https://doi.org/10.62836/gss.v5i1.0002

Global Science Publishing

GSS

Global Sport Science

https://ojs.sgsci.org/journals/gss

Article

Current Situation and Innovation of the Practical Teaching System in Physical Education Majors at Local Normal Universities

Yanying Liu * and Yongyang Ou

School of Physical Education and Health, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing 526061, China

Abstract: Practical teaching stands as a central concern in the accreditation of teacher education programs and is vital for cultivating application-oriented professionals in Physical Education. In response to the heightened demands of basic education in the new era for comprehensively competent physical education teachers, the traditional practical teaching systems in local normal universities have revealed several structural deficiencies. This paper systematically examines the practical challenges faced by Physical Education programs in local normal universities across two dimensions: system construction and teaching implementation. It identifies prominent issues such as a fragmented system, disjointed content, weak support mechanisms, simplistic evaluation, alongside formalistic implementation, inadequate guidance, and insufficient collaboration. To address these constraints, this study innovatively proposes and elaborates a comprehensive, university-community linked practical teaching system characterized by "One Center, Two Main Threads, Three Entities, and Four Stages". Centered on the "comprehensive enhancement of teacher candidates' practical abilities and professional competence", the system integrates two main threads—"Physical Education teaching skills" and "educational management and innovation"—and relies on the collaborative efforts of three entities: universities, government, and schools (U-G-S). It progresses sequentially through four stages: "Perception and Identification, Foundation and Simulation, Integration and Deepening, and Reflection and Sublimation". The aim is to construct an integrated framework characterized by unified objectives, coherent content, continuous processes, and collaborative engagement. Finally, the paper proposes implementation safeguard strategies for this system from four aspects: mechanisms, personnel, platforms, and evaluation, with the goal of providing theoretical insights and a practical blueprint for promoting the connotative development of Physical Education programs in local normal universities and enhancing the quality of talent cultivation.

Keywords: local normal universities; physical education; practical teaching system; U-G-S collaboration; comprehensive practical teaching; one center, two main threads, three entities, four stages

1. Introduction

"A strong nation must first have strong education, and strong education must first have strong teachers". Against the backdrop of the deepening advancement of the "Healthy China" strategy and the increasingly clarified "four-in-one" objective for school physical education—enjoying fun, enhancing physique, improving character, and forging will—physical education work in primary and secondary schools has been entrusted with unprecedented significance. Physical education teachers, as the core executors and leaders of this endeavor,

Received: 8 June 2026; Accepted: 23 June 2026.

* Corresponding: Yanying Liu (1034494456@qq.com)

possess professional competence and practical abilities that directly impact the implementation of national strategies and the healthy growth of hundreds of millions of young people [1]. Local normal universities, serving as the main force in cultivating grassroots physical education teachers in China, have a direct bearing on the foundation of physical education in basic education through the quality of talent they develop.

As the crucial link between theoretical knowledge and professional practice, practical teaching serves as a key process in enabling students to transform what they have "learned" into what they can "do". It is the essential path to honing their teaching skills, cultivating their educational wisdom, and shaping their professional identity [2]. However, a closer look at the current state of practical teaching in physical education programs at local normal universities reveals a significant gap between reality and the ideal vision. For a long time, constrained by limited institutional resources, traditional mindsets, and managerial inertia, the practical teaching systems in many universities have exhibited a "fragmented" state. Components such as teaching practicum, course laboratory work, and social practice often operate in isolation, lacking systematic design and effective integration. The implementation process risks becoming a mere formality, suffering from insufficient guidance and superficial student reflection. Furthermore, the collaboration between universities and primary schools often remains shallow and symbolic—akin to "tossing bricks over a wall"—making it difficult to form a synergistic educational force [3]. As a result, graduates often possess adequate theoretical knowledge but lack the practical ability to independently handle complex teaching scenarios and undertake educational work, leading to a prolonged adaptation period upon entering the profession.

Therefore, systematically examining and reflecting on the long-standing deficiencies of the existing practical teaching system, and subsequently undertaking its forward-looking and systematic reconstruction, has become a core issue and an urgent task for physical education programs in local normal universities to address the demands of the times, enhance the quality of talent cultivation, and demonstrate their distinctive strengths. This study aims to conduct an in-depth analysis of the current situation and to construct a new practical teaching system that spans the entire training process, integrates on-campus and off-campus resources, and synergizes multiple stakeholders, with the goal of providing a reference-worthy solution for teaching reforms in relevant institutions.

2. A Critical Review of the Practical Teaching System in Physical Education Programs at Local Normal Universities

Based on a review of relevant literature and field research conducted at several institutions, we find that while progress has been made in the construction of practical teaching systems for physical education programs at local normal universities, severe challenges remain across the following four dimensions:

2.1. The System Structure Is Loose, Lacking Top-Level Design and Integrated Planning

A well-developed practical teaching system should constitute an organic whole with clear objectives, closely linked components, and sequential progression. In reality, however, many institutions lack a scientific top-level design for their practical teaching systems. The practical curriculum in their talent cultivation plans is often insufficient, mainly structured around modules such as educational observation, practicum, and research, while a comprehensive practical framework encompassing teacher ethics experience, teaching practice, class management practice, and teaching research practice remains underdeveloped [4]. Instead, the system often resembles a mere "assemblage" of loosely connected segments—educational observation, course experiments, professional skill training, teaching practicum, and graduation thesis. The sequencing of these components is often poorly planned, with weak logical connections among them, failing to form a spiraling competency ladder of "cognition–simulation–practice–reflection". For instance, educational observation is often arranged hastily without adequately paving the way for subsequent practicum, while graduation theses remain disconnected from teaching practicum experiences, missing the opportunity for in-depth inquiry based on practical problems. This structural fragmentation results in the overall function of practical teaching falling far short of the sum of its parts, making it difficult to systematically support the continuous development of students' professional competencies.

2.2. The Teaching Content Lags Behind and Is Disconnected from the Practice of Basic Education Reform

The content of practical teaching constitutes the "flesh and blood" of the system. Currently, the practical teaching content in many institutions is updated slowly and fails to closely align with the latest developments and core requirements of China's basic education reform in physical education and health curricula. Specific manifestations include: First, there is insufficient integration of new concepts and methodologies emphasized in the Physical Education and Health Curriculum Standards, such as "core competencies", "structured teaching", "contextualized learning", and "interdisciplinary thematic learning". Most practical teaching classrooms still adhere to the singular "explanation – demonstration" instructional model. This linear knowledge transmission approach of "teacher demonstration – student imitation", while ensuring the standardized teaching of motor skills, severely limits the development of educational professional competencies such as instructional design ability and classroom management. When demonstrating movements, teachers often focus on isolated technical points and fail to systematically showcase implicit pedagogical wisdom, such as pacing control and teacher-student interaction strategies [5]. Second, practical projects predominantly concentrate on teaching traditional activities such as track and field, ball games, and gymnastics, with limited coverage of emerging sports (e.g., rock climbing, roller skating, outdoor expansion), health education, and physical fitness training. Third, Many students lack opportunities during their university studies to engage in teaching practices such as instructional design, classroom organization, and other pedagogical activities, making it difficult for them to translate motor skills into teaching competencies. The curriculum objectives deviate from the actual demands of physical education teaching in primary and secondary schools [5], resulting in insufficient training in comprehensive practical abilities such as classroom organization, competition planning, and activity design under the framework of "teaching effectively, practicing diligently, and competing regularly". This disconnect prevents teacher candidates from quickly adapting the knowledge and skills they have acquired to the authentic teaching environments of primary and secondary schools, highlighting the mismatch between the "supply side" of talent cultivation and the "demand side" of practical needs. Fourth, the learning and application of modern information technology tools remain superficial and are not deeply integrated with teaching practice. As a result, graduates from normal universities often struggle to effectively navigate emerging complex teaching scenarios in basic education, such as "smart sports environments" and "cloud-based collaborative teaching research", and are inadequately prepared for real classroom teaching in primary and secondary schools [5].

2.3. Inadequate Resource Support: Deficiencies in Supporting Conditions and Long-Term Mechanisms

Robust resource support forms the foundation for the effective operation of a practical teaching system. Local normal universities commonly face significant challenges in this regard. First, the development of practical teaching bases suffers from both quantitative and qualitative shortcomings. The number of bases is often insufficient to meet the demand for extended, multi-cycle practical training for all students. Furthermore, the quality of these bases is uneven. The development of digital teaching resource repositories is incomplete, and there is often a mismatch between the basic teaching equipment available at training facilities and actual pedagogical needs. Existing venue resources typically only satisfy the requirements for fundamental skill training, while systematic teaching case libraries and digital course resource packages remain underdeveloped. This inadequacy fails to meet the instructional demands of smart campuses in primary and secondary schools [5]. Additionally, some primary and secondary schools exhibit weak and unstable cooperation willingness due to concerns about disrupting teaching order and a lack of incentive mechanisms. Second, there is a shortage of a "dual-qualified" teaching instructor workforce. Although university faculty possess strong theoretical knowledge, some have been detached from frontline teaching in primary and secondary schools for an extended period, which can render their guidance overly theoretical and impractical. On the other hand, frontline instructors from primary and secondary schools, while experienced, often lack systematic training in mentoring methodologies. Their additional mentoring efforts frequently go without effective evaluation or commensurate compensation, which dampens their motivation and can compromise the scientific rigor of their guidance. Furthermore, younger instructors often exhibit a sports-skill-oriented approach in their teaching, overemphasizing the standardized training of technical movements during practical sessions while underemphasizing

core teacher candidate competencies such as pedagogical methodology and the integration of curriculum-based ideological and political education. Concurrently, senior instructors often rely excessively on personal experience in lesson preparation and commonly demonstrate a lag in the application of information technology tools [5]. Finally, insufficient funding constrains the in-depth implementation of practical activities, the quality enhancement and upgrading of teaching bases, and the effective implementation of incentive policies for instructors. The most direct manifestation of this constraint is the incomplete development of systematic teaching case libraries and digital course resource packages. Limitations in hardware conditions make it difficult for teachers to conduct high-quality demonstration teaching, and consequently, students are deprived of immersive learning experiences across the various stages of practical teaching [5].

2.4. Monolithic Evaluation Mechanism: Weakened Feedback, Improvement, and Guiding Functions

A scientific and effective evaluation mechanism serves as the "guiding baton" and "corrective tool" for the practical teaching system. Currently, the evaluation of practical teaching is often plagued by the following shortcomings. Firstly, regarding the evaluation approach, there is an overemphasis on summative evaluation at the expense of formative evaluation. Assessments rely excessively on final outcomes, such as internship reports, demonstration lesson scores, and graduation thesis grades for theoretical courses in physical education, while practical skill courses predominantly focus on the quantitative assessment of sports skills, overemphasizing the standardization of technical movements. This approach neglects students' growth trajectories, degree of effort, and progress throughout the entire practical process. Secondly, concerning the evaluation subjects, the process is predominantly led by university faculty, lacking diverse participation. Evaluative input from practical base instructors, peer students, and even the service recipients (primary and secondary school students) is not sufficiently incorporated, resulting in a singular evaluative perspective. Thirdly, in terms of evaluation function, the focus is placed on appraisal and screening rather than diagnosis and improvement. Evaluation results are primarily used for grading and ranking but fail to facilitate in-depth analysis of common problems and individual shortcomings exposed during practical teaching. Consequently, this information is not effectively fed back into teaching improvements, and a closed-loop management system for evaluation has not been established. Furthermore, there is a lack of qualitative evaluation indicators. Core competencies for teacher candidates, such as classroom management ability and teaching adaptability strategies, have not been effectively integrated into the evaluation framework. This omission misaligns with the requirements for "teaching innovation capability" and "digital literacy" outlined in relevant standards and is insufficient to meet the demands of basic education reform [6].

3. Analysis of the Current State of Practical Teaching Implementation in Physical Education Programs at Local Normal Universities

From the perspective of dynamic implementation, the concrete execution of practical teaching is also fraught with numerous issues, which are primarily manifested in the following four aspects:

3.1. Monolithic Practical Formats, Insufficient Comprehensiveness and Pervasiveness

The "block-practice internship" remains the primary, and often the sole, centerpiece of practical teaching in the vast majority of institutions, typically concentrated in the second semester of the third year or the first semester of the fourth year. In contrast, practical activities such as educational observation, course-based inquiry, social surveys, sports competition organization and officiating, and student club guidance—which should span the first through third academic years—occupy a peripheral, supplementary, or even absent role. This arrangement, characterized by passive observation in the early stages followed by an intensive rush later, contradicts the gradual nature of teacher professional development. Students, lacking sustained exposure to the professional environment and repeated practice of micro-skills in their preceding years, are abruptly thrust into internship positions, which can easily lead to maladjustment and a sense of frustration. Practical teaching fails to infuse the entire talent cultivation process like blood, significantly diminishing its educational effectiveness [7].

3.2. Ineffective Guidance: Insufficient Collaboration Between Dual Mentors and Lack of Guidance Depth

Issues within the guidance process are particularly pronounced. On one hand, the collaborative mechanism between university-based and school-based mentors functions poorly. There is often a lack of stable communication platforms and clear division of responsibilities between the two, leading to situations where students receive disjointed guidance, encounter conflicting standards, or fall into gaps where neither mentor assumes responsibility. On the other hand, the focus of guidance tends to emphasize "technique" over "pedagogy". Instructors frequently concentrate on visible skills such as command delivery, formation management, and movement demonstration, while providing insufficient guidance on the implicit knowledge and competencies underlying instructional design, handling classroom contingencies, addressing individual student differences, and exploring the educational value of physical education [8]. Furthermore, systematic and in-depth reflective guidance aimed at helping students transition from practical experience to theoretical understanding is generally lacking. In reality, physical education teacher educators may not have deeply studied the physical education curriculum standards, nor paid adequate attention to the impact of structured teaching, contextual design, and the application of techniques and tactics on physical education instruction. They often perceive the cultivation of teaching competence in physical education teacher candidates as the sole responsibility of courses such as Physical Education Teaching Materials and Methods, School Physical Education, and Teaching Skill Training, viewing it as largely unrelated to practical skill courses and other theoretical instruction. This directly affects teacher candidates' understanding of physical education teaching and their learning experience of technical movements [9].

3.3. Lack of Student Agency: Insufficient Reflective Practice and Inadequate Stimulation of Intrinsic Motivation

In practical teaching, students should be active constructors of their learning. However, in reality, students often find themselves in a passive position, merely "assigned" tasks with limited opportunity to exercise their agency. Internship content frequently revolves around assisting mentors with routine instructional tasks, such as organizing recess exercises, while opportunities to independently undertake challenging responsibilities—such as designing and delivering full teaching units, creating innovative sports activities, or managing student conflicts—remain scarce. As a result, students often resemble passive recipients or even bystanders [10], which stifles their autonomy and creativity. Furthermore, the reflective practice component is notably weak. Reflection reports tend to be superficial, often limited to simple descriptions or generalized accounts of the teaching process. There is a lack of deep, theoretically grounded critique and analysis of their own practical actions. Consequently, the professional growth cycle of "action-reflection-reaction" is not effectively realized, and students' intrinsic motivation for professional development remains inadequately stimulated.

3.4. Superficia University-Community Collaboration: A Mutually Beneficial Educational Ecosystem Has Yet to Materialize

Although the concept of "University-Government-School (U-G-S)" collaborative education is widely recognized, cooperation between local normal universities, local governments, and primary/secondary schools in most cases remains superficial. Collaboration is often based on personal connections or short-term projects, lacking stable, institutionalized mechanisms for mutual benefit. Within these partnerships, primary and secondary schools primarily assume the roles of "recipients" and "supporting actors", failing to participate deeply in the development of talent cultivation programs, the design of practical courses, or the joint evaluation of student competencies. For instance, in the educational practice process for physical education majors, some mentor teachers in primary and secondary schools have limited understanding of the student teachers' university-based learning activities, while university faculty are often unaware of what the student teachers actually learn during their internships [11]. Conversely, the reciprocal support that universities could provide to primary and secondary schools—such as offering teacher training, research support, and curriculum resources—is also not fully realized. This "one-sided" and extractive form of collaboration is difficult to sustain and ultimately fails to achieve genuine mutual empowerment and symbiosis between higher education and basic

education. Additionally, problems such as poor communication between internal and external teaching guidance, lack of clear criteria for selecting practice bases, and insufficient educational opportunities and content provided by the bases persist [12].

4. Constructing a Comprehensive University-Community Linked Practical Teaching System Characterized by "One Center, Two Main Threads, Three Entities, and Four Stages"

To fundamentally address the aforementioned challenges, a systematic reconstruction is imperative. This study proposes a comprehensive practical teaching system for the training process of physical education majors, characterized by "One Center, Two Main Threads, Three Entities, and Four Stages". Developed in accordance with the standards for teacher education program accreditation, this system strives to achieve the holistic development of students and cultivate well-rounded socialist builders and successors who are developed morally, intellectually, physically, aesthetically, and in terms of labor [2]. Its basic framework and core essence are as follows.

4.1. Analysis of the Core Essence

"One Center": Centering on the comprehensive enhancement of teacher candidates' practical abilities and professional competence.

This is the "soul" and fundamental objective of the entire system. It emphasizes that the design, implementation, and evaluation of all practical teaching activities must be closely aligned with the core mission of effectively fostering solid teaching skills, profound educational commitment, exceptional innovative awareness, and capacity for lifelong learning among teacher candidates, thereby ensuring that practical teaching remains firmly on the course of holistic education. Guided closely by the functional tasks of physical education in the new era and referencing the Ministry of Education's standards for the "four major professional competencies" of teacher candidates established around the concept of the "Four Qualities" of good teachers, this center responds to the specific requirements of "teaching effectively, practicing diligently, and competing regularly" in current school physical education work [13]. It aims to transform the training of physical education teachers from a singular focus into the cultivation of comprehensive physical education professionals with innovative capabilities [14].

"Two Main Threads": The two enduring competency dimensions that run throughout the system are the thread of Physical Education Teaching Skills and the thread of Educational Management and Innovation.

Physical Education Teaching Skills Thread: This focuses on the core professional competencies of teacher candidates as "subject instructors". It encompasses: instructional design for Physical Education and Health curricula; classroom teaching organization and management; accurate demonstration and explanation of motor skills; diagnosis and correction of common movement errors; integration of multimedia technology into teaching; planning and organization of sports events; and prevention, care, and emergency response for sports injuries. In school physical education practice, this thread emphasizes adhering to the "health first" principle, prioritizing student development, and leveraging knowledge and abilities in sports. It involves the organic integration of educational teaching knowledge and skills with medical and health education knowledge and abilities. Within the framework of "teaching, practicing, and competing", it aims to integrate pedagogy into physical activities and medical knowledge into sports, thereby realizing the comprehensive educational function of physical education. The goal is to enable students to enjoy themselves, enhance their physical fitness, develop sound character, and strengthen their willpower through physical exercise [13].

Educational Management and Innovation Thread: This focuses on the comprehensive soft skills of teacher candidates as "holistic educators". It includes: practical work of class advisors; adolescent mental health education and guidance; communication and cooperation among family, school, and community; development and leadership of sports clubs; fostering campus sports culture; teaching reflection and action research; and innovative capabilities in physical education teaching reform.

These two main threads are intertwined and mutually supportive, akin to a double helix of DNA. They organically merge disciplinary competence with educational literacy, covering the three modules of

"disciplinary knowledge + educational theory + practical application" [5]. Together, they constitute the complete professional competency profile of a teacher candidate.

"Three Entities": The three collaborative entities with shared educational responsibility are the University (U), Government (G), and School (S). This establishes a deeply synergistic "U-G-S" community of shared future for talent cultivation. Universities play the roles of theoretical leadership and overall coordination. They are responsible for revising talent cultivation programs, developing practical course modules, selecting and managing supervising instructors, organizing the assessment of practical outcomes, and proactively providing intellectual and resource support to primary and secondary schools. Local Governments/Education Administrative Departments play the roles of policy support and resource allocation. They provide institutional guarantees for deep "U-G-S" cooperation by issuing incentive policies, establishing special funding, and building platforms such as regional pilot zones for teacher education innovation. Primary and Secondary Schools (Practical Bases) play the roles of providing the main practical arena and contributing back to teaching development. They offer authentic, stable, and high-quality practical placements, select "practical mentors" to participate in the entire guidance process, collaborate with universities to develop practical task lists and evaluation criteria, and provide feedback on the evolving talent needs of basic education. These three entities establish a "Practical Teaching Steering Committee" for regular consultations [15]. This mechanism aims to achieve shared decision-making, resource sharing, responsibility sharing, and mutual benefit from the outcomes.

"Four Stages": Four progressive practical stages—Perception and Identification, Foundation and Simulation, Integration and Deepening, and Reflection and Sublimation.

This design aligns with the principles of cognitive and competency development, forming a spiraling, comprehensive progression:

Stage 1: Perception and Identification (Semesters 1–2). The objective is "Dream Ignition". Through courses such as Introduction to the Major, lectures by distinguished physical education teachers, observation of "Sunshine Sports" activities in primary and secondary schools, and participation in community sports volunteer services, students are introduced to authentic physical education settings. This allows for an intuitive understanding of the professional role and fosters initial professional identity and commitment.

Stage 2: Foundation and Simulation (Semesters 3 – 5). The objective is "Foundation Building". Closely integrated with core courses like School Physical Education and Instructional Theory of Various Sports, this stage involves on-campus activities including micro-teaching, grouped skill training, simulated trial teaching, and teaching case analysis and seminars. Concurrently, short-term, thematic educational practicum sessions are arranged—such as observing sports meet organization or assisting with after-school sports services—to create preliminary links between theoretical learning and practical observation.

Stage 3: Integration and Deepening (Semesters 6–7). The objective is "Tempering through Practice". This stage features a semester-long (or 18-week) "teaching residency". Under the guidance of dual mentors, students assume relatively independent responsibility for a class's physical education instruction, homeroom teaching assistance, and extracurricular sports activity organization. It serves as a comprehensive integration and practical test of the knowledge and skills acquired in the preceding stages, with a focus on cultivating students' holistic ability to independently navigate complex educational situations. Students are also required to complete a "thematic practicum report" based on their residency experience.

Stage 4: Reflection and Sublimation (Semester 8). The objective is "Transcendence". Upon returning to the university, students engage in systematic, theorized, and in-depth reflection based on the rich experiences and insights gained during their teaching residency. The graduation thesis (or project) must be practice-oriented, encouraging research into genuine problems encountered during the practicum—such as "Research on Engaging Teaching Strategies for Basketball Shooting Techniques in Primary Schools" or "Analysis of Pathways to Enhance Middle School Students' Engagement in Physical Education Classes". This stage aims to sublimate perceptual experience into rational understanding, facilitating the crucial transition from a "pre-service teacher" to a "reflective practitioner".

4.2. Implementation Safeguard Strategies

To ensure the effective implementation of this system, a four-in-one safeguard framework must be established:

Mechanism Safeguards: Refining Collaborative Governance Structures: A "trinity" collaborative education mechanism involving universities, local education administrative departments, and primary/secondary schools should be established, ensuring their joint participation in the training of teacher candidates. A substantively operational "Practical Teaching Steering Committee" comprising representatives from all three parties should be formed. This committee would develop a series of regulatory documents, such as the Management Measures for Practical Teaching Bases, Detailed Rules for the Selection and Assessment of Dual Mentors, and Quality Standards for Practical Teaching, to achieve standardized and institutionalized management. The "trinity" collaborative training mechanism requires routine operational management to ensure coordination and efficiency, thereby enhancing the quality of both educational practice and teacher candidate preparation [4].

Personnel Safeguards: Building a High-Level "Dual-Mentor" Team: A mechanism of "mutual appointment and mutual exchange" should be implemented. Renowned and master physical education teachers from primary/secondary schools should be invited to serve as adjunct professors at universities, delivering lectures and supervising theses periodically. Conversely, young university faculty should be selected for temporary positions in primary/secondary schools to gain firsthand understanding of frontline needs. Regular "U-G-S" joint teaching and research activities should be organized to collectively enhance guidance capabilities. Additionally, a special fund should be established to provide reasonable compensation and honorary incentives to partner schools and their supervising instructors. Strict systems for mentor selection, professional training, condition support, and performance evaluation should be implemented to achieve tangible outcomes in educational practice and continuously elevate teacher candidates' practical wisdom in teacher education [4].

Platform Safeguards: Developing an Intelligent Practical Teaching Management and Resource Platform

On one hand, a number of "Professional Development Schools" should be established and certified to improve the quality and increase the quantity of practice bases. On the other hand, an integrated information management platform should be developed. This platform would combine functions such as task assignment, process documentation, remote observation, online seminars, submission of outcomes, and multi-faceted evaluation. It aims to break spatiotemporal constraints, enabling refined management of the practical process and facilitating the widespread sharing of high-quality resources.

Evaluation Safeguards: Constructing a Multi-faceted Evaluation System for Continuous Improvement

The "portfolio assessment method" should be adopted to document students' growth throughout the entire process. A comprehensive, objective, and diversified educational practice evaluation system should be established, combining process assessment with outcome evaluation and involving multiple stakeholders, to thoroughly assess teacher candidates' performance in educational practice and promote the high-quality development of practical teaching [4]. The evaluators should include university mentors, base mentors, peer students, and the candidates themselves. The evaluation content should consider not only teaching outcomes but also, more importantly, the degree of progress, depth of reflection, and demonstration of innovation. A regular evaluation feedback meeting system should be instituted to utilize evaluation results for optimizing training programs, improving teaching practice, and incentivizing outstanding students and instructors, thereby forming a virtuous closed-loop of "evaluation-feedback-improvement".

5. Conclusions and Prospects

Faced with the new mission entrusted to physical education in the new era, the reform of practical teaching for physical education majors in local normal universities has entered the "deep-water zone". Based on a profound analysis of the multiple challenges inherent in the existing practical teaching system and its current implementation, this paper constructs a comprehensive, university-community linked practical teaching system characterized by "One Center, Two Main Threads, Three Entities, and Four Stages". This framework represents a systematic innovation aimed at transforming the traditional fragmented and short-cycle practical model.

Centered on competency enhancement, structured by dual-thread capabilities, supported by tripartite collaboration, and advanced through a four-stage progression, the system strives to achieve a fundamental shift in practical teaching—from isolated "segments" to an integrated "system", from "concentrated" episodes to a "comprehensive" process, and from "unilateral" efforts to "collaborative" engagement.

The successful construction and effective implementation of this system are expected to significantly enhance the job adaptability, professional competitiveness, and lifelong development capacity of physical education teacher candidates. It holds the potential to supply grassroots schools with a large number of excellent physical education teachers who are "willing to work at the grassroots level, capable of staying there, effective in teaching, and poised for further development". Admittedly, the implementation and institutionalization of this system constitute a complex systematic project, involving the realignment of multiple interests and resources, and will inevitably encounter numerous challenges. Future research and practice should further focus on developing personalized implementation pathways for the system within specific institutions, creating detailed operational guidelines for each component, and constructing a scientific evaluation index system to assess its effectiveness. Through continuous adjustment and optimization in dynamic practice, the ultimate goal is to drive an overall leap in the quality of talent cultivation for physical education majors at local normal universities, thereby laying a solid talent foundation for the prosperous development of school physical education in China in the new era.

Funding

This research was supported by the project of "Under the Background of Higher Education Transformation: Construction and Practice of the Practical Teaching System for Physical Education Majors in Local Normal Universities (Yue Gao Jiao Han [2023] No. 4-962)".

Author Contributions

Writing—original draft, Y.L.; writing—review and editing, Y.L. and Y.O. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscriptInstitutional Review Board StatementNot applicable. Informed Consent StatementNot applicable.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1 Zhang Y, Gao P. The Training Pathways for Specialized Physical Education Teachers in the Context of the Strong Nation Strategy. *Journal of Physical Education* 2025; **32**(**02**): 97–105.

2 Ge S, Guo X. Re-Conceptualizing the Determination of Cultivation Objectives in PE Program of Teacher Education Accreditation. *Journal of Tianjin University of Sport* 2024; **39**(**05**): 557–563+572.

3 Mao Z, Qiu L, Du XH. Analysis of Major Issues in the Reform and Development of Chinese School Physical Education: From the Five Groups of "Hot Words" in School Physical Education Reform. *Journal of Shanghai University of Sport* 2021; **45**(**4**): 1–14.

4 Dong C, Yang X, Li M, *et al.* Construction of "Three Types" Educational Practice System for Physical Education Teacher Trainees under the Certification of Teacher Training Programs. *Journal of Tianjin University of Sport* 2023; **38**(**05**): 533–541+584.

5 Zhi Q, Li H. Problems and Countermeasures in Football Courses for PE Majors in Normal Universities. *Educational Theory and Practice* 2025; **45**(**21**): 61–64.

6 Ministry of Education. Notice on Issuing the Interim Measures for the Implementation of Teacher Education Programme Accreditation in Ordinary Higher Education Institutions. *Bulletin of the Ministry of Education of the People' s Republic of China* 2017; (**12**): 35–99.

7 Zhong Q. Curriculum Development Based on Core Competencies: Challenges and Issues. *Global Education Outlook* 2016; **45**(**1**): 3–25.

8 Luo W, Deng X. The Reform of the Physical Education and Health Curriculum in Basic Education: Predicaments and Outlets. *Journal of Physical Education* 2018; **25**(**06**): 96–100.

9 Shang L. How to Teach Students Teach Well: Reflections and Countermeasures on the Cultivation of Teaching Ability of Physical Education Students of Normal Universities. *Journal of Shanghai University of Sport* 2024; **48**(**08**):73–81+93.

10 Zhang X. Guiding the High-Quality Development of University Physical Education Major through the Educators' Spirit. *Journal of Physical Education* 2025; **32**(**03**): 121–128.

11 Chen H, Wu N. Construction of ASI Courses of Physical Education Major under the Accreditation of Teacher Education: Value Orientation, Principle Adherence, and System Construction. *Journal of Capital University of Physical Education* 2024; **36**(**4**): 455–463.

12 Ding W, Liang S. Research on the Path of the Construction of Physical Education Major Under the Background of Teacher Education Certification. *Sport and Science* 2022; **43**(**03**): 39–43+49.

13 Yang F, Sun Y, Wang W, *et al.* Appropriate Direction and Practice Path of Physical Education Major in University under the Emerging of New Human and Social Sciences. *Journal of Tianjin University of Sport* 2021; **36**(**05**): 497–504.

14 Liu S. An Exploration of Innovative Talent Cultivation Requirements in Higher Education Physical Education Programmes from an Innovative Education Perspective. *Chinese Journal of Education* 2023; (**04**): 152.

15 Wang L, Xu Y. Research on the Optimization and Operation Mechanism of Practical Teaching System for University Physical Education Major. *Contemporary Sports Technology* 2025; **15**(**19**): 62–65.

© *The Author(s) 2023. Published by Global Science Publishing* (*GSP*).

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.