

Article

Research on Optimizing the Safeguard System for "Three-Whole Education" (Full-staff, Whole-process and All-round Education) in Ideological and Political Education in Colleges and Universities in the New Era

Yutong Wang^{1,*}

¹ Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

* Correspondence: Yutong Wang, Hainan Vocational University of Science and Technology, Haikou, China

Abstract: In the context of the new era, deepening the enhancement of ideological and political education (IPE) in colleges and universities and implementing the comprehensive concept of "Three-whole Education"—namely full-staff, whole-process, and all-round education—is an essential pathway to fulfilling the fundamental task of cultivating virtue and nurturing talent, ultimately improving the overall quality of personnel training. However, the current safeguard system for IPE in many higher education institutions still suffers from significant limitations. These include an unclear division of responsibilities among various educational subjects, fragmented educational processes that disrupt continuity, insufficient integration of critical educational resources, and weak institutional and financial guarantees that hinder effective implementation. Based on a rigorous analysis of the core connotation and structural requirements of the "Three-whole Education" concept, this paper systematically identifies the practical dilemmas inherent in the existing safeguard mechanism. To address these challenges, the study proposes comprehensive optimization strategies from five key aspects: clarifying multi-subject responsibility mechanisms to ensure accountability, constructing a seamless whole-process education chain, integrating all-round educational resources for maximum impact, improving institutional and financial safeguards to provide robust backing, and empowering the entire system with advanced digital technology. These targeted measures aim to establish a highly scientific, well-coordinated, and sustainable safeguard system for IPE. Consequently, this framework will significantly promote the high-quality development and continuous advancement of ideological and political education in contemporary higher education environments.

Keywords: higher education; political education; safeguard system; optimization strategy; educational resources

Received: 01 February 2026

Revised: 17 March 2026

Accepted: 27 March 2026

Published: 31 March 2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The role of ideological and political education (IPE) in higher education has been a focal point of academic and institutional discussions in recent years. This approach emphasizes the integration of educational principles across all aspects of university life, ensuring that students receive a holistic and well-rounded development experience. The concept of "Three-whole Education" represents a comprehensive framework that seeks to involve all members of the academic community, including faculty, administrative staff, and support personnel, in fostering an environment conducive to moral and intellectual growth. This framework underscores the importance of embedding educational values throughout the entirety of a student's academic journey, from enrollment to graduation, and across all dimensions of their university experience, including academic, extracurricular, and personal development activities [1, 2]. By adopting a systematic and inclusive approach, this model aims to transcend traditional boundaries that often confine

IPE to specific courses or instructors, thereby promoting a more integrated and impactful educational experience. A critical component of this framework is the establishment of a robust support system that ensures its effective implementation. This includes strong organizational leadership that provides clear direction and vision, institutional norms that establish consistent standards and expectations, and the allocation of adequate resources to support various initiatives. Additionally, mechanisms for evaluation and incentives play a pivotal role in maintaining accountability and encouraging active participation from all stakeholders. The integration of digital tools and platforms further enhances the reach and efficiency of these efforts, enabling more dynamic and interactive engagement with students. The optimization of this framework is not merely a theoretical exercise but holds significant practical implications for the advancement of higher education. By systematically analyzing and refining the components of the "Three-whole Education" model, institutions can better address the evolving needs of students and society. This process involves identifying potential gaps or inefficiencies within the existing system and implementing targeted strategies to address them. For instance, fostering greater collaboration between academic departments and administrative units can help create a more cohesive and unified approach to education [3]. Similarly, leveraging technology to provide personalized learning experiences and real-time feedback can significantly enhance the effectiveness of IPE initiatives. The ultimate goal of these efforts is to cultivate a generation of students who are not only academically proficient but also socially responsible and ethically grounded. This aligns with the broader mission of higher education to contribute to the development of individuals who can positively impact their communities and the world at large. In conclusion, the "Three-whole Education" framework represents a transformative approach to higher education that prioritizes the holistic development of students. Its successful implementation requires a concerted effort from all members of the academic community, supported by a well-structured system of leadership, norms, resources, and technology. By continuously striving to optimize this model, institutions can ensure that they remain responsive to the changing demands of education and society, ultimately fulfilling their mission to nurture well-rounded and capable individuals.

2. Conceptual Connotation and Safeguard Requirements of "three-Whole Education" in the New Era

(I) Full-staff Education and the Requirement for Multi-subject Coordination. Full-staff education emphasizes the collective responsibility of all university personnel in fostering a comprehensive educational environment. This includes party cadres, teaching faculty, administrative staff, logistic service workers, and student peers, each playing a distinct yet interconnected role in the educational process. To ensure the effective implementation of this approach, it is essential to establish a safeguard system that clearly delineates the responsibilities of each participant. Such a system should prioritize the development of horizontal coordination mechanisms to eliminate the "silo effect," which often hampers collaboration across departments [3, 4]. By fostering a culture of shared accountability and mutual support, universities can create a cohesive educational framework that aligns with institutional goals. Additionally, regular training programs and workshops can be introduced to enhance the understanding of individual roles and responsibilities, thereby promoting a unified approach to education [5]. The integration of feedback loops and performance evaluations can further refine the system, ensuring continuous improvement and adaptability to evolving educational needs.

(II) Whole-process Education and the Requirement for Life-cycle Continuity [6]. Whole-process education underscores the importance of embedding value guidance throughout the entire academic journey, from enrollment to graduation and beyond. This approach necessitates a safeguard system that ensures seamless transitions between different stages of education, thereby maintaining continuity in the cultivation of talent. To achieve this, universities must implement mechanisms that facilitate the integration of ideological and political education (IPE) into every phase of the student lifecycle. For

instance, orientation programs can be designed to instill foundational values during enrollment, while mentorship initiatives can provide ongoing support throughout academic study and internships [7, 8]. Graduation ceremonies and alumni networks can serve as platforms for reinforcing institutional values and fostering lifelong connections. Furthermore, the use of digital tools and platforms can enhance communication and tracking, enabling universities to monitor and support students' development even after they have entered the workforce. By adopting a holistic and interconnected approach, institutions can ensure that educational objectives are consistently met across all stages of the academic experience.

(III) All-round Education and the Requirement for Resource Integration [9, 10]. All-round education advocates for the comprehensive integration of various educational resources to create an immersive and multifaceted learning environment. This approach encompasses classroom instruction, practical activities, campus culture, cyber platforms, and management services, all of which contribute to a well-rounded educational experience. To implement this effectively, universities must establish a safeguard system that breaks down barriers between departments and promotes collaboration across the "Ten Major Education Systems." These systems include teaching, research, practice, management, service, culture, organization, network, funding aid, and mental health, each playing a vital role in shaping the educational ecosystem. By mobilizing these systems, institutions can create a synergistic environment that supports holistic development. For example, interdisciplinary projects and cross-departmental initiatives can encourage collaboration and innovation, while campus-wide events and activities can foster a sense of community and shared purpose. Additionally, leveraging technology and digital platforms can enhance accessibility and engagement, ensuring that educational resources are effectively utilized. Through strategic planning and resource optimization, universities can cultivate an educational ecology that nurtures intellectual growth, emotional well-being, and social responsibility.

3. Main Problems in the Current Safeguard System for IPE "three-Whole Education"

(I) Unclear Subject Responsibilities and Weak Collaboration. In the current framework of the "three-Whole Education" safeguard system, the delineation of responsibilities among various stakeholders remains ambiguous, leading to inefficiencies in implementation. While universities often assign the primary responsibility for ideological and political education (IPE) to the Student Affairs Division and specialized course instructors, other departments, including professional faculty and administrative units, frequently fail to recognize their integral roles in fostering holistic student development. This lack of awareness results in a fragmented approach to education, where the contributions of different departments are siloed rather than synergistic. Furthermore, the absence of robust cross-departmental coordination mechanisms exacerbates this issue, as there is no structured platform for collaboration or resource sharing. To address these challenges, institutions must establish clear guidelines that define the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, ensuring that every department actively participates in the educational process [11, 12]. Additionally, fostering interdepartmental communication and collaboration through formalized coordination frameworks can significantly enhance the effectiveness of the "three-Whole Education" system.

(II) Disconnected Process Links and Formalized Implementation. A critical issue in the current safeguard system is the lack of continuity and integration in the implementation of IPE across different stages of student development. In practice, educational efforts are often concentrated in isolated events, such as freshman orientation programs or sporadic thematic activities, rather than being embedded into a cohesive, long-term strategy. This fragmented approach undermines the "whole-process" dimension of the "three-Whole Education" system, reducing it to mere rhetoric without substantive curricular integration. For instance, while initial efforts may focus on introducing students to key concepts and values, there is often no follow-up to reinforce

these lessons throughout their academic journey. This gap in continuity not only diminishes the impact of educational initiatives but also fails to address the evolving needs of students as they progress through different grade levels. To overcome these shortcomings, universities should prioritize the development of comprehensive, grade-specific curricula that seamlessly integrate IPE into all aspects of academic and extracurricular activities. By doing so, institutions can ensure that educational efforts are sustained and meaningful, fostering a deeper and more lasting impact on students.

(III) **Fragmented Resources and Imbalanced Investment** [13, 14]. The effective implementation of the "three-Whole Education" system is often hindered by insufficient allocation of resources, including funding, physical venues, and digital platforms. Many universities struggle to provide adequate support for IPE initiatives, resulting in superficial integration of educational principles into specialized courses. For example, while some courses may include elements of curriculum-based education, these efforts are often limited to surface-level discussions rather than in-depth exploration of relevant topics. Additionally, the lack of a coordinated approach to resource utilization prevents institutions from leveraging the synergistic potential of various educational tools and platforms. This imbalance in resource allocation not only restricts the scope of educational initiatives but also creates disparities in the quality of education offered across different departments and programs. To address these challenges, universities must adopt a more strategic approach to resource management, ensuring equitable distribution of funding and facilities to support IPE efforts. Furthermore, investing in the development of integrated digital platforms can enhance accessibility and engagement, enabling institutions to maximize the impact of their educational resources.

(IV) **Imperfect Institutional and Incentive Mechanisms**. The current assessment and incentive systems for IPE-related work often fail to adequately recognize and reward qualitative achievements, focusing instead on quantitative metrics that may not accurately reflect educational effectiveness. For instance, faculty members who excel in fostering student development through innovative teaching methods or extracurricular engagement often receive limited recognition in promotions and performance evaluations. This lack of acknowledgment not only undermines their motivation but also discourages others from prioritizing IPE-related efforts. Additionally, the absence of comprehensive evaluation frameworks that consider both qualitative and quantitative aspects of education further compounds this issue, as institutions struggle to measure the true impact of their initiatives. To address these shortcomings, universities should revise their assessment criteria to include qualitative indicators that capture the depth and breadth of educational achievements. Moreover, implementing robust incentive mechanisms, such as awards, promotions, and professional development opportunities, can encourage faculty and staff to actively contribute to the "three-Whole Education" system, fostering a culture of excellence and innovation.

(V) **Lagging Digital Empowerment**. Despite the growing importance of technology in education, many institutions have yet to fully embrace digital tools to enhance the implementation of the "three-Whole Education" system. The lack of an integrated information platform for IPE creates significant barriers to effective data management and analysis, as information related to students' academic performance, psychological well-being, and other developmental indicators remains scattered across multiple systems. This fragmentation not only impedes timely and precise interventions but also limits the ability of educators to tailor their approaches to individual student needs. For example, without a centralized database, it becomes challenging to identify students who may require additional support or to track the long-term impact of educational initiatives. To address these challenges, universities should prioritize the development of comprehensive digital platforms that consolidate all relevant data into a single, accessible system. By leveraging advanced analytics and artificial intelligence, institutions can gain deeper insights into student dynamics, enabling them to implement more targeted and effective educational strategies. Additionally, investing in digital training for faculty and

staff can further enhance their ability to utilize these tools, ensuring that technology becomes an integral part of the "three-Whole Education" system.

4. Strategies for Optimizing the Safeguard System for IPE "three-Whole Education" in the New Era

(I) Clarifying Multi-subject Responsibility Mechanism and Strengthening Organizational Leadership. To ensure the effective implementation of the "Three-whole Education" framework, it is essential to establish a robust and clearly defined responsibility mechanism that involves multiple stakeholders. At the university level, a dedicated leadership group should be formed, headed by the Party Secretary or an equivalent senior official, to oversee and coordinate efforts across various departments and units. This leadership group should outline specific roles and responsibilities for secondary schools, departments, functional offices, faculty, and staff, ensuring that each entity understands its contribution to the overall educational mission. Furthermore, the integration of "Three-whole Education" responsibilities into annual performance assessments can serve as a powerful tool to institutionalize accountability. By creating a system where all staff members actively participate, all departments assume responsibility, and all levels of the organization engage in supervision, a cohesive and collaborative environment can be fostered [15]. This approach not only enhances organizational efficiency but also ensures that the educational objectives are consistently prioritized and achieved.

(II) Constructing a Whole-process Education Chain and Embedding Value Guidance. A comprehensive and structured approach to education is critical for fostering holistic development among students. This can be achieved by designing a graded curriculum system that addresses the evolving needs of students at different stages of their academic journey. For instance, freshmen can benefit from courses focused on foundational values and aspirations, while sophomores and juniors can engage in programs that emphasize professionalism, ethical conduct, and integrity. Seniors, on the other hand, can be guided through modules that explore national development contexts and career planning, equipping them with the knowledge and skills needed for their transition into the workforce. Additionally, continuous engagement with alumni can help maintain a lifelong connection to the institution's values. To ensure seamless integration, these educational elements should be embedded into syllabi, textbooks, and classroom activities, creating a vertically interconnected system that reinforces key principles at every stage of learning.

(III) Integrating All-round Educational Resources and Promoting the "Ten Major Education Systems." The development of a well-rounded educational environment requires the strategic integration of diverse resources and initiatives. Specialized courses should incorporate elements that align with the broader educational goals, ensuring that students receive a balanced and comprehensive learning experience. Practical education bases, such as internships and community service programs, can provide students with hands-on opportunities to apply their knowledge in real-world settings. Enriching campus cultural activities, such as art exhibitions, sports events, and academic competitions, can further enhance the educational atmosphere by fostering creativity, collaboration, and critical thinking. Additionally, the governance of online platforms should be strengthened to ensure a safe and constructive digital environment for students. Support systems, such as psychological counseling services and financial aid programs, should also be enhanced to address the diverse needs of the student body, creating an inclusive and supportive educational ecosystem.

(IV) Improving Institutional Norms and Incentive Guarantees. Establishing clear and effective institutional norms is essential for the successful implementation of the "Three-whole Education" framework. This involves formulating and periodically revising guidelines and measures that provide a structured approach to educational practices [7, 16]. For example, the development of specific implementation measures tailored to the university's unique context can help standardize processes and ensure consistency.

Allocating dedicated funding for educational initiatives can further support the development and execution of innovative programs. Recognizing and rewarding the achievements of faculty and staff in advancing educational objectives is another critical component. By including educational contributions in promotion criteria, performance evaluations, and award systems, institutions can motivate educators to actively engage in and prioritize their roles within the "Three-whole Education" framework. This not only enhances the quality of education but also fosters a culture of excellence and commitment among faculty and staff.

(V) Empowering with Digital Technology and Building an Intelligent Safeguard Platform. Leveraging digital technology can significantly enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of educational initiatives. The development or upgrading of a comprehensive data platform can serve as a central hub for consolidating information from various sources, such as academic records, dormitory management systems, library usage statistics, and online activity logs. By analyzing this data, institutions can generate detailed profiles of students, enabling a deeper understanding of their needs, preferences, and challenges. Advanced technologies, such as artificial intelligence, can be employed to identify students who may require additional support, whether due to academic difficulties, personal challenges, or other factors. This allows for the implementation of targeted and personalized interventions that address specific issues and promote student well-being [17, 18]. By integrating these technological solutions into the educational framework, institutions can create a more responsive and adaptive system that meets the diverse needs of their student population.

5. Conclusion

The safeguard system for comprehensive education in college ideological and political education is a systematic and coordinated framework that involves multiple actors, multiple stages, and multiple dimensions of educational practice. Its effectiveness does not depend on any single department, policy, or technical tool, but rather on the sustained interaction among organizational leadership, faculty participation, student engagement, institutional design, resource allocation, and evaluation mechanisms. Therefore, the construction of such a system should be understood as a long-term and integrated project that requires clear objectives, stable implementation pathways, and continuous improvement.

First, the fundamental educational mission should remain the central point of orientation for all safeguard measures. In practical terms, this means that colleges and universities need to align educational management, curriculum design, student services, campus culture, and administrative support with the overall goal of student development. A safeguard system can function effectively only when educational objectives are translated into concrete responsibilities and operational standards. If the mission remains abstract or disconnected from daily practice, the system may become fragmented, symbolic, or inconsistent across departments.

Second, the responsibilities of different subjects should be clarified and coordinated. University administrators, academic departments, teaching staff, counselors, service units, and students themselves all play distinct yet interconnected roles in the educational process. A sound safeguard system should define these roles with precision, establish channels for communication and collaboration, and reduce overlap, ambiguity, or institutional gaps. In this way, educational work can move from isolated efforts toward a more coherent pattern of shared responsibility. At the same time, coordination mechanisms should be flexible enough to respond to differences in institutional scale, disciplinary structure, and student needs.

Third, institutional provisions should be further improved to ensure continuity, standardization, and accountability. This includes the development of clear regulations, implementation procedures, assessment criteria, feedback systems, and corrective mechanisms. Institutional construction is essential because it transforms educational intentions into stable and repeatable practices. Without adequate support, even well-

designed educational initiatives may depend excessively on temporary enthusiasm or individual commitment. By contrast, a mature institutional framework can provide predictability, strengthen execution, and support the long-term sustainability of educational reform.

Fourth, resource input should be strengthened in a balanced and practical manner. Human resources, financial support, technological infrastructure, training opportunities, and campus service platforms all constitute important conditions for the operation of the safeguard system. In many cases, the quality of educational outcomes is closely related to whether institutions can provide sufficient professional staff, appropriate facilities, and sustained funding. Resource support should not be limited to short-term investment, but should instead form part of a stable guarantee mechanism that matches institutional goals with actual implementation capacity.

Fifth, digital empowerment should be incorporated in a rational and responsible way. Digital platforms, data-based management tools, online learning environments, and intelligent service systems can improve coordination efficiency, expand educational access, and support more refined management. However, digitalization should serve educational quality rather than replace human interaction or reduce education to technical administration. Colleges and universities should therefore combine technological innovation with ethical governance, privacy protection, and pedagogical appropriateness, ensuring that digital tools enhance rather than distort the educational process.

References

1. H. Giroux, "Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere," *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 425-464, 2002.
2. C. D. Kam and C. L. Palmer, "Reconsidering the effects of education on political participation," *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 70, no. 3, pp. 612-631, 2008.
3. A. J. Perrin and A. Gillis, "How college makes citizens: Higher education experiences and political engagement," *Socius*, vol. 5, pp. 2378023119859708, 2019.
4. H. A. Giroux, *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Haymarket Books, 2014.
5. E. Schofer and J. W. Meyer, "The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 898-920, 2005.
6. M. Henkel and B. Little, Eds., *Changing Relationships Between Higher Education and the State*, vol. 45. Readers Digest, 1999.
7. M. Olssen and M. A. Peters, "Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism," *Journal of Education Policy*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 313-345, 2005.
8. J. Brubacher, *Higher Education in Transition: History of American Colleges and Universities*. Routledge, 2017.
9. S. M. Lipset and P. G. Altbach, "Student politics and higher education in the United States," *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 320-349, 1966.
10. R. Barnett, *Higher Education: A Critical Business*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK), 1997.
11. E. Callan, *Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy*. Clarendon Press, 1997.
12. C. Martin, *The Right to Higher Education: A Political Theory*. Oxford University Press, 2022.
13. J. R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education*. JHU Press, 2019.
14. W. A. Galston, "Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education," *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 217-234, 2001.
15. M. Trow, "Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education," 1973.
16. C. J. Lucas, *American Higher Education: A History*. Springer, 2016.
17. D. Sunshine Hillygus, "The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement," *Political Behavior*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 25-47, 2005.
18. H. Bowen, Ed., **Investment in Learning: The Individual and Social Value of American Higher Education**. 2018.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Publisher and/or the editor(s). Publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.