

CONSTRUCTION AND APPLICATION OF A THREE-DIMENSIONAL EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR EMPLOYMENT QUALITY OF HIGHER VOCATIONAL GRADUATES: PROFESSIONAL FIT - STAKEHOLDER SATISFACTION - CAREER DEVELOPMENT CAPABILITY

YuanYu Li

Guangdong Vocational institute of Public Administration, Guangzhou 510550, Guangdong, China.

Abstract: Addressing the common challenges in current higher vocational education employment quality assessments—such as "reliance on single metrics, fragmented data, and delayed feedback"—this paper draws from practical experiences in vocational education to develop a three-dimensional evaluation framework: "Program-Industry Fit - Stakeholder Satisfaction - Career Development Capability". Grounded in the principles of being "perceptible, communicable, and actionable," the framework employs concrete methods like matching programs with industry codes, conducting graduate satisfaction surveys, and following up with career development tracking. These approaches transform abstract quality indicators into tangible, actionable markers represented by symbols—"circle, smiley face, and arrow"—and utilize a "red-yellow-green" traffic-light grading system alongside a structured "six-step closed-loop" implementation process. This innovative approach effectively tackles the longstanding issues of traditional evaluations being "difficult to understand and hard to apply". Ultimately, the study aims to equip higher vocational institutions with a unified employment quality assessment framework, fostering a positive synergy between evaluation practices and talent-development reforms, while providing replicable and scalable best practices to enhance and optimize vocational education.

Keywords: Higher vocational graduates; Employment quality; A three-dimensional evaluation system; Professional suitability; Career development capabilities

1 INTRODUCTION

Employment quality is the core indicator of the quality of talent cultivation in vocational education, as well as a key metric for assessing the overall strength of higher vocational colleges. In recent years, China's higher vocational education has entered a new stage of development characterized by "improving quality, enhancing excellence, adding value, and empowering," with the national government clearly emphasizing the shift in employment evaluation from being "scale-oriented" to "quality-oriented". The "Notice from the Ministry of Education on Doing a Good Job in Employment and Entrepreneurship for 2024 Graduates of National General Higher Education Institutions" underscores the need to "establish a sound employment quality evaluation system, placing particular emphasis on assessing graduates' job satisfaction, employer recognition, and their potential for career growth"[1]. Meanwhile, the "14th Five-Year Plan for Vocational Skills Training" further calls for "building a vocational education evaluation mechanism centered on employment quality, ensuring that vocational institutions precisely align with market demands"[2]. At the provincial level, annual reports on the quality of higher vocational education issued by local education departments explicitly require each institution to establish a "school-specific employment quality evaluation system". This system must not only comply with national policy guidelines but also reflect regional industrial characteristics and the distinct institutional realities of each institution, ultimately yielding quantifiable and comparable evaluation frameworks[3]. However, current vocational education employment quality assessments still face significant, common challenges. In practice, most vocational colleges have maintained high graduate employment rates. Yet, when examining core questions more closely—such as whether programs match job requirements, whether graduates are satisfied with their positions, and whether their career paths offer long-term sustainability—the existing evaluation systems often lack unified standards and scientifically rigorous assessment methods. Some institutions still rely solely on the "employment rate" as their primary metric, neglecting the multifaceted nature of employment quality. Meanwhile, a few colleges that have attempted to develop multi-dimensional assessment frameworks have encountered issues like overly abstract indicator designs, difficulties in collecting reliable data, and misalignment with their own institutional realities[4]. This evaluation approach—focusing heavily on quantitative metrics while downplaying qualitative aspects, emphasizing outcomes over processes—fails to accurately capture graduates' employment experiences or their potential for career growth. As a result, it falls short of providing the precise data needed to guide reforms in talent development and help vocational colleges strategically adjust their program offerings. Ultimately, this disconnect leaves employment evaluations disconnected from real-world educational practices, creating a gap between theory and reality. Based on this, the present article draws from practical experiences in higher vocational education employment

initiatives, focusing on three core dimensions—"professional alignment, stakeholder satisfaction, and career development capability"—which are both tangible in daily practice and supported by quantifiable data. These dimensions form the foundation of a "three-dimensional evaluation system" designed to assess the employment quality of higher vocational graduates. The study aims to move beyond the limitations of traditional, single-dimensional employment rate assessments, clearly defining key indicators and actionable strategies for each dimension. Ultimately, it seeks to establish an employment-quality evaluation framework that is "operational for institutions, credible to higher authorities, and replicable across similar programs". The article first examines the policy context and current challenges surrounding employment quality assessment in higher vocational education, then delves into the rationale behind the three-dimensional system, outlining its core indicators and practical implementation methods. Finally, it summarizes the system's practical value and identifies potential avenues for optimization, offering valuable insights to guide reform efforts in employment quality assessment and enhance talent development at higher vocational institutions.

2 CURRENT SITUATION ANALYSIS

Currently, the field of higher vocational education employment quality assessment exhibits an overall characteristic of "stable scale control coexisting with imbalanced quality," and these trends and challenges are widespread across the industry.

First, From the perspective of employment evaluation, the tendency to focus solely on "rates" has yet to be fundamentally reversed. Although the country has clearly signaled a shift in employment evaluation toward a quality-oriented approach, most vocational colleges still prioritize the employment placement rate as their primary assessment metric. These key indicators carry disproportionately high weight in the evaluation framework, while critical quality dimensions such as professional alignment and career development potential are often treated merely as supplementary references[5]. This focus has inadvertently directed employment initiatives toward "meeting quantitative targets," with some institutions even encouraging graduates to "take a job first before considering long-term career plans"—leading them to accept positions that may not match their academic backgrounds or provide little room for long-term career growth. As a result, the discrepancy between high employment rates and subpar employment quality has become particularly pronounced.

Second, In terms of professional suitability, the situation exhibits characteristics of "overall improvement but localized imbalances". As industry-education integration continues to deepen, the alignment between talent development in higher vocational colleges and market demands has steadily improved. Meanwhile, most traditionally strong programs—benefiting from established institutional foundations and robust industry-university collaboration networks—have maintained a high level of professional adaptability. However, emerging programs generally exhibit relatively lower adaptability, primarily because there is a "time lag" between their curriculum design and the specific skill requirements of industry roles. In some cases, practical training initiatives fail to keep pace with regional industrial upgrading trends, resulting in graduates who, while equipped with foundational competencies, still struggle to directly meet the core demands of job positions[6]. This disparity in adaptability across different programs underscores the current evaluation system's lack of a detailed assessment mechanism that specifically measures "adaptation quality".

Third, The overall satisfaction level exhibits a pattern of "highly positive overall, but uneven across individual dimensions". According to industry research, vocational college graduates generally report high overall job satisfaction. Key indicators such as "salary," "work environment," and "recognition from employers" score particularly well, while "career development opportunities" fall far behind—which stands out as the primary area for improving satisfaction[7]. In-depth interviews reveal that graduates' dissatisfaction with "career growth potential" primarily stems from two key issues: First, promotion pathways are often limited in entry-level positions, and many companies lack clear career development frameworks. Second, opportunities for enhancing professional skills remain insufficient—many graduates report that they haven't received structured training after joining their workplaces, leaving them feeling disconnected from the "sustainable development" expectations they had during their studies[8].

Fourth, The evaluation of career development capabilities suffers from the issues of "fragmented data and a lack of a comprehensive system". From a practical standpoint, the career competitiveness of higher vocational college graduates has been steadily improving. However, key data reflecting their professional development capabilities have long remained fragmented: promotion records often rely on counselors' manual tracking systems, while salary growth information is pieced together from sporadic feedback provided by employers—lacking a unified mechanism for collection, organization, and dissemination[9]. Moreover, the current evaluation framework fails to incorporate career development as a core dimension for systematic assessment, making it difficult for institutions to comprehensively monitor the long-term employment quality of their graduates and hindering their ability to deliver timely feedback for curriculum and talent-development reforms.

Fifth is Data management and horizontal comparison face a dual dilemma. At the data management level, employment-related information is scattered across multiple platforms, including provincial employment portals, student affairs systems, and individual advisors' records, creating "data silos"[10]. These datasets lack unified classification standards and integration mechanisms, with critical data such as major codes, job details, satisfaction scores, and career advancement records stored independently—making it difficult to piece them together into a comprehensive picture of employment quality. Horizontally, since measurement criteria for employment quality assessment vary across similar vocational colleges—with some focusing primarily on "job-major relevance" and others emphasizing "satisfaction"—there is a lack of unified evaluation standards. This makes it impossible for colleges to

conduct objective and meaningful cross-institutional comparisons, rendering their institutional quality evaluations largely self-referential and subjective[5].

3 FIVE MAJOR CORE ISSUES

Combining the practical logic of higher vocational education employment quality assessment, there are currently five major core issues prevalent across the industry, which hinder the scientific validity and practical guidance value of the evaluation results.

First, evaluation metrics are overly simplistic, with insufficient focus on quality. Despite the government's consistent emphasis on multi-dimensional employment quality evaluation, most higher vocational colleges still rely heavily on "rate-based metrics," with the employment rate remaining the dominant factor in performance assessments. Meanwhile, critical quality dimensions—such as job-major alignment, stakeholder satisfaction, and career development potential—are still underemphasized[11]. This singularly focused indicator design obscures the true signals of employment quality, making it difficult to fully capture graduates' employment experiences and developmental potential—and ultimately failing to provide clear guidance for reforming talent cultivation efforts.

Second, data management is fragmented, leading to a prominent issue of "data lying dormant". Graduates' employment-related data is scattered across multiple systems and storage mediums, lacking unified classification standards and an integrated mechanism, which has resulted in "data silos"[10]. Key data such as major codes, job information, satisfaction scores, and career advancement records are stored independently. Integrating this data requires manual extraction and verification across departments and systems, a process that not only consumes significant human resources but also increases the likelihood of data errors. As a result, the evaluation outcomes often fail to fully capture the true quality of employment.

Third, the feedback mechanism has become outdated, leading to a disconnect between evaluation and practice. Currently, most higher vocational colleges primarily rely on "annual summaries" as the main form of employment quality assessment. This approach involves a lengthy process—from data collection to the final output of evaluation results—while tasks such as enrollment planning, curriculum adjustments, and talent development strategy optimization must be completed within the same year[12]. As a result, delayed feedback from such evaluations hinders the timely integration of employment quality data into recruitment and instructional processes, leading to an ongoing mismatch between talent development and market demands. Thus, the practical value of these assessments is greatly reduced.

Fourth, there is fragmentation in evaluation discourse and insufficient interdepartmental collaboration. Departments such as the Employment Office, Teaching Office, and Student Affairs Office have significantly different criteria and core concerns when assessing employment quality: The Employment Office focuses on "employment rate and job availability," while the Teaching Office emphasizes "major-to-job alignment and employer satisfaction". Meanwhile, the Student Affairs Office prioritizes "graduate satisfaction and students' psychological adaptability"[13]. Each department independently develops its own evaluation metrics and collects data, lacking a unified set of standards and a cohesive discourse system. This results in "departmentalized tendencies" in evaluation outcomes, making it challenging for university leaders to obtain consistent feedback during decision-making. Consequently, this situation hampers the coordinated advancement of employment initiatives and reforms aimed at enhancing talent development.

Fifth, the evaluation methods have become overly complex and lack practical applicability. When previously, academic research on employment quality evaluation often relied on sophisticated quantitative methods such as the entropy-weight method, factor analysis, and structural equation modeling. While these approaches enhance the scholarly rigor of evaluations, they also place high demands on the professional expertise of vocational college employment management teams[11]. Typically, the employment staff at vocational institutions consists mainly of counselors and administrative personnel, who often lack specialized skills in data analysis and evaluation. As a result, existing research findings struggle to be effectively translated into practical, institution-specific strategies. Although some colleges have attempted to adopt complex evaluation models, their implementation has frequently ended up being superficial—due to the models' steep learning curves and stringent data requirements—leaving them unable to deliver meaningful insights for ongoing improvements in employment quality and institutional practices[14].

4 THREE-DIMENSIONAL EVALUATION SYSTEM DESIGN

4.1 Design Concept

This system is designed around the core objective of overcoming the challenges of "abstraction, complexity, and disconnect" in evaluating vocational education employment quality. It adheres closely to three key principles—"perceptible, communicable, and actionable"—while returning to the fundamental essence of vocational education: "student-centeredness and practicality"[15]. Building on the existing data infrastructure and operational realities of vocational colleges, the system moves away from intricate models and abstract metrics, instead adopting a progressive logic that links "professional alignment—student satisfaction—career development potential". By leveraging readily available employment-related data fields, survey responses, and alumni feedback records, it weaves together a coherent narrative of graduates' employment journeys—from "job relevance—workplace satisfaction—to long-term career growth"[16]. In doing so, the system not only aligns with national policy directives emphasizing an "employment-quality-driven approach" but also addresses the practical issues of fragmented discourse and operational hurdles inherent in institution-based evaluation frameworks. Ultimately, it achieves its design goals of ensuring "easy

data collection, clear interpretation of results, and effective decision-making," thereby transforming employment quality assessment into a vital "bridge" that connects recruitment, curriculum development, and post-graduation placement efforts.

4.2 Dimensional Explanation

4.2.1 Professional fit: anchoring the synergy between "expertise and role"

The system focuses on the core issue of "whether talent development aligns with market demands," serving as a fundamental metric for assessing the effectiveness of industry-education integration in higher vocational education[6]. This framework employs a quantitative approach based on "code comparison and hierarchical classification": Using the major category codes from the "Catalogue of Higher Vocational Education (Associate Degree) Programs in General Institutions of Higher Education" as the benchmark, it cross-references these with job-specific industry codes from the "National Economic Industry Classification" (GB/T 4754-2017), thereby establishing a comprehensive "Major-Industry" adaptation mapping database [17]. The classification criteria are clearly defined: when a major category perfectly matches an industry role, it is categorized as "Aligned" (100% alignment); if there's a clear upstream-or-downstream relationship between the major and the industry role, it's classified as "Near" (60%-89% alignment); and when no direct link exists between the major and the industry role, it's labeled "Misaligned" (alignment below 60%). This classification method leverages the existing standardized coding system, eliminating the need to develop complex, custom metrics. Moreover, data can be directly sourced from provincial employment management platforms, ensuring both objectivity and practicality in the evaluation process[7].

4.2.2 Subject satisfaction: focusing on the alignment between "students and job roles"

The overall satisfaction level centers on graduates' employment experiences, reflecting whether "job roles align with personal expectations"—a direct manifestation of an "student-centered" approach to employment quality[7]. This system relies on the annual employment quality survey conducted by vocational colleges, using "overall satisfaction with current job" as its core indicator. A 4-point scale is employed for scoring: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Somewhat Dissatisfied, 3=Moderately Satisfied, and 4=Very Satisfied. Responses rated 3 or higher (i.e., "Moderately Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied") are classified as "smiling faces," indicating that satisfaction targets have been met[18]. The survey can also include additional sub-dimensions—such as "salary levels," "work environment," "company management," and "career development opportunities"—as supplementary reference indicators. However, the primary evaluation remains anchored in overall satisfaction, which not only streamlines data processing but also offers a comprehensive snapshot of graduates' employment experiences. By leveraging the colleges' existing survey infrastructure, this approach avoids redundant data collection while yielding actionable and insightful findings[8].

4.2.3 Career development strength: focusing on the growth potential of "role—future"

Career development focus is centered on whether "job positions have sustainable growth potential," serving as a key dimension for measuring the "long-term value" of employment quality[9]. This system employs an evaluation approach that combines "short-term tracking with concrete indicators": Six months after graduates join their roles, counselors conduct follow-up calls or use WeChat surveys to directly ask three critical questions: "Have you been promoted, experienced salary growth (with an increase of at least 10%), or transitioned to a higher-quality position (showing improved industry alignment and significantly higher pay)?" Meeting any one of these criteria classifies the career trajectory as "positive" (indicating favorable long-term development), while failing to meet even one criterion marks it as "stable but unchanged"[19]. This indicator design moves away from abstract concepts like "career competitiveness" or "development potential," instead translating career advancement into tangible, easily measurable outcomes—specific events that can be clearly documented. This approach not only aligns with the practical reality of vocational graduates, where job growth often manifests through changes in salary or position, but also simplifies data collection, ensuring that the evaluation results remain both authentic and highly applicable in real-world settings[14].

4.3 Levels and Scripting

To achieve the goal of "intuitive, easy-to-understand, and rapid decision-making," this system employs a "traffic light" grading mechanism, combining evaluation results from three dimensions to generate an overall assessment level according to the following specific rules:

Green light rating: "Green Checkmark + Smiling Face + Long Arrow," indicating an excellent job-major fit, high graduate satisfaction, and promising career prospects. This signifies the program delivers "high-quality" employment outcomes, with its talent development closely aligned with industry needs.

Yellow light rating: All combinations other than the green and red light options (e.g., "Matching + Smiling Face + Stable," "Close Fit + Smiling Face + Long-term," "Partial Alignment + Smiling Face + Stable," etc.), indicating "moderate" employment quality. There is room for improvement in at least one dimension—such as inadequate job-major alignment or limited career growth opportunities.

Red-light rating: "Partial + Non-smiling Face + Original," indicating low professional alignment, dissatisfaction among graduates, and limited career growth prospects. This suggests that the employment quality of this major "requires improvement," calling for a focused overhaul of the talent development program or a stronger emphasis on job-market orientation[20].

This tiered classification system eliminates complex weight calculations and score aggregations, presenting results

instead through the straightforward "Green Light (Excellent) — Yellow Light (Moderate) — Red Light (Needs Improvement)" framework. At relevant working meetings, school leaders can quickly assess the employment quality of each major—no specialized data-analysis expertise required—to make informed decisions. This approach effectively addresses the issue of "disconnect between evaluation outcomes and actionable decisions"[13].

4.4 Operation Path

This system establishes a "six-step closed-loop" operational process to ensure that evaluation efforts are efficiently implemented and their timelines remain tightly controlled. The specific steps are as follows: ①Data Pre-processing (September): Core data such as "major category codes, industry codes of employers, and job titles" for the previous year's graduates will be exported from the provincial-level university graduate employment management platform, creating a foundational database. ②Satisfaction Survey (October): An online questionnaire focusing on the key metric of "overall satisfaction" will be distributed to graduates via an online survey platform. Detailed feedback across multiple dimensions will also be collected simultaneously, ensuring a response rate of at least 90%. ③Career Development Follow-up (March of the following year): Counselors will conduct follow-up interviews with graduates who have been employed for six months, adhering to the principle of "one record per individual". Responses will clearly indicate whether the graduate has experienced "growth" or remained in their "original position," with a follow-up rate maintained at no less than 80%. ④Data Integration (April of the following year): The employment management department will input the "major alignment classification results, satisfaction 'smiley face' indicators, and career development 'growth/original' records" into a unified data table, ultimately forming a comprehensive "three-dimensional evaluation dataset". ⑤ Results Visualization (May of the following year): Based on this dataset, a "red-yellow-light overview chart of employment quality for each major" will be generated, highlighting the unique combination of dimensions and corresponding rankings for each program—clearly illustrating both strengths and areas needing improvement. ⑥Outcome Presentation (June of the following year): The red-yellow-light evaluation results will be incorporated into the annual employment quality report, which will then be submitted concurrently to university leadership, as well as relevant departments including academic affairs, admissions, and secondary colleges—providing critical insights to inform annual decision-making processes.

The entire operational process spans 9 months, markedly shortening the timeline compared with the traditional release of employment quality reports. This approach effectively addresses "delayed feedback," ensuring evaluation results promptly inform critical initiatives such as enrollment strategy adjustments and curriculum reforms[12].

4.5 Application Cases

In the practical application of the three-dimensional evaluation system, the "light-up" results for certain majors have effectively highlighted the core weaknesses affecting employment quality. For instance, some emerging fields once showed a "two yellow, one red" combination, with the primary issues revolving around insufficient program alignment and limited growth opportunities. Meanwhile, several traditionally strong programs achieved the "three green" rating, positioning them as benchmarked majors in terms of employment quality. Based on these evaluation findings, institutions can swiftly implement corrective measures—such as refining enrollment strategies, recruiting industry mentors, and revising hands-on curriculum components—creating an immediate feedback loop between "evaluation, decision-making, and improvement". This approach not only drives the collaborative advancement of program development and employment quality but also fully demonstrates the practical value of the evaluation system.

4.6 Mechanism Solidification

To prevent the evaluation process from becoming merely a formality or being abandoned halfway, institutions should integrate the three-dimensional evaluation system and the red-yellow-light grading results into their professional development management frameworks, establishing a coordinated "evaluation-incentive-restraint" mechanism [21]. It explicitly stipulates that programs receiving "green lights" for two consecutive years will be given priority in enrollment plan adjustments, receive additional funding support for teaching and research, and obtain special recommendations when applying for various high-level professional development programs. Programs flagged with a "yellow light," on the other hand, must submit detailed improvement plans and be under the joint supervision of academic affairs, career services, and other relevant departments to guide curriculum reforms and strengthen industry-university collaborations. Finally, programs receiving "red lights" for two consecutive years will be subject to enrollment plan reallocation or even temporary suspension, with a mandatory deadline to complete required rectifications[16]. By institutionalizing this evaluation framework, the "red-yellow-light" system will transition from an annual task into a regular, ongoing mechanism, ensuring continuous progress and effective implementation of employment quality assessments, ultimately fostering a positive cycle between talent cultivation and employment outcomes.

5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This article draws on practical experiences in evaluating employment quality at higher vocational institutions. Addressing the common challenges of "single indicators, fragmented data, delayed feedback, fragmented

communication, and complex operations," it proposes a three-dimensional evaluation system centered around "professional alignment, stakeholder satisfaction, and career development capability". The system moves away from intricate quantitative models and abstract metrics, instead using three relatable, everyday terms—"harmony (professional alignment), smiley face (stakeholder satisfaction), and growth (career advancement)—to transform employment quality from "cold, impersonal data" into "vivid, human stories". This approach makes the evaluation criteria more "down-to-earth," streamlines the operational process to be "cost-effective," and presents the results in a "visually intuitive" manner, effectively overcoming the longstanding issues of traditional evaluation methods being "difficult to understand and hard to apply"[22].

From a practical perspective, the three-dimensional system provides a "common language" for campus governance: departments focused on employment, teaching, and student affairs no longer operate in isolation, instead using the "red-yellow-green light" grading system as a unified benchmark. This approach swiftly establishes a closed-loop feedback mechanism—encompassing evaluation, decision-making, and improvement—thereby enabling precise implementation of initiatives such as adjusting enrollment plans, reforming curricula, and strengthening industry-university partnerships[21]. Externally, the system leverages standardized code comparisons and concrete, measurable indicators to address the longstanding issue of inconsistent evaluation criteria among similar institutions. As a result, it offers a replicable and scalable template for conducting horizontal comparisons of employment quality across higher vocational colleges within a province, directly aligning with local education authorities' call for "collaborative development and shared use of institution-specific evaluation frameworks"[3]. At its core, this system reaffirms the "practice-oriented" nature of vocational education assessment, ensuring that employment-quality evaluations genuinely support efforts to enhance talent cultivation and meet the evolving needs of graduates—rather than merely serving academic research or compliance-driven metrics[15].

Looking ahead, this system still has room for further refinement and expansion. Temporally, the career development tracking timeframe could be extended from six months to three years, with a specific emphasis on long-term indicators such as graduates' "occupational mobility skills" and "cross-disciplinary growth potential"—offering a more holistic view of the sustainability of employment outcomes[19]. On the data front, integrating employer feedback into the evaluation framework—perhaps by introducing "employer recognition" as an additional dimension—could help create a robust, closed-loop assessment system that connects graduates, institutions, and employers[23]. Moreover, if local education authorities adopt this system as a foundation, standardizing the core metrics and evaluation criteria for vocational college employment quality across the province, it could break down the silos where institutions often evaluate themselves in isolation. This would pave the way for the establishment of a unified provincial framework for assessing vocational college employment quality, offering more precise, evidence-based support for monitoring vocational education outcomes and informing policy decisions.

When evaluating employment quality, there's no need to aim for "highbrow" academic jargon—instead, let the data speak in plain, relatable terms, and ensure that the evaluation results are actionable and grounded in reality. Only then can professional development and reform truly "take root". The three-dimensional evaluation system developed in this paper isn't the final destination for assessing vocational college graduates' employment quality; rather, it serves as the "opening statement" for a transformative shift toward a culture of quality in vocational education. This system emphasizes practicality, clarity, and effectiveness as its core principles, encouraging a shift in employment-quality assessment—from benchmarking against external standards upward, to cultivating deeper, more sustainable connections with students' real-world needs and institutional growth. Ultimately, it aims to empower both graduates' success and institutions' meaningful development[20]. Looking ahead, we must continue refining the system's indicators and operational mechanisms, providing more robust practical examples to guide the ongoing reform of employment-quality assessments in vocational education. By doing so, we can help vocational education confidently and steadily advance on its journey toward "quality enhancement and excellence improvement," paving the way for even greater achievements in the future.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ministry of Education. Notice from the Ministry of Education on Effectively Supporting Employment and Entrepreneurship among 2024 Graduates of National General Higher Education Institutions. MOE Employment [2023] No. 4, December 2023.
- [2] State Council. "14th Five-Year Plan" for Vocational Skills Training. Guofa [2021] No. 32, October 8, 2021.
- [3] Guangdong Provincial Department of Education. Guangdong Province 2023 Annual Report on the Quality of Higher Vocational Education. Guangzhou: Guangdong Provincial Department of Education, 2024.
- [4] Liu Chunsheng, Li Jun. Reconstructing and Implementing an Employment Quality Evaluation System for Higher Vocational Graduates: A Dual-Logic Approach Based on "Demand-Oriented" and "Competency-Based" Principles. Vocational and Technical Education, 2022, 43(24):56-62.
- [5] Zhang Qiwu, Wang Zhanren. The Dilemmas and Breakthroughs in Evaluating Employment Quality of College Graduates: A Stakeholder Theory Perspective. Educational Development Research, 2021, 41(19):65-72.

- [6] Chen Jiefang. A Study on the Mechanism for Aligning Higher Vocational Programs with Industry Needs from the Perspective of Industry-Education Integration. *China Vocational and Technical Education*, 2022(18):45-51.
- [7] Li Hongqu, Zhou Jing. An Empirical Study on the Factors Influencing Employment Satisfaction Among Higher Vocational College Graduates: Evidence from a Survey of 12 Higher Vocational Institutions in Hubei Province. *Vocational and Technical Education*, 2023, 44(15):63-68.
- [8] Wang Jianjun, Zhang Ying. Career Development Aspirations and Employment Service Optimization Among the New Generation of Higher Vocational Graduates: Insights from a Survey of 2,000 Graduates in the Yangtze River Delta Region. *Vocational Education Research*, 2023(7):58-64.
- [9] Zhao Pengfei, Chen Lijun. The Predicament of Missing Career Development Competency Assessment Systems for Higher Vocational Graduates and Corresponding Strategies. *Education and Career*, 2022(22):89-95.
- [10] Huang Daren, Li Zeyu. A Study on the Data Governance Path for Vocational College Employment Quality in the Big Data Era. *Research in Higher Engineering Education*, 2021(6):156-161.
- [11] Zhang Zaisheng, Li Ting. Reflection and Reconstruction of the Employment Quality Evaluation System for College Graduates: A Value-Oriented Approach Rooted in "People-Centricity". *China Population Science*, 2022(3):102-112.
- [12] Zhu Dequan, Long Li. Feedback Mechanisms in Vocational Education Quality Assessment: Logic, Challenges, and Optimization. *Educational Research*, 2023, 44(5):123-132.
- [13] Liu Xianjun. The Core and Key Elements of Building a Quality Assurance System in Higher Education Institutions. *Higher Education Research*, 2021, 42(9):35-42.
- [14] Chen Yan, Li Mengling. Practical Challenges and Innovative Approaches in Evaluating Employment Quality at Higher Vocational Colleges: Insights from a Survey of 23 Higher Vocational Institutions Across 7 Provinces. *Vocational and Technical Education*, 2022, 43(33):48-54.
- [15] Wang Yangnan. The Core Principles and Practical Approaches to Reforming Vocational Education Assessment. *China Vocational and Technical Education*, 2023(9):15-21.
- [16] Li Shurui, Zhang Yu. The Logical Framework and Practical Exploration of a School-Based Evaluation System for Higher Vocational Education Employment Quality. *Vocational Education Research*, 2023(11):45-50.
- [17] National Bureau of Statistics of the People's Republic of China. *National Economic Industry Classification (GB/T4754-2017)*. Beijing: China Standards Publishing House, 2017.
- [18] Wu Xueping, Zhou Jun. Structural Equation Modeling Analysis of Employment Satisfaction Among Higher Vocational Graduates: A Survey Based on 10 Higher Vocational Colleges in Zhejiang Province. *Vocational and Technical Education*, 2022, 43(12):59-65.
- [19] Yang Liming. Practical Exploration of Evaluating Career Development Competencies of Vocational Education Graduates. *China Vocational and Technical Education*, 2021(27):68-73.
- [20] Zhou Jiansong. "Breaking and Establishing" in Quality Assessment of Higher Vocational Education: Reflections Based on the Characteristics of Type-Based Education. *Higher Education Research*, 2022, 43(8):78-84.
- [21] Liu Haifeng. Constructing China's "Discourse" on Higher Education Evaluation: A Perspective Based on Type-Based Education. *Higher Education Research*, 2022, 43(11):1-8.
- [22] Xu Guoqing. Typological Characteristics and Implementation Paths of Vocational Education Quality Assessment. *Educational Research*, 2023, 44(8):98-107.
- [23] Zhao Wei. Construction and Practice of a "Tripartite Evaluation" System for Employment Quality of Higher Vocational Graduates—Based on Stakeholder Theory. *Vocational and Technical Education*, 2023, 44(21):53-58.