

Exploration on the Construction and Implementation Strategies of the Quality Assurance System for Cross Regional Campus Teaching: A closed-loop Mechanism Centered around Multi-party Participation in Evaluation and Dynamic Feedback

Yan Sun¹, Xuanyi He², Linqi Du³

¹Geely University of China, Chengdu, Sichuan, 641423, China

²Tianfu College of SWUFE, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610052, China

³Sichuan Technology and Business University, Chengdu, Sichuan, 611745, China

ABSTRACT

The multi campus and cross regional educational model has brought development opportunities, but also unprecedented challenges to ensuring teaching quality. This study is based on the practical needs of cross regional education and innovatively proposes a closed-loop quality assurance system with "multi-party participation evaluation" and "dynamic feedback mechanism" as the core. This system breaks through the limitations of traditional quality assurance models and achieves monitoring and improvement of teaching quality through the establishment of an evaluation mechanism and dynamic feedback system that involves multiple stakeholders' collaborative participation. Its theoretical value lies in enriching the theory of cross regional education quality management, and its practical significance lies in providing operational implementation paths for universities, which plays an important guiding role in improving the overall quality of cross regional education and promoting balanced development of education.

KEYWORDS

Cross district campus; Teaching quality; Security system; Multi party participation in evaluation; Dynamic feedback

1 Introduction

With the deepening development of educational globalization, cross regional campuses have gradually become the new norm in the field of higher education. However, while cross regional campuses enjoy the advantages of resource integration and brand expansion, they also face complex challenges in ensuring teaching quality. Domestic and foreign scholars have conducted extensive research on the quality assurance system of teaching, mainly focusing on the formulation of evaluation standards and the construction of feedback mechanisms. However, there is still a lack of research on the teaching quality assurance system for cross regional campuses, especially the closed-loop mechanism centered on multi-party participation evaluation and dynamic feedback. The aim of this project is to fill the gap in research on the quality assurance system of cross regional campus teaching. By constructing a closed-loop mechanism with multi-party participation evaluation and dynamic feedback as the core, a scientific and systematic teaching quality assurance plan will be provided for cross regional campuses.

2 The Problems and Causes of Teaching Quality Assurance in Current Cross District Campuses

2.1 Existing Problems

2.1.1 Inconsistent Systems and Standards

The primary challenge in ensuring teaching quality in cross regional campuses lies in the fragmentation of institutional systems and differences in standard implementation. Due to the geographical separation of each campus and often having different development histories, local policy environments, and resource endowments, it is difficult for them to establish a unified and authoritative teaching quality management system. This inconsistency is deeply reflected in multiple dimensions such as the formulation of teaching syllabi, the scale of curriculum assessment, and teacher admission and evaluation; For example, the same major may adopt different teaching syllabi and evaluation standards in different campuses, resulting in significant differences in the knowledge structure and ability level of the students ultimately cultivated. Institutional barriers have led to an increase in management costs, fundamentally weakening the scale effect and brand consistency pursued by cross regional education, making "cross regional" to some extent a form of geographical expansion rather than substantive quality community construction.

2.1.2 The Feedback Mechanism Lags Behind and Lacks Dynamic Adjustment

Currently, many cross regional campus teaching quality feedback mechanisms exhibit significant lag, making it difficult to respond promptly and effectively to problems that arise during the teaching process. Traditional feedback often relies

on periodic final student evaluations or teaching inspections, with a lengthy process of data collection, organization, and analysis. By the time conclusions are formed, the courses involved have often already ended, missing the best opportunity for intervention. Evaluation cannot be applied to ongoing teaching improvements, resulting in problems accumulating and circulating year after year. The deeper problem lies in the lack of a dynamic information platform that can integrate multi-party data and achieve real-time warning, and teaching management personnel are unable to perceive the real ecology of classrooms in different campuses. The adjustment of teaching strategies therefore relies more on empirical judgment rather than data-driven approaches, and the agility of the entire quality assurance system is insufficient, unable to adapt to the rapid changes in student needs and external environment, and falling into the dilemma of passive response rather than active optimization.

2.1.3 The Evaluation Subject is Single and Lacks Multi-party Participation

Effective evaluation of teaching quality should be a process of gathering multiple perspectives and forming a three-dimensional image, but in reality, the evaluation subject structure of cross regional campuses appears quite single and closed. The evaluation power is overly concentrated in the hands of teaching management departments or a few managers, while students who are stakeholders in teaching, teachers who undertake frontline teaching tasks, and industry and enterprise experts who can best measure the match between talent cultivation and social needs are often placed on the edge of the evaluation system. Student evaluation of teaching often becomes a formality, and its deep demands are not effectively absorbed; Professional peer evaluation among teachers is also difficult to conduct due to inconvenient cross campus communication; External feedback from employers lacks institutionalized channels for introduction. The evaluation model of a single subject inevitably brings blind spots in perspective, and its conclusions may be biased and unable to objectively reflect the true quality of teaching, resulting in insufficient motivation for improvement measures based on such evaluation results at the implementation level.

2.2 Cause Analysis

The formation of many problems in the quality assurance of cross regional campus teaching is rooted in the intertwined effects of structural, historical, and conceptual factors. From the perspective of management system, many education groups have not yet established a governance model that is fully adapted to their cross regional expansion, with clear rights and responsibilities and efficient operation. It is difficult for each campus to find a balance between school autonomy and unified management by the headquarters, resulting in resistance to implementation or regional variations in top-level institutional design when penetrating downwards. Insufficient technological empowerment is another constraint. Building a real-time dynamic feedback mechanism relies on powerful intelligent analysis systems as support. However, some cross campus information construction still remains in a state of fragmentation and data isolation, lacking investment in cross campus data integration and process reengineering, with delayed information transmission and lack of decision-making basis. The deeper reason stems from the lack of collaborative culture and the lagging evaluation concept. Traditional management thinking still dominates, and the modern education quality concept of "student-centered and multi-party governance" has not been truly established. Management personnel are accustomed to vertical control rather than empowering services, and teachers, students, and social forces are seen as managed objects rather than co built partners. Conceptual barriers directly lead to the singularity of evaluation subjects, causing the quality assurance system to lose its widely recognized foundation.

3 The Construction Path of Cross Regional Campus Teaching Quality Assurance System and the Formulation of Teaching Standards

3.1 Monitoring of Teaching Process

The purpose of monitoring the teaching process is to ensure that the actual operation of teaching activities does not deviate from the predetermined standard track. Traditional monitoring methods often rely on periodic teaching inspections or listening to lectures, which not only incurs high costs in cross regional contexts, but also has limited coverage and poor timeliness. Therefore, it is necessary to shift towards a new monitoring mode based on information technology. This means building a cross campus unified teaching quality data platform that comprehensively integrates multi-dimensional real-time information such as classroom videos, learning management system logs, online teaching interaction data, in class test scores, and even student attendance rates. By utilizing big data analysis technology, the platform can automatically identify abnormal patterns in the teaching process, such as sustained low student participation in a specific course at a certain campus, or significant differences in the teaching of the same knowledge point by multiple teachers, thereby issuing warnings to managers. Monitoring is no longer simply "staring" at teachers, but objectively depicting the "ecological map" of teaching through the collection and analysis of data from the entire teaching process, making implicit teaching behaviors explicit, providing an objective data basis for subsequent evaluation and feedback, and achieving a fundamental transformation from experiential management to data-driven decision-making.

3.2 Multi Party Participation Evaluation

Multi party participation in evaluation breaks through the limitations of a single evaluation subject, by gathering the perspectives of all stakeholders related to teaching, and jointly conducting a comprehensive, three-dimensional, and fair "consultation" on teaching quality. As direct experiencers of teaching services, students' evaluation of teaching should be carried out throughout the semester, through a combination of structured questionnaires and open-ended opinion collection, to collect students' direct feelings about course content, teaching methods, classroom atmosphere, and learning outcomes. Teacher peer evaluation focuses on examining at the professional level, promoting the exchange and collision of teaching concepts and methods through cross campus online lectures, teaching seminars, and mutual review of course materials, forming mutual supervision within the professional community. The evaluation of teaching management personnel focuses on controlling the fit between teaching standards, progress, and overall goals. It is particularly important to introduce industry and enterprise experts as external evaluation forces to evaluate the training program, practical teaching content, and students' comprehensive literacy from the perspective of market demand and professional ability, ensuring the effective connection between educational output and social demand.

3.3 Dynamic Feedback Mechanism

The dynamic feedback mechanism is the key to continuously optimizing the entire quality assurance system. The failure of traditional feedback mechanisms often lies in the serious lag in the feedback of evaluation results, while dynamic feedback mechanisms strive to break this deadlock. It relies on a unified teaching data platform, and once the data from multiple evaluations and warning information from teaching process monitoring are generated, the system will automatically trigger the targeted feedback process. For individual teachers, personalized diagnostic reports from students, peers, and the system should be seen in their personal workstations as soon as possible, including quantitative ratings, qualitative descriptions of problems, and specific improvement suggestions, to clarify their own teaching strengths and weaknesses. For campus or course team managers, the system provides group analysis reports to reveal common issues. This mechanism requires the recipient of feedback to report a specific improvement plan, and the system tracks the implementation and subsequent effects of improvement measures, forming a complete closed loop of "evaluation feedback improvement re evaluation".

4 Implementation Strategy

4.1 Institutional Construction

The system is the criterion for the stable operation of the quality assurance system, providing clear norms for the behavior of all parties involved. Cross regional campuses must go beyond simply copying the management model of a single campus and strive to build a unified, adaptable, and binding institutional framework. The framework should clearly define the rights and responsibilities of the headquarters and each branch campus in teaching quality management. It should ensure the rigid unity of core teaching standards, evaluation principles, and feedback processes, prevent each campus from acting independently, and give each campus the autonomy to flexibly implement within a certain range based on local characteristics, achieving a combination of integration and decentralization with a degree of tension and relaxation. The main measures include the formulation and promulgation of the "Charter for Quality Assurance of Cross Regional Campus Teaching", which serves as a guiding document to clarify the purpose, principles, and organizational structure of the system; A series of operational systems have been introduced, including the "Management Measures for Teaching Quality Standards", "Implementation Rules for Multi party Participation Evaluation", and "Regulations on Dynamic Feedback and Improvement Supervision". It is particularly important to establish an incentive and accountability mechanism linked to the system, incorporating the evaluation results of teaching quality into the performance assessment, professional title evaluation, and resource allocation system of each campus leader and teacher, so as to transform quality assurance from a "soft requirement" to a "hard constraint", and thus stimulate the endogenous motivation of all staff to improve at the institutional level.

4.2 Teacher Training

Teachers are the direct executors of teaching activities, and their ideas, abilities, and level of involvement directly determine the ultimate effectiveness of the guarantee system. Therefore, the implementation strategy must prioritize cross campus systematic teacher training. The training content should be a deep level professional development activity aimed at unifying teaching culture, empowering teaching innovation, and strengthening cross regional identity. It should systematically cover curriculum design and teaching method training based on unified standards, introduce advanced models such as case teaching and project-based learning, and help teachers understand the concepts behind the standards. At the same time, training must attach great importance to improving teachers' information literacy, enabling them to proficiently use cross campus quality data platforms for self diagnosis, participate in online peer reviews, and respond to dynamic feedback. The organizational form of training should fully reflect the "cross regional" characteristics,

establish a normalized online teaching and research community and regular offline cross campus teaching seminars, encourage excellent teachers to share experiences, and form a cross campus teaching mutual assistance network.

4.3 Resource Allocation

The implementation of any educational philosophy and system cannot be separated from corresponding resource support, and scientific and rational resource allocation is the fuel driving the effective operation of the quality assurance system. For cross regional campuses, resource allocation aims to pursue "excellence under balance", which means supporting characteristic development and quality innovation with emphasis while ensuring that the basic teaching conditions of each campus reach a unified benchmark. Firstly, the budget should be directly tilted towards the important aspect of ensuring teaching quality, and special funds should be established to support cross campus teacher training, teaching reform research, awards for excellent teaching achievements, and the operation and upgrading of information platforms, ensuring sufficient funding for key activities. Secondly, the allocation of hardware resources should break down campus barriers, promote the sharing and use of high-quality teaching resources such as large instruments and equipment, virtual simulation laboratories, and characteristic library collections between regions, make up for the lack of resources in individual campuses, and achieve the maximization of resource utilization efficiency. Finally, the allocation of human resources is particularly important. A specialized, cross campus teaching quality support team should be established, including teaching designers, educational technology experts, and data analysts, to go deep into the front line of teaching and provide teachers with professional support throughout the entire process from curriculum design to data interpretation and improvement plan consultation. Resource allocation should be upgraded from simple material investment to high-value intellectual empowerment.

4.4 Application of Information Technology

In the digital age, information technology is the technological lever for achieving large-scale, real-time, and refined teaching quality management. The depth of its application directly determines the sensitivity of monitoring, the depth of evaluation, and the timeliness of feedback. We must strive to build an intelligent cloud platform that integrates data collection, analysis, and interaction, serving as the "digital hub" of the entire quality assurance system. The platform should seamlessly integrate with the educational administration system, classroom recording system, online learning platform, etc. of each campus, automatically gather comprehensive data such as teaching process, learning behavior, evaluation results, etc., and use learning analysis and artificial intelligence technology to achieve early warning of students' learning difficulties, intelligent evaluation of teaching mode effectiveness, and multi-dimensional prediction of teaching quality trends. More importantly, the platform should design a user-friendly interface where teachers can intuitively view their teaching diagnostic reports, students can easily participate in teaching evaluations, and management personnel can real-time grasp the overall teaching quality situation. The ultimate goal of the deep application of information technology is to simplify and improve complex quality management processes, break down data silos, and make data an asset driving teaching improvement. This will solidify the concept of a closed-loop mechanism with multi-party participation evaluation and dynamic feedback as the core from a conceptual level to a reality that can operate normally.

5 Conclusion

The closed-loop mechanism constructed in this article, with multi-party participation evaluation and dynamic feedback as the core, provides a systematic solution for ensuring the quality of cross regional campus teaching. Through the organic integration of unified standards, strengthened monitoring, diversified evaluation, and dynamic feedback, it can effectively solve the prominent problems of institutional fragmentation, feedback lag, and single evaluation in current cross regional education. This system helps to achieve balanced development of teaching quality in various campuses, and has important practical value in promoting educational equity and enhancing school competitiveness.

References

- [1] Zhang Guochen, Peng Xumei, Liu Junpeng. Practical exploration of constructing a self-evaluation based internal teaching quality monitoring and guarantee system in universities: a case study of Dalian Ocean University[J].China Higher Education Evaluation, 2016,000 (3): 43-47.
- [2] Huang Xuhong, Wang Songlin, Li Chunmei. Analysis of the Current Situation and Countermeasures of Teaching Quality Monitoring in Vocational Colleges[J].China Education Technology Equipment, 2021,000 (18): 58-59,65.
- [3] Liu Xue. Research on the Teaching Quality Monitoring System of Applied Private Undergraduate Universities: Based on the Perspective of Teacher Professional Development [J]. Journal of Pu'er College, 2020,036 (5): 89-91.
- [4] Wang Xuemei, Guo Ruihua, Li Huiqin, Zhao Liping, Dong Xurong, Cai Ying, Liu Yongzhen. Research on the Construction of Teaching Quality Monitoring System under the Background of Engineering Education Certification[J].Science and Technology Innovation Guide, 2020,17 (5): 218-219.
- [5] Shen Lingzhi Research on University Teaching Quality Monitoring and Evaluation System in the Internet plus Era[J].Talent, 2022 (31): 166-169.