Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 2025, Volume 9, Issue 10
http://ojs.bbwpublisher.com/index.php/JCER
ISSN Online: 2208-8474
ISSN Print: 2208-8466

Research on the High-Quality Development of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Universities from the Perspective of Dual-Track Drive: An Analysis Based on the Synergetic Evolution of Institutions and Teachers

Fan Yu*

Jiangsu University Jingjiang College, Zhenjiang 212113, China

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Abstract: The high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations in universities is crucial to improving the quality of higher education. From the perspective of dual-track drive, this paper deeply analyzes the synergetic evolution relationship between institutions and teachers in the development of grassroots teaching organizations in universities. At present, the development of grassroots teaching organizations in universities is faced with such dilemmas as lagging institutional supply, insufficient motivation for teachers' development, and lack of synergy mechanisms. These interwoven problems have formed systemic obstacles restricting high-quality development, which urgently need in-depth analysis and resolution. Currently, only from the perspective of synergistic promotion of institutions and teachers and by constructing a systematic implementation framework can the existing problems be effectively solved. Through three dimensions—goal guidance, resource guarantee, and mechanism optimization—this paper refines nine specific measures, aiming to break the barriers between institutional development and teachers' development, form a joint force, provide theoretical support and practical paths for improving the efficiency of grassroots teaching organizations, promote the overall improvement of education and teaching quality, enhance the quality of talent training in universities, and advance the in-depth development of education and teaching reform.

Keywords: Dual-track drive; Grassroots teaching organizations in universities; High-quality development

Online publication: November 10, 2025

1. Introduction

As a teaching community of university teachers, grassroots teaching organizations are the core foundation of university teaching activities, the main body for realizing talent training goals, and a key force for revitalizing undergraduate education. They undertake the important mission of promoting university education and teaching

work in an orderly manner, and are directly related to the effectiveness of education and teaching [1]. With the continuous deepening of education reform, grassroots teaching organizations are facing multiple challenges. As the foundation of the construction of grassroots teaching organizations, institutions provide institutional guarantees for standardizing organizational operations; as the core subject of grassroots teaching organizations, teachers provide human support for the advancement of teaching tasks and the development of teaching research. At present, grassroots teaching organizations in universities are confronted with many challenges, such as the generally incomplete institutional system, low enthusiasm of participating teachers, and the lack of professional echelons due to the fault in teachers' development. In the face of such dual dilemmas of institutions and teachers, it is difficult to promote their high-quality development by making efforts only from the single level of institutions or teachers [2]. In the future, only by deepening the interaction mechanism between institutions and teachers and promoting the transformation of grassroots teaching organizations from "passive execution" to "active innovation" can we inject lasting impetus into their construction.

2. Concept analysis: Characteristics of high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations

The form of grassroots teaching organizations has evolved from the single teaching and research section model in the early days of the People's Republic of China to the current development state where multiple forms coexist, including teaching and research sections, departments, teaching teams, curriculum groups, and experimental centers. Meanwhile, the operating mechanisms, teachers' roles, and development impetus of grassroots teaching organizations are also constantly evolving and changing [3]. Institutions and teachers are two key elements affecting the high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations. The development process urgently needs to break through the dual constraints of "institutional rigidity" and "teacher motivation," and establish a dual-track driving model of institutions and teachers. Through the coordinated evolution of the two core elements—institutional supply and teacher development—the high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations can be jointly promoted. Among them, the "institutional track" focuses on top-level design and policy guarantees, covering systematic arrangements such as organizational structure, management system, and evaluation mechanism; the "teacher track" focuses on the improvement of teaching ability and the development of teaching academia, emphasizing the activation of teachers' subjectivity and the release of professional autonomy. The coordinated advancement of the two tracks actually requires standardizing the exercise of educational and teaching administrative power in university grassroots teaching organizations, and promptly promoting the transformation of administrative power from "manager" to "service provider." It also requires encouraging teachers to actively engage in academic work through policies, supporting them in carrying out interdisciplinary academic activities, and promoting academic prosperity and innovation. See **Table 1** for the differences between the traditional model and the dual-track driving model.

Table 1. Comparison of core characteristics between the traditional model and the dual-track driving model

Dimension	Traditional management model	Dual-track driving model
Organizational structure	Hierarchical and vertical management	Networked and distributed collaboration
Operation mechanism	Administered by administrative orders	Synergy of institutional guarantees and teacher autonomy
Teacher role	Policy implementer	Subject of teaching innovation
Development impetus	Driven by external tasks	Constructed by endogenous capabilities

As the basic unit of higher education and teaching activities, the development quality of grassroots teaching organizations is directly related to the effectiveness of talent cultivation and the long-term development of education. Analyzing the characteristics of high-quality development from different perspectives helps to accurately grasp the laws of organizational development and provide theoretical support for educational and teaching reforms.

2.1. Characteristics of high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations from an institutional perspective

2.1.1. Systematicity: The institutional system requires scientific completeness

For grassroots teaching organizations with high-quality development, on the one hand, the institutional design can cover the entire teaching process, from the formulation of talent training programs, curriculum construction, teaching implementation to quality evaluation, forming a closed-loop management system [4]; on the other hand, the content of the system must be deeply aligned with the school's overall strategy and discipline development plan, constructing an institutional network with vertical connection and horizontal linkage, which effectively avoids the phenomenon of institutional fragmentation or contradictions.

2.1.2. Adaptability: The institutional system needs timely and dynamic updates

The adaptability of the system is the core capability of grassroots teaching organizations to respond to changes in the educational environment. A high-quality institutional system can be timely optimized and updated in accordance with social needs, technological changes and adjustments to educational policies. For example, in the era of rapid development of artificial intelligence, facing the impact and reshaping of educational models by artificial intelligence technology, some universities have quickly issued documents such as Measures for the Use and Management of Smart Teaching Facilities and Detailed Rules for the Implementation of Blended Teaching Reform, organically integrating new technologies into teaching management systems.

2.1.3. Incentiveness: The institutional system should have a positive driving effect

A sound incentive mechanism is an important guarantee for promoting the high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations. Systems such as professional title appointment and promotion, performance appraisal, and reward and recognition should play a role in positive incentive and driving. By deeply linking teachers' teaching quality and teaching reform achievements with their professional development, a sound ecosystem is formed where institutions drive teachers to engage in teaching and pursue excellence.

2.2. Characteristics of high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations from teachers' perspective

2.2.1. Professionalism: Facilitating the comprehensive improvement of teachers' competence

In grassroots teaching organizations with high-quality development, outstanding teaching teams and renowned teachers should play a leading role, setting examples in aspects such as program development, curriculum construction, and teaching material compilation. Within such high-quality teaching organizations, while being responsible for mastering the knowledge of the courses they teach, teachers can also grasp the dynamics and trends of the fields related to their courses, keep abreast of the latest course content and educational teaching methods, integrate daily teaching with teaching research, and timely update teaching content and methods to better achieve curriculum objectives.

2.2.2. Innovation: Driving breakthroughs and reforms in teaching practice

Innovation is the core driving force for teachers to promote the high-quality development of teaching organizations. Teacher groups committed to high-quality development actively explore innovations in teaching methods, such as introducing project-based learning and flipped classroom models into teaching practice; they also proactively conduct teaching research and propose solutions to teaching difficulties. This kind of innovation not only improves the quality of talent cultivation but also ensures the quality and effectiveness of teaching and research activities, driving the continuous improvement of teachers' teaching standards.

2.2.3. Collaboration: Promoting cooperation and sharing among teacher teams

The high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations cannot be separated from the collaborative cooperation among teachers. Through forms such as establishing curriculum teams and teaching innovation teams, teachers realize knowledge sharing and experience complementarity [5]. Many teaching links in colleges and universities require the establishment of teaching teams for full cooperation. For example, in curriculum construction, teachers with different professional backgrounds divide work and collaborate to jointly develop interdisciplinary courses; in teaching reforms, backbone teachers lead young teachers in research, forming a positive "mentorship" cycle. In addition, teachers actively cooperate with external enterprises and research institutions, integrate multiple resources, expand teaching practice platforms, and promote in-depth integration between teaching organizations and the external environment.

Systems and teachers do not exist in isolation; their collaborative interaction further strengthens the characteristics of high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations. On the one hand, a scientific system provides resource guarantees and institutional incentives for teachers' development, boosting the improvement of teachers' professional capabilities and teaching innovation; on the other hand, teachers' active practice and feedback in turn contribute to system optimization, forming a two-way promotion mechanism of "systems guide teachers' development, and teachers feedback system innovation."

3. Practical dilemmas: Deep-seated contradictions of dual-track imbalance

As the core carrier for talent cultivation in universities, the development quality of grassroots teaching organizations directly affects the effectiveness of education and teaching. Against the backdrop of educational digital transformation and the construction of "New Engineering, New Agriculture, New Medicine, and New Liberal Arts" ("Four News" initiative), grassroots teaching organizations have exposed deep-seated contradictions such as lagging institutional supply, insufficient motivation for teacher development, and lack of coordination mechanisms. These intertwined issues have formed systemic obstacles restricting high-quality development, which urgently require in-depth analysis and resolution.

3.1. External dilemmas: Lagging institutional supply and implementation deviations

3.1.1. Disconnection between institutional design and educational practice

Teaching management systems are relatively rigid. The current teaching management systems are mostly constructed based on traditional disciplinary systems, with inflexible standards for curriculum setup, credit allocation, and teaching evaluation, making them difficult to adapt to the needs of interdisciplinary talent cultivation [6]. According to the undergraduate teaching quality report data publicly released by various universities, some universities still maintain the proportion of specialized compulsory courses at over 70%, which compresses the development space for courses in emerging fields such as artificial intelligence and big

data; the update cycle of course syllabi is as long as 3–5 years, leading to a serious disconnection between teaching content and industry frontiers.

3.1.2. Formalization and deviations in institutional implementation

On the one hand, the quality monitoring mechanism is ineffective. Teaching quality evaluation relies excessively on quantitative indicators such as student evaluations of teaching and classroom attendance, while ignoring innovative exploration in the teaching process. Many current universities are attempting project-based teaching, but cases where teachers are forced to return to traditional lecture-style teaching due to "substandard teaching quality" determined by student performance fluctuations caused by project-based teaching attempts are not uncommon. In addition, teaching supervision mainly focuses on "checking lesson plans and counting class hours," making it difficult to provide substantive guidance for teaching reform. On the other hand, the implementation of systems lacks flexibility. Some universities adopt a "one-size-fits-all" management approach to the teaching process, formulating strict standards from lesson plan formats to teaching progress, which inhibits teachers' teaching autonomy. For example, teachers being deemed to have engaged in "irregular operations" for completing teaching tasks ahead of schedule has led to their reluctance to attempt optimizing teaching rhythms or expanding content, reducing institutional implementation to mechanical process control [7].

3.2. Internal contradictions: Insufficient self-motivation and role conflicts of teachers

3.2.1. Lack of motivation for professional development

There is a lack of mechanisms for improving teachers' teaching capabilities. The teacher training system has problems of "valuing theory over practice and generality over individuality." Young teachers lack sufficient practical training in teaching design and classroom management that they urgently need, while the needs of senior teachers for interdisciplinary teaching and the application of digital tools are not met. According to preliminary survey data, teachers from a certain university reported that the repetition rate of training content they participated in for three consecutive years exceeded 60%, which was difficult to solve practical teaching problems. The risk of occupational burnout is increasing: the pressure from multiple roles disperses teachers' energy—heavy teaching tasks, strict scientific research assessment, and trivial administrative affairs make teachers busy coping with daily work.

3.2.2. Contradictions and conflicts in role orientation

Under the institutional orientation of "valuing scientific research over teaching," teachers face the dilemma of "relying on scientific research for survival and teaching for conscience," resulting in a serious imbalance between teaching and scientific research. During the survey, many young teachers admitted that they had to reduce lesson preparation time to complete scientific research tasks, and even phenomena such as "reading PPT in class and not answering questions after class" occurred [8]. Conflict between traditional roles and innovative demands: The digital transformation requires teachers to shift from "knowledge imparters" to "learning guides," but teachers generally lack digital literacy training and technical support. For instance, after a university implemented a smart teaching platform, 70% of teachers only used it as an online attendance tool instead of realizing teaching model innovation due to the lack of supporting training.

3.3. Coordination difficulties: Lack of synergy mechanism and digital-intelligent divide

3.3.1. Inefficient internal synergy in teaching organizations

On one hand, there is a lack of team collaboration mechanisms. Most grassroots teaching organizations do not have clear team collaboration systems; curriculum development and teaching reform are mainly led

by individual teachers, resulting in insufficient resource sharing [9]. For example, due to teachers working independently on a professional course, the content repetition rate reached 40%, and there was a lack of cross-chapter connection design, leading to low teaching efficiency. On the other hand, interdisciplinary cooperation is hindered. Interdisciplinary teaching reform is difficult to advance due to the lack of resource integration and benefit distribution mechanisms. When teachers participate in interdisciplinary projects, they often face problems such as time conflicts and disputes over the ownership of achievements.

3.3.2. Significant digital-intelligent competence gap

In the era of artificial intelligence, there is still an obvious gap in the digital-intelligent competence of some university teachers. For instance, young teachers accept and apply emerging digital-intelligent tools quickly and proficiently, while older teachers have shortcomings in using complex tools and integrating technologies; teachers of science and engineering have stronger digital-intelligent tool application capabilities due to research needs, while teachers of humanities and social sciences are relatively backward in digital resource development and intelligent evaluation; teachers in key universities or those in developed regions can access more digital-intelligent resources and training, so their competence improves rapidly, while teachers in remote or local colleges and universities are limited by resources, hindering their competence improvement; some teachers only stay at the level of using basic tools, while a small number of backbone teachers have been able to deeply apply digital-intelligent technologies to innovate teaching and research models.

4. Practical path: Constructing a “Three-Dimension & Nine-Step” collaborative development model

Against the backdrop of deepening education reform, grassroots teaching organizations are facing complex challenges. It is difficult to break through the bottlenecks only by improving the system or relying on teachers alone. Only from the perspective of coordinated advancement of the system and teachers, and by constructing a systematic implementation framework, can the existing problems be effectively solved and the organizational vitality and creativity be stimulated. Based on this, this paper innovatively proposes a “Three-Dimension & Nine-Step” implementation framework. Through three dimensions—goal guidance, resource guarantee, and mechanism optimization—it is refined into nine specific measures, aiming to break the barriers between the system and teacher development, form a synergy, provide theoretical support and practical paths for improving the efficiency of grassroots teaching organizations, and promote the overall improvement of education and teaching quality.

4.1. Goal guidance dimension

4.1.1. Clarifying the orientation of talent cultivation goals

Grassroots teaching organizations need to closely align with the national education policy, social needs, and the school’s running orientation, conduct in-depth research on industry development trends and student characteristics, and formulate accurate and forward-looking talent cultivation goals. This requires widely soliciting opinions from teachers, enterprise experts, graduates, and other parties, and jointly discussing to determine talent cultivation standards that meet the needs of the times, so that the goals not only highlight professional characteristics but also emphasize practical orientation, and anchor the direction for subsequent teaching activities.

4.1.2. Formulating teacher development goal plans

According to teachers’ career development stages and personal characteristics, customized development goals

should be formulated for them [10]. For novice teachers, the focus is on improving basic teaching skills and educational teaching theories; backbone teachers are encouraged to carry out teaching reform research and pursue teaching innovation; senior teachers can lead team development and play a demonstration and radiating role. At the same time, teachers' development goals should be closely integrated with talent cultivation goals to ensure that teachers promote the improvement of talent cultivation quality in the process of their own growth.

4.1.3. Establishing a teaching quality goal system

Construct a quality goal system covering the entire teaching process, including specific quantitative indicators for curriculum teaching, practical teaching, academic evaluation, and other aspects. Clarify the teaching quality standards for each course (such as students' knowledge mastery and ability improvement level) and the evaluation indicators for practical teaching effects. Through regular teaching quality inspections, student evaluations of teaching, peer evaluations, and other methods, track the achievement of quality goals, adjust teaching strategies in a timely manner, and ensure the steady improvement of teaching quality.

4.2. Resource guarantee dimension

4.2.1. Optimizing institutional resource allocation

At the university level, improve the teaching resource allocation system to ensure that grassroots teaching organizations receive adequate support in terms of teaching funds, facilities, and equipment. Reasonably plan the teaching fund budget, tilting it toward key areas such as teaching reform, curriculum development, and teacher training; establish a teaching resource sharing platform to break down barriers between departments and majors and improve resource utilization efficiency.

4.2.2. Strengthening teacher human resource development

Focus on the construction of the teaching staff, and improve the overall quality of the team through diversified methods such as talent introduction, on-the-job training, and academic exchanges. Reasonably allocate teacher resources according to teaching needs to avoid shortages or redundancies; establish an incentive mechanism for teacher development, encourage teachers to pursue higher academic qualifications and participate in academic research, and reward those who excel in teaching and research to stimulate their development motivation [11].

4.2.3. Integrating social resources for collaborative development

Strengthen cooperation with social forces such as enterprises and research institutions, and actively introduce social resources: jointly build internship and training bases with enterprises to provide practical opportunities for students; invite enterprise experts to participate in the formulation of teaching and talent training programs to make teaching content more in line with actual needs; strive for social donations to broaden the sources of teaching resources, realize the complementary advantages of university and social resources, and jointly promote the development of grassroots teaching organizations.

4.3. Mechanism optimization dimension

4.3.1. Improving teaching management systems

Establish and improve teaching management systems, and standardize the processes and standards for teaching plan formulation, teaching process implementation, and teaching evaluation. Clarify teachers' teaching responsibilities and students' learning requirements, and strengthen the supervision and management of the teaching process; establish a dynamic system update mechanism, and timely revise and improve the system

according to the development of education reform and practical teaching problems to ensure its scientificity and effectiveness.

4.3.2. Constructing teacher development support mechanisms

Provide diversified development support for teachers, including teaching skills training, teaching research guidance, and career development planning consultation. Regularly organize teaching seminars to promote experience exchange and cooperation among teachers; encourage teachers to participate in domestic and foreign academic conferences and teaching training to broaden their academic horizons and update their educational concepts; establish teacher development files, track their growth process, and provide personalized development suggestions and support [12].

4.3.3. Establishing a collaborative feedback mechanism between systems and teachers

Build a communication and feedback platform between systems and teachers, enabling teachers to timely feedback problems in the implementation of teaching management systems, and system formulators to accurately grasp teachers' needs and development status. Collect teachers' opinions and suggestions through regular forums, questionnaires, online feedback, etc., to optimize and adjust teaching management systems; at the same time, timely feedback system adjustments to teachers to promote positive interaction between systems and teacher development, and jointly drive the high-quality development of grassroots teaching organizations [13].

5. Conclusion: Model innovation and future outlook

Grassroots teaching organizations are the "last mile" for universities to implement the fundamental task of fostering virtue through education, as well as the "last mile" for the implementation of various teaching work at the university and college levels [14]. With the overall deployment of "building a high-quality education system," the attributes and status of grassroots teaching organizations have been consolidated and deepened, and their construction has been incorporated into the track of quality governance [15]. To formulate effective plans for the construction and quality governance of grassroots teaching organizations, it is necessary to realize a fundamental shift from quality management to quality governance. This paper analyzes the process of collaborative evolution between institutional rationality and teacher initiative in a specific educational field, aiming to break the traditional binary opposition of "institutions suppressing innovation" or "practice being divorced from institutions." By constructing a virtuous cycle of "teacher independent innovation under institutional guarantee" and "teacher innovation feeding back institutional optimization," the organic integration of institutional improvement and teacher development is realized, providing more powerful theoretical support and practical guidance for the high-quality development of university grassroots teaching organizations.

Funding

(1) Interim results of the 2024 high-quality development project at Jingjiang College, Jiangsu University, titled "Research on the Teacher Evaluation Mechanism of Independent Colleges Based on the Three-Dimensional System of Innovation-Efficiency-Impact" (2024JFYA001)

(2) Interim results of the special project "Research on the Digitalization of Textbooks in the New Era" in Jiangsu Province's universities in 2024 (2024JCSZ37)

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Lu G, Sun J, Meng C, et al., 2014, The Most Basic Teacher Teaching Community in Universities: Grassroots Teaching Organizations. Research in Higher Education of Engineering, 2014(01): 58.

[2] Gu Z, Ma J, Qin S, 2023, The Subjective Dilemma and Breakthrough of Teachers' Self-evaluation. Contemporary Educational Science, 2023(2): 17–26.

[3] Shang S, 2022, The Current Situation, Problems and Countermeasures of Grassroots Teaching Organization Construction in Local Ordinary Undergraduate Universities: A Case Study Based on J University. Continental Bridge Perspective, (11): 102–104.

[4] Wu X, 2023, High-Quality Construction and Development of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Universities—Taking Master Studios and Virtual Teaching and Research Sections as Examples. Journal of Nanjing University of Science and Technology: Social Science Edition, 36(4): 16–21.

[5] Liu X, 2017, Research on the Construction of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Universities—A Case Study of Huazhong Agricultural University, dissertation, Huazhong Agricultural University.

[6] Song Z, Wang Y, 2019, Development Dilemmas and Governance Paths of University Grassroots Academic Organizations—From the Perspective of Disciplinary System. Journal of Nanjing Normal University (Social Science Edition), 2019(05): 45–53.

[7] Niu S, 2020, Research on University Classroom Teaching Model Based on PAD Class—A Review of "PAD Class: New Wisdom of Chinese Education." Leadership Science, 2020(2): 2.

[8] Li X, 2023, Construction of Teaching Quality Evaluation Mechanism for Ideological and Political Theory Courses in Higher Vocational Colleges. 2023(12): 55–63.

[9] Cui Y, Zhu X, 2018, Research on the Construction of Academic System for Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Chinese Universities. Journal of Southwest University (Social Sciences Edition), 44(05): 77–83.

[10] Lu G, Zhang C, 2018, Paths, Strategies and Reflections on the Construction of Grassroots Teaching Organizations—Based on the Practice and Exploration of Zhejiang University. Research in Higher Education of Engineering, 2018(03): 130–136 + 141.

[11] Hong Z, 2020, Reform and Development of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Universities. Research in Educational Development, 40(19): 62–68.

[12] Chen Y, 2024, Research on the Construction of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Local Application-Oriented Universities. New Curriculum Research, 2024(33): 9–11.

[13] Zhang Y, Li L, Chen N, et al., 2021, Preliminary Study on Teaching Strategies and Instructional Design Based on Online Integrated Teaching Model—Taking "Social Medicine" as an Example. Education Modernization, 2021(12): 69–72.

[14] Yan X, 2023, Exploration on the Construction of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Secondary Colleges of Local Universities—Taking the School of Information Science and Engineering of Zaozhuang University as an Example. Journal of Heze University, 2023(10): 139–142.

[15] Ge N, 2021, Reform and Innovation of Grassroots Teaching Organizations in Universities in the New Era. Journal of Jilin Engineering Normal University, 2021(9): 84–86.