ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (ISRGJAHSS)

ISRG PUBLISHERS
Abbreviated Key Title: ISRG J Arts Humanit Soc Sci
ISSN: 2583-7672 (Online)
Journal homepage: https://isrgpublishers.com/isrgjahss
Volume – IV Issue -I (January- February) 2026
Frequency: Bimonthly

Research Progress on the Effectiveness Evaluation of "Curriculum-Based Ideological and Political Education"

Hou Yongmei

Department of Psychology, School of Humanities and Management, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, Guangdong, China

| **Received:** 26.01.2026 | **Accepted:** 02.02.2026 | **Published:** 07.02.2026

***Corresponding author:** Hou Yongmei

Department of Psychology, School of Humanities and Management, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, Guangdong, China

Abstract

Background: *Curriculum-based ideological and political education (CBIPE) serves as a pivotal measure to fulfill the fundamental task of fostering students' moral character.*

Objective: To comprehend the progress in research on the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE, aiming to offer insights for enhancing teaching and educational practices in universities.

Methods: *We searched for relevant articles over the past 20 years on databases such as CNKI, Wanfang, Baidu Scholar, Google, and PubMed, using keywords like "university curriculum-based ideological and political education + evaluation," "university curriculum-based ideological and political education +implementation challenges," and "university curriculum-based ideological and political education + optimization strategies."*

Results: *Previous studies have indicated that the theoretical foundation of the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE is extensive and profound. However, it is imperative to adhere to principles such as multi-stakeholder participation, multi-dimension content, equal emphasis on process and outcomes, and a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Nevertheless, current research still faces challenges such as incomplete evaluation content, inconsistent evaluation standards, and singular evaluation methods, making it difficult for evaluation results to reflect the actual effectiveness of CBIPE.*

Conclusion: *Future research should further explore the dynamic nature of the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE, focus on the long-term effects, and adapt the evaluation system according to disciplinary contexts.*

Keywords: Curriculum-based ideological and political education (CBIPE) ; Evaluation mechanism ; Evaluation methods

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

1. Definition of related concepts

1.1 Ideological and political education

Ideological and political education is a social practice activity with distinct characteristics of the times and nationality, emphasizing comprehensive human development. It focuses on strengthening personal education in ideology, moral concepts, and thought and behavior, in order to promote individuals to cultivate positive political literacy and ideological concepts in the context of diversified social development, and to safeguard the core position of the mainstream national values [1].

1.2 Curriculum-based ideological and political education

CBIPE is an invisible educational concept [2] which refers to the development and utilization of ideological and political education elements in academic and professional courses, including theoretical knowledge, value concepts, and spiritual pursuits. These elements are integrated into professional course, leveraging the ideological and political education functions inherent in all courses. This approach enables various courses to work in concert with ideological and political courses, achieving an organic unity of "knowledge impartation" and "value guidance". It subtly exerts a positive influence on students' thoughts and behaviors, aiming to construct a comprehensive educational framework that involves all personnel, covers the entire process, and encompasses all aspects [2].

1.3 Teaching evaluation

Evaluation represents the process of a subject making value judgments on an object. Teaching evaluation is a process of objective judgment and exploratory research on the actual or potential value of teachers' teaching and students' learning behaviors throughout the entire teaching process. It is an important organic component of teaching systems across all disciplines and majors, playing a significant role in supervising teaching processes, guiding teaching implementation, evaluating teaching effectiveness, and promoting teaching reform [3]. The most crucial aspect is the evaluation of learning outcomes and the overall teaching process [4].

The evaluation of CBIPE serves as a means to assess the implementation of such education. It involves analyzing and verifying elements and aspects of the integrated curriculum, in order to determine whether the implementation meets the standards or achieves a certain level.

1.4 Evaluation Indicator System

Due to the abstract and non-operational nature of evaluation objectives, in order to achieve the evaluation purpose, it is necessary to strictly follow the constructing principles and decompose the evaluation objectives into specific, actionable, and quantifiable items that reflect the interconnections between various parts within the evaluation object. These items constitute the evaluation indicators [3]. The evaluation system is an organic system that encompasses elements such as evaluation purpose, evaluation indicators, indicator weights, and evaluation criteria [3].

2. Theoretical Basis for Evaluating the Effectiveness of CBIPE

In the research on the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE, scholars have extensively referenced various theories such as BSC theory, CIPP model, Kirkpatrick's model, authentic assessment theory, stakeholder theory, and Vygotsky's theory.

2.1 BSC Theory

2.1.1The connotation of BSC theory

The Balanced Score Card (BSC) Theory, invented by Kaplan and Norton of Harvard Business School and refined through three generations, is a tool for performance management. It represents a novel performance management system that translates organizational strategies into operational metrics and target values from four perspectives: finance, customers, internal operations, and learning and growth. The BSC primarily facilitates strategic planning through diagrams, cards, and tables. It emphasizes the measurement of organizational performance from multiple angles, encompassing not only financial outcomes but also non-financial indicators such as customer satisfaction, internal process efficiency, and learning and growth [5].

2.1.2 The Inspiration of BSC Theory on the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of CBIPE

BSC theory manifests in the construction of a multidimensional and comprehensive evaluation system by introducing multiple dimensions such as the comparison between customers (students), internal processes (teaching content and methods), learning and growth (faculty development), funding investment, and output results.

2.2 Koch's Model

2.2.1The connotation of the Koch's Model

The Kirkpatrick Model, proposed by Donald Kirkpatrick in 1959, aims to provide a clear framework and assist organizations in systematically measuring the training effectiveness. Initially applied to the evaluation of corporates, this model has since been extended to various types of organizations, including educational institutions, government agencies, and private enterprises. This model assesses the effectiveness through 4 levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and result [6].

The Reaction level evaluates participants' reactions to training activities, that is, their satisfaction with the training and whether the training is attractive. Its contribution lies in understanding the initial acceptance of participants. The Learning level measures the growth of participants in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and self-confidence. Its contribution lies in directly indicating whether the training has achieved its educational objectives and whether participants have truly understood and absorbed the training content. The Behavior level assesses the extent to which participants apply the knowledge learned in the training to their work. Its contribution lies in reflecting whether the training has been translated into actual work improvements, which is crucial for enterprises to measure the return on investment in training. The Results level measures the impact of training on business outcomes, such as productivity, sales growth, cost reduction, or customer satisfaction improvement. Its contribution lies in providing final evidence to demonstrate the direct business value of training activities to the organization [6].

2.2.2The inspiration of the Kirkpatrick Model for evaluating the effectiveness of CBIPE

Kirkpatrick's Model primarily manifested in the construction of a comprehensive, all-encompassing, and multi-level evaluation index system. The evaluation integrates students' internal perceptions with external behaviors, encompassing their responses to teaching, as well as learning behaviors, abilities, and outcomes. Furthermore, the evaluation system for CBIPE based on Kirkpatrick's Model, provides a clear direction for the

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

implementation of this approach. It not only emphasizes knowledge impartation but also focuses on value guidance, ability cultivation, and moral character enhancement.

2.3 CIPP Model

2.3.1The connotation of the CIPP Model

The CIPP Model, also known as the "Improvement-Oriented Evaluation Model," is a management-oriented evaluation model proposed by American scholar Daniel L. Stufflebeam in 1966. It centers on decision-making and emphasizes the value orientation of social utility. It is widely applied in fields such as educational assessment and project management. This model views educational evaluation as a decision-oriented activity, emphasizing the scientificity and effectiveness. Its purpose is not to prove, but to emphasize the comprehensive, dynamic, and feedback nature of evaluation, that is, to comprehensively cover the evaluation of curricula and make a comprehensive judgment on various elements and environments of educational activities, in order to promote the improvement and perfection of educational programs [3].

The CIPP model provides organizations with a comprehensive evaluation perspective by introducing multiple dimensions such as Context Evaluation, Input Evaluation, Process Evaluation, and Product Evaluation. Context Evaluation focuses on diagnosing the rationality of objectives, where researchers assess needs, problems, resources, and strengths through systematic reviews and literature surveys. Input Evaluation measures the feasibility of resource allocation, evaluating the conditions, resources, and strengths required to achieve objectives, ensuring overall consideration. Process Evaluation involves dynamic monitoring, continuously supervising, inspecting, and providing feedback during the implementation of the plan to achieve improvement. Product Evaluation verifies the degree of achievement of objectives, achieving the purpose of verifying the differences between the results and objectives [3].

2.3.2The inspiration of CIPP Model for evaluating the effectiveness of CBIPE

CIPP constructs a closed-loop process from background analysis to outcome verification by embedding evaluation into the core links of the project. Its outcome evaluation can be implemented in stages or conducted after the project is completed, and it has given rise to evaluation systems in areas such as professional group construction, teacher training, and digital transformation of higher education, providing a full-process evaluation perspective.

2.4 Stakeholder Theory

2.4.1The Connotation of Stakeholder Theory

The stakeholder Theory was proposed in "Strategic Management: An Analytical Approach to Stakeholder Management" by Freeman. Stakeholders are individuals who rely on businesses to achieve their personal goals, while businesses also rely on them for survival. For businesses, stakeholders include shareholders, creditors, employees, consumers, suppliers, and other trading partners, as well as individuals or organizations that directly or indirectly affected by business activities, like government departments, local residents, media, and environmental groups [7].

The stakeholder Theory posits that the actions and decisions of any organization have an impact on the interests of all stakeholders, thus necessitating the consideration of their opinions. In contrast to the traditional shareholder primacy, this theory asserts that the development of any company is inseparable from the input or participation of stakeholders. The enterprise pursues the overall interests of all stakeholders, rather than merely certain individuals [7].

2.4.2Practical significance and limitations of Stakeholder Theory

The emergence of Stakeholder Theory has profound theoretical and practical backgrounds. With the development of the times, the status of material capital owners in companies has gradually weakened, while the importance of non-material capital such as human capital and social capital has become increasingly prominent. This change has prompted people to question the traditional core concept that "a company is owned by individuals and institutions who hold its common stock". In practice, Stakeholder Theory helps companies better balance the interests of all parties and improve corporate performance. By involving stakeholders in joint governance, companies can attract more specialized asset investments while reducing stakeholders' risk concerns, thereby contributing to the long-term stable development of the company [7].

Although Stakeholder Theory holds significant application value in organizational management, it exhibits limitations. For instance, the classification of stakeholders remain ambiguous, lacking unified standards and scientific rigor. Furthermore, this theory has yet to establish a comprehensive theoretical framework, with diverse research methodologies but a lack of integration. Additionally, there is no conclusive empirical evidence to support the validity of the theory regarding the relationship between stakeholder governance and corporate performance.

2.4.3The inspiration of Stakeholder Theory on educational evaluation

In the field of education, the stakeholder theory provides a multi-subject evaluation perspective by introducing stakeholders such as students, teachers, school administrators, industry enterprises, parents, and communities. It emphasizes multi-party participation, value co-creation, and dynamic balance, which means that evaluation is not only a means to test the curriculum but also an activity to coordinate the interests of all parties. This approach helps to construct a more comprehensive and practical evaluation framework, facilitating the educational goals.

2.5 Vygotsky's theory

The core of Vygotsky's theory lies in social constructivism, emphasizing the importance of the interaction between social environment and individual cognition, as well as the process of internalization. Vygotsky's theory provides a new perspective for teaching evaluation, with the key being to shift evaluation from a static, one-sided "measurement of results" to a dynamic, interactive "promotion of development" process [8].

2.5.1Theoretical connotation

1. **Evaluation Focus: From "Existing Level" to "Development Potential"**

Traditional assessments focus on students' "current level of development" in completing tasks independently. Vygotsky, however, proposed that assessments should pay more attention to the "zone of proximal development" — the gap between a student's current level and the "potential level" they can achieve with others' help. This implies that the focus of assessment is on students' developmental possibilities, rather than the end point of their current abilities [8].

2. **Evaluation method: From "static measurement" to "dynamic assessment"**

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

Based on the theory of "Zone of Proximal Development", Vygotsky advocates dynamic assessment. This is an interactive and process-oriented method, typically conducted within teaching interventions. Processual: ① Assessment is embedded in the teaching process, observing students as they gradually solve problems through the "scaffolding" provided by teachers (such as prompts and guidance). ② Interactive: Assessing students' performance with assistance allows for the inference of their potential for independent learning and the type of support they require. ③Developmental: The purpose of assessment is not to label students, but to plan the next steps in teaching and provide "scaffolding" for students to reach higher levels [8].

3. Evaluation function: From "discrimination and judgment" to "promoting development"

Under the framework of Vygotsky, the core function of evaluation has undergone a fundamental transformation:① diagnosing developmental needs: by identifying students' "zone of proximal development", evaluation can accurately diagnose students' current developmental stage and the optimal entry point for their next learning step. ②Guiding teaching interventions: evaluation results are directly translated into teaching strategies, and teachers provide appropriate "scaffolding" accordingly to help students leapfrog their zone of proximal development. ③Promoting metacognition: this interactive assessment process itself helps students internalize knowledge and strategies, develop metacognitive abilities, and lay the foundation for future independent learning [8].

2.5.2 Implications for the reform of teaching evaluation

Vygotsky's theory provides profound guidance for the current teaching evaluation reform that emphasizes "student-centeredness" and "core competencies": ① Promoting the innovation of evaluation concepts: It shifts the focus from "what has been learned" to "how to learn" and "how to learn better," emphasizing the role of learning processes, thinking strategies, and social interaction. ② Supporting personalized evaluation: Dynamic assessment provides a theoretical basis for implementing personalized and differentiated evaluations, helping to meet the developmental needs of different students. ③Integrating into the educational evaluation system: The concept of dynamic assessment can be integrated into modern evaluation methods such as formative evaluation and performance evaluation, capturing students' "zone of proximal development" and growth trajectory through learning portfolios, classroom observation records, teacher-student dialogue analysis, and other methods [8].

2.5.3 Application in the evaluation of the effectiveness of CBIPE

This is specifically manifested in the following 4 aspects: Firstly, the evaluation content should be selected from fresh and vibrant social information resources, ensuring that the teaching content closely aligns with the needs of social. Secondly, teachers should be guided in designing teaching activities and projects to help students effectively internalize knowledge, subtly implementing CBIPE. Thirdly, Vygotsky believes that language is a tool for thinking, as well as a tool for self-regulation and reflection. Therefore, teachers need to guide students' thinking through language expression, promoting the development of students' self-regulation and reflection abilities. Finally, Vygotsky emphasizes the important role of interaction, and one of the evaluation indicators for CBIPE is classroom interaction, such as immersive learning through role-playing.

2.6 Authentic Assessment Theory

2.6.1 Basic connotation

The theory of authentic assessment involves allowing students to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and qualities through practical tasks in real or simulated real-life situations, rather than relying solely on paper-and-pencil tests. Its core principle is "learning by doing, assessing through doing," emphasizing the integration of assessment and the learning process. It aims to shift the focus of assessment from "solving problems" to "real-world application," making it particularly suitable for designing dynamic tasks that can truly reflect students' abilities [9].

2.6.2 Core features

1. Situational: Tasks are based on real-life scenarios, such as designing a community environmental protection plan, rather than merely discussing environmental protection concepts. (2) Flexibility: Students are allowed to demonstrate their abilities in different ways, such as writing reports, giving speeches, or creating videos, while respecting individual differences. (3) Holistic: Focus is placed on comprehensive abilities, such as problem-solving and teamwork, rather than isolated knowledge points. (4) Developmental: Evaluation itself is part of the learning process [9].

2.6.3 Implementation path

1. Design authentic tasks: The tasks should be complex and meaningful, such as simulating a courtroom debate or planning a campus event.
2. Clarify evaluation criteria: Let students know the scoring criteria in advance, such as using a rubric to assess logical thinking and innovation.
3. Adopt multiple evaluation methods: Combine observation, portfolios, student self-assessment, and peer assessment to comprehensively collect information.
4. Build a multi-participant evaluation system: Teachers, classmates, parents, and even community members can participate in the evaluation and provide multi-dimensional feedback[9].

2.6.4Application in the evaluation of the effectiveness of CBIPE

It is primarily manifested through the comprehensive training and assessment of intrinsic values and extrinsic professional skills through the setting of authentic work tasks. Firstly, the results of evaluation can be a product, work, or performance, which can reflect the potential for future real-world work. Secondly, the evaluation content is required to be authentic in social contexts, by setting tasks similar to real-world work to assess students' problem-solving abilities. Furthermore, the implementation of evaluation shows that it can improve students' attitudes towards studies, enhance their communication skills, and boost their employability.

2.7 Hidden Curriculum Theory

2.7.1 The Connotation of Hidden Curriculum Theory

In 1968, American scholar Jackson first introduced the concept of "hidden curriculum" in "Class Life", also known as the implicit curriculum, as opposed to the explicit curriculum [10]. Scholars have interpreted the concept of "hidden curriculum" from various perspectives. Jackson proposed that the hidden curriculum can be used as a medium to improve students' moral concepts, thoughts, and emotions, enabling the subtle development of students' moral character and personality. Swedish educationalist Husen [11] believed that the hidden curriculum refers to those aspects that are

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

not explicitly taught, yet are inaccessible. Most domestic scholars believe that the hidden curriculum is a type of curriculum through which schools implicitly enable students to acquire experiences in an unconscious state and influence their moral and value concepts [12]. In summary, the hidden curriculum is characterized by its unpredictability, concealment, and arbitrariness. It represents the subtle influence in informal courses, providing moral education in an indirect and implicit manner, yet achieving long-term educational effects.

2.7.2 The inspiration of Hidden Curriculum Theory on CBIPE

The characteristics of Hidden Curriculum Theory align with the concept of CBIPE. The construction of CBIPE aims to explore the ideological and political elements beyond the ideological and political courses, and to fully leverage the educational value of each course. Applying Hidden Curriculum Theory to the education of students' values differs from the education provided in ideological and political courses. Ideological and political courses are specialized courses that directly educate students on morality, while CBIPE emphasizes embedding value education in the impartation of knowledge and the cultivation of abilities. It requires fully exploring the ideological value and spiritual connotation in non-ideological and political courses, in order to achieve an imperceptible and subtle educational effect on students.

It is evident that Hidden Curriculum Theory provides theoretical guidance for CBIPE. By exploring the potential ideological and political elements in each course, students can receive ideological and political education while acquiring professional knowledge and skills.

2.8 Constructivist Theory

2.8.1 The connotation of Constructivist Theory

The representative figure of Constructivist Theory is the Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget. This theory [13] posits that learning involves a change in the learner's cognitive structure. In other words, learning is the process of reconstructing a new knowledge structure based on the existing knowledge structure. "Assimilation" and "accommodation" are two modes of learning. "Assimilation" refers to the process by which individuals incorporate external things into their existing cognitive structure during interaction with the environment. "Accommodation" refers to the process by which individuals adjust their existing cognitive structure to adapt to environmental changes when it cannot assimilate new experiences, that is, to reorganize and transform their cognitive structure [13]. Through assimilation and accommodation, an individual's cognitive structure continuously achieves a new equilibrium. In the process of constructing cognitive structure, individuals continuously experience a cycle of "equilibrium - disequilibrium - new equilibrium" to gradually enrich and develop their cognitive structure. At the same time, this theory also believes that the process of acquiring knowledge is a learner's active process of meaning construction, in which the teacher acts as a facilitator of meaning construction.

2.8.2 The inspiration of Constructivist Theory on CBIPE

CBIPE requires teachers to fully exert their dominant role in teaching, deeply explore the ideological values and spiritual connotations contained in the professional knowledge system, and give full play to the subjective role of students, guiding them to actively construct new knowledge based on their existing knowledge and experience. This is consistent with the viewpoint of constructivist theory. Therefore, when selecting resources for ideological and political education, teachers need to fully consider students' existing knowledge and experience, choose cases closely related to their lives, to achieve resonance with students, so that students can receive ideological and political education while learning knowledge.

2.9 Developmental Curriculum Evaluation Theory

The concept of developmental evaluation is grounded in reflection on educational practice and practical educational issues, representing a forward-looking educational evaluation philosophy. Guided by the concept of developmental evaluation, Developmental Curriculum Evaluation Theory aims to meet the common development needs of both the curriculum and students. The evaluation process primarily involves making value judgments on the planning, structure, implementation, and implementation outcomes of the curriculum **[14]**.

2.9.1 The connotation of developmental curriculum evaluation theory

Developmental Curriculum Evaluation Theory embodies 3 fundamental concepts **[14]**:

1. **Student-centered development**

Developmental curriculum evaluation emphasizes that the curriculum evaluation should be student-oriented. It aims to establish a robust curriculum quality assurance mechanism that facilitates students' comprehensive development through curriculum evaluation. Consequently, it has shifted away from past evaluations that were biased towards knowledge, focusing instead on assessing students' overall qualities. The specific changes are as follows: firstly, it no longer focuses solely on evaluating the cognitive domain, but instead emphasizes multi-faceted evaluation across both the cognitive and emotional-moral domains; secondly, it no longer emphasizes mastery of a single subject, but instead underscores the application of interdisciplinary knowledge; thirdly, it extends beyond evaluating students' past performance to encompassing evaluations of their past, present, and future; lastly, it no longer solely focuses on evaluating learning outcomes, but instead evaluates both learning outcomes and the learning process.

2. **Promote continuous improvement and enhancement of the curriculum**

Developmental curriculum evaluation emphasizes process evaluation, integrating curriculum evaluation throughout the entire process of curriculum. This facilitates timely identification and resolution of issues by both curriculum evaluators and developers. Additionally, this theory pays attention to unintended effects. Generally, it is believed that curriculum effects can be accurately predicted. However, due to various factors that influence the outcomes of curriculum, some unintended effects may arise. Sometimes, these unintended effects may have a greater impact on curriculum than the intended effects. Therefore, paying attention to unintended effects helps to further enhance the quality of curriculum.

3. **Diversity-oriented**

Past curriculum evaluations mostly emphasized the unification of evaluation subjects, standards, and methods. Developmental curriculum evaluation focuses on the diversification of evaluation requires the following: First, dialogue. To avoid relativism in evaluation, it is necessary to establish a reasonable dialogue mechanism to eliminate opinion differences among evaluation subjects. Second, openness. The diversification of subjects, methods, and values in the evaluation requires a balance point.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

Third, reflection. Through reflection on curriculum development, implementation, and effects, sustainable development of the curriculum can be achieved.

2.9.2 The enlightenment of Developmental Curriculum Evaluation Theory on CBIPE

Curriculum serves as the carrier of CBIPE. Developmental Curriculum Evaluation Theory holds significant reference value for this approach. For instance, firstly, it incorporates various characteristics of students, including knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors, into the evaluation index system. This aims to promote student development through evaluation. Secondly, it divides the evaluation index system for the entire process of CBIPE into 3 parts: teaching preparation, implementation, and feedback. This demonstrates that evaluation focuses not only on teaching outcomes but also on the teaching process. Lastly, the construction of the index system should reflect a diversified evaluation concept, especially in terms of multi-angle and multi-directional evaluation of the optimized supply of CBIPE content, teaching methods, and teaching outcomes.

3. The overall inspiration of educational theory on CBIPE

In summary, educational theories have different applicable models in different periods and scopes, and all possess certain values. They play an important guiding role in the evaluation research of ideological and political education integrated into the curriculum in certain aspects. In addition to considering the alignment between objectives and outcomes, the evaluation of CBIPE should also focus on students' needs in terms of emotions and cognition. A model that integrates quantitative and qualitative evaluation should be applied to comprehensively grasp the situation.

Both CIPP model and Stakeholder Theory advocate evaluating the effectiveness of teaching content and methods through student feedback, and assessing the improvement of teaching quality through teachers' professional growth and team development. Simultaneously, these two models consider the allocation of school resources to ensure the smooth teaching activities. Furthermore, the BSC theory, CIPP model, and Stakeholder Theory all emphasize the balance between long-term and short-term goals, providing suggestions for the formulation and implementation of CBIPE from different objects (teachers, students, teaching administrators, employers) and application scenarios (the preparation, implementation, conclusion , and feedback stage of a course). This requires individuals to consider not only the pursuit of immediate teaching effects but also to enhance long-term educational quality through continuous professional development.

Kirkpatrick Model, grounded in BSC Theory, CIPP model, and Stakeholder Theory, possesses a richer connotation, clearer delineation of various stages of the evaluated activity such as teaching, and stronger operability.

The theories of Vygotsky, Constructivism, and Developmental Curriculum Evaluation all emphasize the development of students' intelligence and psychology. The essence of Vygotsky's theory lies in utilizing the "Zone of Proximal Development" to fully tap into the potential of both teachers and students. This theory emphasizes the role of interaction and language in the development of thinking, requiring teachers to create appropriate interactive scenarios based on students' specific levels, strengthen the design of teaching processes, and utilize media such as language and symbols to bridge the connection between knowledge and value, achieving the transformation from existing to a higher knowledge level, as well as the transformation between knowledge, thinking, and values. Constructivism focuses on how to integrate new knowledge into existing knowledge systems through assimilation and accommodation. Similar to Vygotsky's theory, emphasize interaction and the connection between old and new knowledge. The difference lies in that constructivism emphasizes individual effort, while Vygotsky pays more attention to the role of social factors. The theory of developmental curriculum evaluation focuses on how to achieve comprehensive physical and mental development and mastery of knowledge and skills through the design and implementation of the entire process of curriculum and education.

The significance of authentic assessment lies in teaching, learning, and evaluation in real-life situations. The assessment results are highly objective, measurable, and provide practical guidance. However, creating authentic scenarios is often challenging. In contrast, the theory of hidden curriculum emphasizes elements in teaching and learning that are difficult or even impossible to clearly understand and measure, but cannot be ignored for student development. From this perspective, it aligns closely with the teaching philosophy of CBIPE. The difficulty lies in how to use explicit evaluation indicators to reflect the implicit effects.

4. Current research status of CBIPE

4.1 Characteristics of effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE

The main characteristics of the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE are as follows [15]. Firstly, it combines the characteristics of course and teaching evaluation. CBIPE emphasizes the deep exploration of potential ideological and political elements in professional courses. To achieve this goal, teaching activities must be regarded as the "main battlefield," which determines that CBIPE must be guided by teaching evaluation. Secondly, it is the organic integration of ideological and political course and professional course evaluation. CBIPE emphasizes the integration of "value guidance into knowledge impartation and ability cultivation." Therefore, the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE combines the evaluation of professional courses and ideological and political literacy. Thirdly, the effectiveness of CBIPE is not easy to evaluate, but it must be evaluated. The comprehensive promotion of CBIPE aims to better leverage the educational role of each course, emphasizing the integration of value shaping, knowledge impartation, and ability cultivation to provide implicit education for students. This makes it difficult to accurately separate and quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness. Therefore, the teaching evaluation should be conducted through multiple subjects, methods, and channels.

4.2 Evaluation function of University CBIPE

Effectiveness evaluation is a crucial aspect in enhancing the quality of university CBIPE, playing significant roles in diagnosis, guidance, regulation, and motivation [16].

4.2.1. Diagnostic function

Evaluation can promptly reveal the current status and existing issues, serving as a diagnostic tool. CBIPE is a developing matter with a wide range of implications. Establishing an evaluation index system for this education helps accurately identify problems and their causes that arise during implementation, and proposes targeted solutions to prevent future issues [16].

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

4.2.2. Guiding function

Evaluation is often influenced by socio-political, economic, and cultural factors, implicitly reflecting people's certain value orientations. The greatest function of CBIPE lies in guiding core values, enabling students to better grasp professional knowledge and serve society under the edification of mainstream culture. The effectiveness evaluation helps to reasonably judge whether the curriculum's orientation deviates from society's core values [16].

4.2.3. Regulatory function

The evaluation results can reflect the effectiveness of CBIPE. Based on the feedback information, administrators and teachers can grasp the status of ideological and political education integrated into each course or a specific course at this stage, and judge whether their work meets the standards. Students can understand their own learning situation at some stage, thereby providing a basis for improving the work [16].

4.2.4. Incentive function

The evaluation results not only provide feedback information for course implementers but also serve as an incentive for them. Upon seeing the achievements, implementers will assess the degree of goal attainment and strive to improve related work [16].

4.3 Principles for evaluating the effectiveness of CBIPE

4.3.1Principle of objectivity

Objectivity and fairness are the fundamental requirements for evaluation. Firstly, the evaluation criteria must be objective and free from arbitrariness. Secondly, the evaluation methods must be objective, adopting different methods based on the nature of the discipline to ensure the effectiveness, and avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach. Lastly, the attitude must be objective, coordinating the value perspectives of evaluators. Evaluation should not be based on subjective assumptions or personal emotions, but rather on facts, conducted seriously and fairly [17].

4.3.2 Principle of processuality

CBIPE is not a mere "addition" to the curriculum, but rather a methodology that should permeate the entire process of education [17]. It encompasses both the general teaching objectives of the curriculum and specific moral education goals. This necessitates that when constructing an evaluation index system, attention should be paid to the entire process of education and teaching, ensuring the fundamental task of cultivating students' moral character is fulfilled. Classroom teaching serves as the "main channel" for ideological and political education. It is essential to deeply explore the elements of ideological and political education integrated into the curriculum, seamlessly integrate them into classroom teaching, achieve a subtle and imperceptible effect, and highlight the process-oriented nature of the evaluation of CBIPE.

4.3.3 Principle of development

The evaluation criteria are not static. They should be appropriately adjusted according to different schools and majors, and improved and optimized based on practical feedback. The "Guidelines for the Construction of Ideological and Political Education Integrated into University Courses" issued by the Ministry of Education clearly states that the construction of CBIPE should be promoted in accordance with the characteristics of different majors. Therefore, evaluation system should focus on administrators, teachers, and students, and be continuously adjusted in line with the unique characteristics of universities, ensuring it keeps pace with the times [17].

4.3.4 Principle of operability

The evaluation of CBIPE necessitates a set of indicators that elucidate the characteristics of various entities. Hence, the evaluation indicators should be concise, specific, interconnected, observable, quantifiable, and easy to implement and promote [17].

4.4 Subjects and objects

The evaluation subject addresses the question of "who evaluates". CBIPE requires teachers to be not only transmitters of knowledge but also guides of student values. Teachers are the main force in CBIPE, the primary implementers and responsible parties of teaching, and have the most direct and intuitive understanding of the situation. It is indisputable to make teachers the subject of evaluation. Since CBIPE involves the evaluation of implicit indicators such as students' will, emotions, attitudes, and thoughts, student participation is required. However, students find it difficult to grasp evaluation elements, and the design of CBIPE also struggles to stimulate students' enthusiasm for active participation. Therefore, teacher self-evaluation or peer evaluation can be adopted, and external evaluation can also be conducted by personnel such as ideological and political course teachers, professional course teachers, administrators, and students [15].

Regarding the objects, there are three perspectives: "evaluating teachers", "evaluating teaching effectiveness", and "evaluating courses". Different definitions lead to significant differences in the focus and direction of evaluation [15].

The first tendency is to "evaluate teachers". It believes that the focus of evaluation content is on the impact of teachers on students' thoughts and moral qualities. However, due to the diverse teaching styles, teaching contents, and ways of influencing students among teachers, it is difficult to operate. The second tendency holds that we should "evaluate courses". The evaluation of courses mainly focuses on whether the implementation of teaching conforms to the requirements of CBIPE. It can be evaluated from 4 aspects: teachers' attitudes towards lesson preparation and teaching, the implementation of teaching objectives, the selection and integration of teaching content, and the teaching methods. This evaluation considers professional characteristics and content, but it is prone to overlap with conventional educational and teaching evaluations. The third tendency believes that we should "evaluate students", mainly focusing on students' learning outcomes. It can be evaluated from 3 aspects: students' professional attitudes, ethical and moral concepts, and understanding of scientific research. The rationale is that students are the objects of teaching, and the purpose of teaching is to cultivate students' physical or intellectual qualities. So the evaluation of teaching effectiveness should focus on students' learning outcomes. However, when it comes to CBIPE, it is quite difficult to measure whether students have been influenced. If relying solely on subjective evaluation, the cost is too high and the efficiency is relatively low.

4.5 Evaluating methods

It is crucial to consider both the evaluation of teaching contents and implementation outcomes, making the selection of appropriate evaluation methods particularly important.

4.5.1Combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluation

Quantitative evaluation refers to the application of mathematical methods to collect relevant elements and data pertaining to CBIPE, and to quantitatively compare and analyze these elements and data, thereby assessing the education effectiveness. The advantage of

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

quantitative evaluation lies in its utilization of statistical and mathematical operations to enhance the accuracy of results, improve the operability and objectivity, and reduce the arbitrariness and subjectivity . However, quantitative evaluation has its limitations, such as the difficulty in quantifying elements like ideology, attitude, concept, value, and emotional expression involved in CBIPE [18].

Qualitative evaluation refers to the use of methods such as observation and survey to collect relevant content. After conducting in-depth analysis of these materials using descriptive tools such as images and text, the characteristics are revealed. The advantage of qualitative evaluation lies in the interaction and communication between the evaluator and the evaluated, which helps to obtain more authentic, comprehensive, deep, and personalized answers. The disadvantage is that the interaction inevitably subjects evaluation results, thereby affecting the reliability and validity [18].

Actual evaluation often cannot be addressed solely through quantitative or qualitative analysis. Universities must adhere to the combination of quantitative and qualitative evaluation, utilizing a variety of methods such as scales, interviews, thought development archives, and exams. Scales are compiled based on unified standards, effectively combining quantitative and qualitative evaluation, generally including evaluation content, indicators,and criteria, with evaluation criteria generally divided into four levels: excellent, good, fair, and poor. Using scales, teachers can identify their own shortcomings for timely improvement. Interviews facilitate direct communication between the evaluator and the evaluated, allowing to design an interview outline to understand the required content. Thought development archives can systematically collect information and understand students' status. Through these archives, teachers can judge changes in students' knowledge, abilities, and emotions over a certain period of time. Exams are one of the most commonly used methods of quantitative evaluation, including written tests, experimental operations, practical skills, and essays.

By integrating the aforementioned approaches, evaluations can not only reflect common requirements but also embody individual development, providing scientific criteria for evaluation.

4.5.2 Combination of diagnostic, formative, and summative evaluation

Diagnostic assessment, also known as preparatory assessment, refers to the evaluation of students' knowledge, skills, emotions, attitudes, and values before the commencement of a particular course. Its purpose is to propose a implementation plan that meets the characteristics and needs of students, highlighting the diagnostic function. Methods such as questionnaires, interviews, and exams can be used to understand students' acceptance of the course and determine whether they possess the conditions necessary to achieve the current teaching objectives. Teachers can also integrate ideological and political elements that are most conducive to student acceptance, and design the best teaching plan to eliminate cognitive barriers for students [19].

Formative evaluation, also known as process evaluation, refers to the periodic assessment of students' achievements, attitudes, thoughts, and values reflected through tests during the course of a particular subject. It enables students to identify their shortcomings and regulate the subsequent learning. Tteachers can adjust the teaching plans based on the evaluation results [19].

Summative evaluation, also known as terminal evaluation, refers to the assessment conducted after the completion of a course to understand the effectiveness of CBIPE. Summative evaluation can assess the effectiveness of ideological and political education in a course, determine the gap between teaching effectiveness and objectives, identify existing problems, and make improvements [19].

Diagnostic assessment lays the foundation for teaching. It ensures the precision of the teaching starting point and sets reasonable benchmarks and goals for formative and summative assessments. For instance, only by understanding students' proficiency levels through an entrance diagnostic test can a teaching plan tailored to the class be designed. Formative assessment connects the starting point of diagnostic assessment with the end point of summative assessment. Through classroom questioning, quizzes, homework analysis, and other methods, teachers can promptly identify obstacles students encounter in their learning and adjust teaching strategies. This makes teaching no longer a "fixed" preset, but a dynamically adjustable process. If common issues are identified in formative assessment, it is even possible to trace back to the results of diagnostic assessment and re-examine the rationality of teaching design. Summative assessment examines the overall effectiveness of the previous two stages of assessment. The results of summative assessment can be fed back into the diagnostic assessment of the next round of teaching, helping teachers understand the effectiveness of long-term teaching strategies and providing a basis for setting teaching goals. It is not only an "end point" but also a reference for a "new starting point." The combination of these three types of assessments forms a closed-loop system of "diagnostic starting point → process regulation → summative feedback → optimized starting point." This combination avoids one-sidedness: it focuses on both outcomes (summative) and processes (formative), with greater emphasis on the starting point (diagnostic). It comprehensively reflects student development and enhances the pertinence, ensuring that teaching activities revolve around the real needs of students, thus promoting continuous improvement. It provides teachers with comprehensive feedback from before, during, and after class, driving a spiral rise in teaching quality.

4.6 Research status of evaluation index system for the effectiveness of CBIPE

Research on the evaluation of the effectiveness of CBIPE remains limited, mostly confined to descriptions on the connotation and evaluation methods. A comprehensive and effective evaluation index system for the effectiveness of such integrated courses has yet to be established [16].

4.6.1 Theoretical research

In terms of the theoretical construction of the evaluation index system, Shen [20] analyzed the operation of the mechanism for CBIPE from the perspective of educational ecology, emphasizing that the construction of the evaluation system in universities should focus on the complexity of the social environment and the overall development trend, and adhere to the principles of overall symbiosis, objective balance, and complexity and diversity. Xu [21] compared construction methods by analyzing its connotation and construction principles, and emphasized that universities should conduct evaluations and feedback from multiple perspectives, including teaching objectives, content, processes, and effects. Cao et al. [22] believed that attention should be paid to diversifying evaluation methods and multidimensional evaluation

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

content, emphasizing both professional knowledge and ideological and political elements, as well as a balanced approach between summative and formative evaluations. Lu [15] systematically elaborated on the need to focus on solving 3 key issues: the organization of evaluation activities, the construction of evaluation standards, and the evaluation method system, through an analysis of the principles, characteristics, and routes of CBIPE. Yan [23] took the "Four Confidences" as a starting point, systematically analyzed the practical misunderstandings, and based on this theoretical foundation, constructed a logical framework diagram.

4.6.2 Practical research

In terms of practical research on the construction of an evaluation index system, Wang [24] constructed an evaluation index system from 5 aspects: students, teachers, majors, courses, and schools, and elaborated on the methods for different evaluation subjects to apply this index system. Tan et al. [25] proposed that the construction of an evaluation index system should focus on the subjectivity of teachers, center around students, and reflect the principles of comprehensiveness and development. They constructed an evaluation index system from the perspectives of schools, secondary units, and teachers. Qin et al. [26] took pharmacy-related specialized course teachers as the research object, analyzed the current situation of the construction of CBIPE in pharmacy-related specialized courses through the grounded theory research method, and constructed an evaluation index system for the CBIPE ability of pharmacy-related specialized course teachers, including five dimensions: teacher literacy, teaching skills, teaching content, course impartation, and teaching effectiveness. Sun [27] designed 3 subsystems based on the roles and respective advantages of students, peer experts, and teachers in the teaching process, which together constitute a relatively systematic and comprehensive evaluation index system for ideological and political education in science and engineering courses. Xie et al. [28] analyzed the main mechanisms of university CBIPE, constructed an evaluation system for professional courses from 4 dimensions: teacher ethics and style, ideological and political education in lesson preparation, ideological and political education in lesson delivery, and students' acceptance of CBIPE, and advocated the principle of "who is familiar with it, who evaluates it" for multi-subject evaluation. Some scholars explained the specific usage methods after constructing the evaluation index system. For example, Xu et al. [29] built an evaluation index system based on qualitative and quantitative analyses, including 4 primary indicators: background, input, process, and result evaluation, as well as 11 secondary indicators such as political environment, course resources, teaching plan, and teaching effectiveness. Finally, they explained the usage methods of the index system for overall and individual evaluation. Zheng [30] adopted the steps of theoretical construction first and empirical testing later, proposed an evaluation index system, and explained the usage methods in different situations, such as in process and summative evaluation.

4.6.3 Review of previous index-system constructing studies

In summary, the academic community's understanding of the effectiveness evaluation of CBIPE has gradually deepened, and the evaluation index system has become increasingly systematic and detailed. For example, Wang et al. [24] and Tan et al. [25] outlined the framework structure of the evaluation index system, but did not provide detailed explanations on the principles and bases for the formulation of each index, as well as the weight distribution. The index system by Qin et al. [26] and Sun et al. [27] are highly quantitative and systematic, but it is only applicable to pharmacy and science and engineering disciplines. The index system by Xie et al. [28] has strong universality across disciplines, focusing on the bidirectional influence between teachers and students, but it does not propose screening criteria for evaluation subjects "familiar person". After constructing the evaluation index systems, Xu et al [29] and Zheng [30] provided specific explanations on the usage.

Previous studies have constructed evaluation index systems using various research theories and methodologies, and have provided explanations for the usage from different perspectives, offering valuable references for subsequent research. However, in the practice of CBIPE, there are common dilemmas such as the dissolution of subject characteristics and the mechanization of value transmission. From a realistic perspective, although most universities have established a basic framework for CBIPE, they are trapped in six major dilemmas: the theoretical foundation of the evaluation index system is single and weak, it is not deeply integrated with teaching practice, and its scientific validity is not strong [31]. The evaluation index systems are most based on literature review and logical deduction, leading to insufficient empirical support; the diversity of evaluation subjects does not match the evaluation indicators well; the indicator design is separated from subject characteristics, resulting in the chronic issue of "two skins"; quantitative data obscures the "seeing numbers but not people" dilemma of educational effects; and the lack of a feedback mechanism leads to the predicament of "evaluating but not using". The most prominent issue is that, most scholars, after designing the index system, fail to focus on its practical application, test the satisfaction, reliability, validity, difficulty, challenges, and make revisions to ensure the integrity and scientific nature of the research [32].

5. Issues in the practical evaluation of CBIPE

5.1 The evaluation system and mechanism are not sufficiently robust

The most glaring issue lies in the inherent deficiencies of the institutional framework. Firstly, there is a systemic gap in the top-level design—the absence of both a national guiding framework and regional implementation details, rendering evaluation practices as "a tree without roots." Secondly, the operational mechanism is mired in procedural quagmires: evaluation processes overly rely on administrative directives, trapping grassroots teachers in mechanical tasks such as filling out forms, while the value transmission links that truly influence educational outcomes are marginalized. Thirdly, in terms of safeguard measures, the lack of necessary resource support and policy complementarity makes it difficult to effectively implement. Fourthly, and more challenging, evaluation results often lag behind the teaching cycle, creating a dilemma of outdated data and making it difficult to provide immediate feedback on teaching practices [23].

5.2 The evaluation content system lacks systematicness

Existing evaluations often remain at the micro-level of "classroom-teacher", failing to construct a three-dimensional observation network of the entire teaching process. The direct consequence of this fragmented assessment is that the CBIPE is dissolved into isolated teaching events. The teaching practice of CBIPE is a long-term process, and continuous effectiveness evaluation helps to systematically analyze the educational objects' acceptance and development trajectory regarding value guidance, enabling

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

dynamic tracking and timely supervision of teaching practice. This is a crucial step in forming scientific and effective teaching strategies and fully leveraging the guiding role of teaching evaluation in practice. It is worth noting that when we examine teaching behaviors separately from the knowledge map of the curriculum, we have actually deviated from the original intention of the reform, which is to integrate ideological and political education into professional courses [31-32].

5.3 Inadequate evaluation criteria

The core ideas, key elements, and implementation strategies of CBIPE have not yet been fully integrated into the evaluation system of courses, teachers, and teaching environments. This absence has led to a disconnect between educational evaluation and the evaluation of CBIPE known as the "separation phenomenon". This situation not only significantly reduces the guiding effectiveness of evaluation but also undermines the evaluation effectiveness.

The current design of evaluation criteria overly focuses on quantifiable explicit indicators, while downplaying the implicit dimensions of value internalization. For instance, in the evaluation of science and engineering courses, the depth of penetration of scientific ethics is often reduced to the number of cases, while the substantive transformation of students' values remains unobservable. This "technologization trap" of the standard system essentially alienates the educational process into a numerical game [15, 23, 31-32].

5.4 Evaluation methods and means of CBIPE are not scientific enough

The evaluation methods are still trapped in the traditional paradigm of "expert observation + student questionnaire", lacking both deep integration with big data technology and substantial research exploration. Notably, the evaluation subjects rely excessively on experts, which in turn diminishes teachers' self-reflective awareness as value transmitters. This evaluation model dominated by an external perspective struggles to capture the dynamic generation mechanism of ideological and political elements in the process of knowledge construction [23, 32].

6. Conclusion

The academic community generally recognizes the educational function of CBIPE, and has actively explored its further promotion, discovering a series of issues. The imperfections in the evaluation of CBIPE have to some extent restricted its development. The evaluation itself, as a weak link in teaching practice, faces challenges due to weaknesses in evaluation subjects, content, and modes, which hinder its effectiveness. Scholars have proposed improvement plans for constructing the evaluation of CBIPE in universities, focusing on aspects such as top-level design, as well as evaluation subjects, standards, and methods. However, the construction of CBIPE is still in its initial stage, with evaluation mechanisms and systems not yet fully established, and evaluation methods and techniques urgently needing improvement. In the future, efforts should be made to strengthen top-level design, form multi-level evaluation systems and mechanisms, construct a multi-party evaluation subject and multi-dimensional quantitative evaluation content system, comprehensively assess the effectiveness of education; collect evidence from multiple parties to promote collaborative evaluation; integrate quantitative and qualitative methods to innovate the construction of evaluation systems. At the same time, innovate "diversified" evaluation methods and means, seize suitabale opportunities, explore students' inherent qualities in real context; and utilize online resources to increase the possibility of evaluation.

References

1. Chen WB, Zhang YC. Principles of ideological and Ppolitical education (3rd Edition)[M]. Beijing: Higher Education Press. 2015.
2. Li GJ. The construction of Curriculum-based ideological and political education must firmly grasp five key links [J]. China Higher Education Etc. Education. 2017, (Z3): 28-29.
3. Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Anthony J. Shinkfield. Evaluation Theory, Models, and Applications [M]. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2007.
4. Wiggins G (U.S.). Educational Assessment [M]. Portland: Assessment Training Institute 2005.
5. Whittington R, Johnson G, Scholes K, et al. Exploring Strategy: Text and Cases(13Eds.)[M]. London: Pearson Education, 2024.
6. Kirkpatrick JD, Kirkpatrick WK. The Kirkpatrick Model: Past, Present, and Future [M]. London: Pearson Education, 2012.
7. Freeman RE. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach [M]. London: Routledge, 2010.
8. Lin CD. Developmental Psychology (3 Edition) [M]. Beijing: People's Education Press, 2018.
9. Hart T. Authentic Assessment: A Teacher's Guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2009
10. Jackson MA. Class Life. New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.
11. Husen T, Postlethwaite TN. International Encyclopedia of Education [M]. London: Pergamon Press, 1994.
12. Margolis M, Zhong QQ. The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education [M]. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, 2005.
13. Steffe LP, Gale J. Constructivism in Education [M]. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.
14. Hall J, Lindorff A, Sammons P. International Perspectives in Educational Effectiveness Research [M]. London: Springer, 2020.
15. Lu DK. Some core issues and solutions in the implementation of Curriculum-based ideological and political education-Based on the discussion of ideological and political education in professional courses [J]. Ideological and Theoretical Education, 2018, (3): 64-69.
16. Cheng XD, Qi P. Reflections on the current situation and system reconstruction of ideological and political quality evaluation in university courses [J]. Jiangsu Higher Education 2023, (7): 91-95.
17. Zhang B. Research on the construction of "curriculum-based ideological and political education" in colleges and universities in the new era [D]. Changchun: Jilin University 2022.
18. Bray M, Anderson B, Mason M. Comparative Education Research: Pathways and Methods (2nd Edition) [M]. London: Springer International Publishing, 2014.
19. Popham WJ. A Guide to Classroom Assessment for Teachers (5th Edition) [M]. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2026.
20. Shen LW. Construction of the teaching evaluation

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571

system for "curriculum-based ideological and political education" in universities from the Perspective of Educational Ecology [J]. Journal of Social Sciences, Jiamusi University 2020, 38(4): 205-207.
21. Xu YY. Construction of the evaluation system for Curriculum-based ideological and political education [J]. Think Tank Times 2020, (3): 209-211.
22. Cao SY, Yang Y, Lu XM, et al. Exploration on the evaluation of the curriculum-based ideological and political education in public health practical skills courses [J]. Medical Education Research and Practice 2020, 28(5): 852-854.
23. Yan XJ. On the "ideological and political elements", practical misunderstandings, and educational evaluation of "curriculum-based ideological and political education" in universities. Research on Ideological and Political Education 2020, (2): 88-92.
24. Wang YX. On the Construction of the evaluation system for curriculum-based ideological and political education in university [J]. Journal of Ideological and Theoretical Education, 2020, (10): 125-130.
25. Tan HY, Guo YY, Wang JJ. Construction and improvement of the evaluation indicator system for curriculum-based ideological and political education in university [J]. Journal of Teacher Education Research, 2020, 32(5): 11-15.
26. Qin BH, Hu ZQ, Chen LN, et al. Construction of an evaluation index system for teachers' competence in curriculum-based ideological and political education [J]. Journal of Nanjing Medical University (Social Sciences Edition), 2021, 21(4): 388-393.
27. Sun YD, Cao HY, Yuan XY. Research on the construction of evaluation indicator system for ideological and political education in science and engineering courses [J]. Journal of Jiangsu University (Social Sciences Edition), 2021, 23(6): 77-88.
28. Xie HJ, Li X, Jiang W. Research on the evaluation of curriculum-based ideological and political education for college teachers in the new era [J]. Education and Teaching Forum 2019, (23): 51-53.
29. Xu XY, Wang JJ. Construction of a comprehensive evaluation index system for curriculum-based ideological and political education in university: Based on the theoretical framework of the CIPP evaluation model [J]. Higher Education Management 2022, 16(1): 47-60.
30. Zheng YH. Research on the construction of evaluation indicator system for curriculum-based ideological and political education in University [D]. Chongqing: Southwest University, 2022.
31. Li YB. Research on the evaluation of ideological and political education in higher professional courses: Overview and prospects. Journal of Hubei Open Vocational College 2025, 38(6): 84-86+95.
32. Ge DN, Zhou YX. A scoping review of research on the effectiveness of ideological and political education in undergraduate nursing courses [J]. Journal of Medical Teaching and Research in Universities (Electronic Edition), 2024, 14(5): 3-9.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18515571