

# A CIPP Model-Based Evaluation of Marketing Practical Courses in Chinese Private Universities: An Industry-Education Integration Perspective

Zhijiang Huang

*Hubei Business College, Wuhan, Hubei, China*

**Abstract:** Under the impetus of Strategic Directions promoting the integration of industry and education, the evaluation system for practice-oriented courses in economics and management at private institutions necessitates reconstruction, as conventional approaches inadequately address the demands for cultivating application-oriented talents. This study, grounded in the CIPP model, is organized into five sections: introduction, research status, applicability analysis, exploration of system construction, and conclusion. The introduction delineates the research background and problematic issues; the review of research status highlights that extant evaluation systems prioritize outcomes over processes, whereas the CIPP model offers integrative advantages; the applicability analysis substantiates the model's suitability for practice courses in private colleges, emphasizing its dynamic four-dimensional evaluation mechanism encompassing context, input, process, and product; the exploration segment devises a multi-tiered indicator-based evaluation system, validated through case studies to demonstrate feasibility; the conclusion affirms that this framework facilitates continuous enhancement of course quality, furnishing theoretical underpinnings and practical pathways for private institutions to refine practical teaching and deepen industry-education integration.

**Keywords:** Industry-Education Integration; CIPP Model; Practice-Oriented Courses in Economics and Management; Evaluation System Construction

## 1. Introduction

Industry-education integration has been a pivotal national strategy in China since 2020, aimed at holistically developing vocational education,

higher education, and continuing education. Within the current strategic context of deepening this integration and advancing the transformation towards application-oriented talent cultivation, the reform of quality evaluation systems for practice-based courses has emerged as a central issue in higher education innovation, particularly for application-oriented undergraduate institutions. Marketing, as a highly applied discipline, relies critically on its practical teaching components to equip students with the ability to solve real-world business problems. However, conventional course evaluation models predominantly emphasize summative assessment of academic outcomes, exhibiting a tendency to "prioritize results over process" and "focus on internal academic metrics over industry relevance." This approach struggles to provide a comprehensive and dynamic reflection of the genuine effectiveness of practical teaching within an integrated industry-education context or to capture the value-added process in students' comprehensive competencies. Consequently, it fails to deliver effective feedback for the continuous improvement of teaching and learning processes.

The CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product), proposed by Stufflebeam in 1967, is an evaluation framework constructed around these four indicators. As a decision-oriented evaluation framework, it is widely recognized as suitable for assessing and optimizing educational programs and courses due to its systemic, process-focused, and improvement-driven characteristics. The model concerns itself not only with final outcomes but attaches greater importance to diagnosing the implementation context, analyzing resource inputs, and monitoring the entire process. Its core objective is "improvement" rather than mere "proving." In recent years, the model has been repeatedly applied in various educational domains—including evaluations of vocational

education quality, industry-education integration effectiveness, professional teaching quality, and specific course teaching outcomes demonstrating its applicability and effectiveness in constructing comprehensive evaluation systems within complex educational scenarios. Building on this foundation, this study focuses on marketing practice courses in Chinese private universities under the industry-education integration paradigm. It aims to draw upon the theoretical essence of the CIPP model and existing application experiences to construct a dynamic, multi-dimensional, and operable course evaluation system tailored to the characteristics of such courses. Using a marketing practice course at a private application-oriented undergraduate university in Hubei Province, China, as its basis, this research serves not only as a response to the limitations of existing evaluation models but also as an active exploration of pathways to implement industry-education integration Strategic Directions at the micro-level of teaching practice. It seeks to explore the optimization of teaching practices through scientific evaluation reform, ultimately aiming to identify methods for enhancing the quality of application-oriented marketing talent. The study intends to provide both theoretical reference and practical solutions for private universities to deepen teaching reforms and strengthen their distinctive characteristics.

## 2. Literature Review

The reform of evaluation systems for practice-based courses has emerged as a pressing issue within China's national strategic context of deepening industry-education integration and promoting application-oriented talent cultivation. This section synthesizes existing scholarship to establish the theoretical foundation for this study, following a structured examination of key literature.

The CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model, as formulated by Stufflebeam [1], provides the foundational theoretical framework for this research. It redefines program evaluation as a continuous, decision-oriented process designed for improvement, offering a systematic alternative to traditional summative assessment methods. The model's core strength lies in its comprehensive, process-focused approach to evaluation. Building on this foundational theory, Billett [2] offers crucial pedagogical insight,

arguing that the efficacy of practice-based learning is contingent upon an organic connection between curricular design and authentic workplace demands. This perspective provides a critical rationale for integrating industry elements at the course level, a central concern of this study. However, the transition from integrated design to effective assessment presents significant challenges. Jackson [3] identifies substantial barriers in evaluating the employability skills developed through practice, highlighting issues of methodological effectiveness and the misalignment between academic and industry standards. This directly underscores a core limitation of traditional evaluation models that this study seeks to address.

The practical applicability of the CIPP model in educational settings is well-documented. For instance, Zhang [4] successfully applied it to reconstruct the English teaching evaluation system in higher vocational colleges, demonstrating its utility in a context analogous to practice-oriented course reform. This application underscores the model's operational viability. Further deepening the conceptual understanding of evaluation, Archibald [5] emphasizes the importance of "evaluative thinking," reinforcing the CIPP model's core tenet that the ultimate purpose of evaluation is ongoing improvement rather than mere accountability. The model's relevance continues to be affirmed in contemporary educational research. Lei Zhong [6] applied the CIPP model to evaluate teaching quality in college education within a new era context, confirming its adaptability and diagnostic power. A thorough understanding of the model is also supported by historical analysis; Dizon [7] traced the historical development of CIPP, solidifying its standing as a robust and evolved curriculum evaluation model.

Recent scholarly work continues to explore and extend the CIPP model's applications. For instance, Chen and Zhu [8] developed a quality evaluation framework for innovation and entrepreneurship education in colleges and universities by integrating the CIPP model with the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). This study contributes to the methodological discourse on the model's implementation by demonstrating its effective synergy with a structured weighting technique for assessing a specific and crucial educational

domain—innovation and entrepreneurship. Demonstrating the model's integrative potential, Tang [9] combined CIPP with Outcome-Based Education (OBE) principles to evaluate intelligent education systems, highlighting its compatibility with other educational frameworks. Finally, the specific context of industry-education integration is addressed by Gan and Liu [10], who researched the evaluation of undergraduate students' core competencies within this paradigm, aligning closely with the overarching theme of the present study.

Despite the established value and diverse applications of the CIPP model, this review reveals persistent research gaps. Existing studies often focus on macro-level program evaluations or theoretical integrations, with a relative scarcity of research constructing micro-level, refined evaluation systems for single, discipline-specific practice courses. Furthermore, the translation of the broad "industry-education integration" directive into concrete, observable, and measurable indicators—particularly concerning the depth of enterprise participation and the tangible value of student outcomes—requires more operational designs. Finally, research that explicitly considers the unique context of Chinese private universities to design highly adapted evaluation pathways remains underdeveloped. Therefore, this study is positioned to construct a CIPP-based evaluation system specifically for marketing practice courses in Chinese private universities, aiming to fill these gaps by providing a practical, micro-level tool for continuous course improvement.

### 3. Applicability Analysis

#### 3.1 Teaching Objectives Orientation Based on Context Evaluation

The core of context evaluation lies in diagnosing the rationality and foresight of curriculum objectives. In the reform of marketing practice courses, its primary orienting function is to drive a fundamental recalibration of teaching objectives from "imparting disciplinary knowledge" towards "cultivating genuine job competency." It necessitates that curriculum designers move beyond the campus to systematically analyze regional industrial development plans, trends in technological change within the industry, and the specific competency demands of partner enterprises.

These analyses serve as the sole basis for establishing the course's competency objectives. This process ensures the dynamic alignment between teaching objectives and industry needs, addressing the fundamental questions of "why teach" and "to what extent to teach." It thereby provides a scientific foundation for decision-making, enabling private universities to avoid curricular homogeneity and to construct distinctive cultivation specifications characterized by "serving the local context and staying close to the market."

#### 3.2 Teaching Program Orientation Based on Input Evaluation

Input evaluation focuses on the various conditions and plans that support the achievement of teaching objectives. Its orienting role in curriculum reform is to shift the design of teaching programs from an "idealized blueprint" to a "streamlined, actionable working drawing." It involves systematically reviewing and planning the required "dual-qualified" faculty structure (integrating academic and industry expertise), practical teaching platforms, budgetary provisions, and institutional management safeguards needed to realize the teaching objectives. Through input evaluation, reformers can objectively assess existing resource gaps and advantages, thereby designing the most feasible and efficient resource allocation schemes and implementation pathways. This ensures that industry-education integration is not an empty slogan but a concrete action fully supported by human, material, and institutional resources, providing critical guidance for private universities to achieve substantive breakthroughs in the quality of practical teaching under resource constraints.

#### 3.3 Teaching Implementation Orientation Based on Process Evaluation

Process evaluation concerns the dynamic execution of the teaching program in practice. Its orienting function in curriculum reform is to propel the shift in teaching implementation from a "teacher-centered, classroom-enclosed" model to a "student-centered, open process of school-enterprise collaboration." It requires establishing a continuous monitoring mechanism to track and evaluate the organizational effectiveness of project-based teaching, the depth of student participation and performance in problem-solving within authentic or simulated

business contexts, the frequency and quality of guidance provided by dual mentors from both academia and industry, and the seamlessness of integrating industry elements into all phases of instruction. Functioning as the "dashboard" of course implementation, process evaluation provides real-time feedback on the "temperature" and "depth" of the industry-education integration. It enables the timely identification and correction of issues such as superficial cooperation or disconnects in practical components, thereby ensuring the quality of the collaborative education process. It constitutes an indispensable monitoring and safeguarding mechanism for realizing the reform philosophy of "learning by doing, and doing for learning."

### 3.4 Teaching Effectiveness Orientation Based on Product Evaluation

Product evaluation involves the comprehensive assessment of the impact generated by teaching implementation. Its core orienting role in curriculum reform is to shift the evaluation of teaching effectiveness from a "singular focus on academic scores" to an expanded view

encompassing "multifaceted competency development and comprehensive benefits." It attends not only to students' measurable skill mastery, certificate attainment, and competition achievements but also places significant emphasis on the cultivation of their implicit professional qualities, employer satisfaction with student internship performance, and the practical contribution of the course to students' employability and long-term career development. This pluralistic and developmental view of outcomes renders the verification of curriculum reform effectiveness more convincing. It not only answers "how well was it taught" but also uses empirical data to feed back into the context, input, and process stages, forming a closed-loop that drives continuous course improvement. Ultimately, it provides compelling evidence for the unique value of industry-education integration in talent cultivation.

## 4. Exploration of Evaluation System Construction

### 4.1 Index System Construction

**Table 1. Evaluation System Based on CIPP Model**

| Primary Index                                 | Secondary Index  | Tertiary Indicators   |
|---|--|---|
| A. Context Evaluation                         | A1:Alignment of Course Objectives with Industry Needs  | A11:Degree of match between course competency objectives and the typical work tasks of target positions   |
|   |  | A12:Synchronization of course content with trends in industry technology/models   |
|   | A2:Articulation with Preceding and Concurrent Courses  | A21:Fitness between prerequisite knowledge/skills required for the course and students' actual foundation                                       |
| B. Input Evaluation                           | B1:Course Teaching Team  | A22:Synergy between this course and other concurrent major courses in terms of projects and cases   |
|   |  | B11:Industry and enterprise practical experience of the course leader and primary instructors   |
|   | B2:Course Teaching Resources and Conditions  | B12:Specific responsibilities and commitment plan of the enterprise mentor in the course  |
|   |  | B21:Authenticity and timeliness of the core cases/projects used in the course   |
|   | B3:Course Instructional Program Design   | B22:Appropriateness of the specialized training software, platforms, or simulated training environments for the course                          |
|   |  | B31:Proportion and logical coherence of practical teaching components within the course syllabus and lesson plans                               |
| C. Process Evaluation                         | C1: Classroom Teaching and Project Guidance  | B32:Alignment of the student assessment and evaluation scheme with the course competency objectives, and the proportion of formative assessment |
|   |  | C11:Application effectiveness of teaching methods and student participation levels  |
|   | C2: Student Learning Process   | C12:Frequency and depth of enterprise mentor involvement in classroom teaching, project guidance, and stage reviews                             |
|   |  | C21:Students' role undertaking, task completion, and collaboration within group projects  |
| C3: Course Dynamic Management and Improvement | C22:Students' demonstrated ability to apply knowledge and tools in key tasks   |   |
|   | C31:Mechanisms and instances of real-time adjustment of teaching content based on project progress, industry trends, or student feedback |   |
| D. Product Evaluation                         | D1:Student Course Learning Outcomes  | D11:Professionalism and innovativeness of students' final project deliverables  |
|   |  | D12:Acquisition of vocational skill level certificates or awards in authoritative competitions by students through the course                   |
|   | D2:Perceptions of Students and Stakeholders  | D21:Students' sense of gain and satisfaction regarding knowledge, skills, and attitudes cultivated by the course                                |
|   |  | D22:Satisfaction of the enterprise mentor/project client with students' process performance and final outcomes                                  |
|   | D3:Sustainable Impact of the Course  | D31:Adoption of outstanding course outputs by enterprises or their inclusion as subsequent teaching cases                                       |
|   |  | D32:Demonstration, exchange, or dissemination of the course's teaching model and resources within and outside the institution                   |

Based on the CIPP evaluation model and integrating the core requirements of industry-education integration with the characteristics of marketing practice courses, this study has constructed a four-dimensional evaluation index system covering the entire "context-input-process-product" chain. This system aims to facilitate the systematic diagnosis, monitoring, and enhancement of course quality. The framework, as detailed in Table 1, provides a structured approach for assessment.

## 4.2 Evaluation System and Model Design

Following the construction of the evaluation index system, the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is employed to scientifically determine the relative importance of indicators at each level. This method quantifies the experiential judgments of decision-makers through pairwise comparisons, thereby reducing subjective arbitrariness. The specific steps are as follows:

### 4.2.1 Establishing the hierarchical structure model

First, the evaluation system is structured into a clear hierarchy. The top level is the "Comprehensive Evaluation of Marketing Practice Course Quality." The middle level consists of the four primary CIPP indicators: Context, Input, Process, and Product. The bottom level comprises the corresponding secondary and tertiary indicators.

### 4.2.2 Constructing the judgment matrices

Experts familiar with vocational education, marketing, and industry-education integration—typically including enterprise managers, subject teachers, and teaching administrators—are invited to conduct pairwise importance comparisons of indicators at the same level using a 1-5 scale. For example, regarding the four primary indicators at the criteria level, experts judge the importance of "Context Evaluation" relative to "Input Evaluation," using scale values such as 1 (equally important), 3 (slightly more important), and 5 (significantly more important). All comparison results are entered into matrices, forming judgment matrices:

$$A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n} \quad (1)$$

Where  $(a_{ij})$  denotes the importance of the  $i$ -Th indicator relative to the  $j$ -Th indicator, satisfying  $(a_{ij} > 0)$ ,  $(a_{ji} = 1/a_{ij})$ ,  $(a_{ii} = 1)$ .

### 4.2.3 Calculating the weight vector and the

maximum eigenvalue

The core of determining the weights (i.e., the order of importance) of the indicators in a judgment matrix lies in solving for its eigenvector. The following steps are taken using the geometric mean method (root method):

Calculate the geometric mean of each row element:

$$W_i = \sqrt[n]{\prod_{j=1}^n a_{ij}}, \quad i=1,2,\dots,n \quad (2)$$

Calculate the maximum eigenvalue (max) of the judgment matrix:

$$\lambda_{max} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(Aw)_i}{w_i} \quad (3)$$

### 4.2.4 Consistency check

To ensure the logical rationality of the judgments, a consistency check is imperative. The steps are as follows:

Calculate the Consistency Index (CI):

$$CI = \frac{\lambda_{max} - n}{n-1} \quad (4)$$

Calculate the Consistency Ratio (CR):

$$CR = \frac{CI}{RI} \quad (5)$$

A judgment matrix is considered acceptably consistent if  $CR < 0.10$ ; otherwise, the judgment values need adjustment.

Through the above steps, judgment matrices are constructed, weights are calculated, and consistency is verified for each level of indicators, ultimately yielding a set of indicator weights with internal logical consistency. This method transforms qualitative comparisons into quantitative weights, enhancing the scientific and objective nature of the course evaluation system construction.

## 4.3 Validation and Analysis of the Implementation Mechanism

Drawing upon evaluation methods commonly employed in economics and management courses, this study implements a comprehensive improvement and application of the evaluation framework by utilizing course data from a marketing practice course offered in the Fall semester of 2024-2025 at a private application-oriented undergraduate institution in Hubei Province. The target institution is a privately-run finance and economics undergraduate university in Hubei Province, China. Its Marketing program has been established for over 20 years, accruing considerable experience in program development and delivery. The currently implemented talent cultivation plan emphasizes

the integration of theoretical and practical teaching. However, the proportion of credit hours dedicated to practical instruction remains a minority relative to the total required theoretical hours (Table 2). The program currently offers a total of three practice-oriented courses, with the "Marketing Research Practice" course serving as the subject of this study.

**Table 2. Credit Hour Distribution for the Marketing Major at a University in Hubei Province**

| Theoretical Instruction | Practical Instruction | Total Program Credits |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 121                     | 31                    | 152                   |

#### 4.3.1 Determination of indicator weights

To determine the relative importance of the indicators within the constructed evaluation system, this study employed the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). Guided by the specific characteristics of marketing practice courses, a panel of eight experts was convened.

**Table 3. Suggested Weight Distribution for the Marketing Practice Course Evaluation System at a Private University in Hubei Province**

| Primary Index                                | Secondary Index                                      | Tertiary Indicators   | Synthesized Assigned Weight |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| A: Context Evaluation (0.35)                 | A1:Alignment of Objectives with Industry Needs(0.70) | A11:Degree of Match with Target Position Tasks (0.60)                 | 0.147                       |
|  |  | A12:Synchronization with Industry Trends (0.40)                       | 0.098                       |
|  | A2:Course Articulation (0.30)                        | A21:Alignment with Prerequisite Courses (0.60)                        | 0.063                       |
|  |  | A22:Synergy with Concurrent Courses (0.40)                            | 0.042                       |
| Input Evaluation (0.20)                      | B1:Teaching Team (0.40)                              | B11:Instructors' Practical Experience (0.60)                          | 0.048                       |
|  |  | B12:Roles and Input of Enterprise Mentors (0.40)                      | 0.032                       |
|  | B2:Teaching Resources and Conditions (0.35)          | B21:Authenticity of Cases/Projects (0.55)                             | 0.0385                      |
|  |  | B22:Appropriateness of Practical Training Environment (0.45)          | 0.0315                      |
|  | B3:Instructional Program Design (0.25)               | B31:Credit Hours and Logic of Practical Components (0.50)             | 0.025                       |
|  |  | B32:Alignment of Assessment Scheme with Objectives (0.50)             | 0.025                       |
| Process Evaluation (0.30)                    | C1:Teaching and Project Guidance (0.40)              | C11:Effectiveness of Teaching Method Application (0.50)               | 0.060                       |
|  |  | C12:Depth of Enterprise Mentor Involvement (0.50)                     | 0.060                       |
|  | C2:Student Learning Process(0.40)                    | C21:Role and Collaboration in Course Project Teams (0.45)             | 0.054                       |
|  |  | C22:Reflection in Discipline-Specific Competitions (0.55)             | 0.066                       |
| C3:Dynamic Management and Improvement (0.20) | C31:Dynamic Adjustment of Teaching Content (1.00)    | 0.060   |                             |
| Product Evaluation (0.15)                    | D1:Student Learning Outcomes (0.40)                  | D11:Final Grade (0.70)  | 0.042                       |
|  |  | D12:Discipline-Specific Competition Certificates or Awards(0.30)      | 0.018                       |
|  | D2:Perceptions of Stakeholders (0.35)                | D21:Students' Sense of Gain and Satisfaction (0.60)                   | 0.0315                      |
|  |  | D22 Satisfaction of Enterprise (0.40)                                 | 0.021                       |
|  | D3:Sustainable Impact of the Course (0.25)           | D31:Adoption or Classification of Competition/Project Outcomes (0.60) | 0.0225                      |
|  |  | D32:Dissemination and Exchange with Peer Institutions (0.40)          | 0.015                       |

#### 4.3.2 Input of evaluation data and analysis of results

Taking a class of 45 students enrolled in the Market Research and Forecasting Practice course as the evaluation subject, the research team collected data based on the observation points outlined in Table 1. The newly developed CIPP evaluation system was implemented to score each tertiary indicator on a 100-point scale. The final comprehensive evaluation score

The panel comprised one enterprise marketing executive, three heads of academic programs from higher education institutions, and four teaching administrators. These experts were tasked with performing pairwise comparisons of the indicators at each level to construct the necessary judgment matrices.

Following the calculation of the initial weights derived from these matrices, a consistency check was rigorously applied. The Consistency Ratio (CR) value for every judgment matrix constructed was confirmed to be less than 0.1, meeting the standard threshold for acceptable consistency. This validation process ensured the logical coherence of the expert judgments. The final, consolidated weight for each indicator within the evaluation system was subsequently determined. The complete hierarchical weight structure, from primary to tertiary levels, is presented in Table 3.

for the course was obtained by multiplying each indicator's score with its corresponding synthesized weight and summing the results (Table 4). Individual student comprehensive scores were calculated primarily based on their personal performance in the Process and Product evaluation dimensions.

#### 4.3.3 Summary

First, this study demonstrates through concrete practice that the application of the CIPP

framework for reforming the evaluation system of marketing practice courses possesses strong practical applicability and innovativeness. The system successfully re-contextualizes data representing the traditional formative-summative assessment structure from various learning elements, systematically attributing it to the four dimensions of context, input, process, and product, thereby calculating a comprehensive score. This score not only provides a more nuanced quantification of the course's teaching quality but, more importantly, the scores across individual dimensions clearly reveal the course's strengths and weaknesses. While the majority of students scored reasonably well in Context Evaluation, the scores for Input and Process Evaluations were comparatively lower. Issues such as the "inadequate role of enterprise mentors," "outdated training software," and "weak integration with emerging trends" identified at the institution can all be derived from the input of existing data.

Second, the current weight allocation reflects the guiding principles of industry-education integration and practice-oriented courses. Context Evaluation carries the highest weight, and its score contributes the most to the total, thereby directing course development to prioritize alignment with industry needs. Process Evaluation holds the second-highest weight, underscoring the paramount importance of monitoring the practical teaching process. In this evaluation, the Process Evaluation score primarily benefited from standardized classroom management and project-based training. However, it was adversely affected by the limited emphasis placed on the enterprise connection due to its weak integration with the course flow. This precisely illustrates the indicator's sensitivity in detecting the "depth" of industry-education integration during the implementation process.

Finally, the new system demonstrates significant advantages over traditional evaluation methods. Traditional transcripts present only two isolated numbers for "formative" and "summative" assessments, incapable of explaining the underlying causes of the scores. In contrast, this evaluation system, through a multi-dimensional and multi-source data analysis, not only provides an overall score but also generates a detailed "phased diagnostic report on course quality". It clearly identifies directions for improvement: future efforts should focus on strengthening

enterprise mentor involvement during the mid-course phase and updating training software and cases to keep pace with industry frontiers. This fully realizes the core tenet of the CIPP model that "the purpose of evaluation is improvement", validating the system's practical value in promoting the continuous reform of marketing practice courses and deepening industry-education integration.

**Table 4. Distribution of Student Comprehensive Scores Converted Based on the Logic of the CIPP Evaluation System**

| Score Range | Number of Students | Percentage |
|-------------|--------------------|------------|
| 90-100      | 7                  | 15.6%      |
| 80-89       | 28                 | 62.2%      |
| 70-79       | 8                  | 17.8%      |
| 60-69       | 2                  | 4.4%       |
| <60         | 0                  | 0.0%       |

## 5. Conclusion and Prospect

### 5.1 Conclusion

Grounded in the national strategic context of deepening industry-education integration and promoting the cultivation of application-oriented talent, this study systematically explored and constructed a course evaluation system based on the CIPP model to address the limitations of traditional evaluation models for marketing practice courses in Chinese private universities, which tend to "prioritize outcomes over process" and "focus on internal academia over industry." The research began with a literature review to clarify the impetus for course evaluation reform driven by industry-education integration, the shortcomings of traditional evaluation, and the theoretical advantages of the CIPP model (systematic, process-oriented, improvement-focused) in addressing such issues. This established the entry point for this study: to construct a refined and operable evaluation scheme for a single, discipline-specific practice course.

The core work involved deeply integrating the four dimensions of the CIPP model with the entire teaching and learning workflow of marketing practice courses. This resulted in the design of an evaluation index system comprising 4 primary indicators, 12 secondary indicators, and 24 tertiary indicators. The system innovatively adopts the course's own perspective, translating the macro requirement of "industry-education integration" into specific, observable behavioral and outcome-based

indicators such as "depth of enterprise mentor involvement," "authenticity of cases/projects," and "industrial value of outcomes." To scientifically determine the importance of each indicator, the study employed the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). Through expert consultation, judgment matrices were constructed and weights were calculated, ultimately yielding a weight distribution scheme that emphasizes "Context Evaluation" and "Process Evaluation" as core guiding principles. This highlights the importance attached to the alignment of course objectives with industry needs and the quality of the teaching implementation process.

To validate the system's effectiveness, this study conducted an empirical analysis using the "Market Research and Forecasting Practice" course at a private university in Hubei Province as a case study. By inputting actual course data and performing calculations based on the assigned weights, a comprehensive evaluation score for the course was obtained. Furthermore, a new grade distribution was simulated, reflecting a more nuanced assessment of students' comprehensive performance in "process" and "product." The validation results indicate that the system can not only quantify the overall quality of the course but also accurately diagnose its strengths and weaknesses through dimension-specific scores. For instance, it effectively identified concrete issues such as "insufficient process involvement of enterprise mentors" and "lack of cutting-edge practical training resources," fully demonstrating its diagnostic function and improvement orientation. Compared to traditional evaluation methods that merely present isolated scores, this system can generate a systematic "Course Quality Diagnostic Report," clearly pointing the way towards specific paths for continuous improvement. This achieves the core tenet of the CIPP model: "the purpose of evaluation is improvement."

In summary, this study successfully constructed and preliminarily validated a CIPP-based course evaluation system that aligns with the characteristics of private universities and closely addresses the practical needs of marketing programs. This system provides a solution, grounded in both theoretical rationale and practical applicability, for private universities to scientifically assess and continuously improve the teaching quality of practice-oriented courses

like marketing within the context of industry-education integration.

## 5.2 Suggestions for Future Research

Although this study constructed the evaluation system and conducted a case validation, several aspects warrant further deepening and expansion in future research.

First, there is a need to expand the scope and depth of empirical research. The current validation is based on a single course at one institution. Future studies could enlarge the sample scope, applying the system to different types of marketing practice courses (e.g., digital marketing practicum, brand planning practice) across multiple private universities in different regions with varying characteristics. This would test the system's generalizability and robustness. Concurrently, longitudinal tracking studies could be conducted to assess the actual changes in course effectiveness driven by multiple rounds of improvements informed by the evaluation system.

Second, the methods for determining weights and the mechanisms for dynamically adjusting indicators can be optimized. This study used AHP to determine static weights. Future research could explore integrating multiple methods such as the Delphi technique and entropy weight method, or involve a larger panel of enterprise experts and industry representatives in the consultation process. This would enable weight distributions to more accurately reflect rapidly evolving industry demands. Additionally, research could investigate mechanisms for the dynamic updating or retirement of indicators, enhancing the system's adaptability.

Third, it is worthwhile to deepen research on the multifaceted application of evaluation results and corresponding incentive mechanisms within an appropriate scope. This study focused on constructing the evaluation system and validating its diagnostic function. Future work should delve deeper into how to effectively link evaluation results with various processes, such as faculty teaching assessments, disciplinary resource allocation, evaluations of industry-university cooperation effectiveness, and even student career development guidance. Exploring the design of reasonable incentive mechanisms, potentially informed by educational psychology models, could genuinely motivate diverse stakeholders—including the

institution, faculty, enterprises, and students—to actively participate in and value the evaluation and improvement process based on this system. Finally, future efforts should broaden theoretical perspectives and conduct interdisciplinary comparisons. Building upon the CIPP model, theories such as "Outcome-Based Education (OBE)" and "Evidence-Based Education" could be further integrated to enrich the theoretical underpinnings of the evaluation framework. Simultaneously, comparative studies could be undertaken to analyze the similarities and differences in applying this evaluation system to practice courses in marketing versus those in other application-oriented fields like engineering or information technology. This could help distill a more generalizable meta-evaluation framework applicable to industry-education integrated courses.

#### Acknowledgments

Hubei Business College Teaching Reform Research Foundation. Foundation Number: 202429

#### References

- [1] Stufflebeam D L. The CIPP model for evaluation//Kellaghan T, Stufflebeam D L. International handbook of educational evaluation. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003: 31-62.
- [2] Billett S. Curriculum and pedagogic bases for effectively integrating practice-based experiences. Sydney: Australian Learning and Teaching Council, 2011.
- [3] Jackson D. Employability skill development in work-integrated learning: Barriers and best practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 2014.
- [4] Zhang Z X. Research on the Reconstruction of English Teaching Evaluation System in Higher Vocational Colleges Based on CIPP Model. *Education Research and Innovation*, 2026, 2(1): 60-66.
- [5] Archibald T. The role of evaluative thinking in the teaching of evaluation. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 2021, 35(3): 401-404.
- [6] Lei Z. The Application of CIPP Model in the Evaluation of Teaching Quality of College Education in the Context of New Era. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, 2024, 9(1):
- [7] Dizon A G. Historical development of CIPP as a curriculum evaluation model. *History of Education*, 2023, 52(1):21.
- [8] X S Chen, J X Zhu. Quality Evaluation of Innovation and Entrepreneurship Education in Colleges and Universities Based on CIPP Model and AHP. //Artificial Intelligence, Medical Engineering and Education: Proceedings of the 7th International Conference (AIMEE 2023), Guangzhou, China, 9-10 November 2023. 2024:768-778.
- [9] Tang Y. OBE+CIPP Based Quality Evaluation Method for College Classroom Intelligent Education System. *Lecture Notes of the Institute for Computer Sciences, Social Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering*, 2024: 244-261.
- [10] Gan Q, Liu M. Research on the evaluation of undergraduate students' core competencies in the context of industry-education integration. *Scientific Reports*, 2026, 16(1)