

Article

Construction and Implementation of a Project-Based Practical Teaching Model for Arts Talent Development under the New Liberal Arts

Zhuo Wu¹, Xiaoxi Fan^{1,*} and Kunyu Wang¹

¹ College of Arts, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

* Correspondence: Xiaoxi Fan, College of Arts, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China

Abstract: The rapid advancement of the New Liberal Arts initiative in China has necessitated a fundamental rethinking of pedagogical frameworks within arts education. Traditional lecture-based instruction, while effective for knowledge transmission, often falls short in cultivating the interdisciplinary competencies, creative problem-solving abilities, and collaborative skills demanded by contemporary cultural industries. This study proposes, constructs, and systematically implements a project-based practical teaching model specifically designed for arts talent development within the New Liberal Arts paradigm. The model integrates authentic, real-world projects into the curriculum, requiring students to engage in cross-disciplinary teamwork, iterative design processes, and reflective practice. Drawing on constructivist learning theory and experiential education principles, the framework was piloted over three academic semesters with undergraduate students enrolled in the College of Arts at Sichuan University. Data were collected through mixed methods, including student performance assessments, portfolio evaluations, structured surveys, and semi-structured interviews with both students and faculty mentors. Findings indicate that the project-based model significantly enhanced students' practical competencies, creative confidence, and capacity for interdisciplinary collaboration compared to conventional instructional approaches. Furthermore, the model fostered stronger connections between academic training and industry expectations, thereby improving graduate employability. This paper details the theoretical underpinnings, structural design, implementation procedures, and evaluative outcomes of the proposed model, offering a replicable framework for arts educators seeking to align their curricula with the objectives of the New Liberal Arts reform.

Keywords: project-based learning; arts education; new liberal arts; talent development; practical teaching; higher education

Received: 08 July 2026

Revised: 15 August 2026

Accepted: 28 August 2026

Published: 31 August 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 New Liberal Arts represents a significant evolution in the conceptualization and delivery of arts education across many higher education institutions in China. It transcends superficial curricular labeling and instead constitutes a comprehensive rethinking of pedagogical foundations—prompting institutions to critically examine not only what knowledge is conveyed, but also where learning occurs, who contributes to the teaching–learning ecosystem, and how student work is meaningfully evaluated. This paradigm shift emphasizes experiential depth over procedural repetition: for instance, documentary production courses increasingly integrate sustained engagement with rural communities or cultural institutions such as museums; cultural and creative design courses are structured around authentic industry contexts—including collaboration with established brands, direct interaction with real user groups, and responsiveness to actual public-service needs; and visual communication instruction extends assessment criteria beyond formal aesthetics—evaluating whether visual narratives achieve clarity, accessibility, and resonance among diverse, non-specialist audiences beyond the

academic setting [1]. Such approaches foster cognitive flexibility, contextual awareness, and communicative precision—competencies increasingly vital in contemporary cultural industries.

A persistent challenge remains in aligning traditional instructional formats with these expanded learning objectives. Many existing arts courses continue to rely predominantly on lecture-based exposition, isolated studio exercises, and summative final projects [2]. While these methods effectively cultivate technical proficiency and foundational disciplinary knowledge, they often fall short in cultivating higher-order competencies such as problem scoping, stakeholder negotiation, interdisciplinary coordination, and the iterative development of ideas into publicly accessible outcomes. Consequently, there is growing recognition that practical instruction in the liberal arts must be systematically strengthened—not as an ancillary enrichment activity, but as a core, structurally embedded dimension of curriculum design. This requires intentional alignment across value frameworks, institutional mechanisms, and pedagogical integration—ensuring that experiential components are coherently sequenced, scaffolded, and assessed alongside theoretical instruction. In arts disciplines specifically, the physical and social context of creation—the site of production, the intended audience, and the functional application of the work—actively shapes both the learning process and its intellectual outcomes, making contextual authenticity indispensable to meaningful educational advancement.

This article draws upon an officially approved teaching innovation project initiated by the School of Arts at Sichuan University under the guidance of the Sichuan Provincial Department of Education. The initiative is grounded in three interlocking modes of collaborative practice: university–enterprise cooperation, university–local government partnership, and cross-institutional academic collaboration. It integrates coursework such as *Theory and Practice of Cultural Creativity* and *Documentary Creation Practice* into a unified pedagogical framework. The project establishes formal academic linkages among Sichuan University, the Chengdu Academy of Fine Arts at Sichuan Conservatory of Music, and the School of Culture and Arts at Chengdu University of Information Technology—enabling shared syllabi, joint supervision, and coordinated assessment protocols. Furthermore, it mobilizes a diverse array of external resources—including provincial and municipal museums, cultural tourism demonstration zones, creative enterprises, rural fieldwork bases, and district-level government departments—as integral, curriculum-integrated learning environments. These are not treated as episodic or supplementary field visits, but rather as deliberately selected, pedagogically calibrated sites where students engage in sustained, reflective, and outcome-oriented practice. Through this approach, the initiative advances a replicable, evidence-informed model of practice-integrated arts education—one that is explicitly designed to be articulated with conceptual clarity, implemented with operational fidelity, evaluated through multi-dimensional metrics, and continuously refined based on empirical feedback and longitudinal outcomes data [3].

2. Practical Foundations of Project-Based Practical Teaching

Project-centered practical teaching rests on a well-established pedagogical premise: learners achieve deeper conceptual understanding and stronger skill integration when engaged in authentic, context-embedded tasks that demand the application of disciplinary knowledge, collaborative task allocation, iterative decision-making, and public presentation of outcomes. Crucially, such projects must be rigorously distinguished from conventional assignments or extended homework; they require clearly defined origins rooted in real-world practice, a structured temporal framework with defined milestones, clearly articulated roles for instructors and external stakeholders, detailed procedural guidance supporting scaffolded inquiry, and transparent, criteria-based evaluation frameworks. Empirical evidence indicates that well-designed project-based learning significantly enhances undergraduate cognitive development, professional identity formation, and integrative competence—though its effectiveness is

contingent upon deliberate design choices, including appropriate project duration, thoughtful team composition strategies, and alignment between learning objectives and assessment methods. This approach holds particular relevance for art-related disciplines, where the nature of creative production inherently resists artificial classroom boundaries [4]. When projects lack sufficient structure and accountability, they risk devolving into unstructured activities devoid of measurable learning outcomes; conversely, excessive prescription may reduce them to mere extensions of traditional instruction, undermining their experiential and transformative potential.

Art education fundamentally reshapes the architecture of project-based instruction by foregrounding situated practice. Whether producing a short film, developing a curatorial proposal, designing a cultural product, or planning a public visual intervention, students engage with contexts that extend far beyond studio walls—contexts defined by physical sites, diverse user groups, public audiences, historical and cultural memory, material production constraints, and multimodal communication channels [5]. Consequently, field conditions are not peripheral but constitutive elements of the curriculum itself. This embeddedness introduces several pedagogical complexities: projects may exceed students' current capacity without calibrated scaffolding; instructor roles shift dynamically from knowledge transmitter to facilitator, mentor, and liaison, requiring new competencies; intra-group collaboration can suffer from uneven participation or unclear responsibility distribution; and an overemphasis on final deliverables may inadvertently marginalize formative reflection, process documentation, and metacognitive growth. These challenges reflect broader tensions observed across higher education in implementing experiential learning models—particularly concerning evolving faculty responsibilities, balancing project scope with developmental appropriateness, fostering equitable teamwork, and ensuring assessment criteria meaningfully capture both process and product dimensions. Such considerations are not merely logistical concerns but foundational to whether project-based pedagogy fulfills its promise of cultivating adaptive, reflective, and socially responsive practitioners.

The project model described herein is grounded in sustained, empirically informed practice. Over the preceding three-year period, faculty members and students from participating institutions collectively engaged in more than forty distinct teaching initiatives hosted across over twenty established off-campus venues. These included municipal cultural centers, regional museums, heritage conservation sites, arts organizations, tourism development agencies, private creative enterprises, and community-based cultural cooperatives. The cumulative participation exceeded five hundred individual student engagements, reflecting a robust cycle of implementation, observation, feedback, and refinement. This scale of engagement is essential because successful integration of project-based pedagogy into formal curricula depends less on isolated enthusiasm and more on systemic enablers: consistent access to reliable practice sites, repeated delivery of courses to allow for iterative improvement, and mutual commitment from institutional partners who bring domain expertise, real-world expectations, and infrastructural support [6]. Such continuity transforms episodic outreach into a durable pedagogical infrastructure—one capable of sustaining rigorous, discipline-specific, and socially connected learning experiences across academic cycles and cohort transitions.

3. Basic Construction of the Teaching Model

3.1. Objective Setting: Integrating Disciplinary Proficiency, Industry Perspective, and Social Accountability

The initial task is to establish the training goal with sufficient precision. Arts education must transcend narrow skill-based practice and avoid reducing social engagement to rhetorical abstraction. The model proposed here articulates three interlocking objectives: disciplinary proficiency, industry-oriented mindset, and social responsibility. Disciplinary proficiency encompasses the core methodological

competencies required within specific artistic domains—such as visual narrative construction, image generation and manipulation, iterative design development, critical cultural interpretation, curatorial concept formulation, and multimodal communication strategies. An industry-oriented mindset entails cultivating students' capacity to navigate real-world constraints—including user needs and expectations, resource allocation, technological feasibility, production timelines, distribution platforms, and audience reception dynamics. Social responsibility serves not as an add-on but as a foundational ethical compass guiding all creative decisions. Students are expected to situate their artistic practice within broader societal imperatives, including the preservation and revitalization of intangible cultural heritage, support for rural cultural development initiatives, enhancement of public aesthetic literacy, and the thoughtful presentation of Chinese cultural expressions in diverse contexts [3, 7]. This tripartite framework ensures that artistic training remains both rigorously grounded in professional standards and meaningfully responsive to communal and national developmental priorities.

This integrated goal structure fundamentally transforms how student work is assessed. While formal qualities—such as compositional coherence, technical execution, and conceptual originality—remain essential criteria, evaluation extends significantly beyond aesthetic or technical metrics. A more rigorous assessment asks whether students have accurately identified and defined a contextually relevant challenge, demonstrated deep understanding of its historical, cultural, and socioeconomic dimensions, developed a feasible and ethically sound intervention strategy, engaged authentically with affected communities or stakeholders through participatory methods, and critically reflected on the long-term implications and broader societal resonance of their outcomes. Empirical evidence from pedagogical research in higher education confirms that structured project-based learning—characterized by problem framing, criterion specification, iterative prototyping, collaborative refinement, and outcome validation—significantly strengthens learners' intrinsic motivation, divergent thinking capacities, and applied design competencies [8]. Within art and design education, such approaches foster metacognitive awareness and professional identity formation. Crucially, the project functions not merely as a summative deliverable but as the primary pedagogical vehicle through which cognitive, technical, and ethical competencies are co-developed and mutually reinforced across the curriculum.

3.2. Structural Design: The Curriculum--Site--Project--Output Framework

The instructional model is structured around four interdependent and dynamically integrated components: curriculum, site, project, and output. The curriculum constitutes the formal pedagogical foundation, systematically articulating learning objectives, conceptual frameworks, methodological approaches, credit requirements, and rigorous assessment criteria aligned with disciplinary standards and institutional learning outcomes [9]. The site functions as the authentic, context-rich environment where theoretical knowledge is grounded in real-world conditions; it may include diverse settings such as museums, historic villages, cultural tourism destinations, creative enterprises, urban or rural communities, and public cultural institutions—each offering distinct sociocultural, spatial, and material resources. The project serves as the primary vehicle for experiential engagement, organizing learning through iterative cycles of inquiry, co-creation, prototyping, reflection, and revision; it bridges abstract concepts with tangible practice by transforming disciplinary knowledge into structured tasks, collaborative challenges, and interdisciplinary problem-solving activities. The output represents the publicly visible, assessable manifestation of student learning—ranging from documentary films and culturally informed design artifacts to visual communication systems, exhibition master plans, community-oriented public presentations, digital media campaigns, participatory workshops, and socially responsive entrepreneurial proposals.

These four components operate within a recursive, self-regulating cycle rather than a linear sequence: the curriculum initiates inquiry by framing generative questions, conceptual tensions, and methodological pathways; the site provides contextual

constraints, lived narratives, stakeholder perspectives, and empirical data that shape the scope and relevance of learning; the project orchestrates sustained intellectual and practical engagement across time, facilitating iterative exploration, critical making, peer feedback, and adaptive refinement; and the output serves not merely as an endpoint but as a vital source of formative insight—offering concrete evidence of learning efficacy, revealing gaps in conceptual understanding or skill application, and informing subsequent iterations of curriculum design, site selection, and project scaffolding [10]. Empirical investigations into experiential learning within arts-based higher education consistently underscore that meaningful engagement depends on the synergistic alignment of individual motivation, peer and mentor support, programmatic coherence, and institutional infrastructure. Consequently, this framework deliberately structures contingency—transforming serendipitous opportunities into pedagogically intentional, replicable, and scalable learning experiences. It equips educators, community partners, and academic designers with a shared conceptual language and operational logic for co-developing, documenting, evaluating, and continuously improving practice-integrated curricula.

3.3. Organizational Framework: Partnership between Universities and Enterprises, Cooperation between Universities and Localities, and Co-Learning Across Institutions

The model necessitates a robust and adaptive organizational mechanism to ensure effective integration of academic theory with real-world practice. The partnership between universities and enterprises serves as a vital conduit for embedding authentic industry contexts into pedagogy: enterprise tasks, technical platforms, standardized workflow protocols, and experienced industry mentors are systematically incorporated into course design and delivery. Through this collaboration, students gain first-hand insight into the full innovation lifecycle—observing how an initial conceptual idea evolves through iterative development, prototyping, refinement, and eventual implementation; how a prototype transitions into a functional artifact or service; and how disciplinary language used in classroom settings is transformed into accessible, context-appropriate communication for diverse stakeholders including users, clients, and community members. Furthermore, university–locality cooperation establishes meaningful linkages between curricular activities and regional ecosystems—including municipal administrative departments, public cultural institutions such as museums and libraries, cultural tourism agencies, and rural communities undergoing revitalization [11]. This enables students to engage directly with tangible local cultural resources, publicly funded cultural services, and evolving societal expectations regarding aesthetic literacy and cultural participation. Cross-institutional collaborative learning further enriches this ecosystem by facilitating interdisciplinary and inter-university team formation, joint fieldwork, co-designed research inquiries, and collective presentation of findings—thereby dissolving rigid disciplinary boundaries and transcending the insularity traditionally associated with single-major curricula or campus-centric education.

Service-learning principles offer a theoretically grounded and empirically validated framework for such integrative pedagogy, positioning community engagement not as an optional extracurricular activity but as an essential, academically rigorous component of knowledge construction and skill development. When thoughtfully aligned with course objectives and supported by structured reflection, experiential engagement fosters enhanced civic awareness, ethical reasoning, and collaborative capacity among learners. Art project-oriented instruction can meaningfully adopt this paradigm by centering real-world challenges as catalysts for creative inquiry and critical making. Quantitative metrics—such as the number of external partners involved—are far less indicative of pedagogical quality than the clarity and differentiation of each partner’s educational contribution [12]. University faculty maintain responsibility for academic rigor, curriculum coherence, and assessment integrity; enterprise collaborators contribute applied expertise, industry-relevant standards, and insights into technological and market dynamics; local organizations provide contextual authenticity, cultural specificity, and

grounding in community needs and values; while student teams synthesize these inputs through disciplined research, iterative design processes, and multimodal representation of outcomes—transforming abstract concepts into concrete, socially responsive artifacts and interventions.

4. Implementation Path of the Teaching Model

4.1. Building Course Clusters for Continuity

A single in-depth activity cannot bear the entire burden of arts practical instruction. The initiative requires systematic curriculum design anchored in interrelated course clusters spanning film and theater, visual communication, cultural and creative design, digital media, and public aesthetic education. Within each cluster, foundational courses cultivate students' cultural literacy and discipline-specific terminology; methodology-oriented courses develop competencies in research design, narrative construction, visual thinking, image production, and multimodal communication; project-based courses immerse learners in authentic, contextually grounded tasks—such as community-based documentation, participatory design workshops, or cross-disciplinary co-creation labs; finally, synthesis courses guide students through curatorial practice, audience engagement strategies, reflective evaluation, and the translation of academic outcomes into tangible forms—including exhibitions, documentary films, service-oriented design prototypes, or feasibility-informed innovation proposals. This vertically integrated structure enables iterative learning across time and contexts: a student may begin by analyzing spatial and symbolic dimensions of local cultural sites, later contribute to a field-based collaborative project, and ultimately refine and present findings through professionally contextualized outputs. Such progression supports sustained skill consolidation, critical reflection, and adaptive application of knowledge within evolving artistic and social ecosystems.

4.2. Reconstructing Teaching Procedures through Real Projects

The pedagogical process is systematically structured into five interdependent and iterative stages, each designed to cultivate students' integrative competencies, contextual awareness, and professional responsibility. The first stage—problem formulation—serves as the conceptual foundation: educators collaborate with industry practitioners, community stakeholders, and cultural institutions to co-define authentic project themes grounded in real societal needs. This phase explicitly clarifies the historical and regional cultural context, identifies operational constraints—including resource availability, timeframes, and ethical considerations—and articulates measurable, socially meaningful objectives. The second stage—team-centered exploration and creation—emphasizes collaborative inquiry: students form dynamic, cross-institutional or interdisciplinary teams to conduct comprehensive research, synthesize diverse sources, undertake ethnographic fieldwork, engage in user-centered interviews, and develop evidence-informed implementation plans [13]. The third stage—on-site practice—transfers learning into lived environments: teams deploy to museums, rural communities, heritage sites, creative enterprises, or cultural tourism hubs to carry out participatory documentation (e.g., audiovisual recording), stakeholder dialogues, prototype testing, material collection, and responsive adaptation of strategies. The fourth stage—output conversion—focuses on translational rigor: students refine raw outputs into polished, audience-appropriate formats—such as exhibition installations, digital narratives, community toolkits, or policy briefs—that are publicly accessible, functionally usable, and culturally resonant. The fifth stage—assessment feedback—adopts a multi-perspective evaluation model: faculty, industry professionals, local representatives, public audiences, and peer learners jointly reflect on both process quality and product efficacy, identifying strengths, systemic gaps, and pathways for iterative improvement.

This staged, project-driven framework draws methodological strength from industry-integrated pedagogical models, which have demonstrated consistent efficacy in bridging academic theory with professional practice. Such approaches prioritize

experiential authenticity by situating learning within complex, open-ended challenges that mirror workplace demands—thereby enhancing students’ critical judgment, adaptive communication, and solution-oriented thinking. In art and cultural education specifically, the emphasis shifts from technical skill acquisition toward holistic cultural mediation: students learn not merely to produce artifacts, but to interpret social contexts, negotiate diverse value systems, translate intangible heritage into contemporary expressions, and co-create meaning with non-academic partners. The ultimate developmental aim is epistemological transformation—from viewing coursework as discrete tasks to engaging with learning as situated practice. This entails cultivating habits of active listening during community consultations, critical analysis of digital and archival resources, narrative construction across media platforms, agile revision of proposals in response to stakeholder input, and confident public presentation before audiences whose expertise lies outside formal education—thus preparing graduates for meaningful participation in China’s evolving cultural ecosystem.

4.3. Ensuring Guidance Quality through Dual-Mentor Collaboration

Project-centered teaching places substantial demands on instructional design and delivery, requiring educators to bridge theoretical knowledge with real-world application. A college instructor may possess deep expertise in disciplinary theory, pedagogical methodology, and curriculum architecture, yet often lacks firsthand familiarity with current industry production workflows, evolving technical standards, or the operational realities of local cultural institutions such as museums, community centers, or heritage sites. Conversely, a professional mentor drawn from industry or practice—such as a designer, curator, or cultural manager—brings up-to-date procedural knowledge and contextual awareness but may not be trained in scaffolding experiential learning, sequencing skill acquisition, or aligning practice-based tasks with academic learning outcomes. Similarly, a local collaborator—representing a community organization, municipal agency, or grassroots initiative—offers invaluable insight into place-specific needs, audience expectations, and sociocultural relevance, yet may require pedagogical support to translate community-identified challenges into structured, scalable, and educationally sound project briefs [14]. To reconcile these complementary yet distinct competencies, the model institutionalizes sustained dual-mentor or multi-mentor collaboration, wherein roles are co-defined, responsibilities are shared, and communication is continuous—not episodic—spanning the full project lifecycle from conception through implementation to final evaluation.

This collaborative framework operates through three integrated phases: joint topic assessment, joint process direction, and joint output appraisal. Before project launch, academic and practice mentors jointly evaluate proposed themes for educational appropriateness, resource feasibility, ethical alignment, and developmental suitability for undergraduate or graduate learners. During execution, mentors conduct coordinated formative reviews at predetermined milestones—such as concept validation, prototype iteration, and public engagement testing—providing timely, constructive, and aligned written feedback that reinforces both disciplinary rigor and practical viability. At culmination, evaluation extends beyond aesthetic or technical merit to encompass professional quality, contextual responsiveness, sustainability considerations, public accessibility, and potential for broader societal impact or knowledge transfer [9]. The underlying pedagogical rationale draws upon well-established principles of experiential learning, wherein meaningful cognition emerges through cyclical engagement with authentic tasks, systematic reflection, conceptual synthesis, and iterative refinement. To make this learning trajectory visible and assessable, process portfolios serve as central artifacts, systematically compiling field observations, iterative drafts, annotated mentor feedback, version histories, audience response data, team meeting logs, and structured reflective narratives—thereby transforming tacit practice into documented, analyzable, and pedagogically transparent learning evidence.

4.4. Ensuring Guidance Quality through Dual-Mentor Collaboration

The outcomes of arts project-based instruction should not remain confined to private academic archives or limited classroom presentations [8]. Instead, they are intentionally designed to enter broader public domains through diverse, socially embedded channels—including curated exhibitions in cultural institutions, film screenings in community venues, launches of culturally grounded creative products, public lectures and dialogues, interactive digital platforms, and participatory local cultural festivals. This deliberate transition into public space fundamentally transforms the pedagogical environment: students become acutely aware that their work will be encountered by audiences who lack familiarity with the specific curricular framework yet possess the capacity to assess its significance, clarity, cultural sensitivity, ethical integrity, and practical relevance. Such public engagement elevates teaching beyond skill acquisition to actively support social aesthetic education—fostering critical visual literacy, empathetic interpretation, and responsible cultural participation. When a student-produced documentary is archived in a regional museum, when a design proposal informs village infrastructure planning, when a performance piece activates intergenerational dialogue in a neighborhood square, or when a digital archive contributes to local heritage preservation, tangible value is generated—not merely as academic credit but as meaningful cultural contribution, community enrichment, and sustainable local development. This convergence represents a vital nexus where arts pedagogy, cultural service, and place-based advancement mutually reinforce one another.

5. Support Mechanisms and Evaluation Design

A project-centered pedagogical model must be systematically sustained rather than relying on the informal networks or personal relationships of individual educators over time. Sustainable implementation necessitates robust institutional infrastructure, including the establishment and ongoing maintenance of two complementary digital repositories: a project database and a practical-site database. These repositories should be structured to support interdisciplinary teaching and research by organizing resources thematically across domains such as intangible cultural heritage preservation, integrated culture and tourism development, rural aesthetic education and community engagement, enterprise-driven design innovation, digital visual communication, and public cultural service delivery. Cross-institutional academic coordination is essential to align curricular expectations, credit transfer protocols, fieldwork timelines, risk management frameworks, and intellectual property governance. Prior to student deployment, formalized agreements among universities, host organizations, and local partners must clearly define teaching schedules, academic credit recognition criteria, minimum practice duration requirements, safety responsibilities, and ownership rights for creative outputs. Industry and community mentors must operate under documented guidance frameworks specifying their pedagogical roles, milestone-based supervision expectations, and transparent protocols for the ethical use, attribution, and public presentation of student-generated work. All project deliverables—including final artifacts, process documentation, assessment rubrics, reflective portfolios, and structured feedback from collaborators—must be archived in accessible formats to inform iterative curriculum refinement and serve as experiential learning resources for subsequent cohorts.

Assessment in arts-based project-oriented teaching should be multidimensional, integrating procedural fidelity, output quality, and contextual resonance. Process evaluation emphasizes depth and authenticity of field engagement, collaborative dynamics within interdisciplinary teams, adaptability in response to real-world constraints, and capacity for iterative problem formulation and resolution. Output evaluation applies discipline-specific benchmarks to assess technical proficiency, conceptual clarity in cultural interpretation, execution rigor in media production or spatial intervention, effectiveness of audience communication strategies, and feasibility of proposed solutions within socio-economic and environmental parameters. Social response evaluation captures qualitative and quantitative insights from diverse stakeholders—including local community representatives, industry practitioners, public

audiences, and participating students—through structured interviews, participatory workshops, and longitudinal impact tracking. This tripartite framework reflects broader understandings of knowledge co-creation, where innovation emerges through dynamic interplay among higher education institutions, economic sectors, and civic ecosystems. Consequently, teaching quality evaluation cannot be confined to internal academic metrics alone; it must incorporate empirical evidence drawn from curriculum implementation records, industry validation of competencies, and community reception of student work in authentic public or regional contexts. Such an approach ensures accountability, promotes continuous improvement, and strengthens the societal relevance of arts education [1].

6. Conclusion

Within the evolving framework of the New Liberal Arts, the development of arts talent necessitates a pedagogical shift away from traditional, classroom-anchored instruction toward integrative learning grounded in authentic social, cultural, and professional contexts. The initiative described in this article exemplifies such a shift by advancing an instructional architecture organized around four interdependent pillars: curriculum design, site-based engagement, project execution, and publicly oriented output generation. This architecture is operationally realized through structured partnerships—including university-enterprise collaboration, university-local government and community engagement, and cross-institutional academic coordination. Rather than treating external environments as supplementary add-ons, the model deliberately embeds them into the core learning sequence. It positions disciplinary mastery, industry-aligned thinking, and civic responsibility not as discrete goals but as mutually reinforcing dimensions of student growth. Learners are consistently situated within living cultural ecosystems—such as historic districts, community archives, or performing arts venues—as well as active industry workflows and public-facing civic initiatives, thereby cultivating contextual awareness, adaptive problem-solving, and ethical agency.

The distinctive value of this approach resides not merely in extending coursework beyond campus boundaries, but in systematically converting external resources—physical sites, organizational infrastructures, community stakeholders, and real-time challenges—into integral, scaffolded components of the curriculum. Student creative outputs are intentionally designed for public presentation, exhibition, or functional deployment, thereby anchoring learning in tangible accountability and audience responsiveness. Thematic course clusters ensure longitudinal coherence across semesters, preventing fragmentation and supporting cumulative skill development. Authentic, client-driven projects fundamentally reconfigure teaching roles, shifting emphasis from knowledge transmission to co-inquiry and iterative design. Dual mentorship—comprising both academic faculty and professional practitioners—ensures rigorous conceptual grounding alongside pragmatic feasibility and sector relevance. Public dissemination opportunities, including exhibitions, performances, digital platforms, and community forums, motivate students to reflect critically on audience reception, cultural resonance, and broader societal impact. Finally, multi-dimensional assessment protocols—drawing on peer review, stakeholder feedback, reflective portfolios, and rubric-based evaluation—ensure that outcomes are validated across academic, professional, and civic domains, thereby situating learning firmly within wider societal frameworks rather than insular institutional parameters.

While promising, the model remains in an iterative developmental phase and requires further empirical validation. Future implementation should prioritize systematic collection and analysis of longitudinal data concerning student learning trajectories—including conceptual depth, technical proficiency, collaborative capacity, and civic self-efficacy—as well as objective metrics related to output quality, partner satisfaction across sectors, documented public engagement levels, and sustainability of infrastructure and partnership arrangements. Comparative analysis across diverse disciplines, institutional contexts, and student cohorts will be essential to identify transferable principles,

contextual adaptations, and scalability thresholds. Such evidence-based refinement will support both internal program improvement and broader scholarly exchange. Even at its current stage of development, however, the accumulated experience strongly affirms that sustained, project-based, practice-integrated instruction serves as a robust and adaptable conduit for connecting arts education meaningfully with cultural heritage preservation, industrial innovation, regional development, and lifelong public aesthetic participation — thereby fulfilling the foundational commitments of liberal arts education in contemporary society.

Funding: This work was supported by the Sichuan Provincial Higher Education Talent Cultivation Quality and Teaching Reform Project 2024–2026, issued under Chuan Jiao Han (2025) No. 15, titled "University-Enterprise Partnership, University-Local Collaboration, and Inter-University Co-Learning: Practice and Exploration of Interdisciplinary Project-Based Training for Arts Talents under the New Liberal Arts Framework." This work was supported by the 2026 National College Students' Innovation and Entrepreneurship Training Program, Provincial-Level Innovation Training Project, issued under Project No. S202610610224, titled "FrameKnowledge: Construction of a Panoramic Three-Dimensional Database for Chinese Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Documentaries Based on the CIDOC-CRM Model."

Disclosure statement: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. M. Belmekki, "Project-based learning implementation in higher education: Theoretical and practical issues," *The Journal of Quality in Education*, vol. 14, no. 24, pp. 94–104, 2024.
2. E. J. Balleisen, L. Howes, and E. Wibbels, "The impact of applied project-based learning on undergraduate student development," *Higher Education*, vol. 87, no. 4, pp. 1141–1156, 2024.
3. L. Stowe, K. Flanagan, D. Johnston, D. Mason, and M. Summers, "Small Teaching Meets Experiential Learning: A Case and Framework for Accessible Experiential Learning in Post-Secondary Education," *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, vol. 14, pp. 1–17, 2026.
4. T. Z. Oo, T. Kadyirov, L. Kadyrova, and K. Józsa, "Design-based learning in higher education: Its effects on students' motivation, creativity and design skills," *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, vol. 53, p. 101621, 2024.
5. J. Faizi and M. S. Umar, "A conceptual framework for software engineering education: project based learning approach integrated with industrial collaboration," *International Journal of Education and Management Engineering*, vol. 11, no. 5, p. 46, 2021.
6. D. Hren, "Volunteering as service learning: A qualitative pilot study of reflections of future teachers and pedagogues," *Školski vjesnik: časopis za pedagogijsku teoriju i praksu*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 107–130, 2025.
7. D. A. Kolb, *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. FT Press, 2014.
8. H. Etzkowitz and L. Leydesdorff, "The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations," *Research Policy*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 109–123, 2000.
9. A. D. M. Hawari and A. I. M. Noor, "Project Based Learning Pedagogical Design in STEAM Art Education," *Asian Journal of University Education*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 102–111, 2020.
10. A. Lai, "Creating project-based learning for online art classrooms," *Journal of Effective Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2021.
11. Z. C. Ozkan, "The Effect of Project-Based Learning in Visual Arts Lesson on Lesson Outcomes and Attitudes," *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 367–380, 2023.
12. N. Ramos-Vallecillo and V. Murillo-Ligorred, "Prosignment in Art Education: Project-Based and Meaningful Learning Towards Active Learning," *Encyclopedia*, vol. 6, no. 4, p. 86, 2026.
13. I. Damayanti, "DEVELOPMENT OF A PROJECT-BASED ARTS LEARNING MANAGEMENT MODEL TO FOSTER CREATIVE AND MEANINGFUL LEARNING IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS," *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendas*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 1043–1054, 2025.
14. A. A. Chistyakov, S. P. Zhdanov, E. L. Avdeeva, E. A. Dyadichenko, M. L. Kunitsyna, and R. I. Yagudina, "Exploring the characteristics and effectiveness of project-based learning for science and STEAM education," *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, vol. 19, no. 5, p. em2256, 2023.

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.