Conducting regular and ad-hoc classroom observations and analyzing teaching sessions	3.74	1.03	1
3.2	Collecting student feedback on teaching methods	3.68	1.21	2
4	Adjusting innovations in organization, methods, and techniques (A)	2.86	1.45	4
4.1	Making adjustments to teaching methods and organization upon identifying shortcomings	2.86	1.45	
	Overall Avg.	3.30	0.57	

The survey results from Table 6 show that:

The current state of managing innovations in organization, methods, and techniques for English teaching at universities under the Ministry of Public Security reflects varied performance across the four management phases: Planning, Executing, Checking, and Adjusting, with an overall average score of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 0.57.

Planning scored 3.11, ranking third among the phases. The highest-rated item was identifying the roles of stakeholders in the innovation process (3.44), demonstrating strong recognition of the importance of collaboration in driving innovation. However, lower scores for defining implementation processes and developing contingency plans (both 2.88) highlight a lack of comprehensive preparation for potential challenges. This suggests that while goal-setting is adequately addressed, planning requires more strategic foresight and flexibility.

Executing innovations achieved a relatively strong performance, with an average score of 3.51, ranking second. Encouraging lecturers to apply modern technology and teaching techniques scored the highest (3.92), reflecting effective efforts to promote the integration of innovative tools into teaching practices. Additionally, directing departments to hold professional meetings on innovative methods scored 3.90, further emphasizing institutional support for knowledge sharing and capacity building. However, inviting experts to train lecturers on active teaching methods received a significantly lower score (2.72), indicating a gap in leveraging external expertise for professional development.

Checking was the highest-rated phase, with an average score of 3.71. Conducting regular and ad-hoc classroom observations and analyzing teaching sessions (3.74) emerged as a key strength, ensuring ongoing monitoring of innovative practices. Collecting student feedback on teaching methods (3.68) further highlights efforts to incorporate learner perspectives into evaluation processes.

In contrast, Adjusting scored the lowest among the phases, with an average of 2.86. Making adjustments to teaching methods and organization upon identifying shortcomings (2.86) underscores a need for more structured mechanisms to respond to evaluation findings and drive continuous improvement.

4.5. Current State of Managing Testing and Evaluation of English Learning Outcomes at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

Table 7

Management of Testing and Evaluation of English Learning Outcomes at Universities under the Ministry of Public Security Toward Standardization

No.	Content	Avg. Score	SD	Rank
1	Planning testing and evaluation (P)	3.84	0.77	1
1.1	Planning testing and evaluation activities by semester or academic year	4.01	1.09	1
1.2	Defining roles of stakeholders in testing and evaluation	3.67	1.28	2
2	Executing testing and evaluation (D)	3.42	0.66	4
2.1	Training staff in standardized test creation	3.25	1.25	3
2.2	Establishing a standardized English test bank	3.06	1.19	5
2.3	Directing lecturers to diversify testing and evaluation methods	3.10	1.26	4
2.4	Establishing clear processes for rechecking test results	3.97	1.09	1
2.5	Using IT in managing students' learning outcomes	3.72	1.38	2
3	Checking testing and evaluation (C)	3.81	0.59	2
3.1	Monitoring the test creation process	4.05	1.04	1
3.2	Monitoring the examination process	3.97	1.23	2
3.3	Monitoring the grading process	3.41	1.17	3
4	Adjusting testing and evaluation activities (A)	3.70	0.51	3
4.1	Addressing student feedback regarding testing and evaluation	4.14	1.08	1
4.2	Implementing corrective measures for issues in testing and evaluation	3.25	1.05	2
	Overall Avg.	3.69	0.36	

The survey results from Table 7 show that:

The management of testing and evaluation of English learning outcomes at universities under the Ministry of Public Security demonstrates strengths in planning and monitoring processes but highlights areas requiring further improvement in execution and adjustment. The overall average score of 3.69 indicates slightly above-average performance, with significant variation across different stages.

Planning testing and evaluation activities scored the highest among the four stages, with an average of 3.84 and a standard deviation of 0.77. Within this phase, planning activities by semester or academic year achieved the top score (4.01), reflecting a well-structured and systematic approach to scheduling evaluations. Defining the roles of stakeholders (3.67) also performed strongly, demonstrating clear delineation of responsibilities. This robust planning ensures that testing and evaluation activities are well-coordinated and aligned with institutional goals.

Execution, however, ranked the lowest, with an average score of 3.42 and a standard deviation of 0.66. The strongest aspect in this stage was establishing clear processes for rechecking test results (3.97), which indicates fairness and transparency in addressing student concerns. The use of IT in managing students' learning outcomes (3.72) also scored well, highlighting efforts to modernize evaluation methods. However, areas such as training staff in standardized test creation (3.25) and establishing a standardized English test bank (3.06) received lower scores, indicating a need for improved resources and training for faculty.

Checking testing and evaluation activities was the second strongest stage, with an average score of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.59. Monitoring the test creation process scored the highest (4.05), reflecting effective oversight of assessment design. However, the grading process (3.41) was weaker, suggesting that additional measures are needed to ensure consistency and accuracy in evaluations.

Adjusting testing and evaluation activities performed relatively well, with an average score of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 0.51. The highest-rated activity was addressing student feedback regarding testing and evaluation (4.14), which emphasizes responsiveness to student concerns. However, implementing corrective measures (3.25) indicates room for improvement in timely and effective adjustments.

5 Findings

The research uncovers several key aspects of managing English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security in pursuit of standardization. These findings highlight areas of strength as well as opportunities for improvement.

Curriculum Implementation stands out as a critical area. While planning efforts are commendable, especially in aligning content with specific frameworks, significant gaps exist in resource alignment and contingency preparation. Institutions have shown limited readiness for unexpected challenges, such as the shift to online learning. Additionally, the execution and adjustment phases reveal a pressing need for improved lecturer motivation and clearer departmental guidance to ensure effective implementation.

Lecturer Activities reveal mixed results. Planning phases are relatively strong, particularly in the development of academic-year teaching plans. However, contingency planning remains a weak point, leaving institutions vulnerable to unforeseen disruptions. Execution activities expose a lack of sufficient guidance for ensuring compliance with standard requirements, while gaps in checking activities highlight the need for more robust evaluations of teaching proficiency.

Student Learning management demonstrates strong planning capabilities, particularly through effective entry-level assessments. However, execution phases lag behind, with weaker efforts in motivating students and promoting self-study habits. Although feedback mechanisms are in place and function effectively, their application to adjustments in teaching methodologies is limited, reducing their overall impact.

Testing and Evaluation emerge as a strong area in planning and checking activities. Institutions excel in semester-wise evaluation planning and maintaining oversight of test creation. Despite these strengths, execution activities, such as the development of standardized English test banks and staff training for test creation, require additional resources and focused improvement to enhance reliability and effectiveness.

Innovative Methods show promising progress, with a strong focus on integrating technology and employing evaluation processes to foster creativity in teaching. However, the lack of structured responses to feedback and insufficient involvement of external experts hinder sustained innovation. Addressing these gaps is essential to fully leverage innovation for teaching improvement.

These findings highlight the need for targeted strategies to address identified weaknesses while building on existing strengths to align English teaching activities with the goals of standardization.

6 Discussion

The findings highlight significant complexities and opportunities in managing English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security toward standardization. While progress has been made in some areas, there are clear challenges that must be addressed to align these activities with institutional and national goals.

Curriculum Implementation plays a central role in achieving standardization, yet the findings reveal critical gaps in planning and resource alignment. Despite efforts to align content with specific frameworks, the lack of contingency preparation has hindered adaptability during disruptions such as the shift to online learning. To address this, universities need to adopt a more proactive and resource-conscious approach, ensuring that curriculum plans are flexible and resilient.

Lecturer Activities are pivotal for maintaining teaching quality, but gaps in guidance and support limit their potential. While academic-year planning is relatively strong, the absence of contingency strategies weakens overall preparedness. Moreover, the findings indicate insufficient compliance monitoring and evaluation of teaching proficiency. Strengthening these areas requires enhanced faculty training, clear frameworks for performance evaluation, and structured support systems that enable lecturers to meet standardized expectations effectively.

Student Learning Management shows strong planning capabilities, particularly in entry-level assessments, but weaker execution phases reduce its overall impact. The lack of focus on student motivation and self-study development highlights a need for more engaging and supportive learning environments. Institutions should invest in creating immersive learning experiences and fostering a culture of self-directed learning to empower students and improve learning outcomes.

Testing and Evaluation have demonstrated strengths in planning and oversight, but execution challenges remain. The absence of standardized test banks and insufficient training for staff involved in test creation limit the effectiveness and fairness of assessments. Addressing these issues requires better resource allocation and capacity-building initiatives to ensure that evaluation processes are reliable and consistent.

Innovative Methods show promising progress, especially in integrating technology to enhance teaching practices. However, the lack of structured responses to feedback and limited external involvement constrain the potential for sustained innovation. Universities should focus on creating systems to systematically process and act upon feedback, while also engaging external experts to introduce new perspectives and teaching strategies.

Overall, the discussion underscores the importance of adopting a holistic and iterative approach to managing English teaching activities. By addressing these challenges and building on existing strengths, universities under the Ministry of Public Security can enhance their teaching management practices and move closer to achieving their standardization goals.

7 Conclusion

The management of English teaching activities at universities under the Ministry of Public Security exhibits both strengths and areas requiring improvement in the pursuit of standardization. While planning efforts are commendable, particularly in curriculum implementation and lecturer activities, challenges persist in aligning resources, preparing for contingencies, and motivating both faculty and students. Execution phases often lack sufficient guidance and support, leading to gaps in compliance and proficiency evaluations. Testing and evaluation processes demonstrate strong planning

and oversight; however, the development of standardized test banks and staff training necessitate further attention. Innovative methods integrating technology into teaching are promising, yet the absence of structured feedback mechanisms and external expert involvement limits their effectiveness. To achieve the desired standardization, it is imperative to adopt a systematic, iterative approach, such as the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) cycle, to address these challenges. By enhancing resource alignment, contingency planning, faculty and student engagement, and by fostering a culture of continuous improvement, Ministry of Public Security universities can strengthen their English teaching management practices, thereby aligning more closely with national educational standards.

References

- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- Dinh, N. L., Nguyen, T. T. H., & Ngo, T. K. T. (2018). Evaluation of the B1 English program based on standardization of the National Foreign Language Project 2020 at the University of Transport and Communications. *Journal of Education*, Special Issue, August, 251–256.
- Dinh, T. H. T. (2019). *Quality management of English for specific purposes teaching in technical and technological colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Vietnam National University, Hanoi.
- Do, T. X. D., & Cai, N. D. A. (2010). Teaching and learning English for specific purposes in the new context: Challenges and solutions. *Journal of Science, Hue University*, 60, 31–41.
- Lam, Q. D. (2011). English for specific purposes - Some issues on teaching content. *Language and Life Journal*, 11(193), 27–32.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2014). *Six-level foreign language proficiency framework for Vietnam* (Circular No. 01/2014/TT-BGDĐT).
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2018). *Official dispatch No. 768/QLCL-KDCLGD on guidelines for evaluating the quality of higher education institutions*.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2020). *National Foreign Language Project 2020* (Decision No. 1400/QĐ-TTg).
- Ministry of Public Security. (2018a). *Guidelines for curriculum development in universities under the Ministry of Public Security*. Ministry of Public Security Press.
- Ministry of Public Security. (2018b). *Proceedings of the scientific workshop: Assessing the current state and solutions for improving the quality of teaching and learning English in people's police schools*.
- Ministry of Public Security. (2020). *Standards for managing English language teaching activities*. Ministry of Public Security Press.
- Ministry of Public Security. (2022). *Faculty and resource management framework*. Ministry of Public Security Press.

- Nguyen, T. V. H. (2021). *Management of English language teaching in academies and universities of the People's Police in the context of international integration* (Doctoral dissertation). Vietnam National University, Hanoi.
- Shewhart, W. A. (1939). *Statistical method from the viewpoint of quality control*. Dover Publications.
- Tran, T. M. K. (2018). The current state of non-major English teaching and learning at Vietnamese universities & solutions to improve English proficiency for non-major students at Nha Trang University. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Improving the Quality of Non-Major Foreign Language Teaching*. Nha Trang University.
- Truong, T. L. (2019). Some measures for managing English language teaching at universities to meet output standards. *Journal of Education*, Special Issue, October, 113–118.
- Zhang, Z. (2007). Towards an integrated approach to teaching business English: A Chinese experience. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26, 399–413.