Trends in Social Sciences and Humanities Research
Print ISSN: 2959-992X
Online ISSN: 2959-9938
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/tsshr3274

FROM PARTNERSHIP INPUTS TO DEMONSTRABLE LEARNING: A QUALITY EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR INDUSTRY–EDUCATION INTEGRATION

JiaMei Geng, Di Yao*
College of Applied Science and Technology, Beijing Union University, Beijing 100101, China.
**Corresponding Author: Di Yao*

Abstract: Industry–education integration is increasingly regarded as a defining feature of professional master's education, yet the existence of university–enterprise partnerships does not necessarily establish the quality of postgraduate learning. Evaluation often emphasizes visible inputs, such as cooperation agreements, practice bases and external supervisors, while offering less evidence about the educational work undertaken, the competencies developed or the use of findings to improve programs. This article develops a process-oriented evaluation and improvement framework for professional master's programs at application-oriented universities, using China as the institutional context. A critical integrative synthesis of scholarship on work-integrated learning, authentic assessment, university–industry collaboration and educational quality is combined with focused analysis of two national graduate-education policy documents. The resulting framework distinguishes partnership conditions, enacted learning opportunities, supervisory and assessment processes, demonstrated capabilities and improvement governance. It specifies fifteen illustrative evidence prompts, proposes rules for triangulating student, university, enterprise and documentary evidence, and links recurring quality problems to proportionate improvement actions. Rather than assigning untested weights or reporting simulated performance as empirical results, the article offers an auditable design for program-level diagnosis. It argues that meaningful integration should be judged by the alignment between a program's educational purposes, students' participation in consequential professional tasks and independently assessable learning, not by collaboration intensity alone. The framework is intended for local adaptation, empirical validation and iterative quality enhancement.
Keywords: Industry–education integration; Professional master's education; Application-oriented universities; Quality evaluation; Work-integrated learning; Authentic assessment; Continuous improvement

1 INTRODUCTION

Universities are increasingly expected to educate graduates who can work with uncertain problems, cross organizational boundaries and apply disciplinary knowledge beyond classroom settings. For professional master's programs, these expectations are particularly demanding. Students are not simply preparing for entry-level employment; they should learn to interpret advanced knowledge, make defensible judgments, manage complex tasks and contribute to the improvement of professional practice. Partnerships with enterprises, public organizations and other practice settings can make such learning possible. Nevertheless, a partnership is not itself an educational achievement. Its value depends on whether students encounter suitable tasks, receive informed guidance and develop capabilities that can be demonstrated and assessed.

This distinction has become especially relevant in China. The Development Plan for Professional Degree Graduate Education (2020–2025) identifies industry–education integration as a central approach to preparing high-level applied professionals and calls for closer collaboration in curricula, practice and supervision [1]. A subsequent policy on differentiated development of academic and professional degrees emphasizes practice-oriented curricula, joint training bases, external supervisors and assessment appropriate to professional degrees [2]. Both documents shift attention toward the educational substance of cooperation. Their implementation, however, raises an evaluative problem: how can institutions distinguish a program that has established many partnerships from one in which those partnerships actually support meaningful postgraduate learning?

The issue is important for application-oriented universities because their institutional missions are closely connected to regional economies and occupational practice. Such universities may have productive relationships with local enterprises but differ considerably in the capacity of partners to offer advanced projects, the availability of supervisors and the procedures used to assess learning. A signed agreement can coexist with routine placement work. An enterprise mentor may have extensive professional expertise but little time or preparation for educational supervision. A student may complete a technically impressive project without demonstrating what was learned independently. Conversely, a modest partnership may provide unusually strong feedback and opportunities for reflective problem solving. These possibilities are reasons to evaluate the actual learning process rather than treating formal participation as a sufficient proxy for quality.

Research offers valuable but fragmented guidance. Studies of university–industry collaboration describe motives, organizational arrangements and barriers to sustained cooperation [3-4]. Research on work-integrated learning asks how

© By the Author(s) 2026, under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0).

experiences in workplaces acquire educational value [5-6]. Assessment scholarship shows why authentic tasks, feedback and judgments based on multiple observations matter [7-9]. Studies specifically focused on Chinese professional master's education have examined students' experience of enterprise practice and identified problems of relevance, supervision and support [10-11]. These bodies of work illuminate different pieces of the same problem, but their implications are not always translated into an operational quality-review process at the program level.

Existing perspectives also leave unresolved questions concerning the relationship between quality evaluation and improvement. A high score on cooperation conditions does not identify what should be changed during the next teaching cycle. An overall satisfaction rating may conceal a serious mismatch between a student's learning goals and assigned project. Assessors may combine administrative, student and enterprise information without considering whether sources are credible, independent or directly relevant to the judgment. Before assigning indicators and weights, institutions need an account of what counts as educationally meaningful integration and how evidence can be used responsibly.

This article therefore addresses three questions. First, which distinct dimensions should be examined when judging the quality of industry–education integration in professional master's programs? Second, what forms of evidence would allow program teams to distinguish documented activity from demonstrable educational contribution? Third, how can evaluation findings be converted into feasible improvement actions without reducing diverse programs to a single league table? The objective is not to estimate the effects of a particular partnership or to validate a numerical index. It is to develop a conceptually grounded and practically usable evaluation design that can subsequently be tested with empirical evidence.

The paper contributes by connecting a learning-process perspective with program-level quality governance. It treats collaboration resources as enabling conditions, not automatic outcomes; places the student's professional work and feedback at the center of assessment; and introduces an evidence-to-action protocol through which findings can inform curriculum redesign, supervisor development and partnership renewal. Its intended unit of analysis is the professional master's program or joint-training arrangement, not an entire university. Although the institutional context is Chinese, the underlying problem—how to evaluate learning across university and workplace boundaries—has relevance wherever higher education depends on external practice partners.

2 CONCEPTUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS

2.1 What Constitutes Quality in a Professionally Oriented Master's Program?

Quality in higher education cannot be reduced to a single universally accepted attribute. Harvey and Green distinguish several understandings, including exceptional standards, consistency, fitness for purpose, value for money and transformation [12]. Tam likewise shows that quality measures reflect assumptions about what universities should accomplish and how results are produced [13]. These arguments have direct implications for professional master's education. If the purpose is to develop advanced professional judgment, then compliance with procedural standards is necessary but incomplete. Quality must also concern whether students gain the capacity to frame real problems, weigh evidence, justify decisions and learn from consequences.

A useful distinction is between three types of claim. A compliance claim asks whether requirements were met: for example, whether a practice agreement, safety provision or supervisor appointment exists. A process claim asks what educational activities actually occurred: for example, whether students encountered progressively demanding tasks and received feedback. A capability claim asks what students can now demonstrate, ideally using evidence extending beyond self-reported confidence. Each claim demands different evidence. A complete quality judgment draws on all three but should not substitute one for another. An institution cannot infer capability simply from the existence of a curriculum or the number of placement days.

Professional degrees also require sensitivity to disciplinary difference. An advanced finance project, an engineering design assignment and a clinical practice placement involve different forms of risk, professional standards and observable performance. A generic framework should identify common principles while allowing local indicators to reflect occupational tasks. Constructive alignment provides the link: intended learning outcomes, learning activities and assessment should require coherent forms of performance [14]. In a joint-training setting, alignment must operate across organizations. A university cannot plausibly promise analytical independence while the enterprise permits only repetitive assistance; nor can an enterprise reasonably certify competence when it has observed only attendance.

2.2 University–Industry Collaboration Is Not the Same as Integrated Learning

Research on university–industry relations has long examined knowledge exchange, innovation and institutional coordination. Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff emphasize interaction among universities, industry and government in innovation systems [15]. Perkmann et al. distinguish academic engagement from commercialization and show that relationships may serve varied organizational purposes [16]. Reviewing the field, Ankrah and Al-Tabbaa identify multiple dimensions of collaboration, while Bruneel et al. show the importance of experience and trust in reducing barriers [3-4]. Such work explains why partnerships arise and persist. Yet a relationship that is valuable for research or recruitment is not necessarily designed for postgraduate education. The educational unit of analysis must therefore be more precise than the organizational partnership itself.

Billett argues that work experiences become educationally valuable when university and practice-based activities are deliberately organized and integrated [5]. Workplace participation offers opportunities, but it does not guarantee that learners can interpret what they encounter. Jackson similarly directs attention to the ways placement design can facilitate or obstruct employability development [6]. The distinction becomes crucial at master's level, where projects should encourage analysis, synthesis and defensible action rather than merely familiarity with workplace routines.

Recent Chinese studies reinforce this concern without resolving it for every program. Zhang and Chen, studying postgraduates at a university of applied sciences, identify difficulties in aligning enterprise assignments with professional learning [10]. Wang et al. report student perceptions of industrial placements in professional master's engineering education and discuss the importance of placement relevance and institutional support [11]. These empirical studies provide context-sensitive indications of possible bottlenecks, not universal estimates of program quality. Their significance for the present paper is conceptual: stakeholders should examine the content of the student's work and the support surrounding it, rather than relying only on positive descriptions of cooperation.

2.3 Authentic Assessment, Feedback and Educational Accountability

Authentic assessment asks learners to perform tasks resembling the demands of practice. Gulikers et al. distinguish authenticity in tasks, physical context, social context, assessment result and criteria [8]. For professional master's students, this means that a final artifact should not be judged simply because it comes from an enterprise. Assessors need to know the student's contribution, the complexity of the problem, the standards applied and the extent to which the work supports a defensible claim about competence. A confidential industry report might be sophisticated as an organizational product but poor assessment evidence if the student's role cannot be verified.

Assessment is also a learning intervention. Boud and Falchikov argue that assessment should prepare learners for judgments they will make after graduation [7]. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick connect effective feedback with self-regulated learning, and Boud and Molloy call for feedback designs in which students actively seek and use information [17-18]. These ideas complicate the familiar arrangement in which university and enterprise supervisors independently assign end-of-placement marks. A richer approach records what feedback students received, how they responded and whether successive work products improved. It treats students as emerging professionals capable of critically evaluating their own performance rather than passive recipients of scores.

Programmatic assessment offers a further principle: high-stakes judgments are more trustworthy when based on multiple information points gathered over time [9]. The application to joint training is not a direct transplant of a medical-education model. Rather, it supports a practical rule that professional competence should be inferred from a portfolio of observations, artifacts, explanations and judgments, with important disagreements examined rather than averaged away. This is particularly pertinent when an enterprise supervisor evaluates workplace utility and a university supervisor evaluates analytical rigor. Both perspectives can be informative, but they assess partly different features of quality.

2.4 Institutional Policies and the Problem of Implementation

China's 2020 plan for professional-degree graduate education calls for stronger industry participation in program design, practice-oriented instruction, joint bases and supervisor development [1]. The 2023 policy on differentiated academic and professional degrees develops these expectations by emphasizing the distinctive educational purpose of professional qualifications, the joint development of training schemes, external-supervisor arrangements and flexible forms of practice-based degree outputs [2]. The documents establish a policy rationale for quality evaluation that is not limited to research publications or conventional thesis standards.

International quality-assurance principles provide a complementary perspective. The Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area emphasize program design, student-centered learning, information management and ongoing monitoring [19]. These principles should not be treated as a direct regulatory standard for Chinese institutions. They nevertheless illustrate that credible quality assurance involves a cycle of purposeful design, evidence gathering, review and revision. The challenge is to make that cycle workable when delivery is distributed between a university and organizations whose primary mission is not teaching.

Collaboration spans actors who differ in incentives, information and authority. Universities award degrees and remain accountable for academic standards. Enterprises control access to projects, workplace conditions and much of the immediate supervision. Students possess first-hand information about what they actually do but may fear that criticism could affect placement opportunities. A governance arrangement that asks only one partner to define evidence and interpret results is liable to produce a partial account. Independent checks and protected channels for student feedback are therefore central design features, not administrative luxuries.

3 APPROACH: A CRITICAL INTEGRATIVE SYNTHESIS

This article is a conceptual design study informed by a focused integrative synthesis of scholarly and policy literature. It does not report interviews, surveys, experiments or numerical evaluations of university programs. An integrative approach is appropriate because the evaluation problem spans several domains that are rarely examined together: higher-education quality, interorganizational collaboration, work-integrated learning and professional assessment. Integrative reviews can develop conceptual connections between bodies of knowledge rather than merely summarize

the findings of individual studies [20-21]. The output sought here is a transparent set of evaluative propositions and implementable evidence prompts.

The source base was assembled purposively around four questions: what collaboration makes possible, how professional learning is organized, how capability can be assessed and how evaluation supports improvement. Foundational contributions were selected for their theoretical or methodological relevance, complemented by recent studies addressing Chinese postgraduate collaboration and the two official policy documents cited above. The policy documents were read for their expressed expectations concerning program design, practice, supervision, assessment and quality assurance. Scholarly sources were compared to identify claims about mechanisms, likely limitations and implications for observable evidence. This is a focused synthesis, not a systematic review claiming exhaustive database coverage; no search-result totals, screening counts or meta-analytic estimates are asserted.

The analytic procedure involved four linked operations. First, concepts referring to partnership arrangements, learning opportunities, supervisory actions, student capabilities and institutional review were separated. Second, relationships among these concepts were inferred using constructive alignment, work-integrated learning and program-evaluation principles. Third, candidate quality dimensions were checked against policy expectations and practical questions likely to arise in a joint-training review. Fourth, each dimension was translated into observable evidence, a potential failure signal and a possible improvement response. This movement from conceptual categories to review questions follows the logic of framework development described by Jabareen, while document analysis and directed content analysis offer methodological guidance for interpreting written sources [22-24].

Three constraints guided the synthesis. The first was to avoid equating collaboration activity with educational effectiveness. The second was to avoid treating student satisfaction, graduate employment or enterprise productivity as interchangeable with learning. The third was to preserve differences among professional fields while identifying minimum common expectations. The proposed indicators consequently have no empirically calibrated weights. Their function is diagnostic: they direct attention to evidence that program teams should examine, not to a supposedly universal metric of institutional excellence. Where the following sections give examples, those examples illustrate how a review could be conducted; they are not presented as observations from a completed field study.

A later empirical study would need to establish whether the indicators are understandable to evaluators, whether evidence can be collected reliably, whether judgments are sufficiently consistent and whether the review leads to measurable educational improvement. Recognizing this boundary is essential to the credibility of a conceptual contribution.

4 AN EVIDENCE-LINKED FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING TRAINING QUALITY

4.1 The Logic of Educational Contribution

The proposed framework begins with a simple premise: a productive partnership is an enabling condition for learning, whereas training quality concerns what the partnership allows students to do and become. Five linked domains organize the evaluation: (1) shared educational purpose and partnership readiness; (2) authenticity and progression of learning opportunities; (3) integrated supervision and feedback; (4) demonstrated professional capability; and (5) improvement governance. These domains correspond broadly to conditions, opportunities, enactment, outcomes and institutional response. They are analytically distinct but connected through a contribution logic rather than an assumed linear causal model.

The contribution logic asks evaluators to trace a plausible educational chain. Partners first agree on the capabilities that graduates should develop. They then provide tasks, data, equipment and supervisory access consistent with those goals. Students engage with the tasks and receive feedback, producing artifacts that permit judgments about learning. Finally, program teams use evidence to revise curricula, placement arrangements or partnership rules. If any connection is absent, the institution may possess collaboration resources without obtaining their intended educational value. For example, extensive workplace access cannot compensate for a project that provides no opportunity to exercise master's-level judgment. Equally, an impressive final deliverable does not establish learning if the student's personal contribution is unknown.

The model is deliberately noncompensatory in its diagnostic logic. A strong performance in resource provision should not automatically offset a serious failure in safety, ethical conduct or assessment integrity. Programs may summarize domains for administrative purposes, but consequential failures should remain visible. This differs from a single weighted index in which all indicators contribute to an overall score. Composite scores can be useful for monitoring, yet they may hide the very mechanism that an improvement-oriented evaluation needs to identify. The framework therefore makes the evidence trail and the reasoning behind each judgment more important than the final numerical result.

4.2 Domain 1: Shared Educational Purpose and Partnership Readiness

The first domain asks whether the partnership is organized around explicit educational aims. Relevant evidence includes a jointly endorsed description of graduate capabilities, documented roles for supervisors, criteria for approving practice projects and arrangements for student protection. The existence of a signed agreement is a minimum condition; its educational significance depends on whether it specifies responsibilities that can be implemented. Partners should be able to explain which capabilities a placement develops, how those capabilities relate to the curriculum and which decisions require joint approval.

Readiness also concerns the suitability of work opportunities. Not every enterprise has projects that are appropriate for postgraduate learning in every semester. Periodic assessment should consider whether project supply, available datasets, facilities and supervisor capacity match the number and preparation of students. Thus, initial approval cannot replace continuing educational scrutiny.

The most informative questions are not whether a cooperation mechanism exists but whether it shapes decisions. Can the university decline a project that offers insufficient learning? Can an enterprise raise concerns about a student's preparation? Is there a procedure for replacing an unsuitable assignment? Can the student seek help without threatening their assessment? Answers reveal whether collaboration is operational or ceremonial. This domain draws on the literature on interorganizational barriers while directing the judgment toward program-level educational accountability [3-4].

4.3 Domain 2: Authenticity and Progression of Learning Opportunities

The second domain examines the substance of workplace learning. Authenticity means more than physical presence at an enterprise. Students should encounter problems whose constraints, stakeholder interests and uncertainties resemble those of professional work. Depending on discipline, such opportunities may involve constructing a model for a client decision, diagnosing a production bottleneck, evaluating a public service intervention or designing and testing a technical solution. A suitable project also permits students to explain why a chosen method was appropriate and what its limitations were. These criteria draw on the distinction between the appearance of an authentic setting and the features of an authentic assessment [8].

Progression is equally important. Master's-level work should not consist of repeated tasks at a fixed level of demand. An effective sequence might move from observing a process and interpreting established procedures to framing a problem, comparing alternatives and justifying a decision under supervision. Later tasks should require greater independence while maintaining proportionate safeguards. A progression map need not impose identical milestones on all students, but it should make increasing complexity and responsibility visible. Evidence may include project briefs, work logs, versions of outputs and records of decisions made by the student.

In reviewing this domain, evaluators should be alert to several deceptive signals. Length of placement is an exposure measure, not a direct measure of learning. Enterprise prestige may influence opportunities but does not establish the quality of a particular assignment. A project's commercial value may reflect collective effort rather than the student's development. The pertinent question is whether the individual student had sustained access to work that required the capabilities expected of a professional master's graduate. The educational value of workplace experience depends on how participation and reflection are structured [5-6].

4.4 Domain 3: Integrated Supervision and Feedback

The third domain addresses the work of university and enterprise supervisors. A dual-supervisor arrangement should be evaluated by the functions it performs rather than by the number of appointed mentors. University supervisors can help students connect workplace questions with disciplinary concepts, research design and academic standards. Enterprise supervisors can interpret operational constraints, professional risks and the practical consequences of decisions. The two perspectives are complementary when they are brought into conversation. They become fragmented when supervisors provide unrelated tasks, contradictory advice or only ceremonial signatures.

Review evidence should include a joint learning plan, substantive feedback at defined checkpoints and records of how disagreements were resolved. Feedback quality is more important than meeting frequency alone. This makes feedback a traceable process rather than an unverified claim that mentoring occurred. The approach is consistent with the literature on self-regulated learning and feedback design [17-18].

Supervisory integration also requires attention to incentives and capacity. Enterprise mentors may face production deadlines and have little protected time for education. University supervisors may be unfamiliar with changing workplace technologies. Institutions should not respond solely by adding more reporting forms. Instead, they need feasible workload recognition, role clarification, short joint-development sessions and mechanisms for raising problems early. The review should distinguish lack of willingness from lack of institutional support, because the appropriate improvement action differs.

4.5 Domain 4: Demonstrated Professional Capability

The fourth domain asks what the student can demonstrably do, using standards appropriate to professional master's study. Capability includes technical competence but also problem framing, evidence-based judgment, ethical reasoning, communication across roles and transfer of knowledge to unfamiliar conditions. The assessment should combine evidence of the final result with evidence of the process through which it was produced. A technically sound report is stronger evidence if the student can defend assumptions, discuss alternatives, acknowledge risks and explain their individual contribution.

A portfolio may include a project proposal, annotated work products, supervisor observations, records of revisions, a reflective account and an oral defense. Confidentiality procedures may permit redacted artifacts or controlled assessment access when enterprise information is sensitive. The assessment rubric should specify criteria in advance and distinguish enterprise usefulness from educational accomplishment. For example, timely completion and practical

adoption may matter, but a student's explanation of method and independent judgment should remain visible even when an enterprise has not implemented the recommendation.

A defensible high-stakes decision should involve more than one evidence source and, where possible, more than one evaluator. Disagreements between supervisors should trigger examination of the underlying work rather than immediate arithmetic averaging. Evidence gathered at several stages is preferable to a single final impression [9]. The objective is not to eliminate professional judgment but to make it accountable and supported. This approach also recognizes the long-term purpose of assessment: graduates should become capable of evaluating and improving their own professional practice [7].

4.6 Domain 5: Improvement Governance and Responsible Use of Evidence

A quality system is incomplete if review findings remain in a report that has little influence on subsequent practice. The fifth domain examines whether programs assign responsibility for identified problems, choose realistic responses, implement changes and review their consequences. The relevant unit is a manageable improvement decision: replacing an unsuitable project, revising assessment criteria, training mentors or adjusting the balance of university and enterprise learning activities. Evidence includes meeting decisions, action owners, deadlines, follow-up records and changed student experience.

Review governance should be proportionate to risk. Some deficiencies require urgent action, especially those involving safety, exploitation, ethical violations or assessment integrity. Others can be addressed during routine curriculum review. Problems affecting multiple students or repeated cohorts merit greater attention than isolated complaints, but a single serious event must not be dismissed merely because it is statistically uncommon. Stakeholders also need access to an explanation of how their feedback was handled. Without that feedback loop, students may perceive quality surveys as ceremonial and become less willing to report difficulties.

The 2023 Chinese policy emphasizes continuing oversight of joint-training conditions and outcomes, while international quality-assurance principles highlight continuous program monitoring [2, 19]. In operational terms, the central question is whether a program can show that a specific finding changed a specific practice and whether the change addressed the original problem. Improvement governance thus connects the other four domains and turns evaluation from a retrospective exercise into part of educational design.

5 TRANSLATING THE FRAMEWORK INTO A PROGRAM-LEVEL REVIEW

5.1 Evidence Prompts and Minimum Documentation

An operational review should begin with a manageable set of questions rather than an extensive inventory of easily counted activities. Table 1 presents fifteen illustrative evidence prompts, three for each domain. They are intended to guide discussion and document collection, not to function as an already validated measurement scale. Programs should retain the five overarching concerns while adapting individual prompts to disciplinary standards, placement models and available evidence. A financial analytics program, for instance, may examine whether students justify model assumptions and data ethics, whereas an engineering program may require design verification, safety analysis and testing records.

Table 1 Proposed Evidence Prompts for Quality Evaluation

Domain	Evidence prompt	Illustrative evidence
Shared purpose and readiness	Are graduate capabilities co-defined and communicated?	Training scheme; joint learning outcomes
Shared purpose and readiness	Are practice projects screened for educational suitability?	Project approval records; task specifications
Shared purpose and readiness	Are roles, protections and escalation routes workable?	Agreements; student orientation; incident protocol
Authentic opportunities	Do tasks involve consequential professional problems?	Project briefs; work samples; partner observations
Authentic opportunities	Does complexity or independence increase over time?	Milestones; revised plans; portfolio chronology
Authentic opportunities	Can each student's individual contribution be traced?	Version history; logs; defense records
Integrated supervision	Do supervisors agree on a coherent learning plan?	Joint plan; checkpoint notes
Integrated supervision	Is feedback specific and used in later work?	Annotated drafts; revision explanations
Integrated supervision	Are conflicts or difficulties resolved promptly?	Escalation records; student follow-up
Demonstrated capability	Are decisions supported by evidence and professional reasoning?	Reports; artifacts; oral examination
Demonstrated capability	Are ethical and contextual constraints considered?	Risk analysis; reflective account
Demonstrated capability	Are judgments based on multiple observations?	Rubrics; supervisor reports; portfolio review
Improvement governance	Are weaknesses prioritized by educational significance?	Review minutes; risk register
Improvement governance	Is each action owned and implemented?	Action plan; implementation records
Improvement governance	Is effectiveness checked in the next cycle?	Follow-up evidence; revised student experience

The evidence prompts specify what assessors should seek; they do not presume a particular answer. Documentary evidence can show that a process was designed, but it may not establish that the process was experienced as intended. Student interviews and short, confidential pulse surveys help identify discrepancies between official accounts and lived practice. Supervisor reports contribute contextual interpretation, although their statements may reflect organizational interests. Artifacts and recorded feedback can provide more direct evidence of learning. The most credible judgment considers convergence and disagreement among these sources instead of privileging one type mechanically.

5.2 An Evidence-to-Judgment Protocol

The proposed review proceeds through six actions. At the outset, the program team states its educational claims in observable terms and identifies mandatory protections that cannot be traded against other achievements. The team then requests a limited sample of evidence representing different placements, stages and student experiences. Next, reviewers examine each domain using the prompts in Table 1, recording both supporting evidence and contrary or missing information. Reviewers jointly discuss divergences, distinguish facts from interpretations and document a concise judgment. The fifth action is to identify a priority improvement and assign responsibility. The final action is to review whether the response changed subsequent practice.

A three-level descriptive judgment can help maintain consistency without implying unsupported precision. A domain may be recorded as substantiated when several relevant sources converge; partially substantiated when the activity exists but the learning contribution is unclear or uneven; or not yet substantiated when the necessary evidence is unavailable or contradictory. An unknown finding must not be coded as poor performance simply because data were not collected. Equally, the absence of documentation should not be disguised as proof of success. A separate notation for serious safeguarding or integrity concerns should trigger prompt action regardless of the domain judgment.

To guard against impressionistic assessment, reviewers should briefly record what was examined, why the evidence was relevant, what remained uncertain and how the conclusion was reached. When important disagreements occur, a third reviewer can examine selected artifacts. For cross-program comparisons, reviewers should first establish that prompts and performance standards are sufficiently comparable. A score from a clinically supervised placement and a commercial data project cannot be assumed to have identical meaning. If institutions later decide to create numerical scores, they will need to test the indicators' validity, the reliability of judgments and sensitivity to any aggregation rules before using those scores for consequential decisions.

5.3 Balancing Feasibility, Confidentiality and Student Voice

Quality assurance can fail by imposing a reporting burden greater than its educational benefit. An annual review need not inspect every student's complete portfolio. A small, purposeful sample may reveal how processes work, especially when it deliberately includes ordinary cases, positive examples and placements where concerns have arisen. Sampling decisions must be documented, however, because convenience selection can overrepresent particularly successful projects. Programs should distinguish routine monitoring, intended to detect problems early, from periodic deeper review, intended to examine the quality of educational claims.

Enterprise confidentiality presents a second practical challenge. A program can request redacted work products, structured observations or supervised access to sensitive materials rather than demanding commercial disclosure. Student voice requires equally careful protection. Feedback should be collected in ways that reduce the risk of retaliation and allow students to raise concerns independently of the people who assess them. These arrangements are not peripheral ethical details. Without trustworthy access to evidence, the quality review may systematically miss precisely those placements in which learning opportunities are weakest. The assessment therefore needs procedural credibility as well as technically appropriate indicators.

6 IMPROVEMENT PATHWAYS: FROM DIAGNOSED GAPS TO ACTION

6.1 Redesign the Curriculum–Project Interface

A common weakness occurs when university courses and enterprise tasks are organized in parallel rather than as parts of one learning sequence. The remedy is not necessarily to increase placement hours. Program teams should begin by identifying a small set of advanced capabilities and mapping them to the kinds of problems that enterprise partners can realistically provide. Each approved project should specify the student's expected contribution, disciplinary methods likely to be used, supervisory arrangements and planned evidence of learning. This creates a shared educational contract while leaving room for authentic uncertainty in the project itself.

The timing of university teaching should also respond to the student's developing needs. Instead of delivering all theoretical material before practice and assuming subsequent transfer, programs can organize short seminars around problems encountered during placements. Students might return to examine a failed forecast, reconsider a design constraint or compare alternative approaches to stakeholder communication. Such activities allow workplace experience to generate questions for academic study, while classroom learning improves later decisions. Constructive alignment and the educational integration of work experiences support this reciprocal design [5, 14].

6.2 Make Dual Supervision a Shared Educational Practice

When a review identifies superficial mentoring, appointing additional names to a supervisor list is unlikely to solve the problem. The more useful intervention is a shared supervisory routine. University and enterprise mentors can begin with a short joint planning conversation, agree on two or three learning checkpoints and define when a concern must be escalated. At checkpoints, the student should present a consequential piece of work and a question requiring judgment, not simply a record of hours completed. Feedback can then be captured in a brief note stating what should change and how the student will demonstrate a response.

Institutions must support this arrangement materially. Enterprise supervisors need a realistic allocation of time and an explanation of academic expectations. University supervisors need opportunities to understand contemporary professional practice. Recognition of mentoring contributions, targeted professional development and periodic review of workload may be more effective than extensive procedural requirements. Where a partner cannot provide the necessary supervision, programs should consider redesigning the assignment or reducing placements rather than treating weak mentoring as an unavoidable feature of cooperation.

6.3 Shift Assessment from Attendance and Output to Justified Capability

Evidence about learning is often weakest where programs use a single end-of-placement rating or evaluate the enterprise product without examining the student's reasoning. A stronger assessment sequence combines an initial task statement, interim work samples and a final explanation of decisions. Students should describe the professional problem, the evidence considered, the options rejected, the standards applied and the limitations of the solution. They should also be able to identify what they would change when faced with a similar but not identical problem. These requirements make competence more visible and support the longer-term learning purposes of assessment [7, 9].

Joint assessment need not imply that both supervisors assign identical marks. The enterprise mentor may judge the practicality, safety and professional appropriateness of the work, while the university examiner probes the quality of analysis and the student's independent explanation. The criteria and responsibilities should be transparent before evaluation. Where judgments differ, assessors should document the reason and seek additional evidence if needed. This protects academic standards while respecting the distinct expertise of the two settings. It also avoids assuming that customer satisfaction or workplace adoption is a complete measure of postgraduate learning.

6.4 Create a Responsive Partnership Portfolio

Universities may be tempted to value partnerships by their number, financial contribution or brand recognition. These measures can matter for institutional development but are weak substitutes for educational suitability. One organization may be excellent for introductory observation, another for complex technical projects and a third for interdisciplinary problem solving. A diversified portfolio can also protect students when an enterprise's project availability changes unexpectedly.

Partnership review should include constructive consequences. Partners providing rich opportunities and reliable mentoring can be supported through renewed cooperation, joint curriculum design and recognition. Where problems are remediable, the program should agree on a targeted action and a review date. Persistent absence of suitable tasks, unsafe conditions or unwillingness to support assessment may justify suspension of a particular placement arrangement. The objective is not to punish organizations for operating under commercial constraints; it is to ensure that students are not assigned to environments that cannot meet their educational needs.

6.5 Institutionalize a Small-Cycle Learning System

Improvement is more likely when review findings are linked to decisions that can be implemented within an ordinary teaching cycle. At the end of each placement period, the program can identify one or two recurring problems, specify the educational mechanism involved and test a feasible response in the next cohort. For instance, if students struggle to connect analytic methods to enterprise assignments, the next cycle might introduce a jointly supervised project-scoping meeting and a short applied-methods clinic. Evidence would then be sought about the quality of project questions and students' subsequent explanations, rather than merely counting how many clinics took place.

The review should also identify unintended consequences. More elaborate portfolios might improve assessment evidence but reduce time available for substantive work. A new industry project requirement might improve authenticity while limiting access for students who need additional preparation. Responsive governance therefore involves monitoring both improvement and burden. Treating evaluation as a continuing conversation among students, supervisors and program leaders is preferable to producing an annual ranking that has little connection with specific decisions. This is how an evidence-linked quality framework can support change rather than just documentation.

7 DISCUSSION: CONTRIBUTION, TRANSFERABILITY AND LIMITS

The framework offers three conceptual contributions. First, it changes the evaluative question from whether a university has integrated with industry to whether a specified educational contribution can be traced across organizational boundaries. This matters because partnership intensity and learning quality are related only conditionally. Enterprises

may contribute resources, expertise and authentic problems, but those inputs become educationally meaningful through task design, participation, feedback and credible assessment. The framework therefore treats the student learning process as the connecting mechanism rather than assuming a direct relationship between collaboration resources and graduate quality.

Second, the framework separates evidence of activity, evidence of learning and evidence of improvement. Quality systems frequently collect what is administratively convenient: numbers of bases, supervisor appointments, events or completed placements. Such information remains useful for management, but it does not answer whether advanced capabilities developed. Nor does evidence of capability necessarily show that a university can learn from weaknesses. Keeping these claims separate reduces the risk of exaggerated conclusions and makes diagnostic reviews more useful. It also helps explain why a program with fewer external partners may deliver better learning than a larger program whose partners provide limited access to meaningful work.

Third, the framework connects a quality judgment to a proportionate decision. The proposal does not require all application-oriented universities to adopt identical weights, degree-project formats or industrial sectors. It instead specifies what must be justified: the capabilities intended, the activities experienced, the evidence used and the response to weaknesses. This approach is compatible with the distinctive purposes of professional education and with the broader principle that quality assurance should support educational enhancement, not merely external accountability [12, 19].

The article also relates to emerging scholarship on postgraduate quality governance. Wang et al. propose an industry-linked assurance arrangement involving professional associations, emphasizing the role of intermediary coordination [25]. The present framework is narrower and more educationally specific: it concentrates on the traceability of individual learning and on the decisions made within a program's joint-training cycle. The two perspectives could complement each other, since a well-coordinated partnership ecosystem still requires credible evidence about what students learn. Likewise, empirical findings reported by Zhang and Chen and Wang et al. suggest practical problems to which the framework may be applied, but they do not establish that the proposed framework has been validated [10-11].

Several limitations must be acknowledged. The evidence prompts were developed conceptually and have not yet been tested for reliability, construct validity or sensitivity to disciplinary context. The framework does not estimate the causal effects of industry–education integration on employment, innovation or professional capability. Selection effects are likely to matter: students entering desirable placements may already differ in prior achievement, motivation and access to networks. Outcomes may also depend on economic conditions and institutional resources not captured by the proposed domains. Consequently, before-and-after comparisons or correlations between review ratings and graduate outcomes cannot automatically be interpreted as causal effects.

Further empirical work should begin with cognitive interviews involving students, university supervisors and enterprise mentors to establish whether prompts are interpreted consistently. Multi-program pilots could assess feasibility, document the distribution of missing evidence and test inter-reviewer agreement. Longitudinal studies should examine whether changes in project design or supervision precede improvements in independently assessed student work, preferably while accounting for baseline capability and placement selection. A cross-disciplinary comparison would be particularly useful for identifying which elements are broadly transferable and which require field-specific standards. These steps would transform the present conceptual model into a tested quality-assurance instrument without prematurely claiming universal applicability.

8 CONCLUSION

The quality of industry–education integration in professional master's education should not be inferred from partnership agreements, placement duration or the availability of external mentors alone. These are important enabling conditions, but the educational question is whether students undertake sufficiently challenging professional work, receive coherent guidance, demonstrate advanced capabilities and benefit from program decisions informed by credible evidence. A quality evaluation that cannot connect these stages risks confusing institutional activity with student learning.

This article has developed a five-domain, evidence-linked framework for reviewing shared educational purpose, authentic opportunities, integrated supervision, demonstrated capability and improvement governance. The accompanying prompts and review protocol offer a starting point for application-oriented universities seeking to move from compliance reporting toward educational diagnosis. The proposed improvement pathways focus on curriculum–project alignment, meaningful dual supervision, capability-oriented assessment, responsive partnership management and small-cycle institutional learning.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

FUNDING

This article is a research output of the Beijing Union University Teaching Reform Project entitled “Research on Quality Evaluation and Improvement Pathways for Industry–Education Integrated Postgraduate Training in High-Level Application-Oriented Universities” (Project No. JY2026Y016).

REFERENCES

[1] Academic Degrees Committee of the State Council, Ministry of Education. Development plan for professional degree graduate education (2020-2025), 2020. https://hudong.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/moe_826/202009/t20200930_492590.html.

[2] Ministry of Education. Opinions on Further Advancing the Differentiated Development of Academic and Professional Degree Graduate Education, 2023. https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A22/moe_826/202312/t20231218_1095043.html.

[3] Ankrah S, Al-Tabbaa O. Universities–industry collaboration: A systematic review. Scandinavian Journal of Management, 2015, 31(3): 387-408. DOI: 10.1016/j.scaman.2015.02.003.

[4] Bruneel J, D'Este P, Salter A. Investigating the factors that diminish the barriers to university–industry collaboration. Research Policy, 2010, 39(7): 858-868. DOI: 10.1016/j.respol.2010.03.006.

[5] Billett S. Realising the educational worth of integrating work experiences in higher education. Studies in Higher Education, 2009, 34(7): 827-843. DOI: 10.1080/03075070802706561.

[6] Jackson D. Employability skill development in work-integrated learning: Barriers and best practice. Studies in Higher Education, 2015, 40(2): 350-367. DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2013.842221.

[7] Boud D, Falchikov N. Aligning assessment with long-term learning. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 2006, 31(4): 399-413. DOI: 10.1080/02602930600679050.

[8] Gulikers J T M, Bastiaens T J, Kirschner P A. A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. Educational Technology Research and Development, 2004, 52(3): 67-86. DOI: 10.1007/BF02504676.

[9] van der Vleuten C P M, Schuwirth L W T, Driessen E W, et al. A model for programmatic assessment fit for purpose. Medical Teacher, 2012, 34(3): 205-214. DOI: 10.3109/0142159X.2012.652239.

[10] Zhang Y, Chen X. Empirical analysis of university–industry collaboration in postgraduate education: A case study of Chinese universities of applied sciences. Sustainability, 2023, 15(7): 6252. DOI: 10.3390/su15076252.

[11] Wang L, Xu L, Guo Y, et al. On the impact of industrial placements in professional master education: An empirical study. Frontiers in Education, 2025, 10: 1682874. DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1682874.

[12] Harvey L, Green D. Defining quality. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 1993, 18(1): 9-34. DOI: 10.1080/0260293930180102.

[13] Tam M. Measuring quality and performance in higher education. Quality in Higher Education, 2001, 7(1): 47-54. DOI: 10.1080/13538320120045076.

[14] Biggs J. Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. Higher Education, 1996, 32(3): 347-364. DOI: 10.1007/BF00138871.

[15] Etzkowitz H, Leydesdorff L. The dynamics of innovation: From National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. Research Policy, 2000, 29(2): 109-123. DOI: 10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4.

[16] Perkmann M, Tartari V, McKelvey M, et al. Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. Research Policy, 2013, 42(2): 423-442. DOI: 10.1016/j.respol.2012.09.007.

[17] Nicol D J, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 2006, 31(2): 199-218. DOI: 10.1080/03075070600572090.

[18] Boud D, Molloy E. Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 2013, 38(6): 698-712. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2012.691462.

[19] European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), European Students' Union (ESU), European University Association (EUA), et al. Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG), 2015. https://www.enqa.eu/esg-standards-and-guidelines-for-quality-assurance-in-the-european-higher-education-area/.

[20] Torraco R J. Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. Human Resource Development Review, 2005, 4(3): 356-367. DOI: 10.1177/1534484305278283.

[21] Snyder H. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 2019, 104: 333-339. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

[22] Jabareen Y. Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 2009, 8(4): 49-62. DOI: 10.1177/160940690900800406.

[23] Bowen G A. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 2009, 9(2): 27-40. DOI: 10.3316/QRJ0902027.

[24] Hsieh H F, Shannon S E. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qualitative Health Research, 2005, 15(9): 1277-1288. DOI: 10.1177/1049732305276687.

[25] Wang J, Li Q, Wang B. Aligning postgraduate education with industry: A tripartite quality assurance model for interdisciplinary talent development. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 2026, 37(3-4): 180-196. DOI: 10.1080/14783363.2025.2611341.