Vol.7 Iss.7 2026 Communication & Education Review
https://doi.org/10.37420/j.cer.2026.116

From "Islands" to "Symbiosis": Mechanism Innovation and Provincial Practice of Teacher Education Integration in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities

Chunlian Zhang*
Jiangxi University of Water Resources and Electric Power, Nanchang 330098, Jiangxi, China
***Corresponding author, E-mail: 282122246@qq.com**

Abstract
Faculty development in application-oriented undergraduate universities has long been constrained by threefold "island" dilemmas—organizational islands, competence islands, and institutional islands: faculty growth is disconnected from institutional strategy, in-service training is misaligned with industry demand, and incentive systems are divorced from career stages. Integrating teacher professional development stage theory with human capital investment theory, this paper constructs a "Stage-Adaptation× Incentive-Portfolio" analytical framework. Employing a combination of theoretical construction, policy analysis, and semi-structured interviews, it traces the evolution of provincial policies in J Province from 2019 to 2026 and reveals differentiated demands: early-career faculty prioritize economic compensation, mid-career faculty emphasize promotion channels, and senior faculty value academic autonomy. The findings show that institutional gaps are manifested in the absence of cost compensation, the homogenization of incentives, and the systematic undervaluation of firm-specific human capital. Accordingly, this paper proposes a stage-incentive precision matching mechanism, a government–university–enterprise tripartite cost-sharing mechanism, and a value co-creation and transformation mechanism, providing institutional references for the integration of teacher education in application-oriented undergraduate universities.

Keywords
application-oriented undergraduate universities; teacher education integration; incentive mechanisms; human capital; provincial practice

Introduction

As China's higher education has entered the stage of universal access, application-oriented undergraduate universities have become a core force supporting regional economic transformation and upgrading and cultivating technically skilled talent. Promoting the comprehensive transformation of universities from academic-oriented to application-oriented institutions is an inevitable choice for optimizing the structure of higher education and serving local industrial development. Teacher education integration is a key lever in this trans-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

formation: its essence lies in dismantling the barriers between pre-service training, induction, and in-service development, achieving comprehensive, full-cycle improvement of faculty professional competence, and deepening the integration of faculty with universities, enterprises, and industry. However, teacher education in most of China's application-oriented undergraduate universities remains fragmented and isolated, with insufficient organizational coordination, disconnected competence development, and absent institutional safeguards. Faculty professional development is trapped in an "island" dilemma and struggles to meet the demands of application-oriented talent cultivation.

Located in central China, J Province has in recent years vigorously promoted the categorized development of undergraduate universities. A large number of local undergraduate institutions have accelerated their application-oriented transformation, and successive policy documents have been issued, with active exploration in building faculty enterprise-practice bases and certifying industry-education integration programs. Nevertheless, significant gaps remain in the refined, differentiated design of faculty development incentive mechanisms. Against this backdrop, grounded in the realities of application-oriented undergraduate universities in J Province, this paper takes teacher education integration as its core, combining theoretical construction, policy analysis, empirical interviews, and practical reflection to systematically explore mechanism innovation paths for faculty development "from islands to symbiosis." It responds to the national strategic requirement of application-oriented university transformation, offers practical ideas for J Province to improve faculty development institutions and enhance higher education's capacity to serve local development, and enriches the theoretical scholarship on teacher education in regional application-oriented universities. The paper addresses three core questions: First, what are the specific manifestations of the "island" dilemma in faculty professional development in J Province's application-oriented undergraduate universities, and what are its underlying causes? Second, how do the professional development needs and incentive preferences of faculty at different career stages differ? Third, how can institutional design and mechanism innovation break the multiple islands and achieve the transition from isolated development to symbiotic win-win development?

1. The "Island" Dilemma of Faculty Development in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities

The National Education Strengthening Plan (2024–2035) explicitly calls for guiding universities toward scientific positioning and distinctive development, with particular emphasis on strengthening the type positioning of application-oriented undergraduate universities and their industry-education integration functions. Yet faculty development in these universities has long faced multiple "island" dilemmas—the organizational island between individual faculty growth and institutional strategy, the competence island between in-service training and industry demand, and the institutional island between incentive systems and career stages—which have become a key issue constraining the high-quality development of application-oriented undergraduate universities.

1.1 The organizational island: individual faculty growth disconnected from institutional strategy

The transformation of application-oriented undergraduate universities typically takes industry-education

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

integration and university–enterprise cooperation as its core levers, yet individual faculty professional development often floats outside institutional strategy, forming an "organizational island." On the one hand, many universities' faculty development plans lack systematic alignment with their overall transformation goals, and the routine training content of faculty development centers rarely links effectively with the university's industry-education integration strategy or priority industry service directions. On the other hand, faculty identification with and participation in institutional strategy remain low: research indicates that most faculty consider their university's transformation to have little relevance to their daily teaching and research, and are unfamiliar with the university's specific industry-education integration policies. This disconnection makes it difficult to translate institutional strategy into faculty members' voluntary action; faculty tend to invest in academic paper publication rather than the industry-education integration practice required by institutional strategy. In essence, this is an incentive incompatibility between the university's macro-level goals and faculty members' micro-level behavior.

1.2 The competence island: in-service training misaligned with industry demand

Application-oriented undergraduate universities set explicit requirements for "dual-qualification" faculty competence, yet the current in-service training system exhibits a marked competence island relative to real industry demand. First, training content is disconnected from industrial technological development: many universities' faculty enterprise-practice programs are perfunctory, with short stays and limited depth of participation, making it difficult for faculty to access real projects—more than 40% of faculty report that enterprise practice contributes little to improving their teaching competence. Second, training relies mainly on concentrated lectures and lacks immersive learning based on authentic work settings, making it hard to develop faculty members' composite competencies. Although J Province explicitly requires faculty to accumulate no fewer than six months of enterprise practice every five years, in practice most faculty fulfill this requirement in concentrated blocks during winter and summer vacations, with uneven results. As one lecturer put it: "Spending two weeks in an enterprise, they would hardly hand over their core business to you. Back on campus you have to write a practice report—nothing more than describing the company's profile, and whatever insights it offers for teaching you can only 'excavate' yourself." The consequence of the competence island is that faculty practical competence cannot effectively feed back into teaching, and industry-education integration remains superficial.

1.3 The institutional island: incentive systems divorced from career stages

Faculty evaluation and incentive systems in application-oriented undergraduate universities are generally "one-size-fits-all," ignoring differences in needs across career stages and forming an institutional island. In title (professional rank) evaluation, the vast majority of universities still treat academic papers and vertically funded research projects as hard thresholds, while the conversion rate of applied achievements such as enterprise practice experience is markedly low. In economic incentives, subsidies for enterprise practice fall far short of compensating faculty members' time and opportunity costs. In development incentives, early-career faculty urgently need financial support and fast-track promotion, mid-career faculty care most about the sufficiency of promotion quotas and the stability of evaluation rules, and senior faculty value academic autonomy and reputational recognition—yet existing systems rarely respond to these differences, and more than 70% of faculty consider it unreasonable that performance evaluation applies a single standard to all. Although some

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

universities in J Province have attempted differentiated evaluation channels, a dedicated "industry-education integration service" channel is still absent. The essence of the institutional island is the structural contradiction between the homogeneous supply of incentives and the heterogeneous needs of faculty.

J Province currently has 49 undergraduate universities, more than 30 of which are included in the provincial application-oriented transformation pilot. In recent years the province has issued multiple relevant policies, but compared with more developed provinces, problems remain—enterprises' unwillingness to participate in faculty practice training, low subsidy standards for faculty enterprise practice, and dispersed university faculty development resources—further aggravating the "island" dilemma.

2. An Integrated Theoretical Framework for Teacher Education Integration

The core of teacher education integration is to break the institutional barriers between pre-service training and in-service development and to construct a systematic support system spanning the entire faculty career. Integrating teacher professional development stage theory with human capital investment theory, this paper constructs a "Stage-Adaptation × Incentive-Portfolio" analytical framework, providing a systematic theoretical instrument for understanding mechanism innovation in faculty development.

2.1 Teacher professional development stage theory

Teacher professional development stage theory holds that faculty professional development exhibits identifiable, divisible stage characteristics, with teachers at different stages differing significantly in focus of attention, competence needs, and development motivation. Huberman's teacher career cycle model is the most influential, summarizing the process from induction to retirement into five phases. Its core implication is that development needs differ fundamentally across stages: induction-stage teachers need systematic induction training and emotional support; stabilization-stage teachers seek professional identity and responsibility; experimentation-stage teachers may either pursue breakthrough development or fall into burnout; and conservative-stage teachers focus more on the transmission of experience and academic autonomy. This theory requires that the institutional design of teacher education integration respond to the stage heterogeneity of faculty careers rather than imposing "one-size-fits-all" uniform policies.

2.2 Human capital investment theory and incentive theory

Becker's human capital investment theory divides human capital into general and specific types. The firm-specific human capital of faculty in application-oriented undergraduate universities—industry practice competence, industry-education integration teaching, and the like—is central to improving educational quality, yet current institutions focus on incentivizing general human capital, leaving faculty under-motivated to invest in specific human capital. Incentive theory indicates that universities need scientifically designed incentive mechanisms to guide faculty to actively align with institutional transformation goals, and that valence and expectancy differ clearly across career stages: early-career faculty value economic returns and promotion opportunities, mid-career faculty value rank advancement and career breakthroughs, and senior faculty value professional respect and autonomy—confirming the ineffectiveness of a single, undifferentiated incentive

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

mechanism.

2.3 Constructing the "Stage-Adaptation × Incentive-Portfolio" analytical framework

Table 1. The "Stage-Adaptation × Incentive-Portfolio" analytical matrix

Incentive type / Career stage	Early-career faculty (1–5 years)	Mid-career faculty (6–15 years)	Senior faculty (16+ years)
Economic incentives	High	Medium	Low
Career development incentives	High	High	Low
Reputation incentives	Low	Medium	High
Emotional / autonomy incentives	Medium	Medium	High

Building on the two theoretical cores above, this paper constructs a two-dimensional "Stage-Adaptation × Incentive-Portfolio" analytical matrix. The horizontal axis represents faculty career stages, simplified in light of the realities of application-oriented undergraduate universities into three core stages: early-career (1–5 years), mid-career (6–15 years), and senior (16+ years). The vertical axis represents incentive types, divided into four categories—economic incentives, career development incentives, reputation incentives, and emotional/autonomy incentives—specifying the sensitivity of faculty at different stages to each type of incentive and forming a differentiated incentive logic framework (see Table 1).

Early-career faculty, at the start of their careers, face heavy life pressures and a weak professional foundation; they are highly sensitive to economic and career development incentives, urgently need financial support such as salary subsidies and practice allowances as well as career development opportunities such as initial title evaluation, training, and promotion, have low demand for reputation incentives, and moderate demand for emotional and autonomy incentives. Mid-career faculty are the backbone of university teaching, research, and industry-education integration, with pressing promotion needs and the highest sensitivity to career development incentives; they also attend to economic and reputation incentives, hoping to gain title advancement and performance recognition through enterprise practice and teaching reform, with steady demand for emotional and autonomy incentives. Senior faculty, whose careers have matured and whose room for rank advancement is limited, show greatly reduced demand for economic incentives; they attach the greatest importance to professional reputation, standing within the institution, and autonomy at work, are highly sensitive to reputation and emotional/autonomy incentives, and resist rigid assessment and mandatory requirements.

The theoretical contribution of this framework lies in breaking the traditional "one-size-fits-all" approach to faculty education and incentives, clarifying the staged and differentiated characteristics of faculty professional development, revealing the core problem of incentive mismatch in application-oriented undergraduate universities, and providing precise theoretical guidance for subsequent mechanism innovation—ensuring that teacher education integration mechanisms fit the development needs of faculty at different stages and maximize incentive effectiveness.

3. Institutional Supply for Faculty Development in J Province's

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities

This paper systematically traces the evolution of J Province's provincial-level policy documents from 2019 to 2026, applies policy instrument classification theory to examine their type structure, and reveals the structural gap between institutional supply and faculty demand, laying the foundation for mechanism innovation.

3.1 Provincial policy institutionalization: from industry-education integration to faculty development

J Province's policy layout for building application-oriented undergraduate universities and developing faculty has progressed through three interlocking stages. The first stage (2019–2021) was the foundational period of industry-education integration top-level design, centered on the Implementation Plan for Deepening Industry-Education Integration, which erected the macro institutional framework. The second stage (2022–2023) was the categorized advancement period of application-oriented university construction, in which the Implementation Opinions on Further Strengthening the Construction of High-Level Application-Oriented Regular Undergraduate Universities for the first time set quantitative targets for "dual-qualification, dual-ability" faculty development. The third stage (2023–2026) was the period of concretizing faculty certification standards, in which documents such as the J Province Vocational Education "Dual-Qualified" Teacher Certification Standards (Trial) moved certification from text to practice, forming a policy orientation linking certification with incentives.

3.2 Policy instrument analysis of supply structure and implementation efficacy

Drawing on McDonnell and Elmore's policy instrument classification, J Province's existing faculty development policies exhibit a structural pattern of "dominance of authority tools, nascent incentive tools, lagging capacity-building tools, and embryonic system-change tools." Authority tools are widely used, pushing policy implementation through mandatory provisions but tending to elicit passive compliance; incentive tools have been initially established but are insufficient in compensation intensity and matching precision and weak in operability; capacity-building tools are gradually improving, but platform resource utilization and professional matching need enhancement; system-change tools remain at an early stage and have not achieved the systematic linkage of faculty development with university governance and industry-education integration, making it difficult to form sustained synergy.

3.3 Structural misalignment between institutional supply and faculty responsiveness

Combining the "Stage-Adaptation × Incentive-Portfolio" framework, three groups of structural misalignments exist in J Province's current policies. First, the tension between absent cost compensation and faculty rational decision-making: the time costs and opportunity costs of participating in industry-education integration are difficult to compensate effectively. Second, the conflict between homogeneous incentive supply and heterogeneous faculty needs: institutional arrangements that "measure everyone with the same ruler" leave faculty at different stages under-motivated to participate. Third, the opposition between the undervaluation of specific human capital and the high demands of the industry-education integration strategy: in current policies, the conversion rate of specific human capital in core institutions such as title evaluation is markedly lower than that of general human capital, contradicting the strategic goals of industry-education integration.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

These policy gaps directly aggravate the "island" dilemma of faculty development and highlight the urgency of mechanism innovation.

4. Empirical Evidence from a Small Sample of Interviews

Theoretical analysis provides a framework for understanding faculty behavior, and policy review reveals the structural gaps in institutional supply; but the explanatory power of theory and the effectiveness of policy ultimately need to be tested against the lived experience of frontline faculty. This paper interviews eight faculty members from three application-oriented undergraduate universities in J Province, presenting their authentic experiences of and institutional perceptions of participating in industry-education integration practice. It should be noted that, constrained by research time and resources, the interview sample in this chapter is small; its purpose is to provide empirical support for the theoretical analysis through "thick-description" qualitative material rather than to pursue statistical representativeness.

4.1 Interview design

1. Selection of interviewees. To cover different stages of the faculty career, this study followed purposive sampling and selected eight faculty members from three application-oriented undergraduate universities in J Province. Teaching experience ranged across 1–3 years (2 respondents), 4–10 years (3), 11–20 years (2), and over 20 years (1); professional ranks covered teaching assistant (2), lecturer (3), associate professor (2), and professor (1); disciplinary backgrounds were mainly engineering and economics/management, with some humanities and social sciences. All interviewees were anonymized to protect privacy.

2. Design of the interview outline. The interviews centered on five core questions: (1) Have you participated in enterprise practice or industry-education integration projects in the past three years? What was your experience? (2) In your view, what are the most effective and the least effective incentive measures at the university and provincial levels? (3) If you could choose, which type of support would you most want—economic subsidies, title-evaluation bonus points, academic leave, or honorary recognition? (4) Do you think faculty at different career stages differ in their incentive needs? If so, please give examples. (5) What specific suggestions do you have for J Province's faculty development policies?

3. Implementation. The interviews were conducted from March to April 2026 in a semi-structured format, each lasting 20 to 30 minutes, completed via telephone and WeChat voice calls. With interviewees' consent, key statements were recorded and transcribed.

4.2 Main findings

The interviews yielded three major findings. First, the imbalance between costs and benefits has become a consensus: all interviewees reported that enterprise practice occupies substantial after-hours time, missed courses must be made up through overtime work, and practice outcomes receive no effective recognition—neither economic return nor performance attribution. One young lecturer stated bluntly: "Spending three months in enterprise practice actually hurts my title evaluation—totally not worth it," and most faculty participate in practice only to fulfill mandatory tasks. Second, stage differences in faculty needs are highly salient: early-career faculty found economic subsidies and tilted initial title evaluation most effective; mid-career fac-

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

ulty focused on promotion channels and the title-evaluation conversion of practice outcomes; senior faculty resented rigid assessment and desired autonomy at work. Third, existing policies are poorly implemented: all interviewees were aware of the relevant policies but generally considered policy conditions rigid and implementation inadequate, with low matching between enterprise practice bases and disciplines, practice content disconnected from teaching, and a lack of long-term incentives and institutional safeguards. These micro-level experiences corroborate the preceding theoretical analysis and policy judgments, underscoring the necessity of mechanism innovation.

5. Mechanism Innovation Paths: From "Islands" to "Symbiosis"

Based on the preceding theoretical analysis and empirical evidence, this paper proposes three interrelated mechanism innovation paths that respond to the differentiated incentive needs of faculty at different career stages, restructure cost-sharing arrangements, open channels for value transformation, and build the institutional bridge from islands to symbiosis.

5.1 A precision stage-incentive matching mechanism

In response to the needs differences across career stages, a differentiated incentive system should be constructed. For early-career faculty, economic compensation and fast tracks should be combined: establish a provincial "Industry-Education Integration Faculty Development Special Fund," provide one-time subsidies to early-career faculty participating in enterprise practice, deeply link "dual-qualified" certification with title evaluation, shorten promotion thresholds, and build a full-cycle development support system. For mid-career faculty, smooth channels and institutional fairness should be combined: the provincial education authority should uniformly formulate measures for converting enterprise practice outcomes into title-evaluation credit, establish a dedicated "industry-education integration type" title evaluation channel, build flexible conversion mechanisms between tracks, and strengthen professional care and work–family balance support. For senior faculty, autonomy and reputation incentives should be combined: exempt faculty with more than 20 years of teaching experience or full senior rank from mandatory assessment, establish provincial honorary titles, encourage them to lead industry-education integration innovation teams, and build a "senior mentoring junior" transmission mechanism.

5.2 A government–university–enterprise tripartite cost-sharing mechanism

A tripartite cost-sharing mechanism should be constructed to achieve win-win outcomes. On the government side, the priority is to coordinate policy resources: establish the provincial special fund for industry-education integration faculty development, improve tax incentives and fiscal subsidies for enterprise participation, and build a provincial "dual-qualified" faculty resource-sharing platform to reduce institutional transaction costs. On the university side, the priority is to improve internal institutions: formally incorporate enterprise practice into faculty workload accounting, establish academic leave and flexible work arrangements, and strengthen cross-departmental executive coordination. On the enterprise side, the priority is to innovate cooperation models: promote a "shared talent" cooperation model, establish incentive and cost-compensation mechanisms for enterprise participation, clarify benefit distribution arrangements, and form a multi-party community of shared interests.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

5.3 A value co-creation and transformation mechanism

Channels for transforming faculty practice outcomes should be opened, constructing a complete value chain of "enterprise practice—outcome production—institutional recognition." Faculty enterprise practice experience can be converted into horizontally funded research projects and technical consulting reports, with matching university funding and inclusion in research performance attribution; practical experience can be integrated into teaching through the development of university–enterprise cooperative courses and teaching case libraries, eligible for teaching achievement awards and treated on a par with academic research outcomes; technical patents and industry standards formed during practice can be directly incorporated into core indicators of title evaluation and performance assessment; and faculty mentoring of students based on practical experience can be included in the talent cultivation quality evaluation system as an important basis for performance evaluation. Through this mechanism, faculty enterprise practice shifts from a "mandatory task" to a "voluntary pursuit," achieving multi-party value symbiosis.

5.4 Building a symbiotic ecosystem of "trinity" institutional coordination

The three mechanisms above are not independent but an interdependent, mutually supporting institutional whole. The stage-adaptation incentive mechanism addresses the object question of "who incentivizes and who is incentivized"; the cost-sharing mechanism addresses the resource question of "who bears the costs and how benefits are distributed"; and the value co-creation mechanism addresses the channel question of "how inputs are transformed and value realized." Only when the three work in concert can the fundamental transition from "islands" to "symbiosis" be achieved.

At the level of institutional design, the effective operation of the three mechanisms requires supporting institutions. First, establish a cross-departmental coordination mechanism, enabling the personnel, teaching, research, and finance functions to form synergy in faculty development policy and avoid "multiple authorities issuing conflicting orders." Second, improve the supervision and evaluation mechanism for policy implementation, regularly assessing each application-oriented undergraduate university's implementation of faculty development incentive policies and linking evaluation results with university performance assessment and resource allocation. Third, establish a dynamic policy adjustment mechanism, promptly revising and improving relevant institutions according to implementation effects and faculty feedback to ensure the sustained effectiveness and adaptability of policies.

At the level of regional coordination, J Province should actively draw on the industry-education integration experience of developed regions such as the Yangtze River Delta and Pearl River Delta, and on the advanced practices of Jiangsu, Guangdong, and other provinces in designing faculty development incentive mechanisms, promoting an inter-provincial faculty development cooperation mechanism. The Implementation Opinions of Jiangsu Province on Deepening Industry-Education Integration explicitly calls for "promoting the organic linkage of the education chain, talent chain, industrial chain, and innovation chain," while Guangdong is building a new integrated "science–education–industry–finance–innovation" model for innovation and entrepreneurship talent cultivation. These inter-provincial experiences provide an important reference coordinate for J Province's institutional optimization. Through institutional learning, policy transplantation, and innovative transformation, J Province is fully capable of forging a path of teacher education integration for

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

application-oriented undergraduate universities with central-China characteristics.

6. Conclusions and Prospects

6.1 Research conclusions

Taking teacher education integration in J Province's application-oriented undergraduate universities as its research object, and proceeding through theoretical analysis, policy review, empirical interviews, and practical reflection on the "island" dilemma of faculty development, this paper reaches three core conclusions.

First, faculty professional development in J Province's application-oriented undergraduate universities suffers a triple "island" dilemma—organizational, competence, and institutional: organizational coordination is absent, practical competence development is perfunctory, and evaluation and incentive institutions are rigid; compounded by insufficient provincial policy safeguards and weak university–enterprise linkage, the advancement of teacher education integration is obstructed and fails to meet the demands of application-oriented university transformation.

Second, faculty professional development in application-oriented undergraduate universities exhibits pronounced stage characteristics, with significantly different incentive needs among early-career, mid-career, and senior faculty. Existing "one-size-fits-all" policies and institutions suffer incentive mismatch, absent cost compensation, and outcome transformation barriers, and cannot meet faculty members' differentiated development demands—this is the core cause of the "island" dilemma.

Third, achieving the transition of faculty development "from islands to symbiosis" requires taking "Stage-Adaptation × Incentive-Portfolio" as the theoretical core and innovating four core mechanisms: satisfying differentiated needs through the precision stage-incentive matching mechanism, balancing costs and benefits through the tripartite cost-sharing mechanism, opening the transformation channel for practice outcomes through the value co-creation mechanism, and ultimately building a symbiotic ecosystem of "trinity" institutional coordination.

6.2 Implications for provincial higher education coordination

The findings are applicable not only to J Province's application-oriented undergraduate universities but also provide an important reference for provincial higher education coordination and faculty team building in central China. J Province can rely on these conclusions to further improve provincial faculty development policies, draw on the industry-education integration experience of the Yangtze River Delta and Pearl River Delta, build inter-provincial faculty development credit-recognition and enterprise practice base sharing platforms, promote inter-university linkage and university–enterprise collaboration within the province, break regional resource barriers, and achieve coordinated development of teacher education integration.

Meanwhile, J Province's practical path can offer lessons for comparable central provinces such as Hunan, Anhui, and Henan, which all face common problems of application-oriented university transformation, insufficient faculty practical competence, and shallow industry-education integration. They can, in light of their own industrial development and higher education realities, draw on mechanisms of differentiated incentives,

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

cost sharing, and value co-creation to improve local teacher education integration institutions, promote the deep integration of regional higher education with industrial development, and achieve high-quality coordinated development of provincial higher education.

6.3 Limitations and future research

This study has certain limitations. First, the interview sample is small—only eight faculty members from three universities in J Province—and the generalizability of the conclusions requires further verification. Second, the study is confined to J Province and lacks horizontal comparative analysis with more central provinces. Third, the study incorporates the author's own practical reflection, which introduces a degree of subjectivity, and the depth of empirical analysis needs strengthening.

Future research could expand the sample through large-scale questionnaire surveys to quantitatively analyze faculty development needs and dilemmas; extend the research region through multi-province comparative studies to distill more generalizable mechanisms of teacher education integration; and continuously track the implementation effects of J Province's innovative mechanisms through before-and-after comparative empirical studies, further refining the theoretical and practical system of teacher education integration in application-oriented undergraduate universities.

Funding

This paper is a phased achievement of the Jiangxi Province 14th Five-Year Plan Educational Science Planning Project "Research on the Growth Mechanisms of Faculty in Undergraduate Universities from the Perspective of Teacher Education Integration" (Grant No. 23YB208).

References

[1]Liu Zhentian, Li Sen. The Dilemma and Breakthrough Paths of Faculty Development in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities [J]. Higher Education Research (Gaodeng Jiaoyu Yanjiu), 2024, 45(2): 56–63. (in Chinese)

[2]Zhou Guangli, Sun Yan. Research on the Effectiveness of Faculty Enterprise Practice in Universities from the Perspective of Industry-Education Integration [J]. China Higher Education Research (Zhongguo Gaojiao Yanjiu), 2023(8): 34–41. (in Chinese)

[3]Bie Dunrong, Chen Bin. Reform of Faculty Evaluation Systems in Application-Oriented Universities: Logic, Problems, and Countermeasures [J]. Fudan Education Forum (Fudan Jiaoyu Luntan), 2024, 22(1): 78–85. (in Chinese)

[4]Griffin, N. C. Teacher Professional Development across the Career Cycle: Participation, Preferences, and Organizational Supports [D]. University of Southern California, 2001.

[5]Schultz, T. W. Investment in Human Capital (Chinese ed., trans. Jia Zhan et al.). Beijing: Commercial Press, 1990.

[6]Jia Weiqiang, Fu Mengjie, Fang Ming. Research on the Design of Incentive Mechanisms for Faculty in Private Universities from the Principal–Agent Perspective [J]. Higher Education Journal (Gaojiao Xuekan),

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

2021(15): 80–83. (in Chinese)
[7]Gong Ke. Faculty Evaluation in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities: A Return to "Authenticity" [M]. Jinan: Shandong Education Press, 2024. (in Chinese)
[8]Yang Yan, Zhou Jing. The Relationship between Professional Identity and Professional Development of Faculty in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities: The Moderating Role of Organizational Culture [J]. Vocational and Technical Education (Zhiye Jishu Jiaoyu), 2025(11): 74–80. (in Chinese)
[9]McDonnell, L. M., & Elmore, R. F. Getting the Job Done: Alternative Policy Instruments [J]. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1987, 9(2): 133–152.
[10]General Office of the Ministry of Education. Measures for the Administration of National Enterprise Practice Bases for Vocational Education Teachers (Trial) [Z]. 2024-01-02.
[11]Ministry of Education and Seven Other Departments. Measures for the Administration of Industrial Part-Time Faculty in Regular Undergraduate Universities [Z]. 2025-02-21.

© 2026 by the author(s); licensee Mason Publish Group, this work for open access publication is under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0). (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)