

The “Double-High” Initiative: Driving Paradigm Shift and Systematic Upgrading of Vocational Education

Yuan Kan^{PhD}

*Director, Research Center for Digital Creative Industry,
Shenzhen Polytechnic University,
Hangzhou, Zhejiang Province, China*

Abstract

As a top-level reform initiative for China’s higher vocational education in the new era, the “Double-High Plan” marks a historic inflection point for vocational education: shifting from scale expansion to connotative quality improvement and from remedial hierarchical development toward self-establishment as an independent education type. The interplay of a new round of technological revolution, industrial digital transformation and the orderly expansion of vocational undergraduate education endows the “Double-High” Initiative with the core mission of advancing holistic transformation in vocational education. Grounded in the theory of type-based education, this paper positions the “Double-High” Initiative as a strategic fulcrum for the modernization of China’s vocational education. It systematically dissects the internal mechanisms through which the Initiative promotes profound paradigm shifts in vocational education’s development, talent cultivation, and research. From four dimensions — university system, discipline system, training system and degree system — it elaborates pathways for reconstructing the core structure of vocational education.

Keywords: Double-High Initiative; vocational education; paradigm shift; modern vocational education system; vocational undergraduate education; integration of industry and education

Introduction

The Report to the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China explicitly calls for accelerating the development of a modern vocational education system to cultivate high-quality technical and skilled personnel, proficient craftsmen and great national artisans. The first phase of the *Plan for Constructing High-Level Vocational Colleges and Majors with Chinese Characteristics* (the “Double-High Plan”) was launched in 2019. The second-phase “New Double-High” Initiative commenced in 2025, delivering iterative upgrades in development philosophy, evaluation orientation

and reform tasks, with core priorities of high-standard institutional operation capacity and high-quality industry–education integration.

For a long time, China’s higher vocational education has confronted multiple structural dilemmas. Its development logic has long drawn reference from general higher education, and its operational paradigm remains confined to occupational skill training. The “ceiling constraint” at the junior college level is prominent, obstructing talent career ladders. Research functions have been marginalized, making it difficult to respond to frontline industrial demands for technological innovation. Fragmented specialty development also fails to match the clustered transformation of industrial chains. As a cohort of outstanding “Double-High” colleges have been upgraded into vocational undergraduate institutions, vocational education has expanded upward to higher academic tiers, forcing bottom-level reconstruction of the entire vocational education system.

Existing studies mostly focus on partial topics such as specialty cluster development, industry–education integration, faculty building and evaluation reform within “Double-High” colleges. Most literature separates junior vocational college education from vocational undergraduate education. Few works interpret the holistic value of the “Double-High” Initiative under the macro framework of paradigm shift and systemic reconstruction, and insufficiently reveal how the Initiative, as a reform lever, drives iterative upgrading of the entire modern vocational education system.

Moving beyond the single institutional perspective, this study situates the “Double-High” Initiative within three coordinates: self-establishment of type-based education, development of vocational undergraduate education, and cultivation of new-quality productive forces. It develops arguments along the logical chain of “strategic positioning — paradigm shift — system reconstruction — strategic mission”, and seeks to build an analytical framework covering both junior vocational college and vocational undergraduate education, reconciling theoretical logic and practical pathways. This framework offers theoretical references for further deepening the “New Double-High” reform and improving the modern vocational education system.

I. The “Double-High” Initiative: A Strategic Fulcrum for China’s Vocational Education Development

The “Double-High” Initiative is not a simple continuation of previous exemplary vocational college construction. Instead, following the confirmation of vocational education’s status as an independent education type, it represents a strategic institutional arrangement by the state to achieve structural leapfrogging of the vocational education system. [1] Whereas national exemplary and backbone vocational colleges fulfilled the tasks of standardizing and scaling up higher vocational education, the “Double-High” Initiative undertakes two historic missions: first, to demonstrate the educational value of vocational education as an independent form of higher education; second, to explore feasible articulation models between junior vocational college and vocational undergraduate education and build benchmark carriers for the modern vocational education system. Its value as a strategic fulcrum manifests in two dimensions: reform carrier and type breakthrough.

1) *(I) Reform Carrier: Pooling Resources to Advance Connotative, Systemic Transformation of Vocational Education*

Prior to the “Double-High Plan”, reforms in higher vocational colleges generally suffered from fragmentation: specialty reform, curriculum reform and faculty development proceeded separately without top-level coordination. Reform momentum largely came from institutional spontaneous exploration, lacking institutional traction combining top-down deployment and bottom-up innovation. [2] Through special central fiscal incentives, provincial matching funding, periodic project management and dynamic performance assessment, the “Double-High” Initiative forms a systematic reform lever.

First, it reconstructs the logic of resource allocation. Policies channel capital, platforms and talents toward high-level colleges and high-level specialty clusters, abandoning the former egalitarian resource distribution model. Resources are concentrated to nurture a “national team” for vocational education, forming a landscape of benchmark leadership and tiered development.

Second, it systematizes reform tasks. The “Double-High” Initiative covers all essential elements including specialty clusters, faculty teams, practical training platforms, technological innovation, social services, digital transformation and international exchanges, driving colleges from discrete reforms toward comprehensive institutional transformation.

Third, evaluation mechanisms shift toward contribution orientation. Notably, the second-phase “New Double-High” Initiative abandons simplistic competition over hardware indicators of school conditions. It redirects colleges from “sound infrastructure and favorable conditions” toward “effective services and robust industrial support”, and guides higher vocational colleges to root in regional industrial chains, adopting industrial service capacity as the core evaluation criterion.

2) *(II) Type Breakthrough: Overcoming Path Dependence of Mimicking General Undergraduate Operations in Vocational Education*

For decades, dual cognitive bias has persisted across higher education: general undergraduate education is regarded as the orthodox academic track, while vocational education is perceived as an inferior educational tier. Constrained by such path dependence, some higher vocational colleges inadvertently emulate general undergraduate operational models: pursuing comprehensive disciplinary coverage, prioritizing theory over practice, and blindly developing long-cycle basic research, thereby losing vocational education’s type-specific characteristics. Meanwhile, society holds the stereotype that “higher vocational education equals junior college, with employment as the terminal outcome”, narrowing upward mobility for skilled talents.

The profound strategic significance of the “Double-High” Initiative lies in delineating an independent development track for vocational education at the policy level and accomplishing two cognitive breakthroughs. First, it clarifies that higher vocational education is neither a condensed version of general undergraduate education nor an extended version of secondary vocational education. It constitutes a form of higher education centered on cultivating technology application and capabilities to solve complex on-site problems. The focus of construction shifts from

disciplinary development to specialty cluster development, and from theoretical knowledge transmission to integrated cultivation of technical skills.

Second, it opens institutional channels for upward progression in vocational education. Policies explicitly support qualified high-level “Double-High” colleges to upgrade into vocational undergraduate institutions, enabling vocational education to form a vertically connected talent pathway: secondary vocational education → junior vocational college → vocational undergraduate education (and in the future, vocational professional postgraduate education), breaking the “dead-end” bottleneck.

Third, self-establishment as an education type cannot rely merely on policy proclamations; it requires high-level colleges to provide practical proof through institutional outcomes. “Double-High” colleges serve as testbeds and demonstration windows for type-based education. By exploring talent cultivation, research and governance models distinct from general universities, they construct an indigenous discourse system for vocational education and lay practical foundations for large-scale development of vocational undergraduate education. [3]

II. Paradigm Shift: Reshaping the Developmental Logic of Vocational Education

A paradigm denotes a stable framework of thinking, modes of action and value orientation within a field. Before full implementation of the “Double-High” Initiative, China’s higher vocational education developed a traditional paradigm suited to the era of scale expansion. With industrial intelligentization and the rise of vocational undergraduate education, internal contradictions within the old paradigm continue to intensify. The “Double-High” Initiative drives systematic transformation across three paradigms: development paradigm, talent cultivation paradigm, and research paradigm.

3) (I) Development Paradigm: From Passive Industrial Adaptation to Active Leadership of Industrial Innovation

The traditional development paradigm of higher vocational education can be summarized as passively adaptive operation: colleges launch new specialties responding to newly emerging industrial jobs and adjust curricula according to corporate talent demands. [4] This model effectively supported frontline skilled talent supply in the mid-industrialization stage yet bears notable time lag. In the digital economy marked by shortening technological iteration cycles and continuous emergence of new industries, a passive follow-up model cannot cope with industrial changes.

The “Double-High” Initiative shifts the development paradigm toward collaborative and leading operation, bringing three logical transitions. First, temporal logic: from ex-post adaptation to forward-looking forecasting. Leveraging industry–education consortia, industrial communities and industrial big-data platforms to predict future talent demands and proactively layout emerging specialty directions. Second, spatial logic: from closed campus-based operation toward full embedding within industrial clusters. It promotes building specialty clusters alongside industrial chains, taking industrial colleges as core operational carriers and enabling mutual permeation between campus and industrial boundaries. Third, value logic: from singular talent supply toward composite value output of “talent provision + technical

service + innovation incubation”. Higher vocational colleges are no longer merely human resource suppliers; they also function as supporting platforms for regional small and medium manufacturing enterprises to tackle technical bottlenecks and upgrade production processes.

Vocational undergraduate institutions face higher requirements in this paradigm transition: they shall not only adapt to mature industries but also respond to complex engineering scenarios, cultivate field engineers capable of technology integration and process innovation, undertake pilot-scale testing and technology transfer along industrial chains, and occupy stable ecological niches within regional innovation systems.

4) (II) *Talent Cultivation Paradigm: From Isolated Skill Training to Cultivation of Advanced Technical Literacy*

The traditional talent cultivation paradigm of higher vocational education is job-centered, targeting proficient operation-oriented skilled personnel. Its curriculum system consists of fragmented occupational skill modules, prioritizing operational training while neglecting systematic technical thinking, innovation capacity and lifelong learning competency. [5] This paradigm matched demands from traditional manufacturing but struggles to adapt to intelligent production scenarios. With the popularization of industrial robots, smart manufacturing and digital technologies, occupational boundaries keep dissolving, standalone skills rapidly depreciate, and industries urgently demand high-end technical and skilled talents capable of managing complex working conditions, human-machine collaboration and continuous iterative learning.

The “Double-High” Initiative advances three transformations in the talent cultivation paradigm. First, upgraded training objectives: junior vocational college focuses on high-quality technical and skilled personnel, while vocational undergraduate education targets field engineers and interdisciplinary technical innovators, forming a tiered system of talent objectives. It abandons the “operation-only” evaluation standard and builds a multi-dimensional competency framework: *technical knowledge + practical capability + digital literacy + innovative thinking + professional ethics*. Consistent with prior discussions on digital literacy, “Double-High” colleges are widely advancing teachers’ digital competency to support digital transformation of talent cultivation.

Second, transformed training mode: shifting from simulated practical training toward education in authentic work scenarios. Project-based learning, work-study alternation and modern apprenticeship are promoted; real corporate technical projects run through the whole training process to realize “enrollment equals entering an enterprise, class attendance equals on-the-job practice”.

Third, vertical system articulation: relying on the “Double-High” Initiative to explore integrated talent training schemes spanning secondary vocational education, junior vocational college and vocational undergraduate education, unify competency standards for similar specialties, achieve curriculum articulation and credit recognition, and eliminate fragmentation across tiers of vocational education.

Fourth, a critical misconception must be guarded against: vocational undergraduate education is not simply adding theoretical class hours or raising knowledge difficulty.

Instead, it achieves deep integration of theory and practice at a higher academic level and constructs a unique cultivation paradigm distinct from general academic undergraduate education and junior vocational college education.

5) *(III) Research Paradigm: From Marginal Activity to Industry-Education Integrated Applied Technological Innovation*

A long-standing fixed perception holds that research belongs to general universities and research institutes, while vocational colleges only undertake teaching and skill training. Under such perception, research activities in higher vocational colleges become marginalized. Research evaluation copies standards from general universities, prioritizing journal papers over technology transfer, creating an awkward disconnect between research, teaching and industrial demands.

The “Double-High” Initiative reshapes vocational education’s research paradigm and establishes an industry-oriented paradigm of applied technological innovation, clearly defining research functions for vocational institutions. First, research orientation: prioritizing ground-level practical research with moderate cutting-edge exploration. It focuses on commissioned applied research including enterprise process improvement, technical problem-solving, product iteration, digital retrofitting and technical standard development, rather than blind pursuit of basic theoretical research. Second, reconstructed evaluation criteria: breaking the “paper-only” assessment. Technical service contracts, outcomes transformation benefits, practical industrial application effects, patent implementation and industry standard formulation are adopted as core evaluation indicators. Third, research-teaching integration mechanism: research feeds back into teaching. Teachers convert corporate projects into teaching cases and practical training topics; students participate deeply in technical problem-solving projects to realize integration of teaching, research and social services.

Paradigm transition also removes barriers for vocational undergraduate operation. Vocational undergraduate universities must possess corresponding technological innovation capacity to underpin field engineer cultivation. [6] Some vocational undergraduate institutions take the opportunity of the “Double-High” Initiative to establish engineering technology centers and SME service platforms, continuously expanding the scale of commissioned R&D. They form a progressive pathway: fostering applied R&D capacity at the junior vocational college stage and strengthening complex technical problem-solving after upgrading to vocational undergraduate status, offering references for research transformation among nationwide “Double-High” colleges.

III. System Upgrading: Reconstructing the Core Structure of Vocational Education

Paradigm shift denotes transformation of development logic, whereas system upgrading refers to systemic reconstruction of organizational forms, institutional frameworks and structural elements. The “Double-High” Initiative continuously promotes reconstruction of vocational education’s core structure, carrying out institutional innovation around four pillars: university system, discipline (specialty cluster) system, talent training system and degree system. It propels vocational

education from scattered independent institutions toward a coherently connected modern education system.

6) *(I) University System: Building a Tiered, Categorized Skill-Based University System with Integration between Vocational and General Education*

Prior to the “Double-High Plan”, the higher vocational education system was nearly equivalent to a collection of junior vocational colleges, characterized by a single academic tier and blurred type boundaries. Guided by leading “Double-High” colleges, the new round of reform gradually constructs a skill-based university system with Chinese characteristics.

First, tiered hierarchical structure forms a gradient sequence: ordinary vocational colleges → provincial high-level vocational colleges → national “Double-High Plan” vocational colleges → vocational undergraduate universities. Outstanding “Double-High” colleges serve as reserve candidates for upward upgrading, undertaking dual missions of improving junior college quality and exploring undergraduate education. This structure responds clearly to industrial gradient demands for multi-tiered technical and skilled talents.

Second, categorized type-based development. It clarifies differentiated positioning for three categories of universities: research universities focus on basic innovation; applied undergraduate universities lean toward general technology application; skill-based universities (junior vocational colleges and vocational undergraduate universities) concentrate on complex frontline industrial technical practice, process innovation and on-site technical solutions. Homogenized competition is discouraged, and each type of university is guided to develop distinctive strengths within its own track.

Third, advancing integration between vocational and general education. Relying on pilot programs in “Double-High” colleges for credit recognition, curriculum sharing and student mobility, pathways are opened between general high schools, comprehensive high schools and vocational institutions, breaking the educational barrier of “one examination determines lifelong fate”.

High-level vocational colleges possess endogenous foundations to transform into vocational undergraduate universities, and the “Double-High” Initiative acts as a critical incubator nurturing future providers of vocational undergraduate education. In future, the “New Double-High” Initiative shall establish a dynamic selection mechanism to steadily select qualified institutions for vocational undergraduate development and orderly expand the cohort of skill-based universities.

7) *(II) Discipline System: From Isolated Specialty Construction to Industrial-Chain-Oriented Specialty Cluster System*

General higher education takes disciplines as basic organizational units; vocational education is inherently oriented toward occupations and industries and should adopt specialty clusters as core carriers. [7] Traditional higher vocational colleges long adopted independent specialty construction modes with rigid barriers between specialties and fragmented specialty provision, failing to adapt to cross-industry convergence trends. One core reform task of the “Double-High” Initiative is shifting institutional operational units from individual specialties toward high-level specialty

clusters and reconstructing the knowledge organization system of vocational education.

First, transformed layout logic: deploying specialty clusters around industrial chains to realize precise matching between specialty clusters and regional leading industries and strategic emerging industries. Within specialty clusters, resources are shared, courses interconnected and faculty mobile to accommodate converging occupational roles in industries.

Second, tiered design of construction standards. Specialty clusters at junior vocational college level target mature industrial job chains; specialty clusters for vocational undergraduate education target high-end links and R&D transformation links of industrial chains, moderately broadening coverage and adding training on cross-domain integration capabilities.

Third, establishing dynamic specialty governance mechanisms. A red/yellow warning system for specialties is implemented. Industrial big data is used to regularly evaluate the alignment between specialties and industries, eliminating outdated specialties and adding emerging directions in a timely manner.

A key conceptual distinction needs clarification: vocational education does not have first- and second-level discipline systems in the sense of general higher education. Specialty clusters serve as the “discipline-equivalent form” matching vocational education’s type characteristics. Promoting institutionalized construction of specialty clusters essentially builds an indigenous knowledge framework for vocational education and breaks imitation of the disciplinary systems of general universities.

8) (III) Training System: Constructing a Vertically Connected Talent Cultivation Pipeline Integrating Secondary, Junior and Undergraduate Vocational Education

The long-standing major weakness of the modern vocational education system lies in inadequate vertical articulation. Teaching standards for secondary vocational, junior vocational college and vocational undergraduate education are disconnected, with duplicated or discontinuous curricula and obstructed talent progression pathways. [8] “Double-High” colleges occupy a pivotal intermediate node in the vertical vocational education chain and assume leadership in building integrated training systems.

First, integrated standard system. Taking specialty clusters as the linkage, they collaborate with secondary vocational schools and vocational undergraduate universities to develop progressive professional teaching standards: secondary vocational education consolidates general skill foundations; junior vocational college strengthens applied competency for specialized complex technologies; vocational undergraduate education emphasizes technology integration, innovative design and engineering implementation, with competency requirements rising progressively.

Second, improved articulation pathways. Expanding articulation models such as “3+2”, five-year integrated programs and the Vocational College Entrance Examination, improving vocational-competency-based admission assessment mechanisms, replacing selection relying solely on academic examinations and implementing the evaluation model of “academic literacy + vocational skills”.

Third, building a lifelong training system. Drawing on high-quality resources of “Double-High” colleges to deliver vocational training and technical refresher

programs for enterprise employees, bridging academic education and non-degree training to support the construction of a skilled society.

Current practical bottlenecks mainly stem from insufficient coordination mechanisms across secondary, junior and undergraduate vocational tiers. The “New Double-High” Initiative shall authorize high-level colleges to take the lead in establishing regional vocational education articulation alliances to coordinate collaborative vocational education reforms across tiers within regions. [9]

9) *(IV) Degree System: Improving the Vocational Degree System Adapted to Type-Based Education*

The degree system constitutes a core marker of higher education institutions. For a long time, degree systems were almost an “exclusive institution” for general undergraduate education. Lagged supply of vocational degrees has become an institutional bottleneck restricting vocational education’s attractiveness. The “Double-High” Initiative continuously promotes the formulation and refinement of the vocational degree system.

Since 2021, policies have gradually clarified that vocational undergraduate education grants bachelor’s degrees with equivalent validity to those awarded in general undergraduate education. The long-term direction is developing vocational professional postgraduate education to form a complete vocational degree sequence: vocational bachelor → vocational master.

“Double-High” colleges perform dual roles in degree system construction. On one hand, upgraded vocational undergraduate universities, as the first batch of vocational bachelor’s degree-granting institutions, explore vocational degree awarding criteria, weighting practical innovation and technical problem-solving outcomes, differentiated from general academic degrees. On the other hand, junior vocational colleges build a competency certificate system articulating with vocational degrees and implement the “academic certificate + multiple vocational skill level certificates” (1+X) system, constructing a competency ladder toward vocational undergraduate education and vocational degrees.

Risks must be avoided in institutional development: vocational degrees cannot simply replicate academic degree standards; independent evaluation metrics must be built based on technical and innovative competency. [10] Copying existing degree evaluation logic would trap vocational undergraduate education once more into homogenization with general undergraduate education and erode its type-specific features.

IV. Strategic Missions of the “Double-High” Initiative for Chinese-Style Modernization

Against the macro backdrop of building an education powerhouse, manufacturing powerhouse and skilled society, coupled with the steady advancement of vocational undergraduate education, the “Double-High” Initiative extends far beyond internal quality improvement of individual institutions. It carries four interrelated strategic missions, which represent the value orientation that the second-phase “New Double-High” Initiative must uphold.

10) *(I) Mission 1: Cultivating New-Quality Productive Forces and Building Skill Support Poles for Regional Industrial Upgrading*

Developing new-quality productive forces relies on coordinated efforts of scientific and technological innovation, industrial upgrading and supply of high-quality talents. New-generation information technology, artificial intelligence and advanced manufacturing generate massive high-end technical and skilled positions, while traditional universities show notable gaps in talent supply structure. The unique function of “Double-High” colleges lies in bridging the “last mile” of scientific and technological innovation: research universities focus on cutting-edge basic innovation; “Double-High” colleges and vocational undergraduate universities concentrate on industrialization of scientific achievements, process optimization and on-site technology deployment. Relying on specialty clusters, industrial colleges and applied technology platforms, they continuously supply field engineers and digital technical talents for regions, supporting digital retrofitting of traditional industries and expansion of strategic emerging industries. “Double-High” colleges across regions shall actively embed within municipal industry–education consortia, collaborate with leading chain enterprises on technical research, and become stable supporting forces for local industrial upgrading.

11) *(II) Mission 2: Consolidating the Type Positioning of Vocational Education and Exploring Sustainable Development Pathways for Vocational Undergraduate Education*

Self-establishment as an education type remains a long-term core task for vocational education. As the first echelon of vocational education, “Double-High” colleges undertake two exploratory tasks. First, delivering high-quality junior vocational college education to prove the irreplaceable value of vocational higher education at the junior college tier. Second, promoting orderly upgrading of qualified institutions into vocational undergraduate universities, exploring operational models, governance mechanisms and evaluation systems for vocational undergraduate education and forming replicable construction paradigms. Many debates persist regarding vocational undergraduate development: how to distinguish vocational undergraduate education from applied undergraduate education; how to prevent vocational undergraduate education from “de-skilling and academicization”; how to build independent quality standards. These major propositions require pilot practice and practical answers led by “Double-High” colleges. The “New Double-High” Initiative shall coordinate quality improvement of junior vocational college education and cultivation of undergraduate programs, avoiding the one-sided tendency of “prioritizing undergraduate upgrading over junior college quality” and sustaining coordinated development across vocational education tiers.

12) *(III) Mission 3: Improving the Modern Vocational Education System and Building an “Overpass” for Skilled Talent Progression*

Constructing a modern vocational education system with vertical articulation and horizontal integration constitutes a long-term national strategic goal. System construction cannot be simply pushed top-down via administrative documents; benchmark colleges must lead institutional innovation. As pivotal intermediary hubs, “Double-High” colleges undertake strategic tasks including leading the establishment

of integrated secondary-junior-undergraduate talent cultivation alliances, refining the Vocational College Entrance Examination system and skill-based admission pathways, advancing resource sharing between vocational and general education, and promoting integration of academic education and lifelong vocational training. Only by unblocking continuous talent progression pathways can society’s mindset of “valuing academic learning while despising skills” be reversed, enhancing vocational education’s social appeal and facilitating skilled society construction.

13) *(IV) Mission 4: Exporting China’s Vocational Education Solutions and Elevating International Discourse Power for Vocational Education*

With the global layout of Chinese enterprises, supporting localized technical and skilled talent is required, bringing new opportunities for the internationalization of vocational education. Previously, China’s higher education international exchanges concentrated mainly on research universities; international brand building for vocational education has lagged behind. Benefiting from proximity to industries, “Double-High” colleges can leverage China’s advanced manufacturing standards to carry out vocational education cooperation, overseas campus operations and skill standard export for countries participating in the Belt and Road Initiative. In the long run, a cohort of high-level “Double-High” vocational and technical universities will serve as core windows showcasing the Chinese model of vocational education.

Conclusion

The “Double-High” Initiative is not a phased project but a long-term strategic measure continuously driving systemic reform of vocational education in China. From an internal logical perspective, taking the construction of high-level colleges and specialty clusters as the lever, it promotes three major transformations in vocational education: development logic shifts from passive adaptation toward active leadership; institutional paradigm evolves from isolated skill training toward cultivation of advanced technical literacy; and development landscape expands from isolated colleges toward a connected and integrated modern education system.

The rise of vocational undergraduate education further amplifies the reform value of the “Double-High” Initiative and compels the whole vocational education system to reconstruct its university system, specialty cluster system, training system and degree system. Facing the second-phase “New Double-High” Initiative, policymakers and institutional administrators must break away from the narrow mindset of “project construction” and plan reforms from the heights of self-establishment of type-based education, building an education powerhouse and cultivating new-quality productive forces. In future, several sets of relationships should be properly managed: the balance between quality upgrading of junior vocational college education and expansion of vocational undergraduate education; the relationship between deepened industry–education integration and safeguarding institutional autonomy; the relationship between localized services and international development; and the coordinated development of talent cultivation, technological innovation and social services. By continuously advancing paradigm shift to drive systematic upgrading, modern vocational education can truly become a vital force supporting Chinese-style modernization.

References

- [1] Li Y L. Deepening the Reform and Development of Vocational Education in the Promotion of the “Trinity” Strategy of Education, Science and Technology, and Talents[J]. *Journal of National Academy of Education Administration*, 2023(07):17-21. 【
- [2] Huang W, Qin Z N. Positioning and Breakthrough of Vocational Undergraduate Education in Building an Education Powerhouse — A Review of the 2026 2nd Annual Academic Conference on “Frontiers of Vocational Undergraduate Education”[J]. *Journal of Shenzhen Polytechnic University*, 2026(04):108-111.
- [3] Wang Y, Chen T Y. The Internal Logic and Practical Path of Governance System Construction for Vocational Education under the Background of Building an Education Powerhouse — From the Perspective of System Theory[J]. *Education and Vocation*, 2026(14):5-14.
- [4] Pan H S, Li H R. Generative Logic of Identifying Concepts in China’s Vocational Education — An Analysis Based on Industry–Education Integration[J]. *Chinese Vocational and Technical Education*, 2026(11):15-25.
- [5] Wang Q Q, Le C Y, Zhou S L. Development Logic and Path Orientation of Vocational Undergraduate Education[J]. *Education and Vocation*, 2026(12):106-112.
- [6] Li Z, Qiu Y. Governance of Vocational Education in China under a Capable Government and Effective Market: Theoretical Logic and Practical Paths[J]. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 2025(01):62-73.
- [7] Zhou H Q, Yue X. High-Quality Industry–Education Integration in Higher Vocational Colleges under the New Round of the Double-High Plan: Connotation, Difficulties and Breakthroughs[J]. *Vocational and Technical Education*, 2025(09):46-50.
- [8] Sun H, Lian Y F, Zhu P C. Transformation of New “Double-High” Construction toward High-Level School-running Capacity and High-Quality Industry–Education Integration — New Progress in Research and Practice of the Vocational Education “Double-High Plan” in 2024[J]. *Chinese Vocational and Technical Education*, 2025(02):55-62.
- [9] Li Z, Qiu Y. Governance of Vocational Education in China under a Capable Government and Effective Market: Theoretical Logic and Practical Paths[J]. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 2025(01):62-73.
- [10] Wang Y N. Logical Transition and Practical Path of High-Level Specialty Cluster Construction in Higher Vocational Colleges[J]. *Journal of National Academy of Education Administration*, 2026(04).