

Building a Standards-Based Quality Assurance System for Teacher Education in China: Retrospect and Prospect

Congman Rao

Northeast Normal University, Changchun, P. R. China

E-mail: raocm506@nenu.edu.cn

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2437-1079>

DOI: 10.26907/esd.19.3.06

EDN: KDDZYD

Submitted: 1 March 2024; Accepted: 1 July 2024

Abstract

After entering the 21st century, a series of standards have been developed to build a standards-based quality assurance system for teacher education in China. The building of quality assurance system for teacher education has made some achievements, but it also faces some problems. At present, the building of high-quality teacher education system has been determined as the most important task in the reform and development of teacher education in China. This requires us to improve the quality assurance system for high-quality teacher education on the basis of reflecting on the existing system building. Based on documentary analysis the paper examines the building process and compositions of the standards-based quality assurance system for teacher education in China, and analyzes the problems and challenges of the existing system and puts forward some suggestions on building a quality assurance system for teacher education based on development-oriented teacher professional standards.

Keywords: teacher education, standard, quality, quality assurance, China.

Создание системы обеспечения качества педагогического образования в Китае на основе стандартов: Ретроспектива и перспектива

Конгман Рао

Северо-восточный педагогический университет, Чанчунь, КНР

E-mail: raocm506@nenu.edu.cn

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2437-1079>

DOI: 10.26907/esd.19.3.06

EDN: KDDZYD

Дата поступления: 1 марта 2024; Дата принятия в печать: 1 июля 2024

Аннотация

В XXI веке был разработан ряд стандартов для создания специальной системы обеспечения качества педагогического образования в Китае. Построение системы обеспечения качества педагогического образования достигло определенных успехов, но сталкивается с некоторыми проблемами. В настоящее время создание высококачественной системы педагогического образования определено как самая важная задача в реформе и развитии педагогического образования в Китае. Это требует от нас совершенствования системы обеспечения качества педагогического образования на основе анализа существующей системы. В статье на основе документального анализа рассматривается процесс создания и состав системы обеспечения

качества педагогического образования в Китае на основе стандартов, анализируются проблемы и задачи существующей системы, выдвигаются предложения по созданию системы обеспечения качества педагогического образования на основе профессиональных стандартов учителя, ориентированных на развитие.

Ключевые слова: педагогическое образование, стандарты, качество, обеспечение качества, Китай.

Introduction

Problem Statement

Since the 1980s, the world has entered a period of large-scale quality-oriented education reforms. As the top priority of the global education reform movement, teacher education reform was no exception. Under such background, the building of standards-based quality assurance system (hereafter referred to as “QAS”) for teacher education has become the basic choice of teacher education reform in many countries. In the mid-1990s, the transformation from quantity-focused teacher education to quality-oriented one was initiated, and soon after entering the 21st century, a standards-based QAS for teacher education was set up in China (Rao, 2020). However, after more than 20 years of quality-oriented teacher education reforms, China began to talk about “revitalization” of teacher education from 2017, which means that quality assurance of teacher education in China still has a long way to go. So, what kind of process has China experienced in the building of a standards-based QAS for teacher education? What kind of QAS has been developed? What is wrong with this system? Answering these questions is the main purposes of this paper. Based on this, the paper will also provide some suggestions on how to improve the QAS in the future.

Research Gap

QAS for teacher education has been a major issue and field of study in China since the new century. Most studies on the QAS for teacher education in China focus on “ought-to-be” design of the QAS based on investigations of international QASs for teacher education or theoretical speculations. Different from other studies, the paper aims to put the QAS for teacher education in China against the historical context of teacher education reforms in China since the 1990s to provide a historical perspective on it.

Research Method

Since the purpose is to have retrospective and prospective views on the QAS for teacher education in China, the paper chooses the documentary analysis as the main method. Based on the critical analysis of the policy documents related with teacher education, the paper will provide both a historical examination of the development process and a horizontal investigation of the components of the standards-based QAS for teacher education to find out the problems and challenges in the system and put forward some suggestions for its improvement.

Results and Discussion

The Process of Building Standards-Based QAS for Teacher Education

The development of QAS for teacher education can only be truly understood in the context of teacher education reforms in China since the 1990s. Although quality improvement has been the theme of the teacher education reform since the mid-1990s, the reforms can still be divided into three periods: system restructuring (from the mid-1990s to 2005); capacity building (from 2005 to 2016), and revitalization (since 2017) (Rao, 2020). Based on such division of the historical phases, the development process of China's QAS for teacher education is examined in the following way.

The Emergence of Quality Assurance Awareness in Teacher Education During the Phase of System Restructuring (from the mid-1990s to 2005)

From 1949 until the early 1990s, teacher education in China was carried out in a closed teacher education system corresponding to the planned economic system. Moreover, due to the continuous expansion of basic education and the low status and treatment of teachers, the shortage of teachers lasted for a long time. At that time, teacher education institutions had to focus on preparing enough teachers for schools and had no time to consider the improvement of teacher education quality.

However, in the 1990s, the situation changed. First, in 1992, China began the transition to a socialist market economy, and for some time until the beginning of this century, China's economic and social development policies followed the basic principle of "giving priority to efficiency with due consideration to fairness". In this context, improving the efficiency and quality of education became the focus of education reforms, with teacher education being highly valued as a lever to improve the quality of education. Secondly, the overall situation with teacher shortage was greatly alleviated (Rao, 2007, 2013). The improvement of teacher supply provides space for teacher education institutions to improve quality. In this context, China put forward the slogan of moving from quantity-focused to quality-oriented teacher education.

During the period from the mid-1990s to 2005, due to the recognition that the restructuring of teacher education corresponding to the socialist market economy is a necessary basis for improving the quality of teacher education (Guan, 2004), system restructuring became the focus of teacher education reforms, which mainly concentrated on two dimensions: one is horizontal restructuring to open up preservice teacher preparation system. The other is vertical restructuring to upgrade all teacher preparation to higher education level (Rao, 2020).

In general, although there is a strong quality awareness, the reforms in the period of system restructuring focused on building a structural foundation for improving teacher education quality. With the opening up of teacher education in progress, how to guarantee the quality of teacher education gradually became a task for the government. In 2004, the State Council issued the *2003-2007 Action Plan for Education Revitalization*, requiring the drafting of *Regulations on Teacher education* and the formulation of standards for the institutional accreditation, curriculum and quality of teacher education, with the aim to build a QAS for teacher education (State Council, 2004).

Initial Building of QAS for Teacher Education in the Phase of Capacity Building (from 2005 to 2016)

With the initial creation of an open teacher education system, some unexpected problems emerged: the diversification of teacher education institutions brought about not only the diversification of teacher education models, but also the problems of uneven level of teacher education; the unwilling involvement of comprehensive colleges and universities in teacher education and the trend of traditional normal colleges and universities aiming at becoming comprehensive colleges and universities gradually marginalized teacher education within higher education institutions (hereafter referred to as "HEIs"), with the quality of teacher education going downward.

In order to construct the QAS for teacher education, China mainly took two measures in the capacity building phase. One is the development of standards. The Ministry of Education (MOE) began to develop relevant standards for teacher education in 2004, and promulgated the *"Curriculum Standards for Teacher Education (Trial)"* in 2011 (hereinafter referred to as *"Curriculum Standards"*), *"Teacher Professional Standards (Trial)"* for kindergartens, primary schools, general secondary schools, secondary

vocational schools and special schools (hereinafter referred to as “*Professional Standards*”) were successively promulgated in 2012, 2013 and 2015; The “*Accreditation Standards for Teacher Education Programs (Trial)*” was promulgated in 2014, and pilot tests were carried out in the Jiangsu province and Guangxi autonomous region. These standards were promulgated with two functional expectations: one is used as the basis for carrying out teacher education activities and judging whether the teacher education activities meet the basic requirements of preparing qualified teachers; the other is used as a guide for the reform and development of teacher education (Liu & Rao, 2015, pp. 64-87).

The other measure is a reform of the teacher certification system. In October 2000, the Ministry of Education issued the *Measures for Implementation of Regulations of Teacher Certification*, marking the official launch and full implementation of the teacher certification system in China. However, until 2011, graduates of teacher education programs (hereafter referred to as “TEPs”) could apply for direct recognition of their corresponding teacher certificates with their graduation certificates without the need to take any teacher certification examination. However, on the basis of the pilot reforms from 2011, the teacher certification system reform was announced in 2015, implementing the national teacher certification examination and abolishing the certification-without-examination system for graduates of TEPs. According to the new system, all applicants for the teacher certificates of kindergartens, primary and secondary schools, must take the national teacher certification examination.

It should be pointed out that although the development of QAS for teacher education in the phase of capacity building made great progress in the development of standards, the actual impact of these standards on teacher education was relatively limited, because the teacher education program accreditation was only piloted in two provinces, teacher education institutions lacked the necessary “pressure” and did not pay due attention to the teacher education standards. In the field of teacher certification system reform, applicants from TEPs were required to take both teacher education courses and certification examinations, while graduates of non-TEPs were only required to take certification examination without any requirements on taking teacher education courses and participating in practice teaching, which was considered to be contrary to the idea of teacher professionalism.

Improvement of the QAS for Teacher Education in the Phase of Revitalization (since 2017)

After the two phases of “system restructuring” and “capacity building”, it is found that although China has established an open teacher education system, it is far from being sufficient for preparing high-quality teachers. The following two phenomena is enough to make people worry about the quality of teacher education. First, the overall quality of teacher student intake is generally not high. Teacher education is still not attractive enough for excellent high school graduates. Second, the qualifications of teacher education institutions are uneven. On the one hand, traditional high-level comprehensive universities are not really involved in teacher education; on the other hand, teacher education has gradually been weakened or even marginalized within traditional normal colleges and universities, especially high-level ones, with a large number of low-level vocational and technical schools and colleges involved in preparation of kindergarten teachers (Rao, 2020).

Teacher education institutions with low qualification and capacity may satisfy the needs of schools for teachers quantitatively, but cannot meet the quality demands required by the high-quality development of education. In order to truly realize educational equity, the fair or balanced development of teacher education itself cannot be ignored. It is an

important goal to build a high-level teacher education system to promote the high-quality development of teacher education in the new era.

In order to build a high-level teacher education system, China is committed to building a high-level teacher education base and creating a high-quality teacher education supply system. The country also focuses on improving the QAS of teacher education. Specific measures have been taken, including a nationwide monitoring and accreditation system for TEPs. In 2017, the Ministry of Education issued the *Measures for the Implementation of Teacher Education Program Accreditation in General HEIs (Interim)* (hereinafter referred to as “*Accreditation Measures*”), with *Teacher Education Program Accreditation Standard* (hereinafter referred to as “*Accreditation Standards*”) as attachments, and began to implement the three-level monitoring and accreditation of TEPs nationwide in 2018 (MOE, 2017). The second measure involved re-reforming the teacher certification system. The *Accreditation Measures* stipulate that for the programs that have passed the second-level accreditation the colleges or universities, which provide those programs, can organize the teacher certification examination in the form of interviews for their own teacher students. For those programs that have passed the third-level accreditation, the colleges or universities may organize the written examination and interview (MOE, 2017). On September 4, 2020, the MOE issued the *Implementation Plan for Certification Reform for Graduates of Graduate Programs in Education and Government-Funded TEPs to Apply for Primary and Secondary School Teacher Certificates Exempted from Certification Examination*, requiring the concerned HEIs to set up an assessment system for teacher students’ professional competencies based on the *Professional Competence Standards for Teacher Students* (hereinafter referred to as “*Competence Standards*”) to implement the certification reform for graduates of graduate programs in education and government-funded TEP to apply for primary and secondary school teacher certificates exempted from certification examination.

The quality assurance for teacher education in the phase of capacity building was quite “soft” due to the lack of necessary accreditation pressure. But after entering the phase of revitalization, it gradually becomes “hard” due to the full implementation of the new monitoring and accreditation system for TEPs.

Current QAS for Teacher Education in China

The current QAS for teacher education in China consists of two parts: system of standards and system of implementation.

System of Standards

Ultimately, China has developed a series of teacher education related standards geared for preparation objectives and graduation requirements, preparation process and preparation outcomes.

Standards for Preparation Objectives: *Professional Standards for Teachers*

The five *Professional Standards* are positioned as the state’s basic professional requirements for qualified teachers, the basic norms for teachers to carry out education and teaching activities, the basic guidelines for teachers’ professional development, and the important basis for teacher preparation, teacher recruitment, in-service teacher training and assessment (MOE, 2012). It can be seen that *Professional Standards* are expected to play the basic role in teacher education.

The framework of *Professional Standards* consists of three parts: basic ideas, basic contents and implementation suggestions. “Student-oriented”, “teachers’ ethics first”, “focus on competencies” and “lifelong learning” are put forward as the four basic ideas

that school teachers should follow. Dimensions, fields and basic requirements are the three-level structure of basic contents. The basic dimensions of the five standards are the same: professional ideas and ethics, professional knowledge and professional ability. Under each dimension there are a number of fields, each standard consisting of about 13-14 fields; under each field a number of basic requirements, each standard consists of about 60-63 basic requirements in all. The part of Implementation Suggestions puts forward relevant requirements for education administration sector, teacher education institutions, schools and teachers respectively.

Standards for Graduation Requirements: *Professional Competence Standards for Teacher Students*

The *Competence Standards* consists of five documents, which respectively define the basic professional competence required of graduates of TEPs in the field of preschool education, primary education, general secondary education, vocational secondary education and special education. Each document is divided into four parts to elaborate four competences: (1) The competence to practice teachers' ethics; (2) competencies for instruction ("competence for child care and education" in preschool teacher education program); (3) Comprehensive competencies for education; (4) self-development competence (MOE, 2021).

These five Competence Standards reflect the spirit and requirements of the *Accreditation Standards*. The teacher professional competence prescribed in the Competence Standards is equivalent to the "graduation requirements" stipulated in the *Accreditation Standard*, which also reflect the "outcome-based" orientation stressed by the TPA accreditation.

Standards for Preparation Process: *Curriculum Standards for Teacher Education*¹

The *Curriculum Standard* consists of five parts, including preface, basic idea, curriculum objective, curriculum, and implementation suggestions. The *Curriculum Standards* puts forward three basic concepts of human-centered, practice-oriented and lifelong learning as the guiding ideas on development and implementation of the teacher education curriculum², and divides teacher education curriculum into three main areas of objectives: educational belief and responsibility, educational knowledge and ability, and educational practice and experience, and sets up six learning areas of three-level teacher education. For example, the six learning areas of pre-service preparation for secondary school teachers are: (1) child development and learning; (2) foundation of secondary education; (3) subject matter education and activity guidance in secondary school; (4) mental health and moral education; (5) professional ethics and professional development; (6) educational practice.

Curriculum Standards reflect the basic requirements of the state for teacher education institutions to design a teacher education curriculum, and are an important basis for

¹ In a broad sense, teacher education curriculum should include general education curriculum, subject matter curriculum and pedagogical curriculum provided by teacher education institutions. But in the Curriculum Standards, it specifically refers to pedagogical curriculum.

² The so-called "human-centered" emphasizes that teachers are facilitators of the development of students, and that they should realize professional development in the process of researching and helping students to grow up healthily. The so-called "practice oriented" emphasizes that teachers are reflective practitioners who should achieve professional development in the process of studying their own experiences and improving their teaching behaviors; the so-called "lifelong learning" emphasizes that teachers are lifelong learners who should achieve professional development in the process of continuous learning and improving their own qualities.

formulating teacher education curriculum plans, developing teaching materials and curriculum resources, carrying out teaching and evaluation, and teacher certifications.

Standards for Preparation Outcome: Accreditation Standards for TEPs

Accreditation Standards cover five categories of TEPs (preschool education, primary education, general secondary education, vocational and technical education, special education)³, and three progressive levels. The first level is located in the monitoring of TEPs, putting forward 15 monitoring indicators of TEPs mainly from curriculum and instruction, collaboration and practice, faculty and support conditions, aiming at promoting all teacher education institutions to strengthen the building of TEPs. The second level is located in the accreditation based on conformity standards, which aims to guide all institutions to strengthen the building of program capacities and ensure that the program instruction meets the conformity standards. The third level is located in the accreditation based on excellence standards, aiming to establish and improve the outcome-based preparation system and the effective mechanism for continuous quality improvement.

Both the second and third-level standards specify the concrete requirements for the quality of teacher education from eight indicators: preparation objectives, graduation requirements, curriculum and instruction, collaboration and practice, faculty, support conditions, quality assurance, and student development. These eight indicators are not fragmented and have their own internal logical relationship. The main logical line of *Accreditation Standards* is an interactive relationship among preparation objectives, graduation requirements, curriculum and instruction, collaboration and practice, following the principle of backward design and forward implementation (Macayan, 2017).

System of Implementation: Focus on the Monitoring and Accreditation System for TEPs

As far as the implementation system of QAS for teacher education is concerned, teacher certification examination and TEPs accreditation are the two important elements. Implementation of the national unified certification examination system itself has the intention of regulating the quality of teacher education, but its actual function is not as expected, and the system that plays a major role in the quality assurance of teacher education in China is the monitoring and accreditation system for TEPs.

The core of the monitoring and accreditation for TEPs is to ensure that the competencies of TEPs graduates meet the requirements of the standards upon graduation. The purpose is to promote TEPs to build their capacities, focus on the competence preparation of teacher students, reform the preparation system and mechanism, establish an outcome-based quality assurance mechanism for continuous improvement and quality culture, and constantly improve the quality of teacher education.

“Student-centered”, “Outcome-based”, and “Continuous improvement” are the basic ideas of the TEP monitoring and accreditation. Based on the basic ideas, the TEP accreditation focuses on the five aspects: the achievement level of preparation outcome compared to the preparation objectives; the adaptability level of TEP orientation to social needs; the support level of faculty and teaching resources for teacher preparation; the operational effectiveness of TEP QAS; and students' and employers' satisfaction with TEPs.

³ The three TEP accreditation standards for preschool, primary and secondary education were issued in 2017 as annexes to the Accreditation Measures, and the latter two standards were issued in October 2019.

According to the characteristics of the types and levels of TEP monitoring and accreditation, the vertical three-level progressive system structure is constructed. The first level of monitoring is “full coverage”, meaning that all the undergraduate TEPs of general HEIs and the state-funded TEPs must participate. The second and third levels are subject to voluntary application, and TEPs of HEIs with more than three years of TEP graduates can apply for the second level accreditation; HEIs with more than six years of TEP graduates and in case they passed the second-level accreditation may apply for the third-level accreditation. TEPs with a long history of running and high social recognition can directly apply for the third-level accreditation.

The first level adopts the data collection method through a network platform to carry out routine monitoring of the basic information of the education of TEPs. The second and third levels adopt the method of experts entering the sites to conduct periodic accreditation of the quality of TEPs. The accreditation procedure includes 7 stages: application and acceptance, self-assessment, materials review, on-site inspection, conclusion review, conclusion improvement, rectification and improvement (MOE, 2017).

According to the design of the TEP monitoring and accreditation system, the results of monitoring and accreditation are expected to provide services and decision-making references for the government, universities and society in policy formulation, resource allocation, fund investment, recruitment of employers and many others.

Problems in QAS for Teacher Education

Teacher Education Standards Have Not Formed an Organic System Based on Professional Standards

Although China has formulated relevant standards for the main thresholds affecting the quality of teacher education, which has laid a certain foundation for the quality assurance of teacher education, many problems have also been exposed. While the *Professional Standards* are expected to serve as a basis for teacher education, their role depends on their underlying spirit and requirements being embedded in other relevant standards. However, since the *Professional Standards* were promulgated after the *Curriculum Standard*, its influence on the *Curriculum Standard* was restricted. Although the *Accreditation Standards* and *Competence Standards* were issued after the *Professional Standards*, and the *Accreditation Standards* also show the awareness of docking with the *Professional Standards*, the dimensions of “professional competence” and “graduation requirements” for teacher students of TEPs in the former two types of standards are obviously inconsistent with the *Professional Standards*. Although the *Accreditation Standards*, *Competence Standards* and *Professional Standards* are designed for pre-service teachers and qualified teachers respectively, the requirements should be different in the level rather than in the dimension. The lack of organic relationship among relevant standards affects the leading and integrating role of *Professional Standards* in the quality assurance of teacher education, and also restricts the role of QAS in teacher education (Rao, 2024; Hong, 2022).

The reason why the standards of teacher education have not formed an organic system is partly due to the lack of a good structural distinction in *Professional Standards*. The current *Professional Standards* is a three-level structure: the first level should have played the role of “content standards” reflecting value orientation, but the expressions like professional ideas and teacher ethics, professional knowledge and professional ability cannot reflect the characteristics of the teaching profession, let alone have any function of value orientation. The second level is also expressed in phrases, which also cannot play the role of value orientation. Thus, the third level has to assume not only the role of “performance standard”, but also the role of “content standard”. But the third level

cannot truly reflect the role of value orientation because there are too many items, which are not easy to remember, and it also does not have the operability required for evaluation because some expressions are too general. The lack of effective hierarchical distinction makes both the developmental and regulatory (evaluation) functions of *Professional Standards* severely restricted.

The QAS is Inconsistent with the Professionalization of Teaching and Teacher Education

Just as Harvey has clearly stated, “The process of quality assurance is quite separate from the concept of quality. Quality is to quality assurance what intelligence is to IQ tests” (Harvey, 2007, p. 5) The problems of China’s QAS for teacher education exists not only in the system of standards, but also in the systems of implementation.

First, the teacher certification examination system is not conducive to the quality improvement of teachers as professionals and teacher education as professional education. After entering the phase of “revitalization”, the re-reform of the teacher certification system by the MOE has alleviated the pressure of “examination” on teacher students, but has not made any change to the requirements for non-TEP students. At present, the teacher certification examination in China is not enough to comprehensively examine the competence required of future teachers. The current system goes against the concept of teacher professionalism, not only damaging the social image of teachers, but also against the pursuit of teacher education as professional education.

Second, the imperfection of TEP monitoring and accreditation system affects the continuous improvement of teacher education. Continuous improvement is one of the three concepts of TEP monitoring and certification. However, it is found that in most cases, the continuous improvement of TEP is difficult to become the focus of HEIs’ work, and the responsibility for the development and accreditation of TEPs mainly falls on the faculties where the TEPs is located. However, in the faculties, the identity of ordinary teachers with TEP accreditation is not high, and most of them are not very concerned about continuous improvement of TEPs. Preparation for the accreditation and TEP’s continuous improvement seem to be the work of a small number of faculty administrators and those responsible for instruction management (Hong, 2022). The reason why the implementation of continuous improvement is not in place is related to the fact that the basic orientation of TEP accreditation is to “guarantee the bottom line”, in which emphasis is placed on on-site inspection, not on routine monitoring and post-supervision (Hong, 2024). Up to now, there is no effective move to make the TEPs to keep the strong momentum to build better TEPs before and after the on-site inspection. Even the mid-term inspection is only submission and exchange of document materials, and the actual operation of the teacher education quality monitoring platform that should have played a better role is not satisfactory. If the implementation of continuous improvement is not in place, the problems existing in the TEPs will not be substantively solved, and the level of TEPs is bound to be difficult to consolidate and improve.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Based on the above investigation, we find that it was not until entering the phase of capacity building, China began to build QAS for teacher education. Although the QAS for teacher education has experienced continuous improvement, which is equipped with systems of standards and implementation, it still faces some problems and challenges, among which two can be pointed out: one is that the system of teacher education standards has not formed an organic system based on *Professional Standards*, the other is that the

QAS is inconsistent with the professionalization of teaching and teacher education, which is the basic purpose of teacher education reforms in China since 1990s.

Suggestions for the Improvement of QAS for Teacher Education

Revising the Professional Standards Based on the Functional Orientation of Development First with Regulation Taken into Account

The reason why it is emphasized that the revision of *Professional Standards* should give priority to its developmental function is that it conforms to the idea of teaching professionalism and is conducive to highlighting the role of teachers as the subject of their own development. Many studies have pointed out that the value of any professional standard is that it provides developmental guidance for teachers' career development; using standards as a means to improve teacher outputs by having a strict performance management system in place has been regarded as ineffective (Gleeson & Husbands, 2010; Rao, 2024).

Behind the emphasis on the priority of developmental function, there are considerations for the status quo and policy direction of the teaching force building in China. At present and in the future, any reform of teacher education should consider how to improve the status of teachers and teacher education. If the revised professional standards give priority to regulatory function, it is not conducive to enhancing the attractiveness of the teaching profession (Rao, 2024).

The regulatory function should also be taken into account, because without the regulatory function the developmental function of the standards will lack the necessary guarantee. Before the implementation of TEP accreditation, *Professional Standards* and *Curriculum Standards* were actually shelved in many places, which is a good example.

In order to reflect the above functional orientation, the new *Professional Standards* should have a new three-level structural framework: the first level should be “content standards” reflecting the value orientation, and the items should be no more than 10. the second level should define the “field” of teacher competence; the third level should specify “competency requirements” for teachers, reflecting the operability needed to provide a basis for evaluation (Rao, 2024). When the conditions are ripe, the professional standards adapted to the career stage of teachers should be gradually developed. Considering the current research base, it is suggested that the professional standards can be developed according to the three developmental stages: first, the current *competence standards* should be transformed into “Graduate Standards” for pre-service teachers; the second is the “qualified Teacher Standards”, stipulating the basic competence that teachers should be equipped with as qualified teachers; the third is the “Excellent Teacher Standards”, which provides direction for the professional development of teachers. The three types of standards should be consistent in concept and dimension (Rao, 2024).

Improving the Standard System of Teacher Education Based on the Professional Standards

On the basis of revising the *Professional Standards*, it is necessary to establish an organic system of teacher education standards based on the *Professional Standards*, ensuring that the teacher quality requirements stipulated in the *Professional Standards* are embodied in all aspects of teacher education, so as to realize the stable guarantee and continuous improvement of teacher education quality. This does not mean, of course, that all other relevant policies and standards are simply one-way benchmarked against the professional standards, but rather that a dialogic relationship should be established between the actors involved and between the different policy instruments, documents

and procedures in order to enable the teacher standards to fulfill their role as a tool for dynamic communication and reflection (Révai, 2018; Rao, 2024).

Improving the Implementation and Application of the TEP Monitoring and Accreditation System to Enhance Its Effectiveness

Feedback improvement, and risk prevention and control are the core of the effectiveness research on the accreditation of teacher education programs at this stage (Zhao, 2024). On the basis of past experience, surveys and analysis, we should provide feedback on the problems of accreditation in order to improve its effectiveness.

First, we should strengthen the implementation of TEP accreditation and enhance the effectiveness of accreditation implementation. The relevant problems in the implementation process of accreditation should be solved as soon as possible, especially to break through the dilemma of middle-level agents and give full play to the effectiveness of accreditation assessment and building; improve the expert selection, training and management system to enhance the effectiveness of accreditation experts; enhance the adequacy of the review process to enhance the effectiveness of accreditation review; and strengthen the supervision of the pluralistic main bodies and linkages to enhance the effectiveness of accreditation supervision (Zhao, 2024).

Second, we should optimize the use of the results of TEP accreditation to enhance the effectiveness of the accreditation. Effective accreditation of teacher education programs should play its role as a policy tool to attract universities, programs, teachers and students, schools and the public to participate in the reforms of teacher education through the appropriate use of results. At present, the application of accreditation results is basically at the conceptualization stage. There should be a clear implementation plan for the use of accreditation results, so that the use of accreditation results can be operationalized and put into practice (Hong, 2024; Zhao, 2024).

References

- Gleeson, D., & Husbands, C. (2003). Modernizing schooling through performance management: A critical appraisal. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(5), 499–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093032000124866>
- Guan, P. (2004). Guanyu jiaoshi jiaoyu gaige fazhan de shida guandian [Ten conceptions of teacher education reform and development]. *Zhongguo gaodeng jiaoyu*, 2, 24–26.
- Harvey, L. (2007). The epistemology of quality. *Perspectives in Education*, 25(3), 1–13.
- Hong, Z. (2022). ZhuanYe renzheng zhong shifan zhuanYe chixu gaojin de lixing shensi [Rational reflection on continuous improvement of teacher education in program accreditation]. *Jiaoshi jiaoyu xuebao*, 9(5), 114–124. <https://doi.org/10.13718/j.cnki.jsjy.2022.05.013>
- Hong, Z. (2024). Gaozhiliang fazhan shiyu xia shifan zhuanYe renzheng de jiazhi chuangxin yu gongneng tisheng [Value innovation and functional enhancement of teacher education accreditation from the perspective of high-quality development]. *Jiaoshi jiaoyu xuebao*, 11(1), 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.13718/j.cnki.jsjy.2024.01.002>
- Liu, Y., & Rao, C. (2015). Kaihousei gensoku sita no tyuugoku kyoushi kyouiku no shituhoshou taikai no koutiku [Building a quality assurance system for teacher education in China under the open principle]. In Higashi ajia kyoyuin yousei Kokusai kyoudou kennkyuu purojekkuto hen [International Collaborative Research Project for Teacher Education in East Asia (Ed.)]. Higashi ajia teki kyoushi no ima [The Current Situations of “East Asian Teachers”] (pp. 64–86). Tokyou gakugei daigaku syuppankai.
- Macayan, J. V. (2017). Implementing outcome-based education (OBE) framework: Implications for assessment of students' performance. *Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review*, 8(1), 1–10.

- MOE. (1999). *Guanyu shifan yuanxiao buju jigou tiaozheng de jidian yijian* [Several opinions on the adjustment of the layout structure of normal colleges and universities]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A10/s7058/199903/t19990316_162694.html
- MOE. (2011). *Jiaoshi jiaoyu kecheng biao zhun* [Teacher Education Curriculum Standard]. http://old.MOE.gov.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/MOE/s3702/201110/xxgk_125722.html
- MOE. (2012). *Jiaoyubu guanyu yinfa youeryuan jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun (shixing), xiaoxue jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun (shixing), zhongxue jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun (shixing) de tongzhi* [Notice of the Ministry of Education on the issuance of Professional Standards for Kindergarten Teachers (Trial), Professional Standards for Primary School Teachers (Trial) and Professional Standards for Secondary School Teachers (Trial)]. http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/s6991/201212/xxgk_145603.html
- MOE. (2013). *Jiaoyubu guanyu yinfa zhongdeng zhiye xuexiao jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun (shixing) de tongzhi* [Notice of the Ministry of Education on issuing the Professional Standards for Secondary Vocational School Teachers (Trial)]. https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2013/content_2547146.htm
- MOE. (2014). *Jiaoshi jiaoyu zhuan ye renzheng biao zhun (shixing)* [Accreditation Standards for Teacher Education Programs (trial)]. <http://edu.imnu.edu.cn/n537c19.jsp>
- MOE. (2015). *Jiaoyubu guanyu yinfa teshujiaoyu jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun (shixing) de Tongzhi* [Notice of the Ministry of Education on issuing the Professional Standards for Special Education Teachers (Trial)]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A10/s6991/201509/t20150901_204894.html
- MOE. (2017). *Jiaoyubu guanyu yinfa putong gaodengxuexiao shifanlei zhuan ye renzheng shishi banfa (zanxing) de tongzhi* [Measures for the implementation of teacher education program accreditation in general higher education institutions (interim)]. http://www.MOE.edu.cn/srcsite/A10/s7011/201711/t20171106_318535.html
- MOE. (2021). *Jiaoyubu bangongting guanyu yinfa zhongxue jiaoyu zhuan ye shifansheng zhiye nengli biao zhun (shixing) deng wuge wenjian de tongzhi* [Notice of the General Office of the Ministry of Education on the issuance of five documents including the Professional Competence Standards for Teachers of Teacher Students in Secondary Education (Trial)]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A10/s6991/202104/t20210412_525943.html
- Rao, C. (2007). Tyuogoku kyoushi kyouiku kaikaku no doukou to kadai [The trends and problems of teacher education reform in China]. *Tokyo gakugei daigaku kyouyinn yousei karikyuramu kaihatsu kenkyuu senta nempou*, 6, 39–50.
- Rao, C. (2013). The reform and development of teacher education in China and Japan in an era of social change. In E. Kimonen, & R. Nevalainen (Eds.), *Transforming teachers' work globally: In search of a better way for schools and their communities* (pp. 261–301). Sense Publishers.
- Rao, C. (2020). Teacher education policies in China since the mid-1990s. In G. Fan & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Handbook of Education Policy Studies: School/University, Curriculum and Assessment* (Volume 2, pp. 95–111). Springer Open.
- Rao, C. (2024). Goujian jiyu daoxiangxing jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun de jiaoshi jiaoyu zhi liang baozhang tixi: Guanyu xiuding yu shishi jiaoshi zhuan ye biao zhun de sikao yu jianyi [Building a teacher education quality assurance system based on development-oriented teacher professional standards: Reflections and suggestions on the revision and implementation of teacher professional standards]. *Hebei sifan daxue xuebao (jiaoyu kexue ban)*, 26(2), 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.13763/j.cnki.jhebnu.es.2024.02.007>
- Révai, N. (2018). *What difference do standards make to educating teachers? a review with case studies on Australia, Estonia and Singapore* (OECD Education Working Paper No. 174). Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. [https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/WKP\(2018\)10/En/pdf](https://one.oecd.org/document/EDU/WKP(2018)10/En/pdf).
- Zhao, Q. (2024). Shifanlei zhuan ye renzheng youxiao ma: Yuanfenxi kuangjia de jiangou yu mohu zonghe pingjia [Is teacher education program accreditation effective: The construction of meta-evaluation analysis framework and fuzzy comprehensive evaluation]. *Huanan shifan daxue xuebao (shehui kexue ban)*, 2, 48–68.