Review

High-Quality Ideological and Political Education Empowering the High-Quality Development of Emerging Engineering Education

Jianqiang Wu [1], Zishan Wang [1], Qi Li [1] and Renguang Yuan [1,*]

[1] Guangdong Ocean University, Zhanjiang, Guangdong, 524000, China
* Correspondence: Renguang Yuan, Guangdong Ocean University, Zhanjiang, Guangdong, 524000, China

Abstract: Emerging engineering disciplines, characterized by interdisciplinarity, innovation, and sustainability, require not only technical excellence but also strong ethical and social foundations. This review examines how ideological and political education (IPE) can empower high-quality development in new engineering programs. Through a synthesis of theoretical frameworks, identification of integration challenges, exploration of practical pathways, and analysis of domestic and international case studies, the study demonstrates that embedding IPE into curricula, innovating pedagogical approaches, developing faculty competencies, fostering student agency, and reforming evaluation systems collectively cultivate engineers who are both technically proficient and socially responsible. The paper further outlines future directions, including digital empowerment, international comparative studies, and cross-disciplinary collaboration, providing actionable insights for policymakers and educational practitioners to enhance the holistic development of engineering talent.

Keywords: ideological and political education; emerging engineering; curriculum integration; engineering ethics; high-quality development

Published: 29 September 2025

1. Introduction

1.1. Emerging Engineering Education in the Era of Industry 4.0

The twenty-first century has witnessed a profound transformation in the global economic and technological landscape, driven primarily by the forces of Industry 4.0, artificial intelligence, and the growing imperative of sustainable development. Industry 4.0, often characterized as the fusion of digital, biological, and physical systems, is reshaping the way industries design, produce, and deliver goods and services. This paradigm shift has not only introduced advanced technologies such as the Internet of Things, big data analytics, robotics, and cloud computing, but has also demanded an entirely new skill set for future engineers. Traditional engineering education, which once emphasized mastery of disciplinary knowledge and practical problem-solving within narrowly defined fields, is now confronted with the urgent necessity to prepare students for a world of constant innovation, systemic complexity, and global interdependence [1].

China has responded to this transformation by proposing the concept of "New Engineering", a forward-looking educational strategy designed to align engineering training with the realities of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Emerging engineering education emphasizes interdisciplinarity, integration of information technologies, human–machine collaboration, and an expanded vision of social responsibility [2]. It not only requires technical proficiency but also demands adaptability, creativity, and the capacity to engage with ethical dilemmas inherent in technological progress. For example, engineers of the

future are expected to address challenges such as sustainable energy systems, smart manufacturing, and green urban development, which cannot be solved through technical expertise alone.

Moreover, global sustainability agendas, particularly the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), exert increasing influence on higher education. Engineering graduates are no longer judged solely by their technical performance but also by their ability to contribute to environmental stewardship, social equity, and inclusive innovation. This context underscores the necessity of reforming curricula, teaching methods, and assessment systems in order to develop a new generation of engineers capable of both technological innovation and societal leadership [3].

Emerging engineering education thus represents more than a pedagogical reform; it is a strategic reorientation of higher education toward cultivating comprehensive talents who embody both professional excellence and social responsibility. By embedding values and ethical considerations into the very fabric of engineering education, the New Engineering initiative provides China with an opportunity to contribute globally competitive models of talent development while also responding to national imperatives of modernization, innovation-driven development, and cultural confidence [4].

1.2. Mission, Role of Ideological and Political Education, and Research Aims

Within the Chinese higher education system, ideological and political education has always held a central position in shaping students' worldview, values, and sense of social responsibility. In the context of emerging engineering education, its role has become even more crucial. The development of high-quality engineering talent is not solely a matter of technical training but also one of nurturing responsible global citizens who are committed to national rejuvenation and sustainable development [5]. Ideological and political education provides the normative framework that ensures engineering graduates are not merely technically competent but also ethically grounded and socially conscious [6].

The mission of integrating ideological and political education into New Engineering is twofold. On the one hand, it seeks to instill core socialist values, a sense of duty toward the nation, and a commitment to serving society through scientific and technological innovation. On the other hand, it enriches students' learning experiences by encouraging critical reflection on the ethical, legal, and social implications of engineering practices. This integration transforms engineering education into a holistic process that emphasizes not only knowledge acquisition but also value cultivation and personal growth. For example, courses in artificial intelligence and data science can be accompanied by discussions of privacy, equity, and labor displacement, while sustainable engineering courses can highlight the ethical imperative of ecological protection [7].

Despite its importance, the integration of ideological and political education into emerging engineering faces notable challenges. Faculty often struggle with aligning political and moral instruction with technical curricula, while students may perceive such content as marginal or disconnected from their career ambitions. Furthermore, evaluation mechanisms remain underdeveloped, making it difficult to measure the effectiveness of value-oriented education within technical disciplines. These tensions highlight the urgent need for innovative pedagogical strategies that can effectively embed ideological education into the knowledge and skills training required by the new era [8].

The purpose of this review is to systematically examine how high-quality ideological and political education can empower the high-quality development of emerging engineering education. Specifically, this study aims to (1) analyze the theoretical foundations linking ideological and political work with engineering education reform, (2) identify the major challenges that hinder integration, and (3) explore practical pathways and best practices for empowerment. By synthesizing insights from policy documents, scholarly research, and practical case studies, the review seeks to contribute both conceptual clarity and pragmatic guidance. Ultimately, the novelty of this work lies in its attempt to frame

ideological and political education not as an external supplement to engineering training but as an intrinsic force that enhances talent cultivation, bridges technical innovation with social responsibility, and sustains the high-quality development of China's New Engineering initiative [9].

2. Theoretical Foundations of Ideological and Political Education

2.1. The Connotation and Principles of Ideological and Political Education

Ideological and political education in higher education refers to a systematic process through which students' values, beliefs, and moral orientations are cultivated alongside their acquisition of knowledge and professional competencies. Rather than being an ancillary component of the curriculum, it serves as a guiding framework that connects technical learning with broader social, cultural, and ethical contexts. At its core, ideological and political education emphasizes three intertwined dimensions: the transmission of social and political values, the cultivation of moral character, and the development of the capacity to apply values in practical and professional settings [10].

The theoretical connotation of ideological and political education is rooted in the idea that education is not merely the transfer of information but the holistic development of the human person. It draws upon classical educational philosophy, Marxist humanism, and modern pedagogical theories, all of which highlight the inseparability of knowledge and morality [11]. While technical education provides students with skills for production and innovation, ideological and political education provides the ethical compass necessary to ensure that technological progress aligns with the long-term interests of humanity and the planet.

Several fundamental principles underpin high-quality ideological and political education. The first is value orientation, which requires education to guide students toward socially accepted norms such as integrity, responsibility, and fairness [12]. The second is integration, emphasizing that ideological education should not be detached from disciplinary training but embedded into the daily teaching and research activities of universities. The third is practical relevance, which suggests that ideological education must engage with real-world challenges, making abstract values tangible through case studies, projects, and experiential learning. Finally, the principle of student-centeredness underscores the importance of recognizing learners as active participants rather than passive recipients, encouraging them to reflect, debate, and internalize values within their personal growth.

By adhering to these principles, ideological and political education creates a fertile ground for bridging the divide between technical specialization and the broader mission of higher education: producing citizens who can lead, innovate, and serve society responsibly [13].

2.2. Core Elements of High-Quality Ideological and Political Education

High-quality ideological and political education is distinguished not only by the transmission of values but also by its capacity to integrate with disciplinary learning to create holistic talent development. Three core elements—value shaping, knowledge transmission, and ability cultivation—form the backbone of this approach.

Value Shaping. The first element is the cultivation of values and moral orientation. Engineering students are trained not only to master technical solutions but also to understand their societal implications. Through classroom discussions, project-based assignments, and interdisciplinary courses, students are encouraged to internalize values such as responsibility to society, respect for diversity, and commitment to sustainable development. Value shaping ensures that technological knowledge is not applied in isolation but is continuously evaluated against the yardstick of human well-being.

Knowledge Transmission. The second element concerns the integration of ideological content with disciplinary knowledge. Rather than treating ideological education as a separate subject, high-quality education emphasizes embedding political, cultural, and

ethical discussions within engineering courses. For instance, a course in data science may include debates on privacy and digital rights, while a course in civil engineering may address the ethical consequences of urban displacement. In this way, knowledge transmission becomes multidimensional: students acquire technical expertise while simultaneously developing the cognitive ability to reflect critically on its ethical implications.

Ability Cultivation. The third element is the enhancement of practical abilities. Beyond theoretical reflection, students are trained to apply values in real-world contexts through internships, service-learning, and interdisciplinary projects. The cultivation of abilities is not limited to technical competencies such as problem-solving or digital skills, but extends to ethical decision-making, leadership in diverse teams, and the capacity to communicate effectively across cultural boundaries.

The integration of these three elements can be illustrated by comparing traditional engineering education with the emerging paradigm of New Engineering, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparative Framework.

Dimension	Traditional Engineering Education	Emerging Engineering Education (New Engineering)	Role of Ideological & Political Education
Knowledge	Technical-centric	Interdisciplinary & Innovation-driven	Values-guided knowledge integration
Skills	Problem-solving	Complex system design, digital skills	Social responsibility, ethical awareness
Goals	Employability	Sustainable development leadership	Cultivation of "whole-person" engineers

This comparative framework demonstrates how ideological and political education acts as a transformative force. It elevates knowledge from being purely instrumental to being socially responsible, it expands skills from narrow technical problem-solving to encompassing ethical awareness, and it redefines educational goals from employability to leadership in sustainable development. High-quality ideological and political education thus functions as a catalyst that enables New Engineering to fulfill its mission of cultivating innovative, responsible, and holistic talents.

2.3. Convergence of Emerging Engineering and Ideological and Political Education

The rise of Emerging Engineering presents both a challenge and an opportunity for ideological and political education. At first glance, engineering and politics may seem unrelated: the former is grounded in technical problem-solving, while the latter addresses values, governance, and social systems. Yet in the contemporary era of global challenges, their convergence has become indispensable. The sustainability of technological development depends on ethical reflection, while the credibility of value education depends on its relevance to real-world technological innovation.

One key area of convergence is engineering ethics. Emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and smart infrastructure generate profound ethical dilemmas concerning privacy, equity, safety, and ecological impact. Ideological and political education provides the framework to examine these dilemmas critically and to instill in students the responsibility to make decisions that balance innovation with moral accountability. Rather than treating ethics as an afterthought, the integration of ideological education ensures that ethical considerations are embedded into the design, implementation, and management of engineering solutions.

Another convergence lies in social responsibility. New Engineering aspires to produce graduates who can address grand societal challenges such as climate change, energy transitions, and urban sustainability. Ideological and political education reinforces this

mission by fostering awareness of social equity, public welfare, and collective responsibility. For example, service-learning projects in engineering can be designed to solve community problems while simultaneously developing students' commitment to social justice. This dual focus transforms engineering from a purely technical discipline into a socially embedded practice.

Finally, sustainable development serves as the overarching domain in which the two converge. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) explicitly call for engineers who can advance economic prosperity while safeguarding environmental integrity and promoting social inclusion. By connecting these goals with ideological education, universities ensure that students internalize the principle that technological progress must always align with the long-term interests of humanity and the planet. This creates a synergy between global visions of sustainability and local imperatives of national development, enabling students to function as both innovative engineers and responsible citizens.

In conclusion, the theoretical foundation of high-quality ideological and political education rests upon its connotation and principles, its threefold core elements, and its deep convergence with Emerging Engineering. Together, these foundations establish a framework for cultivating engineers who are not only technically proficient but also ethically conscious, socially responsible, and globally minded. This foundation paves the way for the subsequent discussion of the challenges and strategies in integrating ideological and political education with the development of New Engineering.

3. Challenges in the Integration of Ideological and Political Education with Emerging Engineering

3.1. Tensions Between Technical Centralism and Value Education

A major challenge in integrating ideological and political education into emerging engineering lies in the enduring dominance of technical centralism. Engineering as a discipline has traditionally been defined by its focus on technical expertise, problem-solving efficiency, and measurable outputs. This orientation has cultivated generations of engineers who excel at innovation in hardware and software but often lack systematic engagement with social values, ethical dilemmas, and humanistic concerns. In the context of New Engineering, which emphasizes interdisciplinarity, sustainability, and human-centered design, such a narrow focus is increasingly inadequate.

The tension arises from the perception that values and ethics are "soft" or secondary compared to the "hard" realities of technical design and industrial performance. Students, driven by career ambitions, often prioritize mastering coding languages, simulation tools, and design methodologies while overlooking the broader societal consequences of their work. Similarly, faculty in engineering schools may undervalue ideological education, seeing it as external to their professional identity or as a political imposition rather than an intellectual enrichment. This dichotomy produces an environment where technical training advances rapidly, but moral and ethical formation lags behind, creating an imbalance in talent cultivation.

The result is a disconnection between technical innovation and societal responsibility. Engineers who operate with purely technical rationality may develop solutions that optimize efficiency but neglect long-term sustainability, inclusivity, or fairness. Without a deliberate effort to bridge this gap, ideological and political education risks being marginalized, unable to counterbalance the powerful inertia of technical centralism. Overcoming this tension requires reframing ideological education not as a constraint on technical excellence but as a vital component that elevates engineering practice to meet the complex demands of the twenty-first century.

3.2. Limitations of Faculty Capacity in Interdisciplinary Integration

Another significant challenge lies in the composition and training of faculty. The success of ideological and political education in New Engineering depends heavily on instructors who can bridge disciplinary knowledge with value education. Yet many faculty members, particularly those trained in traditional engineering fields, lack the theoretical grounding and pedagogical strategies required for such integration. Their professional identity is often strongly aligned with technical expertise, publications, and research output, leaving little space for developing competencies in value-oriented teaching.

This limitation is compounded by institutional structures that prioritize research productivity over teaching innovation. Faculty promotion systems typically reward high-impact journal articles, patents, and external funding, while contributions to ideological and political education are undervalued. As a result, even when faculty recognize the importance of ideological integration, they may lack both the incentives and the resources to pursue it. In some cases, ideological and political instruction is relegated to specialized political science departments, creating a disciplinary separation that undermines the goal of embedding values across the curriculum.

Moreover, interdisciplinary teaching requires collaboration between engineering educators and experts in philosophy, sociology, and political science. Such collaboration is often hindered by differences in academic cultures, terminologies, and methodologies. Faculty who attempt to design joint courses may encounter difficulties in aligning teaching objectives, designing interdisciplinary assessments, and maintaining coherence across domains. Without systematic professional development and institutional support, the shortage of faculty who can effectively integrate ideological education into engineering curricula remains a structural obstacle.

3.3. Student Engagement and the Gap Between Value Recognition and Innovation Drive

Students themselves constitute a crucial dimension of the integration challenge. On the one hand, many students acknowledge the importance of values such as social responsibility and sustainability. On the other hand, their educational and professional environments strongly emphasize innovation, competition, and career advancement, often at the expense of value cultivation. This creates a gap between value recognition and innovation drive.

For instance, students in cutting-edge fields such as artificial intelligence or robotics may be highly motivated to push technological boundaries but reluctant to reflect on ethical issues such as job displacement, algorithmic bias, or surveillance. They may perceive ideological education courses as peripheral to their professional growth, leading to passive participation or minimal engagement. This weakens the transformative potential of value education and perpetuates the perception that politics and ethics are external to engineering.

The problem is exacerbated by the way curricula are structured and evaluated. Ideological and political education often takes the form of stand-alone courses, divorced from technical content. Students therefore experience a fragmented learning process: they study technical problems in one classroom and moral concepts in another, without being guided to synthesize the two. Similarly, evaluation systems emphasize grades, technical outputs, and employability, offering little recognition for value-driven achievements such as community service, ethical reasoning, or sustainability initiatives.

These interrelated issues can be summarized in Table 2, which highlights the key barriers and their corresponding impacts on the quality of emerging engineering education.

Table 2. Key Barriers and Corresponding Impacts.

Barrier	Manifestation	Impact on Education Quality
Curriculum Fragmentation	Weak integration of values	Disconnection between knowledge & responsibility
Teacher Limitations	Lack of training in ideological integration	Inconsistent quality of instruction
Student Engagement	Viewing politics as "separate"	Reduced motivation, weaker sense of responsibility
Evaluation Mechanism	Focus on grades & outputs	Neglect of ethics and social value outcomes

As Table 2 illustrates, the integration challenges are systemic, involving curriculum design, faculty development, student motivation, and evaluation criteria. Addressing these barriers requires holistic reforms rather than piecemeal adjustments.

3.4. Teaching Models and Institutional Constraints

A fourth challenge stems from deficiencies in teaching models and institutional systems. Traditional lecture-based instruction, still dominant in many universities, leaves limited space for the kind of interactive, case-based, and project-driven learning that is most effective for integrating values into technical education. Case shortages further limit the effectiveness of ideological education; while real-world engineering dilemmas abound, teaching materials that connect them explicitly to ideological frameworks are underdeveloped. This scarcity leaves instructors reliant on abstract theory rather than applied examples, reducing student engagement and limiting relevance.

Curricular fragmentation also reflects institutional inertia. Engineering programs are often tightly structured around disciplinary requirements, with little flexibility to introduce cross-cutting value-oriented modules. This rigidity not only discourages experimentation with interdisciplinary teaching but also marginalizes ideological content. Moreover, assessment systems remain oriented toward quantitative outputs such as exam scores, patents, and employment rates. Indicators for ethical awareness, social responsibility, or civic participation are either absent or undervalued, making it difficult to measure the success of ideological integration.

Another institutional constraint is the separation between administrative and academic responsibilities. While policy documents may mandate ideological integration, universities often struggle to translate these policies into practical mechanisms. Coordination between academic departments, teaching affairs offices, and student affairs divisions is often weak, resulting in fragmented implementation. Without systemic reform in governance, curriculum design, and evaluation, teaching models remain ill-equipped to address the holistic needs of emerging engineering education.

4. Pathways to Empower High-Quality Development through Ideological and Political Education

The integration of ideological and political education (IPE) into emerging engineering disciplines represents not merely an educational supplement but a fundamental driver of quality improvement. While technological innovation defines the core of new engineering, IPE provides the ethical compass, social vision, and humanistic foundation required for sustainable progress. To realize the vision of high-quality development, institutions must implement comprehensive pathways that span curriculum reform, teaching innovation, faculty and student development, and evaluation restructuring. This section explores these strategies through three interrelated dimensions.

4.1. Embedding IPE in Curriculum and Teaching Practices

The first step toward empowerment is the systematic integration of IPE into engineering curricula. The "all-round education" model advocates that value cultivation should be woven into all stages of learning, not relegated to separate political theory courses. This calls for designing syllabi where ideological elements are organically embedded within technical content. For example, when teaching computer engineering, discussions of algorithmic fairness, cybersecurity ethics, and the social impact of automation can be aligned with core technical knowledge. Similarly, in civil or environmental engineering, lessons on sustainability and ecological responsibility can be incorporated into design modules.

Beyond curricular content, pedagogical reform is equally crucial. Traditional knowledge-transfer methods are insufficient to instill critical thinking and ethical judgment. Instead, case-based learning, project-driven tasks, and interdisciplinary collaboration encourage students to reflect on real-world dilemmas. A project on renewable energy development, for instance, requires learners to consider not only efficiency and cost but also environmental justice and community impact. Virtual simulation tools further expand this potential by enabling students to practice decision-making in complex social-technical contexts, such as disaster response or smart city planning. These methods situate IPE within authentic engineering challenges, transforming abstract values into actionable principles.

In essence, curriculum integration and teaching innovation reshape engineering education from a technology-centered paradigm into one that balances technical capability with moral responsibility, thereby aligning with both national priorities and global sustainability agendas.

4.2. Strengthening Faculty Capacity and Student Agency

While curriculum reform provides the structural framework, its effectiveness depends on the actors who implement it: faculty and students. Faculty members must possess dual competencies—deep technical expertise and the ability to cultivate ethical awareness. However, many engineering educators lack formal training in ideological and political instruction, while political educators may not fully grasp technical contexts. This disconnect can be resolved through structured professional development programs, including interdisciplinary workshops, co-teaching initiatives, and joint research projects that foster collaboration between technical and ideological domains. Such initiatives not only enhance teaching quality but also promote intellectual synergy.

On the student side, empowerment requires fostering active participation and ownership of values. A student-centered approach moves beyond passive reception of lectures toward experiential and reflective learning. Service-learning projects, for instance, allow students to apply engineering skills in real-world social contexts, such as building digital platforms for rural education or designing green technologies for local communities. Innovation competitions that incorporate ethical evaluation criteria also encourage students to connect creativity with responsibility. These practices build a generation of engineers who not only master cutting-edge knowledge but also internalize values of service, accountability, and sustainability.

To summarize these strategies, Table 3 presents a comparative framework that highlights how each pathway of empowerment can be operationalized through practical measures and linked to concrete educational outcomes.

Table 3. Strategies for Empowerment.

Strategy	Practical Measures	Expected Outcomes
Curriculum Integration	Embed value education in engineering syllabi	Value-driven learning

Teaching Innovation	Case-based, interdisciplinary, digital tools	Improved engagement & ethical decision-making
Faculty Development	Training workshops, joint research	Stronger teaching quality
Student-Centered Approach	Service-learning, innovation projects	Enhanced responsibility & creativity
Evaluation Reform	Comprehensive assessment system	Balanced development of skills & values

As illustrated in the table, the effectiveness of IPE-driven empowerment lies not in isolated actions but in a holistic approach that integrates teaching reform, faculty competence, and student agency. Each measure reinforces the others, collectively ensuring that new engineering graduates are shaped into both innovators and responsible global citizens.

4.3. Building Comprehensive Evaluation and Sustainable Empowerment

Finally, the long-term success of IPE integration depends on establishing evaluation systems that recognize both technical and ethical achievements. Current assessment methods in engineering education often privilege grades, productivity, and problem-solving accuracy, while overlooking aspects of value formation. To counter this imbalance, multidimensional assessment frameworks must be designed.

First, curriculum-based evaluations should incorporate ethical case analyses alongside technical problem sets, ensuring that students articulate the value implications of their solutions. Second, project-based assessments should measure teamwork, leadership, and societal impact, not just technical efficiency. Third, reflective components such as journals, portfolios, and peer reviews provide insights into students' personal growth in social responsibility and ethical reasoning. Such tools emphasize process as well as outcomes, encouraging continuous reflection.

This reform of evaluation mechanisms signals to students and faculty alike that values and skills are inseparable dimensions of high-quality engineering education. By systematically recognizing ethical development, institutions establish a sustainable model of empowerment where IPE is not a superficial addition but an integral standard of excellence.

Taken together, embedding IPE into curriculum and teaching, strengthening faculty and student capacities, and reforming evaluation systems constitute a comprehensive pathway. This multidimensional empowerment ensures that the next generation of engineers are not only proficient innovators but also value-driven leaders capable of addressing global challenges with integrity and foresight.

5. Case Studies and Best Practices

The successful integration of ideological and political education (IPE) with emerging engineering disciplines is not merely a theoretical aspiration but has been demonstrated in practice across leading institutions worldwide. Examining these cases provides valuable insights into how different models of integration can inspire transferable practices for other universities. This section highlights both international and domestic experiences, analyzes their distinctive approaches, and identifies replicable strategies for broader application.

5.1. International Experiences: Ethics and Social Responsibility in Engineering Education

A prominent international example comes from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), where engineering ethics has long been embedded into the curriculum as an essential component of professional training. MIT integrates ethical considerations into project-based courses rather than confining them to stand-alone electives. For instance,

design projects in civil engineering often require students to analyze environmental impact, regulatory compliance, and community welfare. Similarly, courses in artificial intelligence emphasize the societal consequences of algorithmic design, including privacy, bias, and accountability.

The MIT model demonstrates how ethical reflection can be systematically woven into technical problem-solving. Instead of treating ethics as supplementary, it is presented as inseparable from innovation. This approach ensures that graduates are not only skilled engineers but also leaders capable of navigating complex social-technical dilemmas. Moreover, MIT's collaboration with industry partners provides students with real-world case studies, making ethical and political discussions tangible rather than abstract. The lesson for global institutions is clear: value-oriented education is most effective when embedded within authentic engineering contexts.

5.2. Domestic Practices: Embedding IPE in New Engineering Initiatives

In China, leading universities such as Tsinghua University and Zhejiang University have pioneered approaches that integrate IPE into the construction of "new engineering". Tsinghua, for example, emphasizes the cultivation of "whole-person" engineers by aligning technical training with national development goals and global sustainability challenges. Their interdisciplinary platforms bring together engineering, humanities, and social sciences to address issues such as green energy, smart cities, and digital governance. These initiatives highlight the dual focus on technical advancement and value orientation.

Zhejiang University has adopted a similar strategy through its innovation-driven teaching reforms. Engineering courses are designed with embedded ideological elements that stress social responsibility, patriotism, and sustainability. Case-based teaching is particularly emphasized: for instance, when students work on projects in environmental engineering, they are asked to assess how their solutions align with the national agenda of ecological civilization. This model underscores that IPE is not limited to classroom lectures but extends into project-driven, experiential learning.

The Chinese cases illustrate that when ideological goals are aligned with both institutional missions and broader societal imperatives, IPE becomes a source of motivation for students rather than a formal requirement. By linking engineering knowledge with questions of responsibility, universities foster a generation of engineers capable of balancing innovation with public good.

5.3. Transferable Insights and Broader Implications

From these cases, several best practices emerge that can be applied across diverse educational settings. First, integration is most effective when IPE is embedded in existing courses and projects rather than taught in isolation. Embedding ensures relevance, as students directly experience how values shape technical outcomes. Second, project-based and interdisciplinary teaching methods bridge the gap between abstract ideology and concrete engineering practice. Whether through community service, sustainability challenges, or industry collaborations, experiential learning deepens students' ethical understanding.

Third, faculty development is indispensable. Both MIT and Chinese universities invest in teacher training and interdisciplinary collaboration, ensuring that educators can bridge technical knowledge with ideological guidance. Fourth, alignment with institutional and national missions enhances legitimacy and student engagement. When students see that value education connects with broader goals—such as sustainable development, innovation leadership, or ecological responsibility—they are more likely to internalize these values.

These practices demonstrate that the integration of IPE with engineering education is neither culturally unique nor institutionally constrained. While the specific ideological content may vary across contexts, the overarching principles of ethics, responsibility, and

sustainability are universally applicable. By adopting embedded curricula, innovative pedagogy, strong faculty training, and mission-oriented frameworks, institutions worldwide can empower engineering education with a balanced emphasis on knowledge, skills, and values.

6. Conclusion and Future Directions

This review has examined the critical role of ideological and political education (IPE) in empowering the high-quality development of emerging engineering disciplines. Through theoretical analysis, identification of challenges, exploration of practical pathways, and examination of domestic and international case studies, it is evident that IPE is not merely an adjunct to technical training but a foundational component that shapes responsible, ethical, and socially aware engineers. Embedding value education within curricula, innovating pedagogical approaches, developing dual-competence faculty, fostering student agency, and reforming evaluation systems collectively ensure that engineering education addresses both technical competence and societal responsibility.

The effectiveness of IPE is demonstrated through diverse best practices. Internationally, institutions like MIT show that integrating ethics and social responsibility into project-based courses produces engineers capable of navigating complex technological and societal dilemmas. Domestically, universities such as Tsinghua and Zhejiang exemplify how ideological education can be aligned with national development priorities and interdisciplinary initiatives, cultivating "whole-person" engineers who balance innovation with public welfare. These experiences highlight the feasibility and necessity of embedding IPE in new engineering curricula, demonstrating that high-quality technical education and value-oriented formation are mutually reinforcing rather than competing objectives.

Looking forward, several directions merit attention for research and practice. First, digital technologies can further enhance IPE integration through virtual simulations, online ethics platforms, and AI-assisted learning analytics, creating interactive environments that strengthen ethical decision-making. Second, international comparative studies can provide insights into diverse models of IPE integration, enabling institutions to adopt context-sensitive best practices. Third, deeper cross-disciplinary collaboration between engineering, social sciences, and humanities can foster curricula that simultaneously advance innovation, societal awareness, and ethical responsibility.

From a policy and practice perspective, the findings suggest that universities and educational authorities should prioritize structural support for IPE, including faculty training, curriculum flexibility, and multi-dimensional evaluation systems. Embedding ideological and political education as an intrinsic component of engineering programs ensures that graduates are not only technically proficient but also capable of contributing responsibly to society, industry, and global sustainability. In essence, the integration of IPE into emerging engineering represents a strategic lever for cultivating the next generation of engineers who are ethically grounded, socially conscious, and professionally competent.

Funding: Student Work Project of Guangdong Ocean University, project source: "High-Quality Ideological and Political Work Empowers the High-Quality Development of Emerging Engineering Disciplines" (2024TS006).

References

1. L. Zhang, Y. Q. Xia, and G. Zhou, "Exploration and Practice of Ideological and Political Education: Taking Engineering Majors as an Example," in *2024 5th International Conference on Mental Health, Education and Human Development (MHEHD 2024)*, 2024, pp. 234-242.
2. H. W. Gao, "Innovation and development of ideological and political education in colleges and universities in the network era," *International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*, vol. 60, no. 2_suppl, pp. 489-499, 2023, doi: 10.1177/00207209211013470.

3. K. Li, M. Jing, X. Tao, and Y. Duan, "Research on online management system of network ideological and political education of college students," *International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*, vol. 60, no. 2_suppl, pp. 377-388, 2023, doi: 10.1177/0020720920983704.
4. D. A. Martin, G. Bombaerts, M. Horst, K. Papageorgiou, and G. Viscusi, "Pedagogical orientations and evolving responsibilities of technological universities: A literature review of the history of engineering education," *Science and Engineering Ethics*, vol. 29, no. 6, p. 40, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11948-023-00460-2.
5. X. Zhao and J. Zhang, "The analysis of integration of ideological political education with innovation entrepreneurship education for college students," *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 12, p. 610409, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.610409.
6. H. Xiaoyang, Z. Junzhi, F. Jingyuan, and Z. Xiuxia, "Effectiveness of ideological and political education reform in universities based on data mining artificial intelligence technology," *Journal of Intelligent & Fuzzy Systems*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 3743-3754, 2021, doi: 10.3233/JIFS-189408.
7. G. Yun, R. V. Ravi, and A. K. Jumani, "Analysis of the teaching quality on deep learning-based innovative ideological political education platform," *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 175-186, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s13748-021-00272-0.
8. Y. Jin, "Analysis of college students' entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial psychological quality from the perspective of ideological and political education," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, p. 739353, 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.739353.
9. T. Zhang, X. Lu, X. Zhu, and J. Zhang, "The contributions of AI in the development of ideological and political perspectives in education," *Heliyon*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e13403.
10. Z. Rui, "Research on evaluation system of ideological and political education of college students based on decision system," *Soft Computing*, vol. 26, no. 20, pp. 10805-10812, 2022, doi: 10.1007/s00500-022-07003-0.
11. N. Wang, "Ideological and political education recommendation system based on ahp and improved collaborative filtering algorithm," *Scientific Programming*, 2021, Art. no. 2648352, doi: 10.1155/2021/2648352.
12. F. Qi, Y. Chang, K. Ramesh, and P. Hemalatha, "Online and offline teaching connection system of college ideological and political education based on deep learning," *Progress in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 163-174, 2023, doi: 10.1007/s13748-021-00268-w.
13. X. He, P. Chen, J. Wu, and Z. Dong, "Deep learning-based teaching strategies of ideological and political courses under the background of educational psychology," *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 12, p. 731166, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731166.