

Research on the construction of a students' comprehensive evaluation system in universities from the perspective of five-education integration

Zhenda Hao *, Hui Zhang and Chengsi Wu

Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing 100081, P. R. China.

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 30(03), 1673–1677

Publication history: Received on 13 May 2026; revised on 19 June 2026; accepted on 22 June 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2026.30.3.1735>

Abstract

The integrated development model of “moral, intellectual, physical, aesthetic, and labor education”—namely, five-education integration—is the core guiding principle of current higher education reform and high-quality talent cultivation in China. Traditional university student evaluation systems have long formed a single assessment logic dominated by academic performance, which leads to unbalanced student development, insufficient comprehensive quality cultivation, and utilitarian educational orientation. To implement the fundamental task of fostering virtue through education and realize the all-round development of college students, it is urgent to build a scientific, systematic, and standardized comprehensive evaluation system based on the five-education integration concept. Starting from the macro perspective of higher education quality reform, this paper analyzes the structural defects of traditional student evaluation mechanisms, expounds the internal logic and practical value of constructing a five-education integrated comprehensive evaluation system, summarizes the current practical difficulties in the balanced implementation of moral, intellectual, physical, aesthetic, and labor education assessment, and proposes systematic optimization pathways for evaluation system construction. The research results can provide theoretical references and practical ideas for universities to improve comprehensive quality assessment mechanisms, promote balanced educational development, and enhance the overall level of talent cultivation.

Keywords: Five-education integration; University students; Comprehensive evaluation system; Educational quality reform; All-round development

1. Introduction

With the continuous transformation of higher education from scale expansion to connotative high-quality development, the single academic-oriented talent evaluation model can no longer adapt to the diversified growth needs of contemporary college students or the social demand for high-quality talents[1]. The country has clearly put forward the educational requirement of “strengthening moral education, consolidating intellectual education, strengthening physical education, cultivating aesthetic education, and advocating labor education,” regarding five-education integration as the basic framework of the modern university quality education system[2].

In actual university management, intellectual education represented by academic scores still occupies an absolutely dominant position in student evaluation, while moral education, physical education, aesthetic education, and labor education are often marginalized, formalized, and fragmented[3]. This unbalanced evaluation orientation leads to many practical problems, such as students' overemphasis on professional grades, insufficient physical exercise, weak labor consciousness, inadequate humanistic quality, and imperfect psychological quality[4].

* Corresponding author: Zhenda Hao

Comprehensive evaluation serves as the baton for educational teaching and student growth guidance[5]. Only by building a complete and balanced five-education integrated evaluation system can universities reverse the long-standing unbalanced educational structure, realize the organic integration of morality, intelligence, physique, aesthetics, and labor throughout the entire talent training process, and guide students to form a comprehensive and healthy development pattern[6]. Against this background, this paper discusses the construction logic, practical difficulties, and optimization strategies of a college student comprehensive evaluation system from the perspective of five-education integration.

2. Deficiencies of Traditional University Student Evaluation Mechanisms

2.1. Serious imbalance of evaluation dimensions and dominant intellectual education orientation

Most university comprehensive evaluation systems still take academic grade point average, professional course scores, and research performance as the core assessment indicators, with the highest weight and strongest binding force[7]. Moral education, physical education, aesthetic education, and labor education are mostly attached indicators with low weight, vague standards, and insufficient institutional constraints[8]. This single evaluation orientation leads students to invest almost all their energy in professional learning, resulting in a structural imbalance in the development of comprehensive quality.

2.2. Fragmented evaluation content and lack of overall systematic design

At present, the five educational modules in most universities are independently managed and separately assessed, lacking an overall top-level design and an integrated linkage mechanism[9]. Moral education assessment is limited to moral performance records, physical education assessment is limited to physical fitness test results, and aesthetic education and labor education are mostly informal supplementary evaluations[10-12]. This fragmented evaluation model prevents the formation of synergistic educational effects and makes it difficult to reflect the overall development level of students' comprehensive quality.

2.3. Emphasis on outcome evaluation and neglect of whole-process growth guidance

Traditional evaluation mechanisms focus too much on final results such as end-of-term grades, qualification certificates, and competition awards, while lacking dynamic monitoring, process recording, and growth tracking of students' daily moral performance, physical exercise status, aesthetic literacy accumulation, and labor practice performance[13]. Outcome-oriented evaluation cannot effectively play the roles of process guidance, daily supervision, and educational incentives.

2.4. Rigid evaluation standards and lack of humanized differentiated design

Existing comprehensive evaluations mostly adopt unified quantitative standards for all students, ignoring individual differences in students' personality characteristics, physical conditions, artistic foundations, and practical abilities. This rigid evaluation method cannot adapt to the diversified growth characteristics of contemporary college students, easily leading to unfair evaluation outcomes and one-sided talent orientation.

3. Necessity and Theoretical Logic of Constructing a Five-Education Integrated Evaluation System

3.1. Helping to realize the fundamental goal of all-round talent cultivation

The core goal of five-education integration is to promote the coordinated development of students' morality, intelligence, physique, aesthetics, and labor. Constructing a comprehensive evaluation system covering all five dimensions can effectively correct the utilitarian educational tendency of "valuing intelligence over morality, physique, aesthetics, and labor," ensure that every educational link is implemented in the student training system, and lay a systematic institutional foundation for all-round quality education[14].

3.2. Fully utilizing the guiding baton function of educational evaluation

Educational evaluation determines students' learning orientation and growth behaviors[15]. By establishing balanced weight indicators, standardized assessment rules, and sound incentive mechanisms, the five-education integrated evaluation system can effectively guide students to pay equal attention to professional learning, moral cultivation, physical exercise, aesthetic accumulation, and labor practice, forming a positive growth atmosphere of comprehensive development.

3.3. Adapting to social demands for high-quality comprehensive talents

Modern society has increasingly higher requirements for the comprehensive quality of college graduates, including professional ability, moral quality, physical and mental health, humanistic literacy, and practical spirit. The single academic evaluation system can no longer meet social talent selection standards[16]. The five-education integrated comprehensive evaluation can help universities cultivate compound high-quality talents with balanced quality and comprehensive ability.

3.4. Promoting the standardized and institutionalized development of university quality education

The construction of a unified five-education evaluation system can integrate the scattered educational work of universities[17], form a complete closed-loop management system of “teaching, practice, assessment, and feedback,” promote the transformation of university quality education from fragmented project development to systematic institutional operation, and continuously improve the level of connotative educational development.

4. Practical Difficulties in Constructing a Five-Education Integrated Evaluation System

4.1. Difficulty in unified quantification of multi-dimensional quality indicators

Among the five educational dimensions, intellectual education has relatively unified quantitative standards, while moral education, physical education, aesthetic education, and labor education contain a large number of qualitative, behavioral, and developmental indicators that are abstract, dynamic, and difficult to quantify accurately[18]. Balancing qualitative evaluation with quantitative scoring is the primary difficulty in system construction.

4.2. Unbalanced resource allocation across the five educational modules

Most universities have complete curriculum systems and teacher resources for intellectual education, while physical education, aesthetic education, and labor education suffer from insufficient teachers, imperfect curriculum systems, and inadequate practice bases[19]. This unbalanced resource supply constrains the unified implementation of comprehensive evaluation.

4.3. Lack of linkage mechanisms among the various educational modules

At present, the five educational modules belong to different functional departments in university management, with independent management systems and disjointed data statistics[20]. There is no unified comprehensive quality data platform, resulting in difficulties in data integration, repeated assessments, and low evaluation efficiency.

4.4. Insufficient awareness of comprehensive development among teachers and students

Influenced by the long-standing academic-oriented evaluation tradition, teachers and students generally lack sufficient recognition of the importance of physical education, aesthetic education, and labor education, and lack active participation awareness[21]. This increases the difficulty of implementing the new evaluation system.

5. Construction Strategies for a Five-Education Integrated Student Comprehensive Evaluation System

5.1. Building a balanced and multi-dimensional evaluation indicator system

Universities should carry out top-level overall design for the five major educational dimensions, formulating standardized assessment indicators and reasonable weight distribution.

- Moral education: focus on moral behavior, political literacy, sense of responsibility, and classroom performance.
- Intellectual education: include academic performance, learning attitude, innovation ability, and academic progress.
- Physical education: cover physical fitness test results, daily exercise participation, and physical health improvement.
- Aesthetic education: assess aesthetic course learning, artistic practice participation, and aesthetic literacy growth.

- Labor education: evaluate labor attitude, labor practice duration, labor task completion, and labor spirit performance.
- Constructing an evaluation system with balanced weights, complete dimensions, and clear standards will achieve full coverage of comprehensive quality assessment.

5.2. Adopting a mixed evaluation model combining process and outcomes

Abandoning the single outcome evaluation model, universities should implement a diversified evaluation mechanism combining daily process assessment, phased assessment, and final outcome assessment. Students' daily growth behaviors should be recorded dynamically, and the improvement trends of comprehensive quality should be tracked, realizing the transformation from "outcome judgment" to "growth evaluation."

5.3. Establishing classified and differentiated assessment standards

According to students' different grade levels, majors, physical conditions, and individual differences, hierarchical and classified evaluation rules should be set. For students with weak foundations or special physical conditions, progressive evaluation standards focusing on participation and progress should be adopted to ensure the fairness, inclusiveness, and scientificity of the evaluation system.

5.4. Building a unified comprehensive quality data management platform

Universities should integrate the data resources of academic affairs, student affairs, physical education departments, art education centers, and labor education management departments, constructing a unified student comprehensive quality database. This will enable automatic statistics, dynamic updates, and real-time queries of five-education assessment data, improving the information level of comprehensive evaluation management.

5.5. Improving the incentive mechanism and creating a comprehensive development atmosphere

Linking the five-education comprehensive evaluation results with scholarship evaluation, excellence selection, graduate recommendation, and comprehensive performance appraisal will form a strong institutional incentive effect, guide teachers and students to change their educational concepts, and create a campus atmosphere that focuses on the all-round development of morality, intelligence, physique, aesthetics, and labor.

6. Conclusion

The construction of a student comprehensive evaluation system from the perspective of five-education integration is an inevitable requirement for the reform of higher education quality and the improvement of comprehensive talent training capacity. Traditional university student evaluation mechanisms suffer from prominent problems such as unbalanced dimensions, fragmented content, single evaluation methods, and utilitarian orientation, which restrict the all-round development of college students.

By constructing a balanced, systematic, whole-process, and humanistic five-education integrated comprehensive evaluation system, universities can effectively correct the defects of the traditional evaluation model, realize the organic integration of moral, intellectual, physical, aesthetic, and labor education throughout the entire talent training process, fully leverage the guiding, supervisory, and educational functions of evaluation, and continuously improve the comprehensive quality and overall competitiveness of college students. This study provides theoretical support and practical references for universities to deepen educational evaluation reform and promote the high-quality development of higher education.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Statement of Ethical approval

This study does not involve human or animal experiments, and no ethical approval is required.

References

- [1] Zhao TT, Li GP. From connotation-oriented to high-quality: evolution and transformation of China's higher education development policy. *Journal of Higher Education Research*. 2023;44(5):8-18.
- [2] Li H, Ma YQ. Five education integration: innovative practice of home-school-community collaborative education under problem orientation. 2025;(10):117-119.
- [3] Chen P. Integration of moral, intellectual, physical, aesthetic and labor education in colleges and universities in the new era and its significance dimension. *Vocational Education Exploration*. 2019;18(5):8.
- [4] Luo J. Analysis on college student management work under new situation. *Caizhi*. 2011;(28):1.
- [5] Xia YX, Zhu B. Thoughts on constructing a comprehensive quality evaluation system for college students. *Education Exploration*. 2003;(8):53-54.
- [6] Ren YW. "Five education integration" boosts students' all-round development. 2025;(11):58-59.
- [7] Huang YP, Zhang YL, Wang XY. Strategic behavior and its logic of high-achieving students under the credit point system. *Educational Science Digest*. 2024;43(3):49-51.
- [8] Feng YG. The value implication and development logic of the "Five Education" integrated education. 2024.
- [9] Chuiyangliu Central Primary School Jinsong Branch, Chaoyang District, Beijing. "Five Education" simultaneously to cultivate new-era talents. *Beijing Education (General Education)*. 2025;(2):49.
- [10] Wang RL. Implementing diversified evaluation and process evaluation of moral education. *Education Digest*. 2019.
- [11] Huang XZ, Zhang YL, Yang DY. Thoughts on college physical education reform based on students' physical health test. *Dajia*. 2011;(5):2.
- [12] Zhong JS, Dai LH. Research on the internal logical relationship and integration path of labor education and aesthetic education in the new era. 2025;(2):111-158.
- [13] Chen LJ. New orientation of innovative talent evaluation: establishing new standards while breaking the "four only". *Petroleum Enterprise Personnel*. 2022;(3):31-33.
- [14] Song YG, Li CW. How labor education integrates the five educations—an explanatory theoretical interconnection framework. *Educational Theory and Practice*. 2023;43(16):3-10.
- [15] Ma CH. The best education is guidance and influence. *Jiangsu Education Research: Practice (Edition B)*. 2016;(1):2.
- [16] Wang ZY. Let comprehensive quality evaluation break the dilemma of "only score". *Hunan Education (A)*. 2015.
- [17] Shi ZY, Dong YX, Qiu MZ. From "five education simultaneously" to "five education integration": connotation, rationality and realization path. *Xinhua Digest*. 2024;(10):113-116.
- [18] Liu QC. Only "five education simultaneously" can achieve complete school education. *Research in Educational Development*. 2021;41(22):3.
- [19] Peng QX. Problems existing in the cultivation of college students' practical ability. *Journal of Luohe Vocational and Technical College*. 2012;11(6):2.
- [20] Huang W. Research on school management under the guidance of "five education simultaneously". *Man Science (Science Education)*. 2024;(10):182-184.
- [21] Liu SS, Li LZ, He DQ. Problems and solutions of "five education integration" in higher vocational education. *New Education Era Electronic Magazine (Student Edition)*. 2021;(42):176-177.
- [22] Wu JN. Comprehensive quality evaluation of students under "five education simultaneously" in higher vocational colleges: value connotation, evaluation requirements and practical path. *Vocational and Technical Education*. 2023;44(35):76-79. <https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1008-3219.2023.35.014>