

An Assessment on the Implementation of the Public Art Education in on the Implementation of the Public Art Education in Enhancement Program

Nani Zeng^{1,2}, Dr. Juliet A. Demalen^{3*}

¹Edd.Candidates Nani Zeng of Arts Sciences and Education, Trinity University of Asia. 275 E. Rodriguez Sr. Avenue Quezon City. Philippines 1102 NCR

²Lecturer Nani Zeng is a full-time teacher in the School of Art and Design, JiangXi University of technology, Nanchang City, China, 330098.

^{3*}Dr. Juliet A. Demalen Department Head of College of Arts Sciences and Education, Trinity University of Asia. 275 E. Rodriguez Sr. Avenue Quezon City. Philippines 1102 NCR

First Author Email: nanzeng@tua.edu.ph

Second & Corresponding Author Email: nanzeng@tua.edu.ph

First Author ORCID : 0009-0001-4608-7696

Second & Corresponding Author ORCID : 0009-0004-4438-1420

First Author: Graduate studies: Fine Arts, Doctoral degree: Educational Management. The current research mainly focuses on exploring the curriculum integration models of art and technology, humanities and other disciplines, and designing differentiated teaching content for students with different professional backgrounds..



Second Author: Name: Dr. Juliet A. Demalen

Employer: Trinity University of Asia

Position: Graduate School and Education Department Part-Time Faculty Member

Research Direction: Educational Management and Teacher Training



ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Submitted: 20 Dec 2024

Received: 11 Feb 2025

Accepted: 21 Feb 2025

This is a study on the implementation and evaluation of public art education courses, mainly exploring the goal setting, activity content, organizational methods, and evaluation methods of public art courses in selected universities. By using a survey questionnaire created by the researcher, data were collected from 169 respondents to analyze the implementation, effectiveness and existing problems of public art courses, students' satisfaction with the courses, learning outcomes, and the rationality of course offerings. Research has found that public art courses play a significant role in enhancing students' aesthetic perception, cultivating elegant aesthetic taste, and promoting humanistic literacy. Significantly, problems such as insufficient class hours and inadequate teaching facilities were found. Considering these findings, a plan to strengthen the implementation of public art education curriculum education developed highlighting the need to increase course hours, improving teaching facilities, strengthening the construction of the teaching staff, and optimizing the curriculum evaluation system to promote students' comprehensive and in-depth participation in art learning, thereby enhancing their artistic literacy and overall abilities.

Keywords: College public art courses, course implementation, course evaluation

Introduction

The guideline of the Ministry of Education of China, "Guidelines for Public Art Courses in Universities," proposes that when universities implement public art education, students must take courses on art appreciation and criticism and earn credits before graduation. At the same time, in 2022, the Ministry of Education

formulated the Guiding Outline of Public Art Curriculum in Colleges and Universities. This stipulates that the goal of the curriculum is to increase efforts in curriculum construction, to cultivate aesthetic and humanistic qualities as the core, pay attention to cultivating creative ability, and strive to improve the core qualities of cultural understanding, aesthetic perception, artistic expression, and innovative practice [1]. To carry out the spirit of the Guiding Outline of Public Art Courses in Colleges and Universities issued by the Ministry of Education and improve students' artistic quality and aesthetic ability, Jiangxi University of Science and Technology has set up art appreciation and criticism courses for all students in the school. It stipulates that one graduation credit can be obtained after completing these courses. However, schools are faced with challenges in the course of curriculum implementation. Shang et al. [2] points out the goals and characteristics of public art education in his research and analysis. He believes that the target of public art education is not art professionals, but to improve the essential artistic aesthetic quality of the educated. Similarly, Qian [3] believes that when public art courses are implemented in areas with high economic development levels in China, there is a problem of formalization because colleges and universities do not make full use of surrounding educational resources to promote the development of art education courses. In addition, Bai [4] proposed that the status of aesthetic education courses should be raised from elective to compulsory, and the frequency of aesthetic education courses should be appropriately increased, which will help improve the level of aesthetic education teaching management and enhance the importance of teachers and students to aesthetic education courses.

Based on the curriculum evaluation model of Taylor discussed by Shang et al. [2] evaluates the implementation of Art Appreciation and Criticism from the four dimensions of curriculum objectives, contents, learning activities, and evaluation. To investigate the implementation and effectiveness of the curriculum in the four aspects of curriculum objectives, curriculum content, curriculum activity organization and curriculum evaluation. To guide the further improvement and reform of this course in the later period.

In addition, this study evaluated the implementation of fine arts education with students in their second year of study, particularly art appreciation and criticism courses. 169 students participating in the SY 2022-2023 Art Appreciation and Criticism event were invited to explore the relationship between public fine arts curriculum implementation and student academic achievement (SY2023-2024). On this basis, the improvement plan for public art curriculum implementation is put forward. The results show that the implementation of the course has obtained the students' "excellent" evaluation, and most of the students have "good" learning performance. However, there is no significant correlation between the implementation of the curriculum and the performance of the students. Jiangxi University of Science and Technology faces challenges in the implementation of the public art curriculum, such as insufficient class hours, insufficient teaching facilities, lack of professionalism and teaching communication among teachers. At the same time, these findings provide insights for school administrators and teachers, particularly in driving curriculum implementation. School administrators can use these findings to improve the quality of curriculum implementation. Improve the curriculum feedback mechanism, timely understand the needs of students and the effects of curriculum

implementation, and ensure continuous curriculum improvement, to achieve a significant improvement in students' artistic achievement. At the same time, develop teachers' abilities and improve students' academic performance and comprehensive skills [5].

Related Work

Recent research emphasizes the importance of public art education in higher education, particularly its role in fostering cultural awareness, aesthetic appreciation, and holistic development. Yang [6] explored music-focused aesthetic education in local universities, proposing targeted reforms to curriculum structure and campus culture. The study highlights the benefits of integrating aesthetic elements into public art instruction, aligning closely with the curriculum goals outlined by the Ministry of Education. Similarly, Ma [7] suggested that digital tools and media platforms can enhance the accessibility and depth of public art programs. His study revealed that informatization strategies—such as online modules and multimedia content—can overcome challenges like limited instructional resources and outdated facilities, which were also identified in the current assessment.

Curriculum implementation practices also require alignment with real-world constraints and stakeholder needs. Leocario and Pawilen [8] conducted a qualitative study on the Special Program in the Arts in secondary education and found significant gaps between policy guidelines and on-ground execution. They emphasized that resource shortages, weak administrative support, and inconsistent pedagogical practices can severely undermine curriculum impact. These findings resonate with issues identified in Jiangxi University's implementation, such as limited class hours and faculty development. Moreover, Niu [9] examined public art curriculum design through a postmodern media lens and concluded that integrating interdisciplinary teaching methods and interactive technologies improves student engagement, expression, and understanding of course content.

At a broader level, general education scholars have also highlighted the multi-dimensional value of art instruction. Lu [5] outlined the educational functions of university-level art curricula, asserting that these courses cultivate aesthetic consciousness, critical thinking, and humanistic values—outcomes that go beyond traditional academic measures. This perspective supports the findings in the current study, which show strong student satisfaction with course design despite limited correlation with academic performance. Together, these studies confirm that effective public art education hinges on curriculum innovation, institutional support, and interdisciplinary integration—critical factors for enhancing both artistic literacy and overall student growth [7].

Methodology

A descriptive correlative research design was used in this study. The study included 300 Grade 2022 Software Engineering and Grade 2022 VR Technology students enrolled in the course Art Appreciation and Criticism, and the purposeful sampling ensured that students from these pilot programs were included, totaling 169 people.

A questionnaire developed by the researchers assessed five aspects of public art curriculum implementation: curriculum objectives, curriculum activities, curriculum activities organization, and curriculum

evaluation. It measures effectiveness using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree."

Four curriculum experts reviewed the questionnaire for content validity. The questionnaire was tested on 15 external students and its reliability was calculated using the Cronbach's Alpha.

The relevant committee has approved the ethical approval. Participation is voluntary and confidential.

Results & Discussion

Survey students' evaluation of curriculum implementation, as shown in Table 1a-1d

Table 1a

Level of Assessment by the Students on the Implementation of the Public Art Education Curriculum in terms of Objectives

Indicator	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
The curriculum objectives . . .		
1. Are aligned with the goals of the fine arts curriculum as stipulated in the national guidance document.	4.69	Strongly Agree
2. Meet the requirements of local educational objectives.	4.56	Strongly Agree
3. Are communicated to relevant university stakeholders.	4.53	Strongly Agree
4. Are reflective of the needs and interests of students.	4.49	Strongly Agree
5. Are regularly reviewed and updated.	4.49	Strongly Agree
6. Are clearly stated leading towards the enhancement of the art performance of students.	4.67	Strongly Agree
7. Are clearly linked in the actual learning outcomes.	4.49	Strongly Agree
8. Are geared towards improving the students' aesthetic ability.	4.56	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	4.55	Strongly Agree

Note. 4.21-5.00 (Strongly Agree) | 3.41-4.20 (Agree) | 2.61-3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree/Inconclusive) | 1.81-2.60 (Disagree) | 1.00-1.80 (Strongly Disagree)

Table 1a presents the level of assessment of the Student-respondents on the Implementation of the Public Art Education Curriculum in terms of Curriculum Objectives. It can be gleaned from the table that the overall mean is 4.55, with a verbal interpretation of Strongly Agree. This suggests that based on the students' opinion, the course "Art Appreciation and Criticism" has achieved its original goal in terms of implementation. Students felt that the teaching objectives were clear and communicated effectively to them.

Table 1b

Level of Assessment by the Students on the Implementation of the Public Art Education Curriculum
in terms of Learning Activities

Indicator The learning activities . . .	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
1. Are designed to achieve the objectives of the National Curriculum.	4.57	Strongly Agree
2. Are highly integrated and interdisciplinary.	4.47	Strongly Agree
3. Include the generation and conceptualization of students' artistic ideas and works.	4.47	Strongly Agree
4. Are meaningful and relevant, enabling students to relate artistic ideas to their social context.	4.49	Strongly Agree
5. Allow students to explain the intent and meaning of their artwork.	4.47	Strongly Agree
6. Include the use of multimedia technology in the classroom thus making the activities interesting and interactive.	4.46	Strongly Agree
7. Include extracurricular activities that enrich classroom instruction	4.50	Strongly Agree
8. Enhance students' ability to access literature and express themselves in writing.	4.44	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	4.48	Strongly Agree

Note. 4.21-5.00 (Strongly Agree) | 3.41-4.20 (Agree) | 2.61-3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree/Inconclusive) | 1.81-2.60 (Disagree) | 1.00-1.80 (Strongly Disagree)

As presented in Table 1b, the overall mean for the level of assessment by the Public Art Education curriculum students in terms of “Learning Activities” is 4.48, with a verbal interpretation of “Strongly Agree or Excellent.” This suggests that students generally agreed that the learning activities in the course were well designed and that they were could actively participate in class discussions, practical exercises, and other activities, which effectively stimulated their interest in learning and enhanced their learning outcomes.

Table 1c

Level of Assessment by the Students on the Implementation of the Public Art Education Curriculum
in terms of Organization of Learning Activities

Indicator	Mean	V Verbal Interpretation
The organization of learning activities . . .		
1. Is well planned and integrated with the school calendar.	4.42	Strongly Agree
2. Does not interfere with or compromise the student's ability to complete the requirements of other subjects.	4.43	Strongly Agree
3. Is strongly supported by school administrators.	4.45	Strongly Agree
4. Includes local and national inter-school competitions.	4.37	Strongly Agree
5. Promotes for comprehensive student learning.	4.43	Strongly Agree
6. Is flexible to meet the needs and progress of students.	4.46	Strongly Agree
7. Is adjusted based on student performance evaluation and feedback.	4.47	Strongly Agree
8. Meets the goal setting of art appreciation and commentary.	4.34	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	4.42	Strongly Agree

Note. 4.21-5.00 (Strongly Agree) | 3.41-4.20 (Agree) | 2.61-3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree/Inconclusive) | 1.81-2.60 (Disagree) | 1.00-1.80 (Strongly Disagree)

As presented in Table 1c, the overall mean for the level of assessment of the student-respondents on the implementation of the art curriculum in terms of “Organization of Learning Activities” is 4.42, with a verbal interpretation of “Strongly Agree/Excellent .” This indicates a general agreement that the learning activities of the course were well organized and that students were able to participate actively in the class and gained a wealth of knowledge and skills.

Table 1d

Level of Assessment by the Students on the Implementation of the Public Art Education Curriculum
in terms of Evaluation

Indicator The evaluation of learning . . .	Mean	V Verbal Interpretation
1. Includes assessment activities on the artistic processes and products.	4.48	Strongly Agree
2. Employs assessment activities that are integrated across disciplines (dance, music, theater, visual arts) from which students can gain artistic experience and connect the arts to other disciplines.	4.50	Strongly Agree
3. Is linked to students' real-life experiences and students can apply their personal knowledge in different art forms.	4.50	Strongly Agree
4. Contains activities include students' knowledge, attitudes, and performance in artistic expressions and forms.	4.40	Strongly Agree
5. Showcases reports that include descriptive information and numerical data on student achievement.	4.46	Strongly Agree
6. Uses evaluation results in recognizing and rewarding students' exemplary performances.	4.44	Strongly Agree
7. Includes remedial activities for students who fall behind the standards .	4.50	Strongly Agree
8. Uses varied evaluation activities and tools to measure learning.	4.42	Strongly Agree
OVERALL MEAN	4.46	Strongly Agree

Note. 4.21-5.00 (Strongly Agree) | 3.41-4.20 (Agree) | 2.61-3.40 (Neither Agree nor Disagree/Inconclusive) | 1.81-2.60 (Disagree) | 1.00-1.80 (Strongly Disagree)

Table 1d presents the level of assessment of the student-respondents on the Implementation of the Public Art Education Curriculum in terms of Evaluation. The computed overall mean is 4.46 with a verbal interpretation of “strongly agree /excellent.” This means that the setting of curriculum evaluation has built a bridge between other disciplines, promoted the integration of knowledge and the improvement of comprehensive literacy, and deeply reflected the diversity and integration value of art education.

Collected art performance of the students in SY 2022-2023. As shown in Table 2

Table 2

Profile of the Students in terms of Academic Performance

Academic performance	Count	% of Total
90 to 100	9	5.3%
80 to 89	136	80.5%
70 to 79	19	11.2%
60 to 69	5	3.0%
Under 60	0	0.0%
Total	169	100

Note. 90-100 (Excellent) | 80-89 (Good) | 70-79 (Average) | 60-69 (Pass) | Under 60 (Fail)

Table 2 shows the distribution of academic performance among 169 students. The distribution of grades for the collected data is as follows: A total of 136 students, accounting for 80.5% of the total, have scores within the 80 to 89 range. In the 70 to 79 range, there are 19 students, constituting 11.2% of the total. The 90 to 100 range includes nine students, representing 5.3%. For the 60 to 69 range, there are five students, which is 3.0% of the total. No grades fall in the under-60 bracket. This indicates that most students have mastered the basic concepts, historical background and artistic characteristics of artworks.

The relationship between student achievement and curriculum implementation is compared, as shown in**Table 3a-3d**

Table 3a

Result of Correlation Analysis (Spearman rho): Implementation of Public Art Education Curriculum and Academic Performance (Objectives)

		Objectives	Academic performance
Objectives	Speaman's rho	—	
	P-value	—	
Academic performance	Speaman's rho	0.050	—
	P-value	0.518	—

Table 3a provides correlation information between the implementation of the "Public Art Education Curriculum (in terms of Objectives)" and the "Academic Performance" using Spearman's rho as the correlation coefficient. For the relationship between these variables, Spearman's rho is reported as 0.050, suggesting a negligible positive correlation between the two variables. Furthermore, the associated p-value is less than 0.518, above the commonly used significance level of 0.05. Therefore, the negligible positive correlation observed is

not statistically significant. In practical terms, this implies that as the implementation of the public art education curriculum in terms of “Objectives” becomes better; its impact is not felt in the academic performance of the students.

Table 3b

Result of Correlation Analysis (Spearman rho): Implementation of Public Art Education Curriculum and Academic Performance (Learning Activities)

		Learning Activities	Academic performance
Learning Activities	Speaman's rho	—	
	P-value	—	
Academic performance	Speaman's rho	0.073	—
	P-value	0.342	—

As shown in table 3b presents the correlation between the implementation of the "Public Art Education Curriculum (in terms of Learning Activities)" and the "Academic Performance" using Spearman's rho as the correlation coefficient. For the relationship between these variables, Spearman's rho is reported as 0.073, suggesting a negligible positive correlation between the two variables. Furthermore, the associated p-value is less than 0.342, above the commonly used significance level of 0.05. Therefore, the negligible positive correlation observed is not statistically significant. In practical terms, this implies that as the implementation of the public art education curriculum in terms of “Learning Activities” becomes better; its impact is not felt in the academic performance of the students.

Table 3c

Result of Correlation Analysis (Spearman rho): Implementation of Public Art Education Curriculum and Academic Performance (Organization of Learning Activities)

		Organization of Learning Activities	Academic performance
Organization of Learning Activities	Speaman's rho	—	
	P-value	—	
Academic performance	Speaman's rho	0.075	—
	P-value	0.330	—

Table 3c presents the correlation between the implementation of the "Public Art Education Curriculum (in terms of Organization of Learning Activities)" and the "Academic Performance" using Spearman's rho as the correlation coefficient. For the relationship between these variables, Spearman's rho is reported as 0.075, suggesting a negligible positive correlation between the two variables. Furthermore, the associated p-value is

less than 0.330, above the commonly used significance level of 0.05. Therefore, the negligible positive correlation observed is not statistically significant. In practical terms, this implies that as the implementation of the public art education curriculum in terms of “Organization of Learning Activities” is high, its impact is not felt in the academic performance of the students.

Table 3d

Result of Correlation Analysis (Spearman rho): Implementation of Public Art Education Curriculum and Academic Performance (Evaluation)

		Evaluation	Academic performance
Evaluation	Speaman's rho	—	
	P-value	—	
Academic performance	Speaman's rho	0.104	—
	P-value	0.179	—

Table 3d presents the correlation between the implementation of the "Public Art Education Curriculum (in terms of Evaluation)" and the "Academic Performance" using Spearman's rho as the correlation coefficient. For the relationship between these variables, Spearman's rho is reported as 0.104, suggesting a negligible positive correlation between the two variables. Furthermore, the associated p-value is less than 0.179, above the commonly used significance level of 0.05. Therefore, the negligible positive correlation observed is not statistically significant. In practical terms, this implies that as the implementation of the public art education curriculum in terms of “Evaluation” becomes better, its impact is not felt in the academic performance of the students.

The main objective of this study is to evaluate the implementation of public art education curriculum in Chinese universities, and analyze students' achievements, and on this basis, propose an improvement implementation plan for the development of public art curriculum in universities. The survey data show that students' evaluation of the implementing of public art courses in

Terms of objectives, activities, activity organization and evaluation is "Strongly Agree." However, the results of the significant correlation test show that curriculum implementation has no significant positive correlation with students' academic performance. The reason may be that in the process of curriculum implementation, the neglect of the improvement of knowledge application ability, the lack of management of learning activities, and the fixed evaluation standards of teachers will lead to the performance of students falling short of expectations, thus making the correlation between the quality of curriculum implementation and academic performance low. On the contrary, the views in collecting interview information, and other relevant literature confirm that specific, clear, personalized and comprehensive curriculum implementation is an essential

indicator of student learning effect and can significantly improve student academic performance.

The straightforward implementation of the objectives of public art curriculum can achieve the objectives set by the fine arts curriculum in the national guidance document, as shown in Table 1a, item1. Li, Pang and Li, [10] believes that in the setting of the objectives of the public art curriculum, the objectives are carefully constructed to clearly and specifically guide students to deeply understand and achieve the broad objectives set by the national education system. Similarly, curriculum activities are reasonably designed to help students understand and achieve the educational objectives set by the state, as shown in Item 1 of Table 1b. Ma [11] proposes that teachers should integrate the core qualities of various fine arts disciplines by the objectives and provisions of the Fine Arts Curriculum Standards for Ordinary High Schools (2017 Edition, 2020 Revision). Design multi-dimensional art appreciation activities. In Table 1c, item 7 "Adjusted based on student performance evaluation and feedback", Shang et al. [2] explained that in art course activities, based on students' real-time performance and positive feedback, The dynamic adjustment of teaching strategies and classroom activity design aims to create a challenging and supportive learning environment. In addition, Table 1d Item 2 "Assessment activities are integrated across disciplines (dance, music, theater, visual arts) from which students can gain artistic experience and connect the arts to other disciplines." Niu [9] emphasizes that the evaluation system of fine arts courses is carefully constructed, aiming to build a bridge connecting different disciplines, and promote the horizontal penetration and vertical deepening of students' knowledge system through interdisciplinary evaluation perspectives.

Table 2 covers the scores ranging from 90 to below 60, with 80.5% of students with academic scores above 80 and no scores below 60, i.e., no failure. This means that more and more attention is paid to the implementation of art curricula, which can improve students' academic performance. Deng [8] argued in his doctoral thesis that in China's higher education system, all kinds of aesthetic education courses, including compulsory and elective courses, are integrated into the credit system and become one of the key factors to in measuring students' graduation and further study qualifications.

As shown in Table 3a, there is a weak correlation between the implementation of curriculum objectives and students' academic performance. Ilic et al. [12] mentioned that the purpose of public art courses in colleges and universities is to establish students' correct aesthetic concepts, cultivate students' elegant aesthetic taste, and improve students' humanistic quality. These goals are mainly to enhance students' aesthetic ability and humanistic quality, rather than directly linked to the academic performance of professional courses, so they can't improve students' academic performance [13]. Similarly, it believes that teachers only pay attention to students' understanding of the curriculum knowledge domain while ignoring the performance of knowledge application ability when setting curriculum goals, which will result in a disconnect between curriculum goals and students' achievements [14].

As shown in Table 3b, the implementation of curriculum activities is weakly correlated with students' academic performance. Yu [15] proposed that In the study of BSED mathematics, if teaching heavily relies on

memory, curriculum content that meets educational standards and is organized in order may not necessarily improve grades, as memory cannot cultivate deep understanding. Similarly, this pointed out that in the teaching process of mathematical game activities, the fun and emotionality of games may lead to distracting students' attention, and students may focus all their attention on the game itself instead of the core mathematical content, thus affecting the in-depth understanding and mastery of mathematical knowledge [16]. This suggests that too much emphasis on gamification will distract students from the core content, therefore limiting their academic performance.

As shown in Table 3c, the analysis and results show a weak correlation between the organization and implementation of curriculum activities and students' academic performance, as Almazan et al. [17] believe there is no significant relationship between the organization of learning activities and students' academic performance. Even if the organization of learning activities is reasonably designed and has strong purpose and planning, If teachers do not supervise students' participation in learning activities in the actual teaching process, and do not provide enough practical opportunities and timely feedback, they will not be able to improve students' academic performance [18]. Meng [19] proposed that the implementation of teaching activities will not encounter difficulties, and even if implementing STEM courses provides students with the 21st century skills and abilities they need, it may not directly affect their academic performance. On the contrary, some scholars hold the opposite view, believing that these activities prioritize creative and practical learning of standardized exam content, resulting in high student satisfaction but little impact on grades [20]. On the other hand, research emphasizes that well-designed teaching activities, including interactive exercises and cooperative learning, can improve academic performance by cultivating active participation, critical thinking, and self-directed learning.

The results in Table 3d show that the implementation of curriculum evaluation has a weak correlation with students' academic performance. indicate that if the evaluation pays too much attention to the evaluation of learning results, the process evaluation does not receive due attention, and the single grade feedback of the evaluator lacks effective communication [21]. This will not reflect its due function, which will mean that the course scoring system has defects in effectiveness and has no direct impact on the improvement of students' grades. Similarly, Deng [22] proposed that the fixed assessment level and performance-working mode of teachers determine the existing assessment system, which to a certain extent obliterates the mobility and flexibility of ideological and political theory education, thus hitting students' enthusiasm for improving their comprehensive quality and ideological and political level. Therefore, only relying on teachers' fixed evaluation criteria to evaluate students may not significantly improve students' academic performance.

Implications of the study

The public art education course of Jiangxi University of Science and Technology has achieved excellent results in the course objectives, learning activities, learning activities organization, and evaluation. It is suggested that schools should further improve the implementation process of public art curricula based on

maintaining the existing curriculum implementation mode and conforming to the curriculum standards. Specifically, the school continues to define curriculum objectives, continuously enrich and organize learning activities in an orderly manner, and establish an effective and professional assessment system that enables students to acquire a wide range of skills, resulting in overall improvement of students' academic performance.

In addition, the distribution of public art performance grades indicates that most students achieve good performance levels, demonstrating the effectiveness of teaching. However, the presence of students with average and pass grade points are targeted for support for improvement. It is recommended that schools, teachers, and students maintain a positive mindset to meet the needs of students for academic growth and overall development.

Finally, given that there is no significant correlation between the implementation of arts appreciation and criticism curriculum and student performance, it is recommended to conduct in-depth analysis of other factors that affect student performance, such as individual needs, participation in extracurricular activities, organization of teaching activities and course evaluation methods, to fully understand the reasons for student excellence. Although the current correlation between curriculum and grades is not strong, students' interest and participation can still be stimulated through innovative ways of organizing learning activities and teaching evaluation. Introduce more interactive and personalized teaching strategies to increase the attractiveness of the course. At the same time, it is recommended to continuously monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of curriculum evaluation, regularly evaluate and adjust the teaching content, improve student achievement, and ensure that the curriculum better meets the needs of students. Through these measures, students' grades are significantly improved and the overall development of students is promoted. The quality of public art courses in the aspects of goal setting, activity content, activity organization, evaluation, and implementation will have a significant impact on stimulating their interest and enthusiasm in art learning and improving their learning efficiency and academic performance.

Acknowledgement

I am deeply grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback, which significantly improved the clarity and rigor of this manuscript.

I am also grateful to my colleagues and peers for their collaboration, stimulating conversations, and moral support during challenging phases of this research. Their camaraderie made the journey intellectually enriching and personally fulfilling.

My heartfelt thanks go to my family and friends for their endless encouragement and understanding. Their belief in my abilities, even during moments of self-doubt, provided the emotional foundation necessary to persevere.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or

not-for-profit sectors.

Author Contributions Statement

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Nani Zeng	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Juliet A. Demal en	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

C:Conceptualization

M : Methodology

So:Software

Va:Validation

Fo:Formal analysis

I : Investigation

R:Resources

D:DataCuration

O : Writing- Original Draft

E : Writing- Review& Editing

Vi:Visualization

Su:Supervision

P:Project administration

Fu:Funding acquisition

Data Availability

No new data were generated or analyzed in this study.

References

- [1] Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, “Guidelines for public art courses in higher education institutions,” 2022. [Online]. Available: http://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_xwfb/gzdt_gzdt/s5987/202212/t20221201_1010266.html

- [2] W. Shang, J. Yang, S. Chen, and J. Wang, "Construction of aesthetic education curriculum system in medical colleges," *Medical Education Management*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 264–269, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://journal06.magtechjournal.com/Jwk3_yyyzlt/EN/10.3969/j.issn.2096-045X.2024.03.002
- [3] X. Qian, "Teaching design reform of secondary vocational art appreciation course from the perspective of art education," *Esang Art*, no. 06, pp. 119–121, 2023.
- [4] T. Bai, "Curriculum reform and evaluation standard exploration of music aesthetic education in colleges and universities," *Curriculum and Teaching Methodology*, 2023. doi: 10.23977/curtm.2023.061415
- [5] J. Lu, Y. Liu, S. Liu, Z. Yan, X. Zhao, Y. Zhang, C. Yang, H. Zhang, W. Su, and P. Zhao, "Machine learning analysis of factors affecting college students' academic performance," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 15, Art. no. 1447825, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1447825>
- [6] A. Yang, "Research on the Implementation Path of Music Aesthetic Education in Public Art Education in Local Colleges and Universities," *Curriculum Learning and Exploration*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2024. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18686/cle.v2i1.3765>
- [7] H. Ma, "Research on the Innovation Path of Public Art Education in Colleges and Universities from the Perspective of Informatization," *Frontiers in Educational Research*, 2021. doi: 10.25236/FER.2021.041307
- [8] M. A. E. Leocario and G. Pawilen, "Implementation of the Special Program in the Arts Curriculum in a Public Secondary School," *International Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 6, 2015.
- [9] R. Niu, "Research on Curriculum Design of Public Art Education in Ordinary Colleges and Universities from the Perspective of Postmodern Media," *Curriculum and Teaching Methodology*, vol. 7, no. 8, 2024. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.23977/mediacr.2024.050324>
- [10] H. Li, X. Pang, and C. Li, "Review the development and evolution of aesthetic education in Chinese schools from a policy perspective," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, no. 6, p. 5275, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065275>
- [11] W. Ma, "The quality evaluation and management mechanism optimization of art education under the guidance of student development," in *Proc. SHS Web of Conferences*, vol. 177, pp. 1–6, 2024. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202420002033>
- [12] Ilić, T., Stojanović, S., Rančić, D., Jorgić, B. M., Cristian, R. S., Iordan, D. A., Mircea, C. C., Leonard, S., & Onu, I. (2024). *Relationship between Physical Activity Levels and Academic Performance in Adolescents from Serbia*. *Children*, 11(10), 1198. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children11101198>
- [13] Kwegyiriba, A., Agyemang, E., Mensah, R. O., & Awudja, J. C. (2021). *Analysis of School Environmental Factors Affecting College Students' Academic Achievement: The Case of Holy Child Training College in the Western Region of Ghana*. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 11(7), 105–111. doi: [doi:10.30845/ijhss.v11n7p13](https://doi.org/10.30845/ijhss.v11n7p13)
- [14] A. G. Roman, "Curriculum implementation and performance of mathematics education students in one state university in the Philippines," *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2019.

- [15] Y. Yu, "Evaluating teaching quality in colleges and universities of public art education using the AHP fuzzy comprehensive method," *Scientific Programming*, vol. 2022, Article ID 3491458, 2022. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2022/3529311>
- [16] C. Pei and Y. Wen, "The influence of mathematics classroom teaching quality on mathematics achievement: The mediating role of mathematics learning involvement," *Journal of Southwest University (Natural Science Edition)*, no. 04, pp. 20–26, 2022. doi: 10.13718/j.cnki.xdzk.2022.04.003
- [17] J. G. I. Almazan, D. A. Jacob, C. J. S. Saniatan, and J. Galangco, "STEM curriculum implementation and academic performance of senior high school students," *UNP Research Journal*, vol. 29, pp. 119–133, 2020. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.69566/ijestm.v29i1.60>
- [18] Yan Pei and Genshu Lu, "Design of An Intelligent Educational Evaluation System Using Deep Learning," *IEEE Access*, 2023. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3260979>
- [19] X. Meng, "Research on innovative paths in the curriculum design and teaching reform of art education," *The Educational Review, USA*, 2024. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.26855/er.2024.07.008>
- [20] Y.-H. Shih, "An Examination of the Functions of a General Education Art Curriculum in Universities," *Policy Futures in Education*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 306–317, 2019. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318811012>
- [21] James Russo, Leicha A. Bragg, and James Russo, "How Primary Teachers Use Games to Support Their Teaching of Mathematics," *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 409–418, 2021. doi: <https://doi.org/10.26822/iejee.2021.200>
- [22] J. Deng, "Research on aesthetics education course," Ph.D. dissertation, Southwest University, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://kns.cnki.net/KCMS/detail/detail.aspx?dbname=CDFDLAST2020&filename=1019914734.nh>