International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

Artificial Intelligence Applications in University Governance: Opportunities, Challenges, and Policy Implications in Vietnam

Dr Le Thi Bich Phuong
Trade Union University, Vietnam

* Corresponding Author: **Dr Le Thi Bich Phuong**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 2582-7138
Impact Factor (RSIF): 8.04
Volume: 07
Issue: 02
March-April 2026
Received: 18-01-2026
Accepted: 20-02-2026
Published: 22-03-2026
Page No: 468-473

Abstract
This paper examines the role of artificial intelligence (AI) in university governance through an interdisciplinary lens that combines business administration and information technology. Rather than viewing AI merely as a pedagogical support tool, the paper conceptualizes it as a strategic managerial capability that can reshape institutional planning, administrative operations, service quality, quality assurance, research management, and stakeholder engagement. Using a conceptual and policy-analytic approach, the study synthesizes international scholarship on AI in higher education and interprets it in light of Vietnam's evolving policy environment. The analysis indicates that AI can enhance evidence-based decision-making, process automation, student success management, risk monitoring, and institutional competitiveness. However, these gains depend on the maturity of data governance, system interoperability, cybersecurity, human resource capacity, and ethical oversight. From a business administration perspective, the critical issue is not technology adoption per se, but strategic alignment, governance design, cost-benefit discipline, and change management. From an information technology perspective, the essential requirements are robust data architecture, system integration, algorithmic transparency, and human-in-the-loop control. In Vietnam, recent policy commitments to AI and digital transformation in education provide a supportive direction, yet universities continue to face fragmented data ecosystems, uneven digital capabilities, legal ambiguity, and institutional inequality. The paper proposes six policy priorities: a national framework for AI in higher education governance; interoperable data infrastructure; digital leadership development; responsible procurement and pilot-based implementation; ethical and legal safeguards; and collaborative platforms for inter-university learning. The study contributes an integrated framework for understanding AI-enabled university governance and offers practical guidance for Vietnamese institutions seeking to modernize in a responsible and context-sensitive manner.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, university governance, higher education, digital transformation, Vietnam, data governance, policy

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence is reshaping how organizations make decisions, allocate resources, design services, and manage risk. In higher education, however, much of the current discussion still focuses on AI in teaching, learning, assessment, and academic integrity. While these issues are important, they capture only one dimension of a broader institutional transformation. Universities are not merely teaching environments; they are also complex organizations responsible for coordinating academic affairs, finance, human resources, student services, quality assurance, research administration, external relations, and long-term strategy. Viewed from this broader perspective, AI is as much a governance issue as it is a pedagogical one.

This governance question is especially salient in Vietnam. Vietnamese universities are operating under increasing pressure to strengthen autonomy, accountability, quality assurance, internationalization, and labor-market responsiveness. At the same time, they are expected to improve service quality while coping with tighter budgets, growing competition, demographic uncertainty, and rising digital expectations from students, staff, regulators, and employers. In this environment, governance models that rely primarily on fragmented reporting and manual administration are becoming inadequate. Universities need faster decision cycles, more reliable data, and more agile operational systems.

The policy context is becoming more favorable to AI-enabled transformation. Decision No. 127/QD-TTg identifies AI as a national strategic priority through 2030, while Decision No. 131/QD-TTg sets out a sector-wide agenda for information technology application and digital transformation in education and training (Prime Minister of Vietnam, 2021, 2022) [5]. UNESCO's 2025 Viet Nam Artificial Intelligence Readiness Assessment further notes that the country has demonstrated strong political commitment to AI and digital transformation, yet still lacks a fully binding ethical AI framework, a unified coordinating body, and sufficient high-quality AI talent for large-scale implementation (UNESCO, 2025) [8]. These observations are directly relevant to higher education, as universities are both users of AI and producers of the human capital and research capacity on which national AI development depends.

From a business administration perspective, the central question is not whether universities can purchase AI tools, but whether those tools can be aligned with institutional strategy, governance mechanisms, budgets, incentives, and stakeholder expectations. From an information technology perspective, the issue is not whether AI appears impressive in demonstration, but whether it is supported by reliable data architecture, interoperability, cybersecurity, model oversight, and user-centered system design. In other words, AI in university governance should be understood as a socio-technical transformation that requires simultaneous attention to strategy, process, technology, and ethics.

This paper therefore reinterprets the topic through an interdisciplinary lens that integrates management thinking with information systems design. It addresses three questions. First, where can AI create the greatest value in university governance? Second, what organizational, technological, ethical, and policy barriers may prevent that value from being realized in Vietnam? Third, what policy directions can help Vietnamese universities adopt AI in ways that are effective, responsible, and institutionally realistic?

The article argues that AI should be treated neither as a miracle solution nor as a purely technical add-on. Its real value emerges when institutions use it to strengthen evidence-based governance, reduce administrative friction, improve student services, and enhance strategic agility, while preserving human judgment, academic values, and public accountability. The remainder of the paper develops this argument through an interdisciplinary analytical framework, a conceptual review of governance use cases, an examination of opportunities and risks, and a policy agenda tailored to the Vietnamese context.

2. Interdisciplinary Research Lens and Analytical Framework

A business administration perspective directs attention to organizational value, strategic fit, cost discipline, process redesign, and stakeholder management. Universities, despite their educational mission, remain organizations that must allocate scarce resources, manage portfolios of programs, coordinate staff performance, sustain service quality, and protect institutional reputation. From this perspective, AI should be evaluated in terms of whether it improves decision quality, reduces transaction costs, enhances responsiveness, and strengthens institutional capabilities. The resource-based view and dynamic capabilities perspective are particularly useful here: AI alone does not create advantage; advantage arises from an institution's ability to combine data, processes, talent, and leadership into governance capabilities that are difficult to imitate.

An information technology perspective highlights the architecture beneath managerial ambition. AI systems depend on data quality, interoperability across platforms, security controls, explainable workflows, user interfaces, audit trails, and effective governance over model updates and vendor dependence. If admissions data, finance data, learning management data, and human resource data are inconsistent or isolated, AI will amplify fragmentation rather than resolve it. Agasisti and Bowers (2017) [1] argued that educational decision-making increasingly requires professionals who can translate complex analytics into usable managerial knowledge. That argument remains highly relevant to university governance, where institutional failure often stems not from the absence of dashboards, but from weak interpretation, low trust in data, and poor integration between technical and managerial actors.

This paper also treats university governance as a socio-technical system. Universities are mission-driven institutions with public obligations, professional autonomy, and diverse stakeholders. Decisions on admissions, scholarships, staff evaluation, student support, and research funding are not merely operational; they also carry normative implications related to fairness, inclusion, due process, and institutional legitimacy. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) and its later guidance on generative AI in education and research emphasize that AI must remain human-centered, transparent, and accountable, particularly in environments where rights, equity, and personal data are at stake (UNESCO, 2021, 2023) [7]. Accordingly, the analytical framework used here combines strategic management, information systems governance, and ethical public governance rather than reducing the issue to software adoption alone.

3. Research Approach

This study adopts a conceptual and policy-analytic approach. It does not test a statistical model or present a new institutional dataset. Instead, it synthesizes four streams of material: the literature on AI in higher education, business administration insights on AI implementation, international ethical guidance, and recent Vietnamese policy developments related to AI and educational digital transformation. This approach is appropriate because the use of AI in university governance in Vietnam remains at an early stage, and greater

conceptual clarity is needed before more robust empirical designs can be developed.

The approach is intentionally interdisciplinary. Research on AI in higher education has often been dominated by technical perspectives, while governance questions remain underexplored. Zawacki-Richter *et al.* (2019) [10] found that scholarship on AI in higher education has been shaped largely by computer science and quantitative methods, with relatively limited integration of educational and critical perspectives. Williamson and Eynon (2020) [9] similarly argued that AI in education should be examined as a historically situated and politically shaped socio-technical development. Building on these insights, this paper focuses specifically on AI as a governance capability and interprets its implications for Vietnam through both managerial and information systems perspectives.

4. AI Use Cases in University Governance

The value of AI in university governance becomes clearer when discussion moves from generic claims to specific governance domains. In practice, AI applications can support strategic planning, routine administration, student support, quality assurance, finance, research management, and external engagement. The literature already shows that AI applications in higher education extend beyond tutoring and assessment to profiling, prediction, administrative services, and institutional support functions (Zawacki-Richter *et al.*, 2019) [10]. What remains essential is to interpret these applications in terms of governance value rather than technological novelty.

The first governance domain is strategic planning and institutional analytics. Universities increasingly need to anticipate enrollment fluctuations, analyze market demand for programs, estimate staffing requirements, and align investment decisions with long-term priorities. AI-supported forecasting can integrate admissions history, labor-market signals, program demand, student progression patterns, and financial trends into scenario-based planning. For autonomous institutions, this is highly significant because revenue sustainability, staffing decisions, and academic portfolio management are tightly interconnected. Predictive tools can help leaders move from retrospective reporting to forward-looking governance, thereby shortening decision cycles and improving preparedness under uncertainty.

A second domain concerns administrative process automation. Universities manage large volumes of repetitive activities, including application processing, document routing, timetable coordination, inquiry management, compliance reporting, procurement screening, and routine financial operations. AI-powered chatbots, document classifiers, anomaly-detection tools, and workflow engines can reduce manual burdens, improve response times, and standardize service delivery. From a business administration perspective, these gains matter because they reduce administrative friction and allow managers and staff to focus on higher-value work such as advising, planning, and quality improvement. From an IT perspective, however, automation is sustainable only when process rules are explicit, data fields are standardized, and systems are integrated across units.

A third and especially important domain is student-centered governance. Universities increasingly compete not only on academic content but also on service quality and student experience. AI can support early warning systems for dropout risk, identify service bottlenecks, analyze student feedback at scale, and improve the timing of interventions by academic advisers, counselors, and financial support units. If implemented carefully, such systems can make governance more proactive rather than reactive. They can also strengthen quality assurance by linking student pathways to program review, course redesign, and institutional support services. Yet this domain is ethically sensitive because the same tools that enable earlier support can also create perceptions of surveillance if their purpose and safeguards are not clearly communicated.

A fourth domain is quality assurance and performance management. Accreditation and internal quality systems require substantial evidence, including data on student outcomes, program evaluations, staffing profiles, research results, community engagement, and regulatory compliance. AI can assist with evidence aggregation, pattern detection, document summarization, and dashboard generation. This can reduce reporting fatigue and strengthen managerial visibility over institutional performance. However, it also introduces a classic management risk: when institutions become overly dependent on machine-generated indicators, they may privilege what is easily measured over what is educationally meaningful. Governance quality therefore depends on combining analytic power with contextual interpretation.

Research management is another promising area. Universities need to identify grant opportunities, map collaboration networks, monitor publication trends, and align research investments with strategic strengths. AI can support bibliometric intelligence, thematic scanning, grant matching, and partnership analysis. For Vietnamese universities seeking greater international visibility, such tools can improve strategic focus and external positioning. They can also help university leaders identify where internal capabilities already exist and where further capacity building is required. Even in this domain, however, a managerial caveat is necessary: the objective should be better strategic learning, not simply a mechanical increase in publication counts or ranking-sensitive metrics.

Table 1: Illustrative AI use cases in university governance from business administration and information systems perspectives.

Governance domain	Representative AI application	Managerial value	Primary governance risk
Strategic planning	Enrollment forecasting, program demand analytics, scenario modeling	Improves resource allocation and medium-term planning	Historical bias and overconfidence in predictions
Student affairs	Chatbots, early warning systems, sentiment and service analytics	Faster response, better retention support, stronger service quality	Privacy invasion and intrusive monitoring
Academic operations	Timetabling, workload balancing, classroom and exam optimization	Reduces cycle time and administrative bottlenecks	Opaque rules that may be perceived as unfair
Finance and compliance	Budget anomaly detection, procurement screening, document automation	Better cost control, compliance, and audit readiness	False positives and weak accountability for automated flags
Quality assurance	Evidence aggregation, accreditation analytics, KPI dashboards	Strengthens reporting discipline and institutional transparency	Metric fixation and loss of contextual judgment
Research governance	Grant matching, collaboration mapping, bibliometric intelligence	Supports productivity, partnerships, and strategic visibility	Overemphasis on measurable outputs over scholarly quality

5. Opportunities from a Business Administration and Information Technology Perspective

The first major opportunity created by AI is stronger evidence-based decision-making. Many university decisions still suffer from delayed reporting, fragmented information, and excessive reliance on personal judgment under pressure. AI can convert dispersed institutional data into structured signals for action. For senior leaders, this means earlier recognition of enrollment decline, financial stress, course bottlenecks, or student disengagement. For deans and unit managers, it provides a more credible basis for staffing, scheduling, program development, and service redesign. Better information does not automatically produce better governance, but it improves the conditions under which better governance becomes possible.

The second opportunity lies in operational efficiency and cost optimization. Davenport and Ronanki (2018) [2] argue that organizations often derive greater value from AI when they begin with focused, incremental projects that augment existing work rather than pursue unrealistic transformation from the outset. This insight is highly relevant to universities. Many governance problems in higher education are not glamorous, but they are costly: duplicated data entry, slow approval processes, inconsistent responses to students, manual reconciliation across systems, and weak audit readiness. AI can reduce these hidden costs, improve service speed, and increase internal consistency. In periods of budget pressure, such gains have clear strategic importance.

A third opportunity is the strengthening of student-centered governance. From a management perspective, students are not merely recipients of instruction but key stakeholders whose experiences influence retention, graduation, institutional reputation, and long-term alumni relations. AI-supported governance can help institutions detect friction points earlier, personalize communication, and allocate support resources more intelligently. This does not mean importing a simplistic corporate customer model into academia. Rather, it means recognizing that responsiveness, accessibility, and timely intervention are now core dimensions of university quality.

A fourth opportunity concerns institutional agility and competitiveness. Universities now operate in environments shaped by rapid policy change, cross-border educational competition, digital learning ecosystems, and shifting labor-market expectations. AI can improve strategic sensing by helping institutions interpret patterns in applicant behavior, employer demand, research trends, and public sentiment. In resource-based terms, this strengthens sensing and reconfiguration capabilities, allowing institutions to adapt more quickly without relying solely on annual review cycles. Universities that learn to combine analytics with managerial judgment are better positioned to redesign programs, protect reputation, and engage new partners.

Finally, AI can support transparency and governance discipline. Properly designed dashboards, audit trails, and anomaly-detection systems can improve compliance, internal control, and performance review. For public universities in particular, this matters because governance quality is closely tied to accountability before regulators, society, and funding bodies. Yet transparency should not be confused with an excess of dashboards or automated rankings. The real managerial value lies in selective, intelligible, and actionable insight rather than in generating more data for its own sake.

6. Challenges and Risks

The most immediate challenge is data fragmentation. Many universities still manage admissions, finance, human resources, learning platforms, library systems, and research databases as partially disconnected islands. Data definitions may differ across units, records may be incomplete, and governance responsibilities may be ambiguous. Under these conditions, AI outputs can easily become unstable or misleading. The problem is not only technical; it is also organizational. Institutions that lack data ownership rules, validation routines, and cross-functional coordination will find that AI magnifies existing inconsistency rather than delivering genuine intelligence.

A second challenge concerns leadership and organizational capability. AI adoption requires more than technical staff. Rectors, vice rectors, deans, department heads, quality assurance units, and administrative managers all need sufficient digital literacy to evaluate use cases, assess risks, ask the right questions, and make informed implementation choices. Without this capacity, universities may purchase fashionable tools without redesigning workflows, building staff ownership, or aligning implementation with institutional strategy. Change management is especially important in universities because academic and administrative cultures often value autonomy and collegiality. If staff perceive AI as a surveillance instrument or a threat to professional judgment, adoption will face silent resistance even when the technology itself functions properly.

A third challenge lies in ethics, legality, and institutional trust. UNESCO's 2023 guidance stresses that educational institutions are often insufficiently prepared to validate AI tools and that the absence of national regulation can leave data privacy inadequately protected (UNESCO, 2023) [7]. These warnings are directly relevant to university

governance. When AI is used to predict student risk, support staff evaluation, screen applicants, or flag anomalies, institutions must be able to explain what data were used, what logic informed the recommendation, who remains accountable, and how individuals can contest adverse outcomes. Without such safeguards, even technically accurate systems may undermine institutional legitimacy. UNESCO's 2021 Recommendation similarly emphasizes transparency, accountability, privacy, and human oversight as foundational principles for responsible AI (UNESCO, 2021) [6].

In the Vietnamese context, these concerns intersect with an evolving but still incomplete policy environment. The UNESCO readiness assessment notes that Viet Nam has made notable progress in policy, infrastructure, and innovation support, yet still lacks a fully binding and unified ethical AI framework and continues to face shortages of high-quality AI talent (UNESCO, 2025) [8]. The assessment also identifies the 2025 Law on Digital Technology Industry as an important milestone in formalizing AI governance, although sector-specific implementation in higher education remains an unfinished agenda. For universities, this means that legal direction is improving, but institutional operating rules for procurement, risk classification, data retention, and appeals still require substantial clarification.

A fourth challenge is financial inequality across institutions. Large national universities and well-connected urban institutions are more likely to secure infrastructure, partnerships, and specialist talent than smaller regional universities. If AI-enabled governance develops only where resources are already concentrated, the gap in management capacity across the higher education system may widen further. This would be problematic not only from an equity perspective, but also for overall system performance, because weaker institutions would be expected to meet digital expectations without comparable means to do so.

A fifth and more subtle challenge is the risk of over-automation and metric reductionism. University governance cannot be reduced to what is easiest to quantify. Academic quality, student development, collegial culture, and social mission all require interpretation, deliberation, and contextual judgment. AI may tempt leaders to assume that more prediction automatically leads to better governance. In reality, governance deteriorates when analytics displace reflection rather than inform it. High-quality university management therefore requires a hybrid model: algorithmic support for routine or large-scale tasks, combined with human review for judgment-intensive and high-stakes decisions.

7. Policy Implications for Vietnam

The first policy priority is to establish a clear national framework for AI in higher education governance. Vietnam already has strategic direction through the national AI strategy and the education digital transformation agenda (Prime Minister of Vietnam, 2021, 2022) [5]. However, universities need more operational guidance that translates broad strategy into sector-specific rules. Such a framework should distinguish low-risk applications, such as workflow automation or demand forecasting, from high-risk applications involving admissions, scholarships, staff evaluation, or disciplinary matters. It should also specify minimum expectations for documentation, human oversight, vendor accountability, and data protection.

The second priority is interoperable data infrastructure. AI cannot generate reliable value in universities that lack common data definitions, secure integration, and cross-system consistency. Policy should therefore encourage shared standards for identifiers, metadata, application programming interfaces (APIs), and reporting structures, while allowing institutional flexibility in implementation. Universities themselves need formal data governance arrangements, including named data stewards, data-quality protocols, access rights, retention policies, and audit logs. Without these foundations, AI projects will remain isolated experiments rather than scalable governance capabilities.

A third priority is leadership and talent development. Universities need digital leadership at the executive level and applied analytics capability at the operational level. Training should not be limited to IT units. Rectors, vice rectors, deans, registrars, finance managers, and quality assurance leaders all need the competence to interpret analytics, understand model limitations, and integrate AI into decision routines responsibly. At the same time, institutions should cultivate a layer of translational professionals who can bridge management and technology, similar to the educational data scientist role discussed by Agasisti and Bowers (2017) [1]. This bridging function is essential because many governance failures occur between departments rather than within any single system.

The fourth priority is responsible procurement and pilot-based implementation. Universities should avoid adopting AI solely through vendor-driven enthusiasm. Every proposed application should begin with a clearly defined managerial problem, a business case, a measurable success criterion, and a risk assessment. Procurement criteria should examine interoperability, data portability, explainability, cybersecurity, support requirements, and auditability. In line with Davenport and Ronanki's (2018) [2] argument, institutions are likely to perform better when they begin with targeted pilots that solve concrete governance problems and scale only after evidence of value has been demonstrated. This approach is especially appropriate for resource-constrained universities that cannot afford large implementation failures.

The fifth priority is ethical governance with explicit human oversight. Each university should establish an internal mechanism, whether a dedicated AI governance committee or a cross-functional steering group, to review use cases, classify risks, approve safeguards, and monitor institutional consequences. High-stakes decisions should never be delegated fully to AI outputs. Individuals affected by AI-assisted decisions should be informed of the role of automation and given meaningful channels for review or correction. These procedures are necessary not only to protect rights, but also to preserve trust in institutional governance.

The sixth priority is system-level collaboration. To reduce inequality, Vietnam should encourage inter-university consortia, shared platforms, communities of practice, and collaborative training programs on data governance and AI management. Leading universities can function as experimental hubs whose lessons are translated into broader system use. Government agencies and professional associations can support model guidelines, procurement templates, and capacity-building modules. This collaborative approach is more realistic than expecting each institution to develop its own governance architecture from scratch, and it can accelerate learning while reducing duplication and cost.

Table 2. Priority actions for responsible AI-enabled university governance in Vietnam.

Priority area	Core action	Lead actors	Expected effect
National framework	Issue sector guidance on AI use, risk categories, data protection, and accountability in higher education	MOET, relevant ministries, universities	Reduced ambiguity and better policy alignment
Data infrastructure	Adopt interoperable standards, common identifiers, APIs, and secure data governance practices	Universities, IT centers, regulators	More reliable analytics and scalable deployment
Leadership and talent	Train rectors, deans, managers, and educational data specialists in AI governance	Universities, training institutes	Stronger strategic alignment and change capacity
Procurement and pilots	Require business cases, vendor due diligence, human oversight, and phased implementation	University councils, procurement units	Lower implementation risk and better return on investment
Ethics and oversight	Create AI governance committees, audit trails, appeals processes, and review protocols	Universities, QA units, legal offices	Higher trust, fairness, and institutional legitimacy
System collaboration	Build shared platforms, consortia, and communities of practice across institutions	Government, leading universities, associations	Reduced inequality and faster knowledge diffusion

8. Conclusion

AI in higher education should no longer be discussed solely as a classroom technology. Its deeper significance lies in university governance: how institutions plan, coordinate, allocate resources, manage risk, support students, and remain accountable. When examined from a combined business administration and information technology perspective, AI appears neither as a magic solution nor as a purely technical system. It is a managerial and socio-technical capability whose value depends on strategic alignment, process redesign, data architecture, leadership capacity, and ethical control.

For Vietnam, the opportunity is substantial. National policy direction on AI and educational digital transformation has become clearer, and the broader legal environment for digital technology is maturing. Yet the path from strategic ambition to institutional value remains demanding. Universities must address fragmented data, uneven digital maturity, limited specialist capability, and unresolved questions of transparency, fairness, and accountability. If these foundations are neglected, AI may intensify weak governance rather than improve it.

The central implication of this paper is therefore straightforward: responsible AI-enabled university governance requires both managerial intelligence and technological discipline. Universities should begin with clearly defined governance problems, develop interoperable and trusted data systems, protect human judgment in high-stakes decisions, and scale implementation only when institutional capacity supports it. Future research can extend this framework through case studies, comparative institutional analysis, and empirical measurement of how AI changes governance performance in Vietnamese universities. For now, the most important task is to ensure that digital transformation in higher education remains human-centered, strategically grounded, and publicly accountable.

References

1. Agasisti T, Bowers AJ. Data analytics and decision-making in education: Toward the educational data scientist as a key actor in schools and higher education institutions. In: Johnes G, Johnes J, Agasisti T, López-Torres L, editors. Handbook of Contemporary Education Economics. Edward Elgar Publishing; 2017. p. 184–210.
2. Davenport TH, Ronanki R. Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harv Bus Rev. 2018;96(1):108–16.
3. National Assembly of Vietnam. Law on Digital Technology Industry, No. 71/2025/QH15. 2025.
4. Prime Minister of Vietnam. Decision No. 127/QD-TTg on the National Strategy on Research, Development and Application of Artificial Intelligence until 2030. 2021.
5. Prime Minister of Vietnam. Decision No. 131/QD-TTg approving the Scheme on Strengthening the Application of Information Technology and Digital Transformation in Education and Training for 2022–2025, with orientation to 2030. 2022.
6. UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. 2021.
7. UNESCO. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. 2023.
8. UNESCO. Viet Nam—Artificial Intelligence Readiness Assessment Report. 2025.
9. Williamson B, Eynon R. Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. Learn Media Technol. 2020;45(3):223–35.
10. Zawacki-Richter O, Marín VI, Bond M, Gouverneur F. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education: Where are the educators? Int J Educ Technol High Educ. 2019;16:39.

How to Cite This Article

Phuong LTB. Artificial intelligence applications in university governance: Opportunities, challenges, and policy implications in Vietnam. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2026;7(2):468–473.