Social Development Studies, 2026, Volume 2, Issue 3
https://www.bbwpublisher.com/journal/SDS
Online ISSN: 3083-3868
Print ISSN: 3083-3876

Construction and Practice of a Teaching Quality Evaluation System for Undergraduate Courses in Higher Vocational Universities

Yinghan He

Chongqing Industry Polytechnic University, Chongqing 401120, China

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: As an important form of undergraduate-level vocational education, undergraduate vocational education relies on curriculum teaching quality evaluation to deliver compound technical and skilled talents. The curriculum evaluation system should balance vocational attributes and undergraduate education characteristics, and establish an observation framework covering the whole teaching process. This paper discusses the content and practical approaches to constructing the teaching quality evaluation system for undergraduate courses in higher vocational universities. It sorts out the core components of the system, including evaluation index dimensions, index weights, evaluation criteria, and implementation mechanisms. Based on a complete workflow including goal setting, demand investigation, scheme design, demonstration and inspection, revision and improvement, this paper illustrates the practical process of system construction and provides references for similar universities to carry out curriculum teaching quality evaluation.

Keywords: Undergraduate programs in higher vocational universities; Curriculum teaching; Teaching quality evaluation; Construction of evaluation system

Online publication: June 30, 2026

1. Introduction

The continuous advancement of undergraduate-level vocational education brings talent training standards closer to the comprehensive competency requirements of industrial posts. Curriculum teaching quality control has become a key part of university teaching management. Curriculum evaluation serves as the core carrier of teaching quality control, and the design quality of the evaluation system directly affects the collection of teaching information and the direction of teaching improvement [1]. Existing evaluation frameworks for general higher education and junior college vocational education cannot fully adapt to the theory-practice integrated curriculum mode of undergraduate programs in higher vocational universities. Based on the inherent features of curriculum teaching for undergraduate vocational programs, this paper sorts out the core

components of the evaluation system, explains the complete practice process of system construction, and explores a curriculum quality evaluation model matching the school-running orientation of undergraduate-level vocational education.

2. Content of teaching quality evaluation system for undergraduate courses in higher vocational universities

2.1. Evaluation index dimensions

The talent cultivation model of vocational undergraduate education emphasizes deep integration between technical skills and specialized theories. Curriculum evaluation frameworks need to cover core elements throughout the whole teaching process. Classroom teaching operation assesses the practical arrangement of teaching content, the construction of training scenarios, and the design of teacher-student interaction. Talent cultivation outcomes track the internalization of professional knowledge, post-adaptive skills and progressive improvement of comprehensive professional literacy among students. Teaching construction and development monitors the update rhythm of curriculum resources and tangible achievements generated from teaching research and innovation undertaken by teachers. Multiple assessment dimensions work in coordination to construct a comprehensive evaluation framework. The constructed framework can precisely adapt to the dual cultivation characteristics of vocational undergraduate education, which includes hierarchical academic training and vocational competency development.

2.2. Evaluation index weights

Variations in the orientation of talent cultivation define the allocation logic for evaluation indicator weights. Practical operational capacity in industrial environments forms the core competency of technology-oriented applied talents. Assessment items associated with practical teaching occupy dominant weight positions within the whole system and conform to practical employment standards set by industrial posts. Indicators for fundamental theoretical teaching maintain reasonable proportional shares to consolidate the underlying professional knowledge architecture of students. Supplementary weights are assigned to items concerning teaching innovation and long-term improvement to support continuous renewal and iteration of curriculum systems. Weight distribution receives appropriate adjustments according to categories of majors. Engineering and technology majors raise the weight proportion allocated to practical training activities, while humanities and service-oriented majors maintain a moderate balance of scoring ratios between theoretical learning and practical training. Weight calculation depends on post-competency models. Post-competency models extract competency elements required by frontline industrial posts. Each category of competency elements corresponds to specific curriculum teaching modules, and the relative importance of teaching modules is converted into numerical values for indicator weights. Colleges and universities may invite enterprise technical staff and core professional teachers to participate in weight discussions during weight formulation work. Joint participation reduces biases arising from subjective judgment made by a single stakeholder group. Customized weight allocation breaks the unified and homogenized evaluation mode. Assessment results generated under such allocation can reflect the genuine talent cultivation value delivered by individual courses.

2.3. Evaluation criteria

Scientific and complete evaluation scales consider both rigid assessment items and implicit teaching connotations to match the integrated theoretical and practical curriculum form of vocational undergraduate majors, and realize full-scale quantification and refined judgment of curriculum teaching quality. Quantitative assessment items rely on precise data for judgment [2]. Unified assessment scales are formulated for the implementation of teaching hours, frequency of practical training activities and academic achievement compliance of learners. Standardized quantitative indicators form intuitive data support for teaching quality judgment and eliminate ambiguous evaluation results caused by fuzzy empirical judgment. Qualitative assessment items focus on the intrinsic quality of teaching activities that cannot be fully quantified by digital indicators. Qualitative assessment judges the degree of matching between teaching designs and professional talent cultivation programs, as well as the integration effect of industrial cases embedded into teaching activities, and examines the rationality of teaching logic, the advanced nature of teaching concepts, and the practicality of teaching design. Evaluation scales also define descriptive boundaries corresponding to different rating grades, including excellent, good, qualified, and unqualified. Clear boundaries reduce judgment deviations induced by subjective comprehension from evaluation subjects and preserve comparability of evaluation outcomes across different courses and majors within the same major cluster. The two types of assessment scales complement and restrict one another in the actual evaluation process. Mutual complementation avoids inherent limitations brought by single evaluation modes and guarantees objective and comprehensive judgment results for curriculum quality, so that evaluation conclusions can truly reflect the overall level of curriculum teaching construction and provide a credible basis for subsequent teaching optimization and curriculum reform.

2.4. Evaluation implementation mechanism

The stable implementation of teaching quality evaluation achieves long-term quality control through systematic operation workflows. Multi-stakeholder participation mechanisms integrate viewpoints from teaching administrators, course instructors, enrolled students and enterprise practitioners. Multi-source viewpoints enrich the acquisition channels for evaluation data. Different evaluation subjects undertake differentiated evaluation assignments. Teaching administrators focus on inspection of standardization for overall course operation. Course instructors conduct self-evaluation covering the full teaching process. Enrolled students provide feedback on the learning experience obtained from classroom sessions. Enterprise practitioners evaluate the post-adaptation capacity of students. Various types of teaching information go through screening, sorting and analytical processing to form complete quality assessment reports. Data embedded in assessment reports serve for more than just judging teaching performance. Report data guide optimization of curriculum contents, renovation of teaching modes and enhancement of faculty competencies. Report materials are delivered synchronously to subjects responsible for curriculum construction. Responsible subjects draw up task lists for curriculum improvement according to report contents and track the implementation progress of all improvement tasks. The evaluation system stores evaluation records from every assessment round. Preserved records support longitudinal comparison of curriculum quality and establish a complete closed-loop management system covering information collection, evaluation, rectification and quality upgrading.

3. Practical approaches to constructing the teaching quality evaluation system for undergraduate courses in higher vocational universities

3.1. Determination of construction goals

Objective setting for the curriculum evaluation model is anchored on the baseline of talent cultivation defined by training programs for vocational undergraduate education. The objective setting accommodates two core demands, including curriculum quality monitoring and teaching improvement. Talent cultivation tracks the growth of comprehensive competencies among technical and skilled talents. Curriculum teaching content can achieve alignment with competency standards of industrial posts. The weight of single written examination scores in curriculum quality judgment is reduced. Curriculum evaluation also monitors the development level of students' engineering thinking and professional literacy. Such monitoring meets the requirements for interdisciplinary talent cultivation in vocational undergraduate education. Teaching management establishes stable measurement benchmarks for quality observation. The benchmarks support regular curriculum quality assessment by internal teaching management departments and mitigate biases derived from subjective evaluation. Measurement benchmarks enable horizontal comparison of curriculum data across multiple semesters. Teaching management departments can identify persistent problems emerging in curriculum construction. Teacher development reserves space for guiding teaching improvement. Course instructors receive guidance to adjust teaching designs actively and optimize the allocation of theoretical and practical teaching resources. Outputs generated from evaluation are accessible to course instructors. The accessible outputs underpin continuous teaching reflection conducted by course instructors. The three categories of objectives provide mutual support and define boundaries for model development. The defined boundaries prevent blind expansion of evaluation indicators and implementation rules away from institutional schooling orientation.

3.2. Implementation of demand investigation

Investigation activities collect authentic demands from multiple stakeholders involved in curriculum evaluation. The investigation scope includes internal teaching management staff, specialized course teachers, enrolled students and technical staff from cooperative enterprises. Questionnaire modules cover pain points in curriculum teaching, competency requirements for professional posts, and preferences for evaluation content to obtain quantitative feedback data. Questionnaires adopt a reasonable sample size matched with the student enrollment scale of each major and the number of cooperative enterprises [3]. Questionnaire distribution avoids periods with intensive teaching assessments to reduce external interference on response quality. Seminar sessions focus on the operational costs of evaluation procedures and the application value of evaluation information to tap implicit demands unavailable from questionnaire surveys. Group interviews are adopted for seminar sessions. Independent groups record viewpoints separately, and transcript verification of interview records reduces errors in information conversion. Talent cultivation documents for relevant majors and industrial post specifications are included in the list of investigation materials to provide external references for the design of evaluation items. All investigation materials are sorted, filed and cross-compared to distinguish common demands and differentiated demands among various stakeholders. Research teams trace and evaluate conflicting demands and identify position differences behind demand divergence. The research work establishes criteria for trade-offs in subsequent scheme design and mitigates resistance to the implementation of the evaluation system.

3.3. Preliminary scheme design

Scheme design builds the overall evaluation framework on the basis of various demand materials obtained from previous investigations. The construction follows defined evaluation indicator dimensions, weight allocation rules and judgment criteria strictly. All indicator items are decomposed in the design process. Data collection channels corresponding to each indicator are refined one by one. Three distinct information acquisition paths are clarified, including on-site classroom observation, academic achievement retrieval and enterprise feedback collection. Corresponding information collection cycles are configured for different acquisition paths to sustain continuous updates of evaluation data. Weight assignment draws fully on verified research findings from peer colleges. Initial numerical values are formulated with consideration of practical schooling characteristics of institutional major clusters. Weight assignment activities organize joint discussions among internal professional teachers and enterprise experts to reduce one-sidedness in weight configuration. Evaluation criteria contain quantitative scoring items and qualitative description items. Clear boundaries are set for scoring authority belonging to different evaluation subjects. Separate calculation standards are adopted for scoring results from different evaluation subjects to avoid distortion caused by score superposition. Supporting evaluation forms, data summarization templates and basic frameworks for quality analysis reports are developed concurrently. The supporting documents minimize data sorting workload in subsequent evaluation implementation. The complete scheme maintains structural integrity while reserving flexible adjustment room. Reserved room facilitates modification and refinement in the subsequent demonstration stage.

3.4. Scheme demonstration and inspection

Personnel from multiple fields are organized to conduct multi-dimensional inspection of the preliminary scheme in the demonstration and verification stage. Participants include teaching management specialists, professional leaders, enterprise technical experts and educational researchers. Text inspection checks the degree of matching between indicator items and teaching standards for vocational undergraduate education. Text inspection screens out items with vague definitions and uncontrollable evaluation scales. The inspection also verifies compatibility between indicator collection methods and existing teaching management platforms of colleges and identifies indicator items incompatible with current management systems. A small number of specialized courses are selected for trial operation in simulation tests. Simulation tests record time consumption of evaluation workflows and examine consistency in indicator comprehension across different evaluation subjects. Training sessions on indicator interpretation are arranged for evaluation subjects in trial operation to reduce interference from cognitive bias on evaluation outcomes. Preliminary reliability analysis is performed on evaluation data generated from trial operation to assess the capacity of indicators to distinguish teaching quality of different courses consistently. Validity testing proceeds simultaneously to verify alignment between indicator contents and core elements of curriculum teaching quality. All opinions raised during the demonstration process are recorded. Recorded opinions are categorized into framework defects, expression ambiguities and operational constraints. The demonstration team conducts classified judgment on all opinions and forms complete documentary records of demonstration activities.

3.5. Scheme revision and improvement

Revision work carries out hierarchical adjustment of the evaluation scheme based on all opinion materials collected in the demonstration and verification stage. Clear explanatory texts are supplemented for indicator

items with ambiguous definitions, and items that cannot obtain valid information are removed. Sections with obvious deviations in weight setting receive numerical recalibration with reference to trial operation data. Recalibration balances the discourse power of multiple stakeholders in evaluation. Evaluation forms and supporting templates undergo synchronous optimization. Redundant filling items are streamlined to reduce workload in evaluation implementation. Revised documents are submitted to teaching management departments for internal filing. Supporting operation guidelines are compiled to define responsibility boundaries of evaluation subjects and norms for information collection [4]. Operation guidelines also specify time schedules and quality check points for evaluation activities. Revised documents enter continuous observation within a limited scope. Feedback is collected persistently to support long-term dynamic updating of the evaluation model.

4. Conclusion

The construction of a teaching quality evaluation system for undergraduate courses in higher vocational universities requires both theoretical rationality of the evaluation framework and systematic construction procedures. Evaluation index dimensions, weight allocation, evaluation criteria and implementation mechanisms constitute the core of the system. The multi-stakeholder collaborative operation mode guarantees diversified sources of evaluation information. The complete construction process connects goal setting, demand investigation, scheme design, demonstration verification and document revision, forming a progressive system development model. Universities can continuously optimize evaluation items and operation rules combined with the school-running characteristics of their professional clusters. Regular evaluation activities can promote continuous improvement of curriculum teaching connotation and better meet the talent training demands of undergraduate-level vocational education.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] He SS, Jia YL, Wang MJ, 2025, Research on Improvement Path and Guarantee System of Core School-Running Capacity for Undergraduate Vocational Education. Mechanical Vocational Education, (2): 13–21.

[2] Shi YW, 2025, Value Orientation and Practical Strategy of Quality Culture Construction in Undergraduate Vocational Colleges. Journal of Hebei Vocational University of Science and Technology, 42(4): 10–15.

[3] Jin HH, Ning XM, Guo JR, et al., 2025, Research on Upgraded Majors from Higher Vocational Colleges in Undergraduate Vocational Education. Contemporary Animal Husbandry, (12): 100–102.

[4] Wang LJ, Wu HH, 2014, Reform Exploration on Constructing Teaching Quality Evaluation System for Applied Undergraduate Courses. China Electric Power Education, (23): 11–12.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.