

Research on the Construction Path of High Level Professional Clusters in Higher Vocational Colleges

Luoluo Wang*

Zhuhai City Polytechnic, Zhuhai Guangdong, China, 519000

*corresponding author: wangluoluo@zhcpt.edu.cn

Abstract: High-level professional clusters have become an important organizational form through which higher vocational colleges respond to changes in regional industries, coordinate educational resources, and improve the preparation of technical and skilled personnel. Their construction cannot be reduced to the administrative grouping of several existing specialties. It requires a continuing process that links regional industrial demand, occupational capability analysis, curriculum organization, teaching-team development, practical training, and institutional governance. Using literature review, comparative analysis, and logical deduction, this paper defines the professional cluster as an educational organization built around a shared technical field and a connected group of occupations. It explains the construction logic through the interaction among industrial chains, occupational chains, professional structures, curriculum modules, and resource platforms. Two comparative tables distinguish professional clusters from conventional specialty collections and examine three common construction modes: core-specialty-led, industrial-chain-aligned, and regional-ecosystem-oriented. The analysis identifies five recurring constraints in higher vocational colleges: static specialty layouts, weak translation of industrial change into curriculum content, fragmented modular curricula, limited dual-qualified faculty capacity, and project-based governance without stable accountability. A systematic construction path is proposed. Colleges should establish an evidence-based mechanism for specialty adjustment, translate work processes into shared and differentiated curriculum modules, organize dual-qualified teaching teams around tasks rather than departments, build productive training platforms with enterprises, and institute collaborative governance supported by periodic evaluation and resource reallocation. The proposed framework treats regional service as an observable outcome measured through graduate destinations, enterprise participation, technical services, and responsiveness to changes in occupational demand. It provides a structured basis for colleges seeking to improve cluster coherence while retaining the educational identity of individual specialties.

Keywords: higher vocational education; professional clusters; industry-education integration; modular curriculum; dual-qualified faculty; regional economic development

1. Research Introduction

Higher vocational colleges face a structural problem rather than a simple shortage of programs. Regional industries reorganize production through digital control, service-oriented manufacturing, green processes, and integrated supply networks, while many colleges still manage specialties as separate administrative units^[9]. Each specialty maintains its own curriculum, laboratories, teaching staff, and external partners. This arrangement can preserve disciplinary clarity, but it often duplicates introductory courses and equipment, leaves cross-occupational capabilities outside any program, and slows curricular response when production systems change. The professional cluster is intended to address this mismatch by coordinating related specialties around a shared technical field and a defined set of occupational groups. Its value

therefore depends on whether coordination changes educational content and resource allocation. A cluster that exists only in planning documents does not alter the experience of students, the work of teachers, or the services supplied to local firms.

Chinese policy has placed professional-group construction at the center of quality improvement in higher vocational education. The first round of the High-Level Higher Vocational Schools and Professional Groups Construction Plan emphasized concentrated investment, institutional reform, and stronger alignment with industrial demand^[4]. The revised Vocational Education Law also established industry-education integration and school-enterprise cooperation as basic features of vocational education^[8]. These policy directions are consistent with international TVET research, which treats employer participation, work-based learning, updated qualifications, and teacher professional development as connected institutional arrangements^[2]. Policy support, however, does not decide which specialties should be grouped, how common capabilities should be represented in courses, or how enterprise participation should be governed. Those decisions are made at college and regional levels, where information is incomplete and organizational interests differ.

This study uses literature review, comparative analysis, and logical deduction. It follows the sequence of concept definition, construction logic, mode comparison, constraint diagnosis, path design, and prospective analysis. The unit of analysis is the professional cluster in a higher vocational college, not a single program or an entire institution. The central question is how a college can convert regional industrial demand into a coherent educational organization while protecting academic standards and students' long-term development. The analysis focuses on five linked domains: specialty layout, the relationship between industrial and educational chains, modular curriculum design, dual-qualified teaching teams, and collaborative governance. The paper does not assume that one cluster model fits every region. It instead identifies design principles and decision procedures that can be adapted to differences in industrial concentration, college capacity, and labor-market mobility.

2. Core Connotation Construction Logic and Research Status Quo

2.1 Core Concepts and Construction Characteristics

A professional cluster is an educational organization composed of related specialties that share a technical domain, serve connected occupational groups, and use coordinated resources. The relationship among its specialties is neither incidental nor purely administrative. It rests on common work objects, transferable technical principles, shared equipment, and progression routes across occupations. A cluster may contain one leading specialty that represents the college's established strength, several supporting specialties that cover adjacent stages of production or service, and adaptable directions that respond to emerging tasks. The leading specialty should provide organizational focus without absorbing the identities of the supporting specialties. Students still require a clear qualification, a recognizable occupational destination, and sufficient depth in their chosen field^[10].

Four characteristics distinguish a high-level cluster. Coherence concerns whether its specialties correspond to a defensible set of related occupations and technologies. Adaptability concerns whether the cluster can adjust enrollment, course modules, and practical projects when regional demand changes. Integration concerns the extent to which curricula, teachers, facilities, and enterprise relations are genuinely shared. Public value concerns the cluster's contribution to employment quality, enterprise upgrading, continuing education, and inclusive access to skills. These characteristics place limits on expansion. A larger cluster is not necessarily better. When specialties share only a broad industry label but lack common technical foundations or occupational transitions, coordination costs rise and educational depth declines. Cluster quality should therefore be judged through internal relationships and external results rather than through the number of programs included.

2.2 Construction Logic Based on Chain Alignment

The construction logic begins with regional production and service systems. An industrial chain identifies stages such as design, component production, system integration, operation, maintenance, and technical service. An occupational chain identifies job families and progression routes within and across those stages. Colleges must then translate occupational activity into capability domains, including technical knowledge, operating procedures, problem diagnosis, quality control, communication, safety, and learning capacity^[1]. This translation provides the basis for deciding which specialties belong together. It also prevents a common error in which an entire industrial chain is assigned to one cluster even though the college lacks the faculty, facilities, or student scale to support it. Selectivity is an academic and managerial requirement.

Chain alignment should operate as a feedback cycle. Regional labor-market data and enterprise consultations inform the initial specialty map^[6]. Occupational task analysis converts this map into capability requirements. Curriculum teams organize the requirements into shared platform modules, specialty core modules, cross-specialty modules, and elective extension modules. Teaching implementation then produces evidence from student performance, internships, graduate employment, and enterprise evaluation. A cluster steering body reviews this evidence and adjusts the specialty structure, curriculum, and resource plan. The cycle links planning with observable outcomes. It also recognizes that industrial demand is not automatically educational demand. Colleges must examine whether a requested skill is sufficiently stable, transferable, and teachable before assigning formal credits and equipment investment to it.

2.3 Review of Domestic and International Research and Practice

Chinese scholarship on professional clusters has developed around industrial alignment, resource sharing, curriculum reconstruction, and governance reform. Policy analyses commonly describe the cluster as a means of connecting the education chain, talent chain, industrial chain, and innovation chain. Practice studies report arrangements led by a strong specialty, organized around a sector, or jointly governed with local enterprises. The literature has clarified the need for shared curriculum platforms and school-enterprise cooperation, yet many accounts remain descriptive. Construction achievements are frequently represented by counts of courses, bases, certificates, and agreements. Such indicators record inputs and products, but they reveal little about whether specialty relationships became more coherent or whether graduates gained wider occupational mobility.

International TVET research uses different institutional terms but addresses comparable problems. Sector skills bodies, regional skills ecosystems, occupational standards, dual training, and applied-learning networks all seek to coordinate providers, employers, public agencies, and learners. UNESCO studies emphasize institutionalized partnerships and the connection between teaching quality, governance, and resources. European work on skills anticipation stresses that labor-market intelligence must be translated through institutional judgment rather than copied directly into qualifications. Studies of dual systems show the importance of workplace learning and qualified trainers, while also documenting coordination costs and unequal employer participation^[5]. These findings support a relational view of cluster construction: employer involvement, curriculum renewal, teacher development, and assessment must be designed together.

A remaining research gap concerns the mechanism connecting the cluster's organizational form with student learning and regional service. Administrative integration may increase resource efficiency without improving curriculum coherence. Employer participation may add current cases but also narrow learning toward firm-specific routines. Modularization may support flexible learning yet fragment knowledge when modules are too small or poorly sequenced^[11]. This paper addresses these tensions by separating construction principles from implementation instruments.

The proposed path gives priority to occupational evidence, curriculum integrity, teacher work organization, and accountable governance.

3. Multi dimensional Comparative Analysis of Professional Cluster Construction

To identify the organizational changes required for high-level construction, two comparisons are used. The first distinguishes a conventional collection of specialties from an integrated professional cluster. The second compares three construction modes found in practice. The comparisons are analytical rather than rankings. Each mode can be appropriate under specific regional and institutional conditions, and each produces characteristic risks that governance arrangements must control.

3.1 Comparison Between Conventional Specialty Collections and High Level Professional Clusters

Conventional specialty collections usually arise from historical program approvals and departmental boundaries. Cooperation depends on individual teachers and temporary projects. A high-level cluster uses a defined occupational and technical relationship to coordinate decisions across specialties. Its distinguishing feature is not shared branding but shared rules for curriculum design, staffing, facilities, external cooperation, and evaluation. Table 1 summarizes the difference across seven dimensions. The comparison suggests that cluster construction requires a redistribution of decision rights. Departments retain responsibility for specialty depth, while the cluster gains authority over shared modules, common platforms, enterprise projects, and periodic specialty adjustment.

Table 1 Comparison Between Conventional Specialty Collections and High Level Professional Clusters

Comparison dimension	Conventional specialty collection	High-level professional cluster
Organizing basis	Historical approvals and departmental boundaries	Related occupational groups, shared technologies, and regional demand
Specialty relationship	Parallel programs with occasional cooperation	Leading and supporting specialties with defined common and differentiated functions
Curriculum	Separate course plans; repeated foundations	Shared platform modules, specialty cores, cross-specialty projects, and extensions
Teaching team	Staff assigned mainly by department	Task-based teams combining academic and enterprise teachers
Training resources	Program-owned laboratories and equipment	Shared productive platforms planned around learning tasks
Industry participation	Internships, donations, and periodic consultation	Participation in task analysis, teaching, assessment, staff development, and technical

		service
Evaluation and adjustment	Input counts and irregular program review	Outcome evidence, periodic review, and resource reallocation

3.2 Comparison of Mainstream Professional Cluster Construction Modes

Three modes can be distinguished according to the primary organizing principle. The core-specialty-led mode extends an established high-performing specialty toward adjacent fields. The industrial-chain-aligned mode maps specialties to selected stages of a regional industrial chain. The regional-ecosystem-oriented mode combines education, training, applied research, and public service through participation by colleges, firms, government departments, and industry organizations. Table 2 compares their advantages, limitations, and conditions of use.

The choice among modes should follow evidence rather than institutional fashion. A college with one mature specialty and limited external coordination capacity may achieve more through controlled extension than through an ambitious ecosystem structure. Industrial-chain alignment is suitable when the regional industry has stable production relationships and identifiable job families. Ecosystem orientation requires mature partners, clear benefit-sharing rules, and enough managerial capacity to sustain activities beyond funded projects. Colleges may also use a staged approach: begin with the core specialty, develop shared curriculum and facilities, then expand governance when cooperation produces reliable results.

Table 2 Comparison of Mainstream Professional Cluster Construction Modes

Construction mode	Primary mechanism	Advantages	Limitations	Suitable conditions
Core-specialty-led	Extend a mature specialty toward closely related programs and shared resources	Clear leadership; manageable coordination; uses established teaching strength	May overprotect the leading specialty and underrepresent new occupations	One strong specialty, moderate college capacity, emerging external partnerships
Industrial-chain-aligned	Map specialties and modules to selected stages of a regional industrial chain	Direct occupational relevance; supports complete work-process projects	Can become too broad or dependent on one regional sector	Concentrated industry, stable job families, reliable employer participation
Regional-ecosystem-oriented	Coordinate education, training, applied research, and public service across multiple actors	Supports continuing education, technical service, and wider regional coordination	High governance cost; difficult attribution; requires sustained partner	Mature college, diverse partners, public coordination, and stable operating resources

			commitment	
--	--	--	------------	--

4. Practical Dilemmas and Causes of Professional Cluster Construction

4.1 Static Specialty Layout and Weak Responsiveness to Regional Industry

Many colleges adjust specialty layouts through occasional administrative reviews. Decisions are influenced by enrollment demand, existing staff, available laboratories, and the desire to retain approved programs. These considerations are legitimate, but they can outweigh evidence about occupational demand and technological change. Programs with falling relevance may remain unchanged because closure affects staff workload and departmental status. New directions may be added rapidly because an industry label attracts attention, even when the college lacks appropriate teachers or practice conditions. The resulting cluster includes specialties with weak technical relationships and unclear graduate destinations.

The deeper cause is the absence of a stable information and decision mechanism. Enterprise surveys are often small, irregular, and dominated by current partners. Job-posting data can indicate demand but may exaggerate fashionable titles and omit small firms. Government industrial plans show policy priorities, not actual entry-level work. Graduate data arrive late and rarely distinguish job quality from simple employment. Without triangulation, colleges cannot separate short-term recruitment fluctuations from lasting changes in occupational structure^[6]. Specialty adjustment then becomes reactive, with new programs added faster than old content is revised.

4.2 Incomplete Integration of Industrial Chains and Educational Chains

The phrase industry-education integration is widely used, but operational connections are often thin. Enterprises may accept interns, donate equipment, or sign cooperation agreements without participating in occupational analysis, curriculum decisions, assessment, or teacher development^[7]. Colleges may invite managers to confirm an existing plan rather than discuss alternative capability structures. In this setting, industrial tasks enter teaching as isolated cases. They do not change course sequences, assessment standards, or the allocation of learning time. Students encounter current equipment but may not understand the technical principles that allow transfer to another firm or process.

Different time horizons contribute to this problem. Firms seek workers who can perform current tasks with limited induction. Colleges must prepare students for immediate employment and later occupational change. Equipment suppliers favor training tied to their products, while curriculum designers must avoid dependence on one technical system. These interests can be reconciled only through explicit translation rules. Enterprise tasks should be analyzed for frequency, difficulty, safety implications, knowledge demands, and transferability. Stable capabilities belong in core modules; rapidly changing tools may be placed in projects, electives, or short-cycle training. Without this distinction, curriculum either lags behind production or follows it too closely.

4.3 Fragmented Curriculum and Insufficient Modular Coordination

Curriculum modularization is sometimes implemented by renaming existing courses or dividing them into smaller units^[11]. Such changes do not necessarily improve learning. Modules may repeat similar content across specialties, omit prerequisite relationships, or concentrate practical tasks before students possess the concepts needed to diagnose errors. Shared modules can become generic introductions with little connection to later specialty work. Conversely, excessive differentiation prevents students from learning with peers in related specialties and reduces equipment utilization. The cluster then carries a modular label while retaining separate curricula.

The difficulty lies in identifying an appropriate unit of curriculum design. A module should correspond to a meaningful capability or work process and have stated entry requirements, learning outcomes, practice conditions, and assessment evidence. It should be large enough to preserve the relationship among knowledge, action, and judgment^[3]. Curriculum teams also need a map showing how modules support each specialty and how students progress from common foundations to differentiated applications. Many colleges lack time, data, and cross-department authority for this work. Course ownership and teacher workload rules further discourage joint design.

4.4 Limited Dual Qualified Faculty Capacity and Rigid Team Organization

A high-level cluster needs teachers who combine pedagogical competence with current occupational and technical experience. Formal recognition as dual-qualified faculty does not always demonstrate this combination. Some teachers obtain certificates without sustained participation in enterprise work. Enterprise part-time teachers bring current experience but may lack knowledge of learning progression, student diversity, and assessment design. Faculty are also organized by specialty departments, whereas cluster teaching requires teams that cross mechanical, electrical, digital, managerial, and service fields. Coordination is added to existing workloads and therefore depends on personal commitment.

Faculty development is often delivered through short training sessions that are detached from curriculum tasks. Teachers learn a tool, visit a factory, or complete a temporary placement, but the acquired knowledge is not converted into new teaching projects or assessment criteria. Enterprise practice may involve observation rather than responsibility for production, maintenance, diagnosis, or improvement. Recruitment alone cannot solve the problem because industry experts with teaching ability are scarce and salary systems differ. Colleges need work-based development, co-teaching, joint technical projects, and team-level evaluation. These arrangements require workload recognition and clear responsibility for the educational quality of enterprise contributions.

4.5 Project Based Governance and Weak Sustainable Support

Cluster construction frequently follows the cycle of a funded project. A temporary office coordinates targets, departments submit products, and resources are concentrated during an evaluation period. When funding ends or leaders change, joint curriculum work and enterprise activities may decline. Decision rights remain ambiguous: the cluster leader may be accountable for results but unable to adjust staffing, budgets, or specialty enrollment. Enterprise committees meet infrequently and receive information after major decisions have been made. Students and frontline teachers have little influence over design, even though they experience implementation problems directly.

Evaluation systems reinforce short-term behavior when they emphasize visible outputs. Numbers of courses, textbooks, bases, certificates, and partnerships are easy to count, but they can be produced without strong learning effects. Regional contribution is sometimes asserted through broad economic indicators that a single college cannot plausibly influence. Sustainable governance requires a smaller set of attributable outcomes, regular review, and authority to redirect resources. It also requires institutional support for data collection, curriculum coordination, equipment maintenance, teacher release time, and partner management. Without these operating arrangements, the cluster remains dependent on exceptional individuals.

5. Systematic Construction Path of High Level Professional Clusters

5.1 Establish an Evidence Based Mechanism for Specialty Layout Adjustment

Colleges should establish a recurring specialty-review process that combines regional industrial analysis with educational capacity assessment. The evidence base should include industrial output and investment, occupational employment, recruitment data, skill standards, enterprise interviews, graduate destinations, internship quality, enrollment, completion, and teaching-resource utilization. No single source should decide the result. A cluster committee can classify signals as structural, cyclical, or uncertain and record the reasons for each judgment. Reviews should examine both the demand for a specialty and its relationship with other specialties in the cluster.

The adjustment mechanism should provide several responses beyond opening or closing a program. A college may revise a specialty direction, change enrollment, replace obsolete modules, share a platform across programs, suspend recruitment, or develop short-cycle training before creating a full qualification. Each option carries different costs and reversibility. A transparent decision matrix can assess regional demand, occupational stability, curriculum relationship, faculty readiness, facility requirements, student interest, and financial sustainability. The college should define thresholds for continuation and review them at fixed intervals. This makes specialty layout a managed portfolio rather than a list of permanent administrative assets.

5.2 Integrate Industrial Occupational and Educational Chains Through Modular Curriculum Design

Curriculum construction should begin with selected production or service processes and the occupational roles associated with them. Joint teams of teachers, technicians, graduates, and curriculum specialists should analyze representative tasks. They should identify performance conditions, tools, quality standards, safety requirements, common errors, and the reasoning used in diagnosis. The resulting capability map should distinguish common capabilities across the cluster from specialty-specific depth. It should also identify capabilities that support occupational progression, such as process analysis, data interpretation, technical communication, and continuous improvement.

A four-part modular architecture can convert the capability map into a teachable program. Shared foundation modules address common technical principles, safety, quality, digital tools, and professional communication. Specialty core modules develop the depth required for a defined qualification. Cross-specialty project modules place students in complete work processes that require collaboration across roles. Extension modules respond to local technologies, certificates, or emerging tasks and can be updated more frequently. The architecture should specify prerequisites and avoid treating modules as interchangeable fragments. Each module needs integrated assessment based on products, procedures, explanations, and workplace conduct.

Curriculum renewal should use a controlled update cycle. Minor changes in software, equipment, or standards can be incorporated annually into projects and extension modules. Changes that alter occupational responsibility or technical principles require a formal review of learning outcomes and credit allocation. Enterprise input should be documented, but academic staff remain responsible for breadth, progression, and fairness. Credit recognition can allow shared modules to support transfer among related specialties and continuing education for employees. Digital resource repositories should store task briefs, datasets, operating documents, assessment rubrics, and revision records rather than only lecture materials.

5.3 Organize Dual Qualified Teaching Teams Around Cluster Tasks

Faculty organization should follow the educational work of the cluster. A cluster may establish stable teams for

occupational research, shared modules, specialty cores, practice projects, student assessment, and technical service. Membership should cross departmental boundaries where the task requires it. The cluster leader needs defined authority over joint work plans and shared resources, while specialty leaders retain responsibility for qualification depth. Workload systems should recognize curriculum design, enterprise coordination, co-teaching, equipment development, and applied technical projects as formal teaching work.

Dual-qualified development should be demonstrated through practice and teaching products. Teachers may undertake enterprise placements with defined responsibilities, participate in equipment commissioning or process improvement, co-develop a technical service, and then convert the experience into a module or assessment task. Each activity should produce evidence that can be reviewed by both academic and industry members. Enterprise teachers should receive preparation in learning outcomes, lesson design, student support, and assessment reliability. Co-teaching is preferable during the early stage because it combines current workplace knowledge with pedagogical control.

A tiered development plan can match roles and experience. New teachers need supervised teaching and structured workplace exposure. Experienced teachers need opportunities to lead cross-specialty curriculum design and applied projects. Cluster and specialty leaders need capability in labor-market interpretation, partnership governance, and resource decisions. Recruitment should fill capability gaps identified in the cluster map, not simply increase staff numbers. Evaluation should consider student learning, curriculum contribution, current technical practice, teamwork, and service outcomes. Individual research outputs may remain relevant, but they should not displace responsibilities central to vocational teaching.

5.4 Build Productive Training Platforms and Reciprocal School Enterprise Cooperation

Practical training platforms should reproduce the logic of work without becoming equipment showrooms. Their design should begin with learning tasks, expected student scale, safety, staffing, maintenance, and use across specialties. Physical equipment, simulation, digital twins, and workplace placements can be combined when each medium serves a defined purpose. Shared platforms should support progressive tasks from component operation to system integration, diagnosis, and improvement. Scheduling rules must ensure that common ownership does not reduce access for any specialty.

School-enterprise cooperation becomes reciprocal when both parties contribute resources and receive defined benefits. Enterprises may provide current tasks, technicians, standards, data, placements, and evaluation. Colleges may provide employee training, testing, process documentation, small-scale technical development, and a recruitment pipeline. Agreements should specify intellectual property, data protection, safety, equipment ownership, staff time, cost sharing, and evaluation. A portfolio of partners reduces dependence on one firm and exposes students to different technical systems. Small and medium-sized enterprises may participate through industry associations or shared service centers when direct involvement is costly.

Productive projects require educational screening. Orders and technical services should be selected according to learning value, risk, timetable, and supervision capacity. Students should not replace paid labor or perform unsafe work. Teachers must connect the project to stated outcomes and retain responsibility for assessment. Revenue, when generated, should support consumables, equipment renewal, student support, and teacher development under transparent rules. The platform's performance should be measured through student participation, competence evidence, partner continuity, technical outputs, safety, and utilization rather than through floor area or purchase value alone.

5.5 Construct Collaborative Governance and Regional Service Evaluation

A cluster governance structure should connect authority, expertise, and accountability. The college level sets strategic priorities, approves specialty changes, and allocates resources. A cluster council includes college leaders, specialty heads, teachers, enterprise representatives, industry organizations, public agencies, graduates, and where appropriate student representatives. It reviews occupational evidence, curriculum maps, partnership performance, and evaluation results. Working groups carry out curriculum, faculty, practice, and data tasks. Terms of reference should define membership, voting or advisory rights, meeting frequency, conflict-of-interest rules, and publication of decisions.

Regional service should be evaluated through outcomes that the cluster can influence. Relevant indicators include graduate employment in related occupations, employment stability, progression to higher skill levels, employer assessment of capability, employee training completions, adoption of technical-service outputs, support for small firms, and access for rural or disadvantaged learners. Results should be disaggregated by specialty and student group. Counts of agreements and activities may be retained as process indicators, but they should not substitute for outcomes. External review can test whether evidence supports claims and whether partner voices are represented fairly.

Evaluation must lead to action. An annual operational review can adjust modules, teaching assignments, partner portfolios, and equipment schedules. A deeper review every three to five years can reconsider the cluster boundary, leading specialty, enrollment structure, and investment plan. The college should reserve a portion of resources for adjustment rather than committing all funds to fixed facilities. When a specialty no longer fits the cluster, separation or reorganization should be possible without treating the decision as failure. Institutional learning depends on recording why changes were made and whether the expected effects occurred.

6. Conclusion and Prospect

6.1 Research Conclusion

High-level professional cluster construction is an institutional process for coordinating related specialties around regional occupational demand and coherent student learning. Its effectiveness depends on relationships that can be observed in curriculum, staffing, facilities, partnership activity, and governance. The analysis identified five common problems: static specialty structures, incomplete translation between industrial and educational chains, fragmented modules, limited dual-qualified capacity, and temporary project governance. These problems share a cause. Colleges often add cluster-level targets without changing the rules through which departments make decisions and resources are allocated.

The proposed path addresses this cause through linked mechanisms. Evidence-based specialty review defines the cluster boundary and adjustment options. Occupational analysis and a four-part modular architecture connect industrial processes with learning progression. Task-based faculty teams and work-based professional development build dual-qualified capacity. Productive training platforms give school-enterprise cooperation a concrete educational purpose. Collaborative governance assigns decision rights and uses attributable regional-service outcomes for review. Implementation should be staged according to institutional capacity. Coherence and sustained operation are more important than rapid expansion.

6.2 Development Prospect

Future professional clusters will face faster changes in occupational content, greater demand for continuing education, and closer interaction between technical and service work. Digital labor-market information can shorten the time required

to detect change, but interpretation will remain necessary because job titles and technology claims do not directly specify curriculum. Microcredentials and flexible modules may allow colleges to serve employed learners and support transfer among specialties. Their value will depend on credit rules, assessment quality, and connection to complete qualifications.

Research should move from construction descriptions toward comparative and longitudinal evidence. Studies are needed on how different cluster boundaries affect student learning, employment mobility, teacher collaboration, and resource use. Process tracing can examine how enterprise proposals are accepted, modified, or rejected in curriculum decisions. Cost studies can compare shared platforms with program-specific facilities. Equity analysis should test whether cluster concentration changes access for students from different locations and backgrounds. Such evidence would allow professional-cluster policy to develop from target compliance toward informed institutional design.

References:

- [1] Billett, S. (2011). *Vocational education: Purposes, traditions and prospects*. Springer.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-1954-5>
- [2] Guile, D., & Unwin, L. (Eds.). (2019). *The Wiley handbook of vocational education and training*. Wiley Blackwell.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119098713>
- [3] Lucas, B., Spencer, E., & Claxton, G. (2012). *How to teach vocational education: A theory of vocational pedagogy*. City & Guilds Centre for Skills Development. <https://books.google.com/books?id=MULGvQEACAAJ>
- [4] Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, & Ministry of Finance of the People's Republic of China. (2019, April 2). *Jiaoyubu Caizhengbu guanyu shishi Zhongguo tese gaoshuiping gaozhi xuexiao he zhuan yequn jianshe jihua de yijian* [Opinions on implementing the plan for high-level higher vocational schools and professional groups with Chinese characteristics] (Jiao Zhi Cheng [2019] No. 5).
https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A07/moe_737/s3876_qt/201904/t20190402_376471.html
- [5] OECD. (2021). *Teachers and leaders in vocational education and training*. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/59d4fbb1-en>
- [6] OECD. (2023). *Building future-ready vocational education and training systems*. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/28551a79-en>
- [7] Paudel, P. K., Parajuli, M. N., & Bhattarai, P. C. (2025). *Exploring technical and vocational education and training and its relationship to employment in Nepal: A mixed methods study*. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 17, Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40461-025-00178-4>
- [8] Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. (2022, April 20). *Zhonghua Renmin Gongheguo zhiye jiaoyu fa* [Vocational Education Law of the People's Republic of China].
https://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_sjzl/sjzl_zcfg/zcfg_jyfl/202204/t20220421_620064.html
- [9] UNESCO. (2022). *Transforming technical and vocational education and training for successful and just transitions: UNESCO strategy 2022–2029*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383360>
- [10] Wheelahan, L., & Moodie, G. (2017). *Vocational education qualifications' roles in pathways to work in liberal market economies*. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 69(1), 10–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2016.1275031>
- [11] Young, M., & Hordern, J. (2022). *Does the vocational curriculum have a future?* *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 74(1), 68–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2020.1833078>