

Original Paper

The Construction Path of “Teaching-Learning-Assessment
Integration” in Senior High School English ——Based on the
Innovation of Academic Quality Standards: From the
Perspective of the Revised Curriculum Standards to the Daily
Revised Curriculum Standards

Yuhong Li¹

¹ Xi'an International Studies University, Xi'an, China

Received: February 23, 2026

Accepted: March 8, 2026

Online Published: March 26, 2026

doi:10.22158/elsr.v7n1p137

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/elsr.v7n1p137>

Abstract

The National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools (2017 Edition), the National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools (2017 Edition, 2020 Revision) and the National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools (Daily Revised Edition, 2017 Edition, 2025 Revision) have continuously promoted the refinement of academic quality standards. The fundamental reform of basic education in the new era takes the cultivation of core competencies as its core objective, and the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” serves as the critical pathway to actualize competency cultivation in practice. Academic quality standards bridge core competencies and instructional assessment; therefore, constructing pathways for “teaching-learning-assessment integration” based on the innovation of academic quality standards is an inevitable response to the competency-oriented reform. This study aims to clarify the intrinsic logic between academic quality standards and “teaching-learning-assessment integration”, so as to implement the requirements of the curriculum standards, address practical challenges in teaching, and enhance the quality of high school English education.

Keywords

High school, Curriculum standards, Academic quality standards, teaching-learning-assessment integration

1. Introduction

1.1 Research Background

The Revision Group of the English Curriculum Standards for General High Schools (hereinafter referred to as the “Revision Group”) adheres to the fundamental task of fostering virtue and cultivating talents and the goal of building an educational power. It innovates and develops on the basis of inheritance. In the new era, the reform of basic education focuses on the cultivation of core competencies as its core goal, and “teaching-learning-assessment integration” is the key path to bridging the final mile of competency cultivation. As a core subject that combines instrumental and humanistic aspects, the effectiveness of competency cultivation in high school English highly depends on a scientific evaluation system. The academic quality standards are the core hub connecting the competency goals with teaching evaluation. Based on the innovation of academic quality standards, constructing an integrated path is an inevitable choice in response to the competency-oriented reform.

The *National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools* (2017 Edition) (hereinafter referred to as the “Revised Curriculum Standards”) (2018) and the *National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools* (2017 Edition, 2020 Revision) (hereinafter referred to as the “2020 Curriculum Standards”) (2020) propose academic quality standards oriented towards core competencies, providing a practical platform for the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” practice. However, during the actual implementation, problems such as mismatch with the actual teaching on the ground and unclear implementation of disciplinary education have been exposed. The *National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools* (Daily Revised Edition, 2017 Edition, 2025 Revision) (hereinafter referred to as the “Daily Revised Curriculum Standards”) (2025) systematically innovates the academic quality standards in response to these issues. This innovation not only continues the core orientation of the revised curriculum standards and the 2020 curriculum standards, but also proposes more precise and more operational requirements. It urgently needs to construct an appropriate “teaching-learning-assessment integration” path to effectively implement the revision concepts of the curriculum standards. In current high school English teaching, some teachers do not have a deep understanding of the curriculum standards, which leads to ambiguous teaching objectives and a single evaluation method, making it difficult to effectively support the cultivation of students’ qualities. At the same time, in the face of the innovative academic quality standards in the daily revised curriculum standards, teachers lack clear guidance for integrated practice and are confused about how to adapt. If the internal logic of the revision logic of different versions of the curriculum standards can be clarified and transformed into an actionable “teaching-learning-assessment integration” path, it can not only ensure the continuity of curriculum standard revisions but also directly address the pain points in teaching practice, thereby improving the quality of English teaching.

1.2 Research Significance

1.2.1 Theoretical Significance

The existing research on “teaching-learning-assessment integration” mostly focuses on a single curriculum standard background. This study, however, is based on the dynamic perspective of curriculum standard revision. By systematically reviewing the progressive innovation logic of academic quality standards in the revised curriculum standards, the 2020 curriculum standards, and the daily revised curriculum standards, it clarifies the evolution pattern from the establishment of core competencies to the contextual implementation. It deeply analyzes the intrinsic relationship between the innovation of academic quality standards and the construction of “teaching-learning-assessment integration”, and can construct a theoretical framework for “teaching-learning-assessment integration” based on the conformity and innovation of multiple versions of curriculum standards. This will supplement the deficiency of systematic theoretical support for related research under the cross-version curriculum standard connection, and at the same time expand the application scenarios of the evaluation theory for English teaching under the orientation of core competencies.

1.2.2 Practical Significance

The “teaching-learning-assessment integration” approach constructed in this study, which takes into account both inheritance and adaptability, can provide high school English teachers with materials for bridging the gap between different curriculum standards. It can strengthen the theoretical research on the connection between curriculum standard revisions and teaching practice, reveal the core laws of the transformation of curriculum standard texts into teaching practice, and help teachers grasp the inheritance points and innovative core of the academic quality standards of the three versions of the curriculum. At the same time, it can clarify the connection logic of each curriculum standard, providing teachers at the front line with reference solutions and cases for optimizing teaching practice and solving the problem of disconnection between “teaching, learning, and assessment”. By promoting the precise connection between “teaching, learning, assessment” and academic quality standards, it can effectively improve the quality of English teaching and the effectiveness of core literacy cultivation.

1.3 Research Approach and Methods

This study is centered on the progressive innovation of the academic quality standards in the revised curriculum standards, the 2020 curriculum standards, and the daily revised curriculum standards. Firstly, through the literature research method, it systematically examines the inheritance and innovation logic of the academic quality standards in the three versions of the curriculum standards, clarifying their evolution in relation to the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” framework. Then, through the comparative research method, it conducts a comparison of the academic quality standards in different versions of the curriculum standards to clarify the internal logic of the evolution of the academic quality standards. Finally, based on the aforementioned analysis, a high school English “teaching-learning-assessment integration” path that balances inheritance and adaptability is constructed.

2. Definition of Core Concepts

2.1 Academic Quality Standards

In 2014, the Ministry of Education issued a special document clearly stating that all subjects should establish a system for students' core literacy and academic quality standards. This requirement was fulfilled in the revised curriculum standards of various subjects subsequently. The academic quality standards we often refer to are not arbitrary rules and regulations; instead, they are closely integrated with the core literacy requirements of each subject and the specific course content, and are formulated as standardized teaching and evaluation bases. The core purpose of establishing academic quality standards is to be able to scientifically evaluate the development level of students' core literacy. It not only focuses on the cultivation of students' core literacy, such as whether they possess language application, cultural awareness, and thinking qualities, but also divides their academic quality into different levels and standards based on their actual learning outcomes. It also clearly stipulates the specific achievement requirements for students at each stage. This standard always places the cultivation of core literacy of the subject and the actual practical performance of students in the core position, not just simply judging by the score level, but also examining the breadth of students' knowledge acquisition, the proficiency of skill practice, and the frequency of participation in learning activities, etc. At the same time, academic quality standards are also an important part of educational quality. It can directly reflect the actual effect of education and teaching. If students can steadily achieve the literacy goals at each stage under the requirements of academic quality standards, it indicates that our classroom teaching is effective and our educational direction is precise. The implementation effect of academic quality standards can also reflect the overall level of current basic education development in China and demonstrate the core direction of education's transformation from "knowledge-based" to "competencies-based" approach.

The development and application of academic quality standards in the international education field have only been ongoing for a relatively short period of time. Just like curriculum standards, they are both products of the "standardization movement" in the field of education, and their relationship is very close. From the reform experiences in the West, such standardized educational reforms mainly focus on two key standards: one is the content standard, which clearly stipulates what specific knowledge students should learn in different educational stages, what core contents they should master, and what cognitive abilities they need to develop. In simple terms, it is to clearly define "what to learn and what cognitive skills to possess"; the other is the academic quality standard, which is often referred to as "academic achievement standard" in the West. It does not involve new learning content but focuses on the effects of students after completing the content standard. Moreover, the development of curriculum standards varies in different countries, and their focuses are also different. Some countries' curriculum standards mainly focus on the content standard, some give more emphasis to academic quality or achievement standards, and some countries incorporate both the content standard and the academic quality standard into their curriculum standards.

The research on “academic quality standards” in our country started relatively late. The goal of the basic education curriculum reform in 2001 was very clear, which was to formulate unified curriculum standards for all subjects. After multiple rounds of reforms, the curriculum standards became a consensus in the basic education field, and reforms in textbooks, teaching, and evaluation all revolved around the curriculum standards. The “standardization movement” flourished in our country. Academic standards should include content standards and academic quality standards. However, the old version of the curriculum standards exposed problems such as being disconnected from teaching practice, lacking basis for teaching implementation and evaluation, and not clearly setting requirements for the cultivation of subject abilities and related to academic quality standards. Domestic scholars have proposed many improvement suggestions for these problems. Yang Xiangdong (2012) proposed that an independent academic quality standard could be formulated separately from the existing curriculum standards, which could not only supplement and improve the existing curriculum standards but also be more in line with reality and have operational feasibility. Lei Xinyong (2012) believed that the formulation of academic quality standards must be based on the curriculum standards. Yao Linqun and Guo Yuanxiang (2012) pointed out that academic quality standards need to be coordinated and unified with the subject curriculum standards and be compatible and complementary. In 2014, the Ministry of Education proposed to research and develop a system for student development core competencies and academic quality standards, a requirement that prompted various disciplines to specifically add content related to academic quality standards in their curriculum standards. The subsequently released revised curriculum standards established, for the first time, a four-dimensional competency-oriented framework centered on language ability, cultural awareness, thinking capacity, and learning ability, while also providing a corresponding three-level quality classification. The 2020 curriculum standards focused on practical optimization, detailed the core literacy connotations, improved teaching and evaluation suggestions, and enhanced guidance for frontline teaching; the daily revised curriculum standards made breakthrough innovations, abandoned the traditional itemized expression, precisely connected with the core competencies levels, emphasized the consistency of “teaching - learning - evaluation”, supplemented contemporary themes, and formed a more precise and more operational quality standard system.

2.2 Teaching-Learning-Assessment Integration

In high school English, the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” aims to shift the assessment towards a student-skill-oriented approach, ensuring that the assessment precisely aligns with the educational goals. It ensures that teaching, learning, and assessment are closely integrated. Teaching focuses on teachers’ teaching practices, requiring them to formulate and implement teaching objectives based on the curriculum standards and students’ learning situations; Learning covers the entire process of students’ learning; “Assessment” takes the lead among the three elements, mainly referring to classroom assessment, with the core being the content, goals, and standards of the assessment. The assessment should run throughout the entire teaching process, with teaching objectives aligning with the academic quality requirements, teaching activities serving the goals and the cultivation of skills,

advocating complementary diverse assessment methods and participation of multiple assessment entities, flexible and scientific assessment methods, and extending the assessment to before and after classes through lesson plans and homework design.

The proposal of the integrated concept of teaching, learning and assessment has drawn on relevant theoretical research and teaching practice achievements from abroad. Taylor (1949) emphasized that the goal is the starting point and the endpoint of curriculum development, reflecting the consistency between the goal and assessment. After Taylor, Bloom and others systematically established the taxonomy of educational objectives, not only clearly expounding the specific connotation of effective teaching assessment, but also clearly sorting out and establishing the consistency logic between teaching goals, teaching implementation and academic assessment, laying the foundation and providing support for the practical implementation and promotion of the integrated theory of teaching, learning and assessment. In the 1980s, a standard-based curriculum reform movement emerged in the United States. The core of this reform was to examine whether the teaching design was in line with the requirements of the curriculum standards (Huang & Liu, 2014). The American educational psychologist Cohen (1987) first proposed the concept of consistency between teaching, learning and assessment, but did not conduct a systematic study on it. Weber (1999) conducted in-depth and comprehensive research on consistency and laid the foundation for subsequent research.

The research on educational evaluation in our country started relatively late. Influenced by foreign research and domestic curriculum reforms, domestic scholars have conducted a series of discussions and studies on the integration of teaching, learning and evaluation. Tang Yunbo (2013) defined the integration of teaching, learning and evaluation as a teaching paradigm, pointed out that the learning plan is the carrier of this paradigm, and advocated integrating evaluation throughout the classroom teaching. Cui Yunhuo and Xia Xuemei (2013) pointed out that the teaching activities of teachers, the learning process of students and the classroom evaluation work must all be anchored on the same goal, and such teaching design can be called effective. Cui Yunhuo and Lei Hao (2015) further explained that the consistency of teaching, learning and evaluation is not a scattered teaching requirement, but a systematic and holistic system centered on teaching objectives. Therefore, in teaching design, the three activities of teaching, learning and evaluation need to be planned comprehensively. In addition, Cui Yunhuo (2015) proposed in *Instruction and Assessment Aimed at Learning Improvement* that the teaching and evaluation that can truly point to the improvement of students' learning have the following characteristics: first, always take students' learning as the core of classroom teaching; second, evaluation should be integrated into the entire learning process, and timely feedback can help students adjust their learning status; third, the goals of teaching, learning and evaluation must remain unified. Lu Zhen (2016) proposed that the integration of teaching, learning and evaluation belongs to a teaching method driven by evaluation. This method can fully exert the dual functions of promoting learning and stimulating development of evaluation, and enable evaluation to participate in the entire learning process of students to the greatest extent. Ding Liyun (2018) explained from the perspective of the relationship among teaching, learning and evaluation,

and proposed that teaching, learning and evaluation do not exist independently, but are a cyclic process of mutual integration and close connection in the teaching activity. Wang Yunsheng explained the integration of teaching, learning and evaluation from the perspective of curriculum concepts, advocating that the goals of teaching, learning and evaluation are unified, setting teaching goals based on curriculum standards, coordinating the design of teaching, learning and evaluation, and optimizing teaching based on evaluation, to achieve teaching goals. Wang Qiang and Li Liang (2019) believed that in the teaching, learning and evaluation integrated classroom model, teaching, learning and evaluation are the three aspects of a complete teaching activity, and curriculum standards can be effectively implemented in classroom teaching, thereby promoting the development of students' core subject literacy. Yang Yuqin (2020) believed that the integration of teaching, learning and evaluation is based on evaluation as a connection, and evaluation is based on students' learning, which can promote students' learning and teachers' teaching.

The related research on the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” in high school English in China has always been deeply intertwined with the revision of the high school English curriculum standards. The two are mutually reinforcing and closely related, and the core direction of the research has always been centered around the requirements proposed by the new curriculum standards, exploring the practical implementation paths of “teaching-learning-assessment integration” that are suitable for the actual high school English teaching in our country. In the revised curriculum standards, the teaching requirements of “teaching-learning-assessment integration” were first clearly proposed. During this stage, most of the research focused on the interpretation of concepts and the initial exploration of teaching practices. After the 2020 curriculum standards was officially implemented, domestic related research also had new focuses. It no longer remained at the level of concept interpretation but instead conducted more targeted research on the problems encountered in the implementation of “teaching-learning-assessment integration” in high school English classrooms. With the continuous implementation and deep advancement of the daily revised curriculum standards, the standards also proposed more innovative requirements that are more in line with the cultivation of new era qualities. For example, it particularly emphasizes contextualized teaching, which has also given rise to new directions and depths for the research on “teaching-learning-assessment integration” in China, and has begun to conduct more forward-looking explorations and practices based on these new requirements.

3. Theoretical Foundation

3.1 Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives

In 1956, Bloom proposed to classify educational objectives. This theory has been widely adopted by the global education community, dividing educational objectives into three major domains. These domains are in a descending order of complexity, with the cognitive domain being divided into six levels in noun form, such as knowledge and comprehension. Since then, this theory has attracted widespread attention and has been continuously improved. Bloom's student Anderson and scholar Krathwohl (2001) revised

the cognitive classification while retaining the original framework, changing the six-level terms from nouns to verbs to strengthen the correlation between the goals and evaluation, and proposing that educational objectives should be both operational and measurable, providing precise guidance for instructional design and learning evaluation.

In this study, this theory provides support for the hierarchical implementation of academic quality standards and the positioning of the “teaching-learning-assessment” goals, decomposing the abstract academic quality standards into different levels of requirements that are operational and feasible.

3.2 Multiple Intelligences

The Theory of Multiple Intelligences was proposed by the renowned American psychologist Gardner (1983). After long-term in-depth research and practical verification, he defined intelligence as the ability of an individual to independently solve various problems encountered in real life, to actively raise new questions and find solutions, as well as the ability to create value for one’s own culture and provide services. Everyone is born with multiple types of intelligence, not just one. For example, we are familiar with linguistic intelligence, logical-mathematical intelligence, spatial intelligence, musical intelligence, as well as bodily-kinesthetic intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, and others. These different types of intelligence exist independently in each individual and do not replace each other. Each person’s combination of intelligence patterns is also different. This theory emphasizes the individuality and diversity of intelligence and, based on this core viewpoint, advocates that our educational activities should not use a uniform standard to require all students, nor should they use a single method to cultivate all students. Instead, we should respect the intelligence differences of each student and implement individualized teaching based on their characteristics.

This theory provides very important theoretical support and basis for the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” practice path, especially strengthening the theoretical foundation for the diversified design and personalized implementation of the integrated path. When designing English teaching activities, teachers should no longer follow the same classroom model. Instead, they should fully consider the learning needs and characteristics of students with different types of intelligence, so that students with different intelligence advantages can all find their own learning methods and participate in classroom learning.

4. The Innovation Trajectory and Core Analysis of Academic Quality Standards in the Three Versions of Senior High School English Curriculum Standards

4.1 Core Content and Foundational Role of the Revised Curriculum Standards

To implement the educational goal and requirements of the 19th National Congress regarding the cultivation of socialist builders and successors, and to ensure the implementation of the principle of fostering virtue and developing talents, the Ministry of Education has incorporated the latest educational concepts and achievements from both domestic and international contexts. In 2018, it released the revised

curriculum standards and revised them again in 2020. This revision of the curriculum standards can be said to be in line with the development of the times (Wang, 2018).

Traditional assessment only focuses on knowledge points and single skills, such as memorizing vocabulary, completing grammar fill-in-the-blank exercises, and literal reading comprehension. These cannot detect core competencies. The revised curriculum standards, on the other hand, emphasize situations and define academic quality levels as the key characteristics that students use to solve problems in different complex situations. Academic quality is divided into three levels, corresponding to compulsory courses, elective compulsory courses, and elective courses. This has certain reference significance for teachers' daily teaching, curriculum design, and implementation, and also provides a basis for the formulation of various English examinations. At the same time, the academic quality standards point to core competencies and require students to apply knowledge and strategies in context to understand and express. They are closely linked to the curriculum goals and contents. Additionally, the revised curriculum standards have added an independent chapter on academic quality, setting evaluation standards for each level of academic quality and improving the curriculum system, truly achieving a curriculum centered on the curriculum goals.

4.2 Transitional Optimization and Implementation Effectiveness of the 2020 Curriculum Standards

The 2020 curriculum standards closely align with the fundamental task of fostering virtue and cultivating talents, strictly implementing the Party's educational policies, and unwaveringly following the path of socialist education development in China (Meng, 2024). Regarding how high school English teaching can better play its role in educating, more specific and clear requirements have also been put forward. This version retains the core framework and core quality orientation of the previous revised curriculum standards, in order to ensure that students' quality cultivation remains coherent and is adapted to current needs. At the same time, it has always adhered to using thematic contexts to guide the entire curriculum content system. Based on China's basic national conditions and the inherent laws of foreign language education, the expression of some course objectives has been refined more meticulously, making these goals more in line with the actual situation of frontline teaching and more convenient for teachers to use and implement.

Since its promulgation, this curriculum standard has quickly gained widespread attention in the education field and high recognition from frontline teachers, providing clear and powerful guidance for the reform of high school English teaching.

4.3 Breakthrough Innovations and Core Orientation of the Daily Revised Curriculum Standards

The daily revised curriculum standards are an important measure for implementing the decisions of the 20th National Congress of the Communist Party of China, the successive plenary sessions of the 20th Central Committee, and the National Education Conference, as well as the tasks stipulated in the *Planning Outline for the Construction of an Education Powerhouse (2024-2035)*. They are also necessary for deepening the construction of the general high school English curriculum and further enhancing the educational function of the curriculum (Chen, 2025). This adjustment and improvement of the curriculum

standards respond to the actual needs of frontline practice, making targeted and necessary revisions to make the curriculum standards more suitable for current teaching realities. Among them, the academic quality standards have undergone a comprehensive reconfiguration and upgrading, optimizing based on the real scenarios that students will encounter in daily life. It not only improves the description of quality levels but also strengthens the connection with examination and evaluation, providing clear guidance for teachers' evaluation work. This revision process is not an isolated modification of a certain part, but combines specific curriculum content to clearly express the achievement of goals at each learning stage. The most obvious change is the alteration of the expression method, discarding the previous itemized description and setting three types of realistic scenarios close to students' lives. It describes how students use the knowledge they have learned to solve practical problems in these scenarios and integrates value guidance. The revised academic quality standards have obvious advantages. They precisely align with core competencies, clearly show the state of students' competencies, optimize the presentation form, and are no longer scattered knowledge points but highlight the comprehensiveness of competencies; they also provide clear and feasible standards for examination and evaluation, solving the problems of previous standards being vague and disconnected from teaching.

5. Construction of the “Teaching-Learning-Assessment Integration” Path for High School English Based on the Innovation of Academic Quality Standards

5.1 Construction of the Logic

The revision of the curriculum standards has always been based on the discipline of English education itself, aiming to adapt to the latest development trends and solve problems in teaching practice, thus forming a scientific development logic. On one hand, it actively incorporates the latest research achievements in English education from both domestic and international sources, integrating advanced educational concepts and teaching methods in each version of the curriculum standards in stages, ensuring that the curriculum standards always align with the frontiers of the discipline. On the other hand, it closely follows the development trends of “situational teaching” and “society-oriented education”, forming a progressive sequence from the foundation laid in 2017, optimization in 2020, and deepening in 2025: The revised curriculum standards establish a core quality orientation, laying the foundation for quality education; the 2020 curriculum standards optimizes the expression and grade-level alignment, making the practice more adaptable; the daily revised curriculum standards further deepen the quality orientation and improve the situational teaching and evaluation system. Moreover, the revision also focuses on practical issues, systematically sorting out the practical problems encountered in the implementation of the previous version of the curriculum standards in stages, making targeted adjustments and improvements, achieving the iterative upgrade of the curriculum system and promoting the continuous healthy development of the English education discipline. It connects with the reform of basic education evaluation, breaks the single evaluation model, strengthens the “teaching-learning-assessment” integration, promotes the transformation of evaluation towards a quality-oriented approach,

and ensures that the evaluation precisely aligns with the educational goals. Strictly implement the requirements of traditional Chinese culture education, strengthen the teaching of Chinese culture vocabulary and cross-cultural communication content in each version of the curriculum standards, help students enhance cultural confidence and inherit traditional culture.

5.2 Target Positioning

Target positioning is the first step of the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” approach. It should be based on the progressive requirements of the three editions of the curriculum standards for academic quality. By studying how the academic quality standards of these three editions have evolved, it helps teachers understand the transformation logic from item-based quality requirements to contextualized quality descriptions, and accurately grasp the specific quality indicators in the three types of scenarios: “daily life”, “learning activities”, and “cross-cultural communication”.

Secondly, teachers need to break down the academic quality standards into layers to make the teaching goals more effective. The core is to use the three types of real scenarios mentioned in the revised curriculum standards as the main framework, and combine the themes of each unit in the textbook to decompose the relatively macro core literacy requirements in the academic quality standards into small, directly applicable teaching unit goals.

Finally, teachers should guide students to understand the role of the academic quality standards and help them truly become the masters of learning. Teachers do not need to conduct complex explanations; the most direct way is to clearly explain the standards in class using language that students can understand. Especially at the beginning of a new unit, clearly inform students of the learning objectives, assessment standards, and evaluation methods of this unit. After making these clear, students will have a clear direction for their efforts and will no longer blindly follow the teacher’s rhythm. In this way, students’ learning becomes more targeted, their awareness of autonomous learning will gradually improve, and they will truly transform from passive observers of learning to active learners.

5.3 Collaborative Design of Teaching

The mutual coordination of teaching and learning is the key to achieving the “teaching-learning-assessment integration”. It is necessary to strictly follow the academic quality standards, especially the contextual requirements in the daily revised curriculum standards, to design teaching activities and learning platforms oriented towards the cultivation of qualities.

In terms of teaching activities, the core is to create contextualized and task-based models. Teachers should combine the real situations corresponding to the unit themes and design clear tasks, integrating scattered language knowledge and skills into them. For example, in the “daily life” context-oriented “shopping” theme unit, design real tasks such as “cross-border online shopping consultation” and “supermarket bilingual shopping guide”; in the “cross-cultural communication” context-oriented “cultural festivals” theme unit, design practical tasks such as “Chinese and foreign festival culture salon” and “Chinese culture overseas dissemination short video production”.

In terms of learning platforms, a diversified learning system combining autonomy and cooperation needs to be constructed. On the one hand, teachers should guide students to use the learning platform to conduct autonomous learning in accordance with the academic quality standards. The key is to find and provide students with appropriate learning resources, helping them lay a solid foundation, such as uploading a series of targeted resources on the platform based on the unit themes in the textbook. On the other hand, the learning platform should also provide a framework for cooperative learning. Teachers can help students form cooperative groups on the platform and clearly define the responsibilities of each member, such as some responsible for collecting materials, some for organizing discussions, and some for organizing the results, to avoid unclear division of responsibilities.

5.4 Evaluation Feedback Mechanism

Evaluation is the core link of the “teaching-learning-assessment integration”. It should be based on the academic quality standards of the three editions of the curriculum standards, and establish an evaluation system that is both suitable for students’ real-life learning scenarios, has diverse evaluation methods, and can promptly provide feedback to students and teachers. When building this evaluation system, the core is to achieve “three considerations”. Only when all these points are met can the evaluation truly serve teaching and learning. The first consideration is that both formative evaluation during the learning process and summative evaluation at the end of the term or unit should be taken into account, and especially the role of formative evaluation should be emphasized. The second consideration is that the evaluation subjects should be more diverse, and cannot rely solely on the teacher. In addition to the teacher’s evaluation, students’ self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and mutual evaluation among classmates should also be included. For example, after the completion of a unit of study, students can rate themselves against the quality standards. The third consideration is that the evaluation methods should be diverse, and must closely adhere to the three real-life scenarios mentioned in the revised curriculum standards: daily life, learning activities, and cross-cultural communication. Emphasize contextualized performance-based evaluation. For example, in the “daily life” scenario, through performance tasks such as simulated shopping and traffic consultation, evaluate students’ language application ability; collect students’ task completion works, reflection diaries, self-evaluation and mutual evaluation records through learning portfolios to comprehensively present students’ learning process and development trajectory of their qualities.

The precise design of evaluation tools is the foundation for ensuring the effectiveness of evaluation. Therefore, when designing these tools, they should be developed based on the progressive requirements of the academic quality standards of the three editions of the curriculum standards, and developed with contextualized and precise evaluation tools. For the three types of scenarios in the daily revised curriculum standards, corresponding performance-based task evaluation scales should be designed, and the evaluation dimensions, specific evaluation indicators, and grade standards should be clearly written in the scales. At the same time, some daily-used evaluation forms should also be designed, such as

developing classroom participation evaluation forms, unit learning self-evaluation forms, and peer evaluation forms, etc. tools.

6. Conclusion

This research is based on the iterative evolution of the revised curriculum standards, the 2020 curriculum standards, and the daily revised curriculum standards. It closely focuses on the key innovations in academic quality standards within each curriculum standard update. Firstly, it clarifies the intrinsic connection between academic quality standards and the “teaching-learning-assessment integration”. Then, it constructs a set of practical paths that are in line with the actual teaching scenarios at the front line. This path transforms the relatively abstract and macroscopic requirements in the curriculum standards into teaching steps that teachers can directly implement in the classroom. It helps teachers smoothly transition between the old and new curriculum standards, accurately grasp the inheritance points and innovation core of academic quality standards, and ultimately achieve a dual improvement in English teaching quality and the cultivation of students’ core competencies. Of course, this research is not the end. There are still many directions that can be further explored in the future. For example, the learning situations of different schools vary, and the students’ foundations in key high schools and ordinary high schools are different. Rural schools and urban schools also have different teaching resources. In the future, more practical teaching experiments can be conducted based on these different learning situations and teaching scenarios to continuously optimize the adaptability and flexibility of this optimization path. This will promote the continuous deepening of the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” practice in high school English in the context of quality-oriented education reform, and provide a more solid foundation for the high-quality development of high school English education in the background of educational power construction.

References

- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. *Longman Publishing*, 10(5), 139.
- Bloom, B. S., Englehart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, handbook I: The cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Cohen, S. A. (1987). Instructional Alignment: Searching for a Magic Bullet. *Educational Researcher*, 16(8), 16-19. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X016008016>
- Cui, Y. (2015). Instruction and assessment aimed at learning improvement. *Educational Measurement and Evaluation* (Theory Edition), (1), 1.
- Cui, Y., & Lei, H. (2015). Construction of a three-factor theoretical model of teaching-learning-assessment alignment. *Journal of East China Normal University* (Educational Sciences), 33(4), 15-22.

- Cui, Y., & Xia, X. (2013). “Teaching-learning-assessment alignment”: Significance and implications. *Management in Primary and Secondary Schools*, (1), 4-6.
- Ding, L. (2018). Problems in the implementation of “teaching-learning-assessment integration” and their solutions. *Journal of the Chinese Society of Education*, (3), 66-68.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Huang, S., & Liu, L. (2014). Teaching-learning-assessment alignment: New trends in classroom research and instruction—A review of the 12th Shanghai International Curriculum Forum. *Research in Educational Development*, 33(22), 82-84.
- Lei, X. (2012). Reflections on constructing national basic education academic quality standards. *Basic Education Curriculum*, (7), 58-61.
- Lu, Z. (2016). Unveiling teaching-learning-assessment integration. *Basic Education Curriculum*, (7), 8-11, 28.
- Mei, D., & Wang, Q. (2025). Interpretation of the National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools (Daily Revised Edition, 2017 Edition, 2025 Revision). *Basic Education Curriculum*, (12), 43-45.
- Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China. (2018). *National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools* (2017 Edition). People’s Education Press.
- Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China. (2020). *National English Curriculum Standards for Senior High Schools* (2017 Edition, 2020 Revision). People’s Education Press.
- Tang, Y. (2013). Construction and implementation of the “teaching-learning-assessment integration” teaching model in junior high school chemistry. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 34(6), 50-54.
- Wang, Q., & Li, L. (2019). Promoting teaching-learning-assessment integration in English classrooms under the background of core competencies: Significance, theory, and methods. *Curriculum, Teaching Material and Method*, 39(5), 114-120.
- Wang, Y. (2019). Exploration of the connotation and implementation of “teaching-learning-assessment” integration. *Chemistry Teaching*, (5), 8-10, 16.
- Webb, N. L. (1999). *Alignment of science and mathematics standards and assessments in four states*. Council of Chief State School Officers. National Institute for Science Education Publications.
- Yang, X. (2012). Development of academic quality standards for basic education. *Global Education*, 41(5), 32-41.
- Yang, Y. (2020). Objective design and achievement under “teaching-learning-assessment integration”: Critical reflections based on appendix cases of the 2017 Curriculum Standards. *Chemistry Teaching*, (9), 3-9.
- Yao, L., & Guo, Y. (2012). Theoretical reflections on academic quality standards in primary and secondary schools. *Modern Teaching*, (6), 79.