Available Online: 17 January 2025 DOI: 10.54254/2753-7080/2025.20522

Research on the Construction of an Evaluation System for College Student Party Building Work Based on Quantitative Methods

Fan Si [1, a], *Yuhan He* [2, b, *]

[1] Management College, Beijing Union University, Beijing, 100101, China
[2] Visiting Scholar at the School of Economics, Peking University, Beijing, 100101, China

a. gltsifan@buu.edu.cn, b. 2547707273@qq.com
* Corresponding author

Abstract. The party-building work for college students is of great significance, as it is a crucial component of higher education party building, concerning the cultivation of socialist builders and successors, and occupies a key position in the development of the Party. However, current research on its quality evaluation is insufficient. This study focuses on this issue and aims to construct a scientifically effective evaluation system. By reviewing related literature, the concepts and research status of party building in colleges are clarified, revealing deficiencies in existing evaluation systems regarding indicator selection, evaluation methods, and dynamic adaptability. The research design constructs an evaluation system framework from four dimensions: organizational work of party building, activity implementation, party member cultivation, and the role exertion of party members. The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is applied to determine indicator weights, with samples selected based on the principles of diversity and representativeness. Questionnaires are distributed through various channels, and multiple statistical analysis methods are employed to validate the system. The results show clear weight distributions for each dimension, with satisfactory outcomes from confirmatory factor analysis and regression analysis. However, the system still faces issues such as the operability of indicators needing improvement, unreasonable weight distribution, and insufficient consideration of dynamics and innovation. Future research can further advance by strengthening dynamic update mechanisms, applying emerging technologies, and enhancing inter-university cooperation.

Keywords: college student party building, evaluation system, party building work quality, questionnaire design, reliability and validity analysis

1. Introduction

In the over 90 years of development of the Communist Party of China, party building work in colleges and universities has always been emphasized. As a key base for cultivating socialist builders and successors, party building in higher education holds a critical position and far-reaching significance [1]. However, research on defining and measuring the evaluation standards for the quality of party building work for college students is limited in both quantity and depth. This study aims to fill this gap by focusing on the quality of party building work for college students and constructing an evaluation system that aligns with the practical needs of party building activities in colleges and universities. The research will select evaluation indicators from multiple dimensions, covering not only the basic aspects such as organizational development of party work and the development of party member teams but also delving into the role of party building in guiding students' thoughts, cultivating their innovative abilities, and enhancing their social impact. In terms of evaluation methods, this study will combine both qualitative and quantitative approaches, using scientific data analysis methods to improve the reliability of the evaluation results. The goal is to provide a more targeted and effective evaluation tool for party building work in colleges, thus promoting the continuous improvement of its quality.

2. Basic Concepts and Literature Review on College Party Building

College student party building work can be simply summarized as the work conducted by the university party committee to develop, educate, and manage active party members and student party members, maintain the advanced nature of student party members,

leverage the role of the student party branch as a battleground, and promote the implementation of specific work in the university [2].

Academic papers on college student party building are numerous, offering various viewpoints, many of which are focused, innovative, and deeply argued. Overall, current research on college student party building mainly concentrates on the following aspects: the scientific connotation and significant importance of college student party building work; the current problems and countermeasures in college student party building; the integration of innovation in college student party building with business practices, and so on [3]. Research on the significance of strengthening party building in colleges is abundant and can be summarized into areas of important historical and practical significance for the construction of the Communist Party of China, the reform and development of higher education, and the personal growth of students [4]. The research on problems in college student party building mainly focuses on three areas: party member development, party member training, and the life of party organizations. In response to these issues, academia has proposed solutions such as strengthening continuing education, establishing and improving the innovation mechanism for student party building, perfecting assessment systems, and tightening the admission standards for party members. Other strategies include building online learning platforms to enhance organizational cohesion [5]. In terms of innovation in party building, proposals have been made on innovating organizational development forms, team structure, and the education and management of teams for university students [6].

However, research on the evaluation system for the quality of party building work is relatively scarce. Existing research on constructing an evaluation system for the quality of college student party building work tends to focus on a few aspects, such as the number of party member developments and the frequency of party organization activities, while neglecting deeper influences such as party building's impact on students' ideological development, innovation abilities, and the cultivation of social service skills. In terms of evaluation methods, many studies mainly use qualitative assessments, with relatively few employing quantitative methods, which limits the objectivity and accuracy of the evaluation results and makes it difficult to reflect the actual quality level of party building work for college students. Moreover, existing research pays insufficient attention to the dynamic adaptability of evaluation systems, failing to fully consider the impact of factors such as the development of the times, changes in educational policies, and shifts in students' ideological trends on the quality evaluation of party building work.

3. Research Design and Process of the Evaluation System for College Student Party Building Work

3.1. Design of the Evaluation System Framework

The evaluation system primarily includes four key dimensions: the organization of party building work, the implementation of activities, party member training, and the role exertion of party members.

3.1.1. Organization of Party Building Work Dimension

This dimension primarily examines whether the setup of student party organizations in colleges is reasonable, whether organizational systems are sound, and whether organizational operations are efficient and orderly. A reasonable and orderly organizational structure is the foundation for the smooth development of party building work. It provides a solid framework for advancing subsequent party building activities and cultivating party members.

3.1.2. Activity Implementation Dimension

This dimension focuses on the planning and organization of party building activities, including whether the themes of the activities are clear, whether the forms are diverse, whether the content is rich and educational, and whether the activities have wide participation and high engagement from student party members. A well-established organizational foundation in the organization dimension provides strong support for activity implementation, while the effectiveness of activities will, in turn, influence organizational development. At the same time, meaningful and diverse activities are also crucial for party member training, as they serve as important platforms for cultivating party members' ideological development [7].

3.1.3. Party Member Training Dimension

This dimension focuses on the completeness and effectiveness of the entire training system for student party members, from the application for party membership to becoming a full party member and their subsequent continuing education. It covers the quality of training for active party members, the rigor of the examination and review process for development targets, the normativity of probationary party members' regularization procedures, and the operation of continuing education and training mechanisms for full party members. The party member training dimension is closely linked to the activity implementation dimension. Activities provide a practical platform and educational material for training, and the results of member training will be reflected in the quality and effectiveness of participation in activities. The training and development of party members directly affect their performance in practical activities, which in turn influences the overall effectiveness of the student party organization [7].

3.1.4. Role Exertion Dimension

This dimension primarily measures the extent to which student party members play a pioneering and exemplary role on campus and their influence in society. It includes whether student party members set an example in academic performance, whether they actively participate in class management and campus cultural construction, and whether they demonstrate the responsibility and dedication of a communist party member in social practices and volunteer services. The ultimate goal of party member training is to enable party members to fully exert their role in various fields. The role exertion dimension is an intuitive test of the outcomes of party member training. Additionally, during the process of exerting their roles, party members can further identify their own shortcomings, thus prompting the party organization to optimize and improve the party member training system and continuously enhance the quality of party building work [8].

3.2. Determination of Indicator Weights

This study uses the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to determine the weights of evaluation indicators. AHP is widely applied in multi-objective decision-making analysis and is notable for its scientific and rational nature. Its core principle is to decompose complex decision-making problems into hierarchical levels, perform pairwise comparisons to clarify the relative importance of each factor, and then calculate the corresponding weights.

First, a hierarchical structure model is constructed. The goal layer is set to the evaluation of the quality of college student party building work, which serves as the central objective of the entire evaluation system. Beneath this, the criteria layer is established, covering key aspects such as the organization of party building work, the implementation of activities, party member training and development, and the role exertion of party members. These criteria are interconnected and jointly support the achievement of the goal layer. In the party building organization criteria layer, specific indicators are further subdivided, such as the rationality of the party organization structure and the completeness of organizational systems. The rationality of the organizational structure directly affects the coordination and efficiency of party building work, while the completeness of organizational systems is related to the normativity and sustainability of party building work. The activity implementation criteria layer includes specific indicators such as the clarity of activity themes and the diversity of activity formats. A clear activity theme helps to focus on the core ideological education of party building, and diverse activity formats can attract more student party members to participate and improve educational effectiveness. The party member training and development criteria layer is refined into indicators such as the depth of training for active party members and the comprehensiveness of the assessment for development targets. The depth of training for active party members determines their level of understanding of party theory and practice, while the comprehensiveness of the assessment ensures the quality and purity of the party member team. The role exertion criteria layer includes indicators such as academic leadership effectiveness and social practice participation. Academic leadership effectiveness reflects the exemplary role of party members in academics, while social practice participation shows their commitment and dedication in social welfare and service. By constructing this clear hierarchical structure, the complex party building work evaluation system is clarified, with each indicator's position and its interconnections clearly defined, laying a foundation for subsequent precise evaluations.

Next, a judgment matrix is constructed. A professional team of experts is invited to carry out pairwise comparisons of the importance of each indicator within the same level relative to the criteria of the previous level. The 1-9 scale method is used to assign values. For example, when comparing "clarity of activity themes" with "diversity of activity formats" within the activity implementation criteria, if experts judge that the clarity of activity themes is slightly more important for the overall effect of the party building activities, a value of 3 is assigned; conversely, a value of 1/3 is assigned if the opposite is true. Using this logic, the judgment matrix for all indicators is constructed, highlighting the relative importance differences of each indicator under different criteria and integrating the experts' experience and professional judgment.

Then, the maximum eigenvalue and corresponding eigenvector of the judgment matrix are calculated. Using specific mathematical methods, the judgment matrix is solved to obtain the maximum eigenvalue and eigenvector. The eigenvector is then normalized, and the relative weights of each indicator with respect to the criteria of the previous level are determined. For instance, if the normalized weights of several indicators at a particular criteria level are calculated to be 0.3, 0.25, 0.2, 0.15, and 0.1, it clearly indicates that the first indicator is the most important, accounting for 30%, while the other indicators are weighted in descending order, visually reflecting the importance of each indicator.

Finally, a consistency test is conducted. Since experts may inevitably have subjective judgment biases during pairwise comparisons, it is necessary to perform a consistency test on the judgment matrix. By calculating the consistency index (CI) and the consistency ratio (CR), the consistency of the judgment matrix is checked to see if it falls within an acceptable range. If $CR < 0.1$, it indicates that the judgment matrix is consistent and that the weights determined through AHP are reliable. On the other hand, if $CR \geqslant 0.1$, the experts need to reassess the judgment matrix and adjust the pairwise comparison results until the consistency test is passed. This consistency check ensures the scientific and rational determination of indicator weights, making sure that each indicator's weight accurately reflects its relative importance in the evaluation system for college student party building work, thus providing a solid quantitative foundation for a comprehensive, objective, and precise evaluation of the quality of party building work.

3.3. Sample Selection and Research Analysis

This study adheres to the principles of diversity and representativeness in sample selection, covering universities from different regions, levels, and types. In terms of geographical distribution, universities from the developed coastal areas in the eastern region, the central region, and the western inland regions are included, aiming to reflect the differences and commonalities in the party building work of university students under varying economic development levels and regional cultural backgrounds. In terms of university levels, the sample includes "Double First-Class" universities, ordinary undergraduate universities, and vocational colleges, to assess the impact of different levels of educational institutions on the requirements and implementation outcomes of party building work. Regarding university types, the sample includes comprehensive universities, universities of science and technology, normal universities, agricultural and forestry universities, etc., ensuring that the unique and universal aspects of party building work in different academic disciplines and professional backgrounds are fully captured.

The distribution of the questionnaire was carried out through multiple channels simultaneously. Online, the survey link was widely shared via university campus networks, student information management systems, class WeChat groups, QQ groups, and other resources, allowing students to participate in the survey anytime and anywhere. Offline, questionnaire distribution points were set up in high-traffic, student-concentrated areas such as university libraries, teaching buildings, and cafeterias. Staff were assigned to manage the distribution and collection of questionnaires. Additionally, student volunteers were sent to various classrooms and dormitories to distribute the questionnaires, ensuring that every selected sample student received the questionnaire. During the questionnaire collection process, incomplete, clearly random, or logically inconsistent responses were excluded to ensure data quality.

Through this detailed sampling process, a total of 32 universities were selected, with 1,465 questionnaires distributed, striving to ensure that the sample accurately reflects the overall state of party building work among university students. After a period of collection and sorting, 1,153 valid questionnaires were recovered, resulting in a valid recovery rate of 78%, providing a sufficient and reliable data foundation for subsequent confirmatory statistical analysis.

This study employs various confirmatory statistical analysis methods to examine and validate the university student party building work evaluation system.

First, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is used to build a theoretical model and fit it with actual data, testing whether the relationship between latent factors and observed indicators aligns with the hypotheses. For example, the organizational dimension of party building work is treated as a latent factor, with specific indicators such as the rationality of the party organization structure as observed variables. Fit indices such as the chi-square degree of freedom ratio (CMIN/DF), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) are used to assess the goodness of fit between the model and the data. A good fit indicates strong structural validity, while a poor fit would require adjustments to the indicators or model structure.

Regression analysis is also used, with the overall evaluation of party building work quality as the dependent variable and specific evaluation indicators of each dimension as independent variables in a multiple linear regression model. The significance and direction (positive or negative) of regression coefficients, as well as the model's explained variance (R^2), are analyzed to determine the impact direction, degree, and relative importance of the indicators on party building work quality. For example, if the regression coefficient for the frequency of party member education activities is significantly positive and the R^2 value is high, this suggests that it contributes positively and significantly to party building quality, and thus should be emphasized and weighted appropriately in the evaluation system. The interaction effects between different variables can also be tested to explore the complex relationships among indicators and provide deeper insights for improving the evaluation system.

4. Research Results of the University Student Party Building Work Evaluation System

4.1. Indicator Weight Results

The weights of each criterion layer and indicator layer determined by the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) show a clear distribution pattern. At the criterion layer, the weight of the Party building organization dimension is 0.28, indicating its importance as the foundational support for Party building work. Among these, the weight of party organization structure rationality is 0.12, and the weight of organizational system perfection is 0.16, highlighting the critical role of a rational structure and a sound system in Party organization work, which are decisive in ensuring the coordination and standardized operation of the overall Party building work. The weight of the Party building activity dimension is 0.23, with specific indicators such as the clarity of activity themes (0.08) and diversity of activity forms (0.07), reflecting the varying impact of activities in attracting Party members' participation and conveying Party building ideas. These weights reveal the different contributions of various elements in the planning and implementation phases of Party building activities. The weight of the Party member cultivation and development dimension is 0.25, with sub-indicators like the depth of training for Party activists (0.10) and the comprehensiveness of development target assessments (0.09). These weights highlight the relative importance of different stages in the Party member cultivation process, indicating key areas to focus on when constructing a comprehensive cultivation system to ensure the steady improvement in the quality of the Party member team. The weight of the Party member role performance dimension is 0.24, with sub-indicators such

as the effectiveness of academic guidance (0.09) and the degree of participation in social practices (0.08), demonstrating the emphasis on Party members' roles in various fields such as campus cultural construction and social image formation, and quantifying their influence in these areas.

Table 1. AHP Weight Distribution Table for Party Building Work

Criteria Layer Dimensions	Criteria Layer Weights	Indicator Layer	Indicator Layer Weights	Explanation
Organizational Dimension of Party Building Work	0.28	Reasonableness of Party Organization Structure	0.12	Highlights the key role of a reasonable structure in Party building organizational work
		Completeness of Organizational Systems	0.16	Reflects the support of well-established systems for the normative operation of overall Party building work
Activity Implementation Dimension of Party Building	0.23	Clarity of Activity Themes	0.08	The influence of activity themes on attracting Party members' participation and transmitting ideology
		Diversity of Activity Formats	0.07	Reflects the contribution of format diversity to the effectiveness of activities
Party Member Development and Training Dimension	0.25	Depth of Training for Active Party Member Candidates	0.10	Emphasizes the importance of training depth in improving the quality of the cultivation system
		Comprehensiveness of Development Target Assessment	0.09	Demonstrates the impact of comprehensive assessments on the construction of the Party member cultivation system
Party Member Role Implementation Dimension	0.24	Impact of Academic Leadership	0.09	Quantifies the role of Party members in academic leadership and as role models
		Participation in Social Practice	0.08	Reflects the pioneering role and contributions of Party members in social practice

4.2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

The chi-square degree of freedom ratio (CMIN/DF) is 2.15, which is within the acceptable range (generally considered ideal when less than 3), indicating a good overall fit of the model. The discrepancy between the observed data and the theoretical model is within a reasonable range. The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) is 0.06, lower than the commonly used threshold of 0.08, indicating a high model fit, with strong explanatory power of the indicators for the latent factors and good compatibility between the data and the model. The comparative fit index (CFI) is 0.93, and the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) is 0.91, both approaching or exceeding the ideal threshold of 0.9, further confirming the structural validity of the evaluation system. This means the relationship between the latent factors and observed indicators aligns with the expected hypotheses. For example, in the confirmatory factor analysis of the Party building organization dimension, the factor loadings of indicators such as party organization structure rationality and organizational system perfection all reach significant levels, strongly supporting the validity of this dimension.

Table 2. Model Fit Indices

Indicator Type	Indicator Name	Value	Explanation
Model Fit Indicators	Chi-Square/Degrees of Freedom Ratio (CMIN/DF)	2.15	Less than 3, indicating that the overall model fit is good, and the differences are within a reasonable range.
	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)	0.06	Below 0.08, suggesting a high model fit, with good data-model compatibility.
	Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	0.93	Above 0.9, proving that the structural validity of the evaluation system is high.
	Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	0.91	Close to 0.9, supporting that the model's structural validity is good.

In the Party building activity dimension, the factor loading of activity theme clarity is 0.72, and that of activity form diversity is 0.68, showing that these indicators effectively reflect the characteristics and connotations of the Party building activity dimension. Each indicator contributes differently to explaining the variance within this dimension. In the Party member cultivation and development dimension, the factor loading for the depth of training for Party activists is 0.75, and the factor loading for the comprehensiveness of development target assessments is 0.70, clearly demonstrating the reflection of each indicator on the latent factor of Party member cultivation and development. This provides a basis for further optimization of the Party member cultivation system.

4.3. Regression Analysis Results

The regression coefficient for the frequency of Party member education activities is 0.35, and it is significantly positive at the 0.01 level. Meanwhile, the model's explained variance (R^2) is 0.42, indicating that this indicator has a significant positive contribution to the overall quality of university student Party building work. Its importance should be fully emphasized in the evaluation system, and in practice, more emphasis should be placed on the frequency and intensity of Party member education activities to improve the quality of Party building work. The regression coefficient for the Party organization cohesion indicator is 0.28, showing a significant positive correlation. This suggests that the stronger the cohesion of the Party organization, the more beneficial it is to the development and quality enhancement of Party building work. Therefore, attention should be given to strengthening internal cohesion during the Party organization construction and development process.

The study also finds a significant interaction effect between Party member training outcomes and Party member role performance, with the interaction coefficient being 0.18. This means that Party member training outcomes not only directly affect Party building work quality but also have a synergistic effect with Party member role performance, either boosting or restricting Party building work. When improving the evaluation system and Party building strategies, this interaction relationship should be fully considered to promote positive interactions and coordinated development between Party member training and role performance. For example, when training outcomes are strong and Party members are able to perform their roles fully, Party building work quality will be significantly improved. Conversely, if the balance between the two is disrupted, it may affect the overall effectiveness of Party building work.

Table 3. Analysis of Party Member Education and Party Building Quality Model

Indicator Type	Regression Coefficient	Significance Level	Explanation
Frequency of Party Member Education Activities	0.35	0.01	Significantly positively correlated, indicating that Party member education activities have an important positive contribution to the quality of Party building in universities.
Cohesion of Party Organization	0.28	0.01	Significantly positively correlated, emphasizing the positive role of enhancing the cohesion of the Party organization on the quality of Party building.
Interaction Term: Party Member Training × Role Performance	0.18	0.05	Significantly positive interaction, suggesting that the synergistic development of the two can more significantly improve the quality of Party building.

5. Conclusion

This study, through in-depth exploration of university student Party building work, reviewing relevant literature, and conducting quantitative analysis through a questionnaire survey, has developed an evaluation system framework covering four dimensions: Party building work organization, activity implementation, Party member cultivation, and role performance. The Party building work organization dimension forms the foundation, with indicators such as the rationality of the party organization structure and the completeness of the organizational system being crucial. The activity implementation dimension serves as the carrier for Party member education, with the clarity of activity themes and diversity of activity forms influencing its effectiveness. The Party member cultivation dimension runs through the entire development process of Party members, with indicators at each stage ensuring the quality of the Party member team. The role performance dimension highlights the influence of Party members. Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), the weights of each dimension and indicator were determined, and questionnaires were distributed to a sample of various types of universities with effective responses collected. The system was validated through confirmatory factor analysis and regression analysis. The confirmatory factor analysis showed good model fit, with indicators such as the chi-square degree of freedom ratio and root mean square error of approximation meeting the required standards, proving the structural validity. Regression analysis clarified that indicators such as the frequency of Party member education activities have a significant positive impact on the quality of Party building work, and that there is an interaction effect between Party member training outcomes and role performance, providing a quantitative basis for optimizing Party building work.

Although this study has developed a quality evaluation system for university student Party building work, there are still shortcomings. Some evaluation indicators need to be more operational. Certain indicators are conceptually vague, and there is a risk of misunderstanding between the parties involved when collecting data and making evaluations, making it difficult to obtain precise data. For example, the "depth and breadth of Party building work's guidance on campus culture" is difficult to quantify in a precise manner due to unclear measurement standards for "depth" and "breadth," affecting the accuracy of the results. There are also some unreasonable aspects in the weight distribution of the evaluation system indicators. While the weights determined through theoretical and empirical analysis are theoretically sound, in practical applications, some key indicators have relatively low weights, failing to highlight their importance, while secondary indicators may have excessively high weights, leading to biased evaluation results. For instance, in the Party member cultivation dimension, the weight of "the quality and effectiveness of Party members' participation in social practice" is low, while the weight of "the number of class hours in Party members' theoretical studies" is high. Social practice plays a critical role in enhancing the comprehensive quality and exemplary role of student Party members, and this weight distribution is not conducive to a comprehensive and objective evaluation of Party member cultivation effectiveness. Furthermore, the evaluation system lacks sufficient consideration of the dynamic and innovative nature of university student Party building work. With the development of the times and changes in the social environment, new forms and methods of Party building work have emerged in universities, such as integration with new media and Party building leading innovation and entrepreneurship practices. However, the current evaluation system has not yet incorporated these new elements, resulting in a lag in evaluation that fails to showcase the era-specific characteristics and innovative achievements of Party building work.

Future research on the evaluation of university student Party building work can be further advanced in the following directions. First, there should be further strengthening of the dynamic update mechanism for evaluation indicators, closely following the new situation, tasks, and requirements in Party building work, and timely incorporating new elements such as the role of Party building work in responding to global cultural exchange and conflict, and the innovative leadership role of Party members in emerging technological fields, into the evaluation indicator system. This will ensure that evaluation indicators remain timely and forward-looking. Second, more efforts should be made to research the application of emerging technologies in Party building evaluation, exploring the construction of a big data-based Party building work evaluation data platform. This platform could integrate data from various university departments and external Party building resources, using data mining algorithms to identify hidden patterns and potential issues in Party building work. Artificial intelligence technologies could also be used to develop intelligent evaluation support tools, such as automatically generating evaluation reports, analyzing evaluation results intelligently, and providing improvement suggestions, to enhance the efficiency and accuracy of evaluation work. Third, cross-institutional and cross-regional cooperative research on the evaluation of university student Party building work should be strengthened. Through the establishment of joint research teams and sharing of evaluation data and case studies, the research horizon can be broadened, and more universally applicable and promotable evaluation standards and methods can be summarized, thus promoting the overall improvement of the research level in Party building work evaluation. This will provide stronger theoretical support and practical guidance for advancing high-quality development in university Party building work.

1. Supported by the Academic Research Projects of the Management College, Beijing Union University for the Benchmark Construction of National Party Building

2. Supported by the Academic Research Projects of Beijing Union University No. ZK10202307

References

[1] Li, H., Li, L., & Liu, G. (2024). A study on the deep integration of Party building and business operations in university administrative bodies. *Leadership Science Forum, 2024*(4), 141–144.

[2] Mao, W. (2024). A thorough study of the academic implications and basic methods of Xi Jinping's view on Party history. *Journal of the Study of the History of the Communist Party of China, 2024*(1), 16–21.

[3] Zhu, C., & Li, J. (2024). The integrated development of Party building and business work in university administrative bodies. *Party and Government Forum, 2024*(2), 22–24.

[4] Xiang, Y. (2023). A study on the integration path of Party building and business operations in university administrative bodies based on a "people-centered" approach. *Industry and Technology Forum, 22*(12), 277–279.

[5] Yun, B., Jia, C., & Leng, S. (2023). A study on strengthening and improving the style construction of university administrative bodies in the new era. *Industry and Technology Forum, 22*(6), 229–230.

[6] Wang, L., Mei, S., Liang, D., Liu, J., & Li, X. (2023). On the important guiding role of Party building in management and educational services in university administrative bodies. *Leadership Science Forum, 2023*(3), 140–143.

[7] Chen, L., & Zhao, L. (2022). A study of the political construction of Party organizations in university administrative bodies under the "Double First-Class" initiative. *Leadership Science Forum, 2022*(3), 80–85.

[8] Luo, J., & Li, G. (2020). The connotation and evaluation standards of Party building work in university administrative bodies in the new era. *School Party Building and Ideological Education, 2020*(13), 50–52.

Appendix 1: Survey on Party Building Work for University Students

I. Personal Information

1. What region is your university located in? ( )
A. Eastern coastal developed areas
B. Central regions
C. Western inland areas
2. What level is your university? ( )
A. “Double First-Class” university
B. Ordinary undergraduate institution
C. Vocational college
3. What is your identity at the university? ( )
A. Student Party member
B. Active Party member candidate
C. Regular student
D. Faculty or staff involved in Party building work

II. Organizational Dimension of Party Building Work

4. Do you think the organizational structure of the student Party organization is reasonable? ( )
A. Very reasonable, operates efficiently
B. Quite reasonable, generally meets needs
C. Average, with some small issues
D. Unreasonable, affects work progress
5. Is the organizational system of the student Party organization well-established? ( )
A. Very well-established, covers all aspects and is well-implemented
B. Quite well-established, with some areas for improvement
C. Average, many systems need improvement
D. Not well-established, many systems are missing or poorly implemented
6. Is internal communication within the Party organization timely and accurate? ( )
A. Always timely and accurate
B. Mostly timely and accurate
C. Occasionally delayed or inaccurate
D. Frequently problematic

III. Activity Implementation Dimension

7. Are the themes of Party building activities clear and educational? ( )
A. Always clear and deeply educational
B. Most activities are like this
C. Some activities have average themes and significance
D. Many activities lack clear themes or educational value
8. Are the forms of Party building activities diverse? ( )
A. Very diverse, highly attractive
B. Quite diverse, meets different needs
C. Relatively monotonous, lacks innovation
D. Mostly limited to a few fixed formats
9. How active are you in participating in Party building activities? ( )
A. Very active, always participate actively
B. Quite active, participate in most activities
C. Average, participate selectively depending on the situation
D. Not active, rarely participate
10. How extensive is the participation in Party building activities? ( )
A. Covers the vast majority of student Party members and active members
B. Most can participate, but a few are missed
C. Only some student Party members and active members participate
D. Very few people participate

IV. Party Member Development Dimension

11. How would you rate the quality of training for active Party member candidates? ( )
A. Very high, effectively improves the quality of candidates
B. Quite high, with some effect
C. Average, the effect is not very noticeable
D. Low, needs significant improvement
12. Is the assessment of development targets rigorous? ( )
A. Very rigorous, strictly follows standards
B. Quite rigorous, occasional small lapses

C. Average, some irregularities exist
D. Not rigorous, standards are not strictly followed
13. Is the process for probationary Party members to become formal members standardized? ( )
A. Completely follows standardized procedures
B. Basically standardized, with some areas for optimization
C. Average, with some non-standard practices
D. Not standardized, process is chaotic
14. How would you rate the operation of continuing education and training mechanisms for formal Party members? ( )
A. Runs well, with a complete training plan and implementation
B. Generally runs well, with basic training arrangements
C. Average, training is infrequent and ineffective
D. Almost non-existent, lacks training
V. Role Implementation Dimension
15. Do you think student Party members set a good example in academic performance? ( )
A. Almost all set a good example
B. Most set a certain example
C. Only a few set an example
D. Hardly any set an example
16. Are student Party members actively involved in class management and campus culture construction, and do they play a leading role? ( )
A. Always actively participate and play an important leading role
B. Quite actively involved, with some leading role
C. Average participation, limited leadership role
D. Rarely participate, almost no leadership role
17. Do student Party members demonstrate the responsibility and dedication of Communists in social practice and volunteer service activities? ( )
A. Always fully demonstrate
B. Mostly demonstrate
C. Occasionally demonstrate
D. Rarely demonstrate

VI. Issues Related to the Evaluation System

18. Do you think the indicator “the depth and breadth of Party building’s influence on campus culture” is easy to measure? ( )
A. Very easy, with clear standards
B. Quite easy, can generally be judged
C. Average, somewhat vague but can be attempted
D. Very difficult, the concept is too vague
19. Do you think the weightings for the indicators “the quality and effect of Party members’ participation in social practice” and “the number of hours of Party members’ theoretical study” in the Party member development dimension are reasonable? ( )
A. Very reasonable
B. Quite reasonable
C. Average
D. Not reasonable
20. Does the Party building work at your university include innovative measures related to new media technology? ( )
A. Many, with significant effects
B. Some, with certain effects
C. Few, with almost no effect
D. None
21. Do you think the Party building work evaluation system should include indicators for evaluating student Party members’ ideological leadership and public opinion guidance capabilities in cyberspace? ( )
A. Definitely, with detailed settings
B. Yes, with appropriate settings
C. No preference
D. No
22. Do you have any other comments or suggestions regarding the evaluation system for Party building work at your university? (Please describe briefly)