Education Reform and Development, 2026, Volume 8, Issue 6
https://ojs.bbwpublisher.com/index.php/ERD
Online ISSN: 2652-5372
Print ISSN: 2652-5364

Theoretical Framework and Practical Implementation of the OBE-PBL Integrated Teaching Model

Yanyan Chen*

Jiangsu Ocean University, Lianyungang 222005, China

Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

Abstract: Addressing the pervasive challenges of the "disconnect between learning and application" and the "separation of goals and processes" in higher education, this paper systematically examines the intrinsic coupling between Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and Project-Based Learning (PBL), arguing that the two approaches are fundamentally complementary along the "goals-process" dimension. Building on this insight, the paper constructs a theoretical framework and implementation pathway for an "OBE-PBL Integrated Teaching Model," establishing a closed-loop teaching cycle of "backward design-forward implementation-multidimensional assessment-continuous improvement." The paper elaborates on the theoretical foundations of the integrated model, a five-step standardized instructional design framework, a four-phase implementation pathway, strategies for transforming the role of the teacher, and a three-dimensional, multi-faceted assessment mechanism. This study aims to provide systematic theoretical support and transferable operational solutions to bridge the gap between learning and application, stimulate intrinsic motivation among students, and advance the paradigm shift in higher education from a "teacher-centered" to a "student-centered" approach.

Keywords: Outcome-based education (OBE); Project-based learning (PBL); Integrated teaching model; Backward design; Multidimensional assessment

Online publication: July 20, 2026

1. Introduction

1.1. Research background and problem statement

Since the beginning of the 21st century, the global labor market has been shifting from a focus on "standardized skills" to non-cognitive abilities such as "complex problem-solving, interdisciplinary collaboration, and innovation and creativity." The traditional "knowledge-transfer" teaching model is no longer sustainable; education must shift from "teaching students what to know" to "teaching students what to do." The "Outline of the Plan for Building an Education Powerhouse (2024–2035)" explicitly calls for "focusing on strengthening the cultivation of innovative capabilities," but how to translate this ambitious goal into practical classroom instruction remains a core issue that urgently needs to be addressed.

Current educational reforms in higher education face three structural challenges: first, the disconnect between research and teaching, which makes it difficult to translate research strengths into teaching resources; second, the separation of theory and practice, which deprives students of opportunities to apply their knowledge in real-world contexts; and third, the misalignment between assessment and development, where the focus on end-of-term exams conflicts with the long-term goals of talent development. These three challenges reinforce one another and hinder substantial improvements in teaching quality.

While many teachers embrace the "student-centered" philosophy, they lack methodological support: How should they design challenging projects? How should they assess student performance? How can they ensure that project tasks align with curriculum objectives? Without a systematic methodology, reform risks becoming a mere "teaching performance" in name only, with its core remaining rooted in traditional models.

The integration of OBE and PBL stems from educational practice's response to two major challenges: how to make educational outcomes "visible" and how to make the learning process "dynamic." OBE [1], centered on "backward design," constructs instruction in reverse starting from expected outcomes, making educational outcomes observable and measurable. However, as a top-down design approach, it lacks specific implementation pathways and is prone to the dilemma of "clear goals but unchanged classroom practices." PBL [2], driven by real-world problems and carried out through projects, naturally offers the advantage of "learning by doing," but it is weaker in goal anchoring, which can easily lead to "plenty of activity but insufficient depth." The two approaches are naturally complementary: OBE anchors "what to cultivate and what outcomes to achieve," while PBL answers "how to cultivate and how to achieve." OBE provides direction and standards for PBL, while PBL provides the vehicle and process for OBE; together, they form a complete "objective-process-assessment" closed loop. This complementarity constitutes the logical starting point for their integration.

1.2. Current state of research and analysis

In recent years, there has been a growing body of theoretical and practical research on OBE and PBL [3–6], and attempts at educational reform integrating the two have rapidly increased [7–11].

(1) The maturity of their respective theoretical frameworks. In the OBE field, represented by Spady's (1994) "backward design" theory, a clear logic for outcomes-based curriculum design has been established; in the PBL field, represented by scholars such as Barrett, a comprehensive methodology spanning from problem design to process organization has been developed. Both possess solid theoretical foundations, providing academic support for integration research.

(2) The Emergence and Development of Integrated Research. At the theoretical level, researchers have drawn upon Acharya's findings and PBL principles to propose a blended OBE teaching model. This model integrates PBL with lecture-based instruction, enhancing learners' initiative and creativity while ensuring the systematic nature of learning outcomes. In the field of engineering education, some researchers have proposed a systematic framework that involves "analyzing industry needs using OBE principles to define talent development objectives, and then designing the PBL teaching process in a backward-design approach."

The above studies indicate that the integration of OBE and PBL is "feasible in practice." However, a deeper analysis reveals that current research still has the following shortcomings: First, the theoretical depth of integration research needs to be strengthened; most studies remain at the level of a simple combination of "concepts and methods," lacking a systematic explanation of the coupling mechanisms. Second, there is a lack of standardized, transferable instructional design frameworks; the frameworks proposed by different studies vary significantly, making it difficult to establish a reusable methodology. Third, research on evaluation mechanisms and the transformation of teachers' roles under the integration model remains relatively weak.

1.3. Research objectives

This paper aims to systematically explore the intrinsic synergy between OBE and PBL, construct a theoretical framework and implementation pathway for the "OBE-PBL Integrated Teaching Model," and, through the complementary mechanism of "OBE anchoring objectives and standards, while PBL supporting the process and serving as a vehicle," establish a teaching cycle of "backward design—forward implementation — Diverse Assessment—Continuous Improvement," effectively bridging the gap between academic learning and practical application, stimulating students' intrinsic motivation to learn, and driving the paradigm shift in higher education from a "teacher-centered" to a "student-centered" approach. This will help cultivate "demand-oriented, application-based" multidisciplinary talents. Additionally, the research findings can provide support for program accreditation, quality enhancement, industry-education integration, teaching innovation, and faculty development, thereby contributing to the high-quality development of education.

2. The theoretical core and coupling mechanisms of OBE and PBL

By analyzing the theoretical core of OBE's "backward design and learning outcomes-based approach" and PBL's "problem-driven and project-based approach," this study reveals their essential complementarity along the "goals–process" dimension: OBE provides direction and standards but lacks implementation pathways, while PBL provides processes and contexts but can lead to fragmented learning objectives. This paper elucidates the logic of their integration and argues that the fusion model represents a structural necessity in the shift of educational paradigms from "knowledge transmission" to "competency-based education," thereby providing a theoretical foundation for future research.

OBE is centered on the logic of "backward design," which involves constructing curricula and instruction in reverse starting from expected learning outcomes, resulting in four key characteristics: "outcome-oriented, standards-referenced, competency-based, and continuously improving." Its strengths lie in clear objectives and well-defined standards; however, as it is essentially a top-down design approach, it lacks specific implementation pathways and is prone to falling into the trap of "lofty goals but business as usual in the classroom."

PBL is driven by real-world problems and delivered through projects. It achieves "learning by doing" through a teaching process characterized by contextual relevance, inquiry-based learning, student-centeredness, and tangible outcomes. Its strengths lie in a comprehensive process and authentic contexts, but it is weaker in terms of goal anchoring and standard-based constraints, which can easily lead to a situation where "there is plenty of activity but insufficient depth."

OBE and PBL are fundamentally complementary on the "goals-process" dimension: OBE has goals and standards but lacks a practical implementation pathway; PBL offers processes and contexts but lacks clear learning objectives. The logic of their integration is as follows: OBE provides PBL with directional anchors and a yardstick for measuring achievement, while PBL provides OBE with a vehicle for implementation and a source of evidence. The integration of the two represents a structural inevitability in the shift of educational paradigms from "knowledge transmission" to "competency-based education."

The integration model proposed in this paper differs from pure OBE, pure PBL, and a simple superposition of the two; it emphasizes the deep coupling of OBE and PBL—where shared learning objectives determine project design, and process outputs support the assessment of achievement. The research focuses on the theoretical construction of design logic, implementation pathways, and methodological tools, and does not yet involve empirical testing. The aim is to develop a standardized framework that is describable, operational, and transferable.

3. Developing a design framework for the OBE-PBL integrated teaching model

Using OBE "backward design" as the guiding principle and PBL "project organization" as the vehicle, we have established a five-step standardized framework comprising "outcome decomposition—goal setting—project design—task sequencing—assessment rubrics." Its core features are as follows: expected outcomes determine project goals and task complexity; project outcomes, in turn, inform the collection of evidence of achievement; this achieves full alignment across the "goals–tasks–assessment" chain, resulting in a design paradigm that is describable, actionable, and transferable.

3.1. Design principles and overall logic

Instructional design for blended learning follows three core principles:

(1) Outcomes determine projects. Project objectives, complexity, and task difficulty are not arbitrarily set, but are directly determined by the expected learning outcomes once they have been broken down. The higher the standards for these outcomes, the more pronounced the project's realism, interdisciplinary nature, and open-ended problem-solving characteristics should be.

(2) Tasks support learning outcomes. The sequence of sub-tasks within a project should be organized according to the logical progression of skill development, ensuring that students move toward specific learning outcome indicators as they complete each sub-task. Tasks should form a progressive relationship rather than being simply listed side by side.

(3) Evidence-Based Assessment. The various works, records, reports, and presentations produced by students during the project should serve directly as evidence of achievement. The descriptive levels of the assessment rubric should correspond to the behavioral manifestations of the competency indicators, ensuring that "what is assessed" aligns with "what is taught and learned."

3.2. The five-step standardized instructional design framework

The five-step standardized instructional design framework is shown in the table below.

Table 1. Five-step instructional design framework

Steps	Step Name	Core Mission
Step 1	Breakdown of Learning Outcomes	Derive measurable learning outcomes from the graduation requirements for courses and majors
Step 2	Setting Learning Objectives	Establish competency indicators and achievement criteria for each learning outcome

Steps	Step Name	Core Mission
Step 3	Project Design	The project's objectives, complexity, and real-world context are determined by the expected outcomes.
Step 4	Sequence of Tasks	Design progressive learning tasks and subtasks to support the project
Step 5	Assessment Rubric	Developing Performance Evaluation Rubrics Aligned with Metrics

(1) Learning outcomes should be broken down according to the principles of "specification, behavioral focus, and measurability." Avoid using vague verbs such as "understand" or "master," and instead use observable action verbs such as "design," "analyze," "evaluate," and "solve." The breakdown should generally be limited to 2–3 levels: Level 1 outcomes correspond to the core course objectives; Level 2 outcomes correspond to unit/module objectives; and Level 3 outcomes correspond to specific task objectives; Each final decomposed learning outcome should be something that students can "demonstrate" or "produce" within a single project cycle.

(2) Each learning outcome should correspond to 2–4 observable behavioral indicators. These indicators should describe "under what conditions students exhibit which behaviors and to what level." Achievement standards should use a graded description (e.g., Excellent, Good, Pass, Needs Improvement) rather than simple yes/no judgments; standards should be discriminative, capable of identifying different stages of student competency development.

(3) Project objectives must directly correspond to the learning outcomes decomposed in Step 1, forming an "Outcome–Project" mapping table; the complexity of the project is determined by the comprehensiveness and challenge level of the outcomes: higher-order outcomes require interdisciplinary, multi-constraint ill-defined problems; project contexts should be as close to reality as possible, drawing from actual corporate problems, real-world social needs, or cutting-edge research topics; projects should be open-ended, allowing for multiple solution pathways.

(4) Projects should be broken down into 3–6 sub-tasks with a logical progression, with each sub-task corresponding to specific outcome indicators; the sequence of sub-tasks should be organized according to the competency development pathway of "problem identification—information gathering—solution design—validation and optimization—outcome presentation"; each sub-task should specify deliverables (e.g., research reports, design sketches, calculation sheets, prototypes, etc.) to serve as the basis for formative assessment; Task difficulty should increase gradually, with early tasks providing substantial scaffolding and later tasks progressively increasing autonomy.

(5) The rubric should cover all established competency indicators, with each indicator corresponding to an evaluation dimension; each dimension should use a graded description (typically 3–5 levels), clearly defining the behavioral characteristics of each grade; the rubric should be shared with students before the project begins, ensuring that evaluation criteria serve as learning guides rather than tools for post-project judgment; the rubric should balance process and outcomes, evaluating both the quality of the final project deliverables and participation, collaboration, and reflection during the inquiry process.

3.3. Key features of the framework

Expected outcomes are the "cause," and projects are the "effect." Teachers first clarify "what students should be able to do," then design backward to determine "what kind of project will allow students to demonstrate that they can achieve this," and finally decide "how complex the project should be." Outcomes determine the project, rather than the project determining the outcomes—this is the fundamental characteristic that distinguishes this framework from conventional PBL.

The research reports, design proposals, calculation sheets, prototypes, presentation slides, and reflection journals produced by students during the project serve as direct evidence of their competency attainment. This evidence inherently possesses the characteristics of "authenticity" (derived from real-world tasks) and "process-oriented" (spanning the entire learning journey), better reflecting students' true competency levels than traditional tests. Assessment of achievement no longer relies on abstract score conversions but is based on behavioral performance judgments grounded in concrete outcomes.

3.4. Illustration of design framework implementation

Each step of the five-step framework can be broken down into a specific checklist, as shown in the table below.

Table 2. List of operations

Steps	Action Checklist
Breakdown of Learning Outcomes	List 3–5 core learning outcomes for the course; break down each outcome into 2–4 observable behaviors; use action verbs to describe them
Setting Objectives	Set 2–3 competency indicators for each outcome; describe behavioral performance for each indicator; establish 3–4 grading criteria
Project Design	Design 1 comprehensive project that covers the core outcomes; the project context should be real or semi-real; the project should be open-ended
Sequence of Tasks	Break the project down into 3–6 subtasks; the subtasks should be sequential; clearly define deliverables for each task
Assessment Rubric	The rubric should cover all indicators; use descriptive grading criteria; publish the rubric before the project begins

This framework can be adapted to different disciplines and course types. When applying this framework across different disciplines, educators can adjust the presentation of learning outcomes, the logic of task organization, and the dimensions of assessment rubrics while maintaining the five-step structure. The framework's "skeleton" is universal, while its "flesh and blood" vary by discipline, ensuring its transferability as a standardized design paradigm.

4. Implementation pathways for blended learning and the transformation of teachers' roles

The teaching process is divided into four progressive stages: "Project Launch—Inquiry Development—Output Production—Presentation and Reflection," with clear definitions of key activities, student tasks, and teacher behaviors for each stage. This framework outlines a systematic pathway for teachers to transition from "knowledge transmitters" to "learning facilitators, scaffolders, and process evaluators," identifying the institutional conditions (class schedules, performance metrics, and team collaboration) and competency requirements (problem design, process guidance, and rubric development) that support this transformation. The four-stage teaching implementation plan is shown in the table below.

Table 3. Four-stage teaching implementation pathway

Phase	Key Activities	Student Tasks	Teacher Actions
Project Launch	Launch the project, form teams, and define criteria for outcomes	Understand project objectives, role assignments, and preliminary planning	Set the context, explain standards, and motivate students
Research and Development	Gather information, collaborate on research, and solve problems	Conduct research, develop a preliminary proposal, and iterate through revisions	Provide scaffolding, facilitate discussions, and offer ongoing feedback
Delivery of Outcomes	Complete the project deliverables and prepare presentation materials	Integrate results, validate quality, and prepare for presentation	Guide refinement, monitor key milestones, and conduct preliminary assessments
Presentation and Reflection	Present findings, conduct peer reviews, and reflect on the process	Present findings, receive feedback, and reflect on the learning process	Organize presentations, guide in-depth reflection, and summarize and enhance learning

The blended learning model requires teachers to transition from their traditional role as knowledge transmitters to three new, interrelated roles:

Table 4. Role design for each stage

Phase	Key Roles	Key Actions
Project Launch	Facilitator + Interpreter of Standards	Create scenarios, interpret rubrics
Research and Development	Scaffolder + Process Guide	Provide support, ask questions to stimulate thinking
Delivery of Outcomes	Quality Controller + Resource Coordinator	Review suggestions, organize practice sessions
Presentation and Reflection	Organizer + Deep Questioner + Summarizer	Design presentations, distill lessons learned

5. Diverse assessment mechanisms and measurement of achievement in an integrated model

Establish a multi-dimensional assessment system covering three dimensions—"process and outcomes, individual and team, and self-assessment and peer assessment"—and develop performance rubrics aligned with competency indicators. The focus is on addressing two key issues: first, translating abstract learning outcomes (such as critical thinking and collaboration skills) into observable assessment indicators; and second, establishing a closed-loop "assessment–feedback–improvement" mechanism so that assessment data can both diagnose and motivate student development, as well as continuously optimize instructional design and measure the achievement of learning outcomes.

5.1. Design of a multi-dimensional evaluation system

Traditional evaluation suffers from three biases: prioritizing outcomes over processes, individuals over teams, and teachers over students. The integrated model's multi-dimensional evaluation system systematically addresses these biases by emphasizing a "three-pronged approach" to evaluation: balancing process and outcomes, individuals and teams, and self-assessment and peer assessment, as detailed in the table below.

Table 5. Evaluation system design table

Dimensions	Content	Assessment Methods	Weighting Recommendations
Process and Outcomes	Formative assessment focuses on performance during the inquiry process (engagement, collaboration, problem-solving strategies); summative assessment focuses on the quality of the final project outcomes.	Process records, work logs, interim deliverables, final projects	Process 40% / Outcomes 60%
Individuals and Teams	Individual assessment focuses on personal contributions and skill development; team assessment focuses on collaborative effectiveness and collective outcomes.	Individual reports, peer feedback, team evaluations, group projects	Individual 50% / Team 50%
Self-Assessment and Peer Assessment	Self-assessment promotes students' metacognitive development; peer and teacher assessment provide diverse perspectives.	Reflection reports, peer assessment, instructor assessment	Self-assessment 10% / Peer assessment 30% / Instructor assessment 60%

5.2. Measurable transformation of abstract outcomes

The higher-order competencies emphasized by the integrated model—such as critical thinking, collaboration, and innovation—are abstract and difficult to assess directly. The core strategy for addressing this challenge is "behavioralization, contextualization, and grading":

(1) Behavioralization: Transforming abstract qualities into specific, observable behaviors. For example, "collaboration" can be broken down into "actively sharing information," "responding to peers' questions," and "taking on assigned tasks."

(2) Contextualization: Describing behaviors within the context of specific project tasks to avoid vague, context-free statements. For example, "During team discussions, is able to politely challenge others' viewpoints and propose alternative solutions."

(3) Grading: Defining different performance levels to describe the progression from novice to expert.

5.3. The "evaluation–feedback–improvement" closed-loop mechanism

Assessment data serves a dual purpose: it has a "formative function" for students—diagnosing their learning status and motivating them to improve—and an "improvement function" for teaching—optimizing instructional design and measuring the extent to which learning objectives are met. These two functions are integrated through a closed-loop process of "assessment—feedback—improvement."

Table 6. The "evaluation–feedback–improvement" closed-loop mechanism

Phase	**Key Tasks**	**Output**
Data Collection	Collect formative evidence (work logs, discussion records, interim deliverables) and summative evidence (final products, performance demonstrations)	Raw assessment data
Analysis and Diagnosis	Assess students against rubrics; identify common challenges and individual differences; calculate achievement levels	Scoring results, diagnostic reports
Feedback and Application	Provide students with timely, specific, and constructive feedback; adjust subsequent teaching strategies based on diagnostic findings	Student feedback, instructional adjustment plans
Adjustment and Optimization	Students improve their learning based on feedback; teachers optimize project design and rubrics based on data	Improved learning outcomes, revised instructional designs

Three Principles of Effective Feedback:

(1) Timeliness: Provide feedback while students are still engaged with the task, rather than at the end of the semester.

(2) Specificity: Focus on specific behaviors or performance, rather than vague comments like “good job” or “needs improvement.”
(3) Actionability: Offer clear guidance on how to improve, so students know “what to do next.”
(4) Forms of feedback: Verbal feedback (immediate in-class feedback, small-group discussions), written feedback (comments, rubric annotations), and peer feedback (peer evaluation forms, peer reviews during seminars).

5.4. Methods for measuring the degree of achievement

The assessment of learning outcomes is achieved through a combination of direct and indirect measurement. Direct measurement involves methods such as project-based assessment, rubric evaluation, and performance-based tasks, which directly observe or evaluate students’ demonstrated abilities. Indirect measurement is conducted through self-assessment questionnaires, reflective reports, and satisfaction surveys. The blended model recommends prioritizing direct measurement (weighting $\geq$ 70%) and using indirect measurement as a supplement (weighting $\leq$ 30%), with the two approaches serving to corroborate one another.

Logic for calculating project outcome achievement:

(1) Step 1: Determine the weights of each learning outcome indicator

Assign weights to each competency indicator based on the importance of the course objectives (total of 100%)

(2) Step 2: Collect evidence of project outcomes

Each project outcome corresponds to several competency indicators

Obtain raw scores for each indicator (on a percentage or letter grade scale) through rubric scoring

(3) Step 3: Calculate individual achievement

Achievement for a single indicator = Score for that indicator / Full score × 100%

Course achievement = Σ(Achievement for each indicator × Weight of each indicator)

(4) Step 4: Calculate overall achievement

Class average achievement = ΣStudent achievement / Number of students

Set an achievement standard (e.g., ≥75% is “Achieved”), and calculate the percentage of students who met the standard

5.5. Integration of the teaching feedback loop with the overall implementation plan

Backward design determines the direction and standards; forward implementation generates the process and outcomes; diverse assessment provides evidence and diagnosis; and continuous improvement drives optimization and iteration. Together, these elements form a spiraling mechanism of continuous improvement, achieving a closed-loop process through the cycle of “backward design—forward implementation—diverse assessment—continuous improvement.” This closed-loop process embodies the deep integration of OBE and PBL: backward design embodies OBE’s “outcome-based” approach, forward implementation embodies PBL’s “project-based” approach, multi-dimensional assessment integrates OBE’s “criterion-referenced” evaluation with PBL’s “explicit outcomes,” and continuous improvement integrates the shared “iterative” nature of both approaches.

Table 7. Frontline teacher operations chart

Phase	Tools	Key Points
Instructional Design	Five-Step Framework + Assessment Templates	Outcomes determine the project; behavioral descriptions; grading criteria
Instructional Delivery	Four-Stage Action Checklist + Quick Reference Guide for Teacher Behavior	Initiation sets the direction; exploration provides scaffolding; outputs ensure quality; reflection fosters growth
Instructional Evaluation	Three-Dimensional Weighting Table + Achievement Calculation	Balancing process and outcomes; integrating individual and team efforts; combining self-assessment and peer assessment
Continuous Improvement	Closed-Loop Self-Assessment Checklist + FAQs	Data-driven; iterative optimization

Formula for calculating achievement rate: Course achievement rate = Σ(Indicator achievement rate × Indicator weight), with a passing threshold of ≥ 75%.

6. Conclusion and outlook

This paper has revealed the intrinsic complementarity of OBE and PBL on the "objective–process" dimension and argues that their integration constitutes a structural necessity for a paradigm shift in education. Building on this foundation, the study constructs a five-step design framework, "outcome decomposition, indicator setting, project design, task sequencing, and evaluation rubrics", a four-phase implementation pathway, "project initiation, inquiry advancement, output production, and presentation and reflection" and a multi-dimensional evaluation mechanism covering "process and outcomes, individual and team, and self-assessment and peer assessment." Together, these elements form a closed-loop teaching cycle of "backward design, forward implementation, multi-dimensional evaluation, and continuous improvement." This research provides transferable practical solutions for professional accreditation, quality enhancement, industry–education integration, and teacher development. Future work should include empirical validation to verify the effectiveness of the model, as well as exploration of strategies for interdisciplinary adaptation, refinement of assessment tools, and digital empowerment.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Wang Y, Hu G, Duan Y, et al., 2019, Outcome-Based Curriculum and Instruction: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. Research on Higher Engineering Education, (3): 62–68.

[2] Hu F, 2021, A Study on the Design and Application of a Project-Based Learning Model Based on the OBE Philosophy, thesis, Liaoning Normal University.

[3] Liao Y, Zhao G, He L, et al., 2024, Instructional Design and Implementation of a Python Programming Course Based on the OBE Approach. Computer Knowledge and Technology, 20(29): 136–138.

[4] Zeng D, Wang S, Ding G, 2025, A Study on the Optimization of the Engineering Education Curriculum System Based on the Integration of the "Knowledge–Ability–Quality" Three-Dimensional Framework. Chinese Higher Education, (8): 31–37.

[5] Zhang W, Lin Y, Wang L, et al., 2025, Prevention of Problems and Optimization Pathways in the Construction of Industry-Education Integration Communities from the Perspective of Complex Adaptive Systems. Research on

Higher Engineering Education, (1): 117–121.

[6] Feng Z, He P, Li F, et al., 2023, Exploring Case-Driven “Theoretical Depth + Practical Application” in Python General Education Courses. Computer Education, (3): 199–202.

[7] Liu H, 2025, Teaching Reform Practice for Cultivating Applied Talents in Emerging Engineering Fields Driven by the OBE+PBL Dual-Track Approach. Proceedings of MPMTT, Kunming.

[8] Zhu J, 2022, A Study on the Application of Project-Based Learning Based on the OBE Philosophy in Vocational High School VB Courses, thesis, Henan University of Science and Technology.

[9] Zhou S, 2023, A Practical Study on Teaching Methods for Vocational Education Programs Based on the OBE Approach, thesis, Nanning Normal University.

[10] Li S, 2026, A Pathway for Reforming Python Course Instruction in Public Security Colleges by Integrating OBE Principles with Case-Driven Teaching in a Practice-Oriented Context. Science and Technology Review, (1): 112–115.

[11] Xu J, Shen J, Chen M, 2023, Design and Implementation of a Blended Course Based on the OBE Philosophy and the Dual PBL Model. Journal of Higher Education, 9(32): 26–31.

Publisher’s note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.