Asia Pacific Science Press

Journal of Educational Theory and Practice
ISSN(O):3005-9313
ISSN(P):3005-9305
Vol. 2 No.4 (2025)

Construction of an Evaluation Index System for the "Three-Wide Education" Mentor Team

Hao Gu[1,2,*]

1. School of Management, Xi 'an Polytechnic University, Xi 'an, 710600, China
2. Institute of Population and Social Policy, Xi 'an Polytechnic University, Xi 'an, 710600, China

Corresponding author: Hao Gu, guhao2023@163.com

Abstract: This study focuses on the construction of an evaluation index system for the "Three-Wide Education" tutor team, aiming to address the current lack of systematic, scientific, and quantitative standards in evaluating university tutor teams. Through literature analysis and policy review, the research team established an evaluation system comprising 3 first-level indicators, 13 second-level indicators, and 24 third-level indicators, covering the three dimensions of input evaluation, process evaluation, and output evaluation. The Analytic Hierarchy Process was employed to determine indicator weights, with results showing that output evaluation (44.9%) and process evaluation (41.7%) dominate the system, highlighting the central role of educational effectiveness and implementation process. Among specific indicators, competency development, employment outcomes, and research growth guidance carry the highest weights, while participation in academic competitions and social practices, employment guidance services, and tutor incentives emerge as key evaluation points. The study demonstrates that this system emphasizes substantive outcomes and core indicators, providing a quantitative basis for the scientific evaluation and continuous improvement of university tutor teams, reflecting the "student development-centered" educational philosophy.

Keywords: Three-Wide Education;Tutor Team; Evaluation System

Published: Dec 30, 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62177/jetp.v2i4.1021

1.Introduction

What kind of people to cultivate, how to cultivate them, and for whom to cultivate them are the three questions that ideological and political education in Chinese universities must always confront directly. Against this backdrop, all universities in Shaanxi Province have been actively carrying out the practical work of "all-round education for all", and the "All-round Education Mentor Group" is an important measure taken by Xi 'an Polytechnic University to implement the requirements of the opinions issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and The State Council and to carry out the practical work of "all-round Education for All". However, in the practical process, universities have not yet established a systematic and scientific evaluation system for the "all-round Education mentor group". The current assessment mostly remains at an empirical and fragmented level, lacking unified and standardized measurement standards. Meanwhile, the current evaluation indicators are highly subjective and mostly rely on qualitative descriptions and impression evaluations, making it difficult to conduct objective and precise quantitative assessments of the effectiveness of educational work. This situation where evaluation is lacking and subjective coexists not only affects the accurate judgment of educational

effectiveness but also restricts the continuous improvement and optimization of the mentor team's work, making it difficult to meet the high standards of moral education and talent cultivation in the new era.

2.Literature Review

By reviewing relevant literature, "all-round education for all" has attracted extensive attention and research from many scholars as an important topic in the current field of higher education. Among them, "mentorship system" is a high-frequency keyword in terms of the main body of education[1]. Different universities, colleges and majors have carried out a series of practices around the "all-round education mentorship system"[2-3]. For instance, the practice of the "six-in-one" undergraduate full-process mentorship education model implemented by Xi 'an Polytechnic University[4]; The Practice of the "1 class, 4 Mentors, 3 Collaborations, 4 Supports" four-in-one Undergraduate mentorship Education Model of the College of Biochemical Engineering, Beijing Union University[5]The practice of the "Tengyue" mentor team model implemented by Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, which covers multiple disciplines of traditional Chinese medicine, attracts and recruits multiple talents in the medical field, and conducts cross-border collaborative education[6].

Based on existing research, current studies on the evaluation of the "all-round education" mentor group focus on different mentor roles and educational collaboration models, such as the role of postgraduate mentors in "moral education and talent cultivation" from the perspective of "all-round education"[7-8], and the role of political theory learning mentors in the construction of the "all-round education" system [9-10]. Exploration of the Collaborative Education Path between Professional Mentors and Counselors[11-12]However, some problems have emerged in the practice of the mentorship system. For instance, the positioning of the "mentorship teams" in various universities is uncertain, and the detailed implementation rules of the mentorship teams are not standardized or specific[13]. Research on the evaluation index system of the "all-round education" mentorship teams is still relatively scarce. When Xi 'an Polytechnic University carried out the "All-Round Education Mentor Team" work, it set up quantitative assessment indicators from three aspects: student evaluation, the implementation of mentor team activities, and the educational effectiveness of the mentor team. However, the evaluation basis was highly subjective.

3.Evaluation index

After multiple rounds of revision and improvement, in combination with the "Implementation Measures for the 'All-Round Education Mentor Group' of Xi 'an Polytechnic University", the "Comprehensive Reform Pilot Construction Standards for 'All-round Education' in Regular Institutions of Higher Learning (Trial)" issued by the Ministry of Education (for details, see the appendix), and other policy documents as well as relevant literature, The research team ultimately established an evaluation index system for the "All-round Education Mentor Group", which includes 3 first-level indicators, 13 second-level indicators, and 24 third-level indicators (see Table 1).

Table 1 Evaluation Index System of the All-round Education Mentor Team

First-level Indicators	Second-level Indicators	Third-level Indicators
A Input Evaluation	A1 Tutor Team Development	A11 Number of Tutors
		A12 Types of Tutors
	A2 External Cooperation Resources	A21 Collaborative Education through Home-School-Community Partnerships
	A3 Incentive Mechanism	A31 Tutor Incentives
B Process Evaluation	B1 Ideological and Political Education	B11 Conducting Various Thematic Education Activities
	B2 Research and Academic Growth Guidance	B21 Professional Knowledge Guidance
		B22 Research Project Guidance
	B3 Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Competition Guidance	B31 Guidance for Academic Competitions, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship Practices
		B32 Organizing Innovation and Entrepreneurship Lectures, Forums, and Simulation Practices
	B4 Mental Health Education	B41 Conducting Mental Health Education Activities
	B5 Employment Guidance	B51 Conducting Vocational Aptitude Tests
		B52 Providing Employment Guidance Services

First-level Indicators	Second-level Indicators	Third-level Indicators
C Output Evaluation	C1 Students' Comprehensive Evaluation of the Tutor Team	C11 Students' Awareness of the Tutor Team
		C12 Students' Satisfaction with the Tutor Team
		C13 Alumni Evaluation of the Tutor Team
	C2 Ideological and Political Development	C21 Moral Education Level
	C3 Academic Level	C31 Participation in Tutor Research Projects
		C32 Publication of Theses and Patents
		C33 Student Academic Performance / Grades
	C4 Competency Development	C41 Participation in Academic Competitions and Social Practices
		C42 Participation in Cultural and Sports Activities
	C5 Employment Outcomes	C51 Graduate Employment Rate
		C52 Graduate Civil Service Examination Success Rate
		C53 Graduate Postgraduate Entrance Examination Success Rate

4.Results

According to the indicator weight analysis results, among the three first-level indicators of the tutor team construction evaluation system, the weight of output evaluation is the highest, reaching 44.9%. Process evaluation follows closely at 41.7%. Together, they account for over 85% of the total, indicating that the quality of output outcomes and the effectiveness of process implementation are regarded by experts as the most critical assessment dimensions in the tutor team construction evaluation system, jointly forming the core content of the evaluation framework. In contrast, the weight of input evaluation is 13.4%. Although relatively low, it still plays a crucial foundational role as a basic support condition in areas such as tutor team development, external cooperation resources, and incentive mechanisms.

Looking at the global weight distribution of the second-level indicators, Competency Development (16.5%), Employment Outcomes (11.8%), and Research and Academic Growth Guidance (11.1%) rank in the top three. Combined, these three indicators account for nearly 40%, fully demonstrating the high priority this evaluation system places on enhancing students' comprehensive qualities, focusing on employment results, and cultivating research capabilities. This reflects the educational philosophy in modern higher education that emphasizes the holistic development of students. In comparison, indicators such as Students' Comprehensive Evaluation of the Tutor Team (6.2%), Ideological and Political Development (3.1%), and External Cooperation Resources (1.7%) have relatively lower weights, suggesting their perceived importance within the current evaluation system is more limited, though they still serve as essential components of the framework, playing unique supplementary roles.

A deeper analysis of the weight distribution of the third-level indicators reveals that Participation in Academic Competitions and Social Practices holds the top position with a global weight of 12.7%. This highlights the critical role of practical education in the talent cultivation process. Providing Employment Guidance Services (7.8%) and Tutor Incentives (7.5%) rank second and third, respectively, indicating the importance of employment service quality and tutor motivation at the implementation level. It is noteworthy that within the Research and Academic Growth Guidance dimension, the weight for Research Project Guidance (7.1%) is significantly higher than that for Professional Knowledge Guidance (4.1%), reflecting the evaluation system's greater emphasis on cultivating students' practical research abilities.

In contrast, indicators such as Students' Awareness of the Tutor Team (1.1%), Conducting Vocational Aptitude Tests (2.8%), and Number of Tutors (1.9%) carry lower weights, suggesting their relative influence on the overall evaluation is more limited. This weight distribution characteristic embodies the design philosophy of the evaluation system constructed in this project, which focuses on substantive outcomes and highlights core indicators. From the perspective of the indicator system's hierarchical structure, Employment Guidance (10.6%) and Innovation and Entrepreneurship Guidance (9.6%) within Process Evaluation carry high weights, demonstrating the importance placed on student career development and innovation capability cultivation. At the Output Evaluation level, the prominent weight of Competency Development further confirms the "student

development-centered" evaluation orientation.

Table 2: A Summary of the Weight Data of Each Indicator in the Evaluation System of the All-round Education Mentor Group

First-level indicator	weight (%)	Second-level indicator	weight at the same level (%)	Global indicator weight (%)	Third-level indicator	weight at the same level (%)	Global indicator weight (%)
Input Evaluation	13.4	Tutor Team Development	32	4.29	Number of supervisors	44.4	1.9
					Mentor type	55.6	2.4
		External Cooperation Resources	12.3	1.7	Families and society work together to educate people	0.60	1.7
		Incentive Mechanism	55.7	7.5	Mentor motivation	0.63	7.5
Process Evaluation	41.7	Ideological and Political Education	8.5	3.5	Carry out various theme education activities	0.60	3.5
		Research and Academic Growth Guidance	26.7	11.1	Professional knowledge guidance	36.4	4.1
					Guidance on scientific research projects	63.6	7.1
		Innovation and Entrepreneurship Guidance	22.9	9.6	Guidance for subject competitions and practical activities	63.2	6
					Hold lectures,forums and simulationpractices on innovation and entrepreneurship	37.8	3.5
Output Evaluation	44.9	Mental Health Education	16.4	6.9	Carry out mental health education activities	0.65	6.9
		Employment Guidance	25.4	10.6	Conduct vocational aptitude tests	26.7	2.8
		Students' Comprehensive Evaluation of the Tutor Team	13.7	6.2	Students' awareness of the mentor team	18	1.1
					Students' satisfaction with the mentor team	58.7	3.6
		Ideological and Political Development	6.9	3.1	Alumni's evaluation of the mentor team	23.3	1.4
					Moral education level	0.63	3.1
		Academic Level	16.3	7.3	Participated in the supervisor's scientific research projects	20.4	1.5
					Publication of papers and patents	41.9	3.1
					Student grades	37.7	2.8
		Competency Development	36.7	16.5	Participation in subject competitions and social practices	77	12.7
					Cultural and sports activities	23	3.8
		Employment Outcomes	26.3	11.8	Graduate employment rate	29.3	3.5
					The civil service examination rate of graduates	28.9	3.4
					The rate of graduates taking the postgraduate entrance examination	41.8	4.9

4.Discussion

In this study, the Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) was adopted to calculate the weights of the indicators, and the consistency test (CR<0.1) was conducted to ensure the reliability of the results. Among the first-level indicators, the weight of output evaluation is the highest (44.9%), followed by process evaluation (41.7%), and the proportion of input evaluation is 13.4%,

highlighting the core position of educational effectiveness and implementation process. Among the secondary indicators, ability development (16.5%), employment situation (11.8%), and scientific research growth guidance (11.1%) have the highest weights. Among the third-level indicators, participation in subject competitions and social practice (12.7%), employment guidance services (7.8%), and mentor incentives (7.5%) have become key evaluation points, providing clear quantitative basis for actual evaluation.

Funding

No

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Reference

[1] Zeng, S. J. (2022). Research status, hotspots and evolution trends of "all-round education for all" in China. Journal of Nanjing University of Science and Technology (Social Sciences Edition), 35(6), 80–85.

[2] Zuo, Q. J., Wang, J., Song, K., et al. (2021). Exploration of the mentorship system for talent cultivation in geological engineering under the concept of "all-round education". China Geological Education, 30(3), 12–16.

[3] Wang, Q., Yang, J., Dai, X., et al. (2022). A preliminary study on the education work of academic mentors in medical technology under the background of "all-round education": Taking the optometry technology major as an example. Journal of Heze Medical College, 34(1), 85–87+90.

[4] Guo, X. P. (2021). An analysis of the construction, improvement and practice of the "all-round education mentor group": A case study of Xi'an Polytechnic University. Research and Practice on Innovation and Entrepreneurship Theory, 4(14), 87–89.

[5] Zhang, E. X., Chen, X. Y., Huo, G., et al. (2022). "Four-in-one" education model of undergraduate mentorship system in applied universities under the concept of "all-round education". Journal of Beijing Union University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition), 20(4), 8–16.

[6] Xia, Q., Xu, H. X., Zheng, C. W., et al. (2023). Exploration and practice of collaborative education "mentor group" under the background of "all-round education": A case study of the "tengyue" mentor group of Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine. Journal of Traditional Chinese Medicine Management, 31(9), 30–32.

[7] Tan, F. E., Xu, J., & Hu, P. (2021). Thoughts on implementing the responsibility of graduate supervisors for moral education and talent cultivation from the perspective of "all-round education". Educational Exploration, (8), 86–89.

[8] Wang, D., Wang, S., & Tang, Y. X. (2021). Analysis of the graduate supervisor responsibility system under the background of "all-round education": Based on the survey data of L university. Higher Education Forum, (10), 81–85.

[9] Ling, X. (2020). The role of political theory learning mentors in the construction of ideological and political education in courses: Innovative measures of Beijing Union University to improve the "all-round education" mechanism and system. Beijing Education (Higher Education), (9), 102–104.

[10] Jin, X. B., Wang, X. Y., Zhang, H. Y., et al. (2022). The ideological and political education model for mentors based on the concept of "all-round education": An exploration of the construction of professional ideological and political education for postgraduate students in colleges and universities. Educational Teaching Forum, (40), 177–180.

[11] Bai, Y., & Leng, W. Y. (2020). Analysis of the collaborative education mechanism of "counselor-mentor" for college students from the perspective of "all-round education". Educational Teaching Forum, (44), 97–99.

[12] Han, D., Wang, B. R., & Liang, X. F. (2020). Exploration of the collaborative education mechanism between graduate student counselors and supervisors from the perspective of all-round education. Science and Education Review (Lower Edition), (33), 71–72.

[13] Liu, X., Zhao, T. G., & Cui, Y. S. (2022). Exploration and practice of undergraduate mentorship system under the background of "all-round education": A case study of the school of electronic engineering, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications. Science, Education and Culture, (18), 2–6.