Received: 26 May. 2026 | Revised: 02 Jun. 2026 | Accepted: 10 Jun. 2026 | Published online: 29 Jun. 2026

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Contemporary Education and Teaching Research
2026, Vol. 7 (6)168-173
DOI: 10.61360/BoniCETR262020220602

Driving Evaluation through Competition and Training through Grading: Integrating CBA Standards into College Basketball Curriculum Reform

Feng Cheng [1] & Yinhua Huang[1,*]
[1]BEIBU GULF University, Qinzhou, Guangxi, P.R. China

Abstract: The basketball skill grading system established by the Chinese Basketball Association provides a standardized, progressive, and authoritative benchmark for evaluating basketball competencies, grounded in a scientifically structured framework. The deep integration of this grading system into public physical education basketball instruction in higher education not only addresses practical challenges inherent in traditional curricula but also offers a stratified basis for differentiated instruction tailored to students' individual needs. Against this backdrop, this study examines the compatibility between the CBA basketball skill grading standards and educational contexts and systematically analyzes the internal logic of integrating competition-driven assessment and level-based skill development into university public basketball teaching. Furthermore, it proposes practical pathways for embedding the CBA grading standards into college-level public basketball curricula. The study aims to provide both a theoretical foundation and practical reference for facilitating a paradigm shift in public basketball instruction—from an exam-oriented approach toward the sustained cultivation of lifelong physical literacy.

Keywords: basketball skill grading standards, university public basketball, competition-driven assessment, level-based skill development, teaching reform

1. Introduction

Basketball is among the most popular elective offerings in university public physical education (PE) programs; however, its instructional effectiveness has long been problematic. A considerable number of students complete one or two semesters with high scores on routine assessments—such as end-of-term shooting tests and dribbling through obstacles—yet these ostensibly high-level skills fail to withstand the demands of real-game competition. The root cause lies in the persistent reliance on static testing to evaluate a fundamentally confrontational and dynamic sport. Such assessments are incapable of capturing students' in-game decision-making abilities under defensive pressure and within team coordination contexts.

In 2024, the Chinese Basketball Association introduced a basketball skill grading system that classifies competencies into twelve distinct levels, thereby delineating a clear developmental progression for players. This system has since been implemented across 19 provinces and 88 accredited institutions nationwide, effectively functioning as a standardized benchmark for basketball skills. With this mature evaluative framework in place, universities are now positioned to move beyond exam-oriented paradigms and to construct more scientifically grounded, practice-oriented instructional models.

2. Systemic Characteristics and Educational Compatibility of the CBA Basketball Skill Grading Standards

2.1 Institutional origins and structural framework of the grading standards

From an institutional development perspective, the basketball skill grading system introduced by the Chinese Basketball Association constitutes a nationwide standard oriented toward the general public and youth populations. To ensure effective implementation, the Association first promulgated the Administrative Measures for the Grading of Chinese Basketball Skill Levels, which clearly define the classification structure and foundational principles. This was subsequently supplemented by a series of regulatory documents, including accreditation protocols for evaluation institutions, examiner management guidelines, and operational manuals. These collectively standardize the processes

Corresponding Author: Yinhua Huang
BEIBU GULF University, Qinzhou, Guangxi, P.R. China
©The Author(s) 2026. Published by BONI FUTURE DIGITAL PUBLISHING CO.,LIMITED. This is an open access article under the CC BY License(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

of evaluation, certification, and record-keeping, ensuring replicability, authorization, and traceability on a national scale.

A salient feature of this system is the twelve-level classification framework, ranging from Level 1 to Level 12, and further categorized into elementary (Levels 1–4), intermediate (Levels 5–8), and advanced (Levels 9–12) stages. This structure transforms the traditionally subjective judgment of "whether one can play basketball" into a measurable and manageable framework—identifying a player's current level, diagnosing specific technical deficiencies, and prescribing targeted training pathways.

In terms of implementation, the system was initially piloted in cities such as Wuhan in the summer of 2024 to collect empirical data. By December 2024, a revised version of the administrative measures and supporting documents was issued, encouraging local basketball associations and affiliated institutions to apply for authorization. Consequently, evaluation sites expanded from a limited number of pilot cities to 19 provinces, with accredited institutions increasing to 88 and annual participation reaching several thousand individuals. The system has thus evolved from an industry initiative into a widely applicable public evaluative instrument.

2.2 Scientific basis and progressive logic of skill dimensions

The grading system primarily evaluates six dimensions: fundamental body posture, footwork and movement, ball-handling control, passing coordination awareness, shooting efficiency, and basic tactical cognition. From a pedagogical perspective, this configuration offers three principal advantages.

First, observability: each assessment criterion corresponds to directly observable student behaviors. For instance, under defensive pressure, whether a student can maintain balance, protect the ball effectively, and execute controlled movements constitutes a set of concrete, assessable indicators within classroom settings.

Second, stratification: the twelve-level framework enables differentiated instruction. Rather than adopting a uniform teaching approach, instructors can conduct preliminary assessments to determine students' proficiency levels and assign tailored tasks accordingly. This mitigates the common instructional dilemma in which advanced learners are insufficiently challenged while beginners struggle to keep pace.

Third, transferability: the evaluation criteria shift away from mere conformity to textbook techniques toward functional effectiveness in real-game contexts. This aligns closely with the fundamental objectives of university PE, which emphasize the cultivation of sustainable physical activity habits that extend beyond the campus environment.

2.3 Mechanisms of alignment with university public PE objectives

First, the principle of teaching in accordance with individual aptitude can be more effectively operationalized (Ma, 2019). Instructors can employ simplified diagnostic assessments at the beginning of the semester to categorize students into approximate level bands (e.g., Levels 1–4 or 5–8), thereby enabling the design of differentiated instructional tasks in terms of intensity and complexity. This ensures that advanced students are not constrained by slower instructional pacing, while less proficient students are not discouraged by excessive difficulty.

Second, the system facilitates a shift in learning motivation, transforming external pressure (i.e., fear of failing) into intrinsic motivation driven by progressive achievement. While most public PE students are not averse to physical effort, they often resist aimless practice. When clearly defined milestones are established, training becomes a process of goal-oriented progression. Moreover, certification and records endorsed by the Chinese Basketball Association carry a degree of social recognition, with potential value extending to extracurricular activities, team selection, and even individual résumés.

Finally, the grading standards help correct the long-standing imbalance in public PE instruction that overemphasizes technical execution while neglecting tactical awareness. The system places greater emphasis on game intelligence and cooperative play, explicitly demonstrating that technical proficiency alone does not equate to effective performance. Students are required to develop competencies in reading defensive situations, utilizing screens, positioning, and off-ball movement—core elements that reflect the inherently confrontational nature of basketball (Cheng et al., 2008). These elements are also critical in fostering sustained interest and long-term engagement in the sport.

3. A Framework for Integrating Competition-Driven Assessment and Level-Based Skill Development into University Public Basketball Instruction

3.1 Reconstructing process-oriented assessment and activating self-directed practice

On the one hand, the core logic of competition-driven assessment lies in transforming a one-off final examination into a continuous record of day-to-day performance. Traditional public basketball courses typically rely on set-shot tests or timed dribbling drills for grading; while such metrics may reflect technical proficiency, they fail to capture performance stability in real competitive contexts. To address this limitation, small-scale instructional formats should be restructured into routine game-based activities, with instructional design systematically aligned to problems observed during gameplay, thereby effectively enhancing performance outcomes (Zhang & Zhou, 2023).

In practice, instructors can translate the six core dimensions of the grading standards established by the Chinese Basketball Association into observable in-game behaviors. These include, for example, whether a student can maintain a low center of gravity and protect the ball under defensive pressure, whether passes are delivered with appropriate anticipation, whether decision-making avoids placing teammates in disadvantageous positions, and whether off-ball movement demonstrates continuous positioning and effective use of screens. By incorporating 10–15 minutes of rotational assessment games in each class session and recording student performance through simple checklist-based instruments, instructors can accumulate a comprehensive process-oriented performance portfolio over the course of the semester.

On the other hand, level-based skill development primarily addresses the constraint of limited instructional hours in physical education. The grading standards should be decomposed into structured extracurricular training tasks, with each level accompanied by explicit practice requirements and performance benchmarks. Students complete these tasks during their own time or in reserved practice spaces, documenting their progress through check-ins. Instructors can ensure quality control through spot checks, short video submissions, and peer verification.

The effectiveness of this mechanism is driven by three factors. First, goal specificity: grading levels translate abstract instructional directives into concrete weekly targets, such as mastering a specific dribble-pass combination required at a given level. Second, social recognition: qualifications and certificates issued within the CBA system function as formal credentials endorsed by a national professional body, thereby enhancing students' sense of legitimacy and achievement. Third, peer influence: group-based instructional structures encourage observation, feedback, and collaborative learning among students (Wang, 2014). When the entire class is oriented toward level progression, peer-organized practice becomes normalized, reducing the need for constant instructor supervision.

3.2 A closed-loop coupling mechanism of "competition–assessment–practice integration"

Competition-driven assessment and level-based skill development together constitute a mutually reinforcing closed-loop system. Within this cycle, grading standards define both the content and threshold of skill acquisition; instructional games then subject these skills to high-pressure testing in authentic competitive contexts, simultaneously generating process-based evaluation data. Subsequently, assessment outcomes precisely identify students' weaknesses, directing them toward targeted remedial practice aligned with specific grading levels.

For this loop to function effectively, instructors must construct a precise mapping between grading dimensions and observable in-game deficiencies. For example, if the grading standard requires accurate chest passes while in motion, yet a student consistently exhibits delayed passing in games—resulting in teammates receiving the ball under defensive pressure—the issue cannot be addressed through generalized feedback such as "passing too slowly." Instead, the instructor must diagnose deficiencies in timing, anticipatory judgment, and defensive reading at the tactical cognition level. Correspondingly, training interventions should shift from undifferentiated repetition to targeted drills, such as practicing anticipatory bounce passes under live defensive interference, combined with immediate transition into triple-threat positioning upon reception.

Only when practice, competition, and assessment operate within a unified competency framework can public PE basketball instruction achieve an integrated state in which "teaching equals training, training equals competition, and competition equals assessment."

4. Pathways for Integrating CBA Grading Standards into University Public Basketball Instruction

4.1 Curriculum-Level embedded reform

First, course objectives must be hierarchically reconstructed in alignment with grading standards. Three instructional tiers should be established: the foundational level, corresponding to Levels 1–4, focusing on center-of-gravity control, ball protection, and fundamental passing skills; the developmental level, aligned with intermediate thresholds (approximately Levels 3–5), emphasizing technical stability under pressure and decision-making in three-on-three scenarios; and the advanced level, designed for high-performing students, incorporating full-court transitions and basic zone defense concepts.

Second, the semester teaching schedule requires systematic reorganization. The initial 1–2 weeks should function as a diagnostic phase to assess baseline proficiency and establish student profiles. The subsequent 10–12 weeks should adopt a cyclical instructional model, in which each technical module integrates both structured practice tasks and corresponding game-based applications. The final phase should involve a class-based mini-league for comprehensive evaluation, combined with accumulated process assessment data to determine final grades.

For instance, Shanghai University of Engineering Science was among the early adopters of embedding grading standards into its public basketball curriculum. The institution developed a four-tier certification system—Elite, Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3—and directly linked assessment outcomes to course placement. Students progress through stratified instructional tracks (beginner, intermediate, advanced, and representative team levels) based on certification results. Assessments are conducted each semester, combining theoretical and practical evaluations, and are administered free of charge by the university's physical education department. Empirical outcomes indicate high participation and pass rates, with sustained expansion in scale and significant improvements in structured skill development and campus basketball engagement.

4.2 Differentiated instructional implementation

At the outset of the course, diagnostic testing should be employed to classify students into three proficiency groups: foundational (Levels 1–2), characterized by inconsistent technique requiring fundamental correction; intermediate (Levels 3–4), demonstrating basic competence but instability under pressure; and advanced (Level 4 and above), possessing technical proficiency yet requiring enhanced decision-making capabilities.

While all groups may share common warm-up activities to maintain instructional cohesion, core training phases must incorporate differentiated constraints. The foundational group should prioritize technical stabilization, focusing on lowering the center of gravity, maintaining correct hand positioning for ball protection, and standardizing passing trajectories (Qi, 2025). The intermediate group should be required to utilize non-dominant hands, with emphasis on directional changes and anticipatory passing under simulated pressure. The advanced group should face heightened constraints, such as limited ball touches, increased defensive intensity, or mandatory tactical conditions (e.g., scoring only through pick-and-roll or weak-side cuts), thereby compelling the application of tactical cognition.

In post-session phases, instructors should strategically manage the communication of performance outcomes. Biweekly anonymized reporting of milestone achievements—such as the number of students attaining a specific level—can enhance visibility of progress while avoiding the negative effects of public ranking. This approach broadens access to achievement-based motivation and fosters a positive, growth-oriented classroom climate.

4.3 Multi-Agent collaborative evaluation mechanisms

First, instructors can employ minimal yet effective assessment tools—such as checklist-based evaluations accompanied by brief qualitative feedback—to identify performance bottlenecks and assign targeted practice tasks, dynamically adjusting evaluations based on student progress (Jin et al., 2010). These fragmented records collectively form a comprehensive process-evaluation chain.

Second, peer assessment is particularly valuable in post-game reflection sessions. Following each mini-game, a brief structured feedback segment (e.g., identifying preferred passing partners or challenging defensive behaviors) encourages students to develop observational and analytical competencies. Although peer evaluation should carry limited weight in final grading, its primary function is to cultivate game literacy.

Finally, self-assessment and check-in

mechanisms establish a closed-loop accountability structure. Through practice modules, short video submissions, attendance verification, and random inspections, students assume responsibility for meeting performance benchmarks, while instructors ensure the validity of submitted evidence. Where institutional infrastructure permits, digital skill portfolios can be developed to track each student's progression, including proficiency levels, key deficiencies, performance indicators, and training records. Such documentation not only supports objective grading but also serves as a credential for team selection and officiating training opportunities.

4.4 Institutional support: training resources and inter-university collaboration

At the implementation level, university physical education departments must formally incorporate the regulatory framework of the Chinese Basketball Association—including administrative measures, operational guidelines, and technical manuals—into faculty development programs. Regular professional training sessions and workshops should be conducted to ensure consensus on key technical criteria, such as the precise definition of effective low-center defensive movement, the accuracy requirements of bounce pass placement, and acceptable error margins for non-dominant hand layups.

In parallel, institutional policies should be refined to standardize teaching evaluation metrics, establish academic exchange programs, and quantify annual performance indicators, thereby fostering a sustainable ecosystem for pedagogical innovation and research (Wang et al., 2013).

Regarding facility management, universities can implement low-cost measures such as reserving time slots for extracurricular practice and designating simple training markers (e.g., cones or target zones). These initiatives signal institutional commitment to skill development and encourage student engagement. Additionally, grading milestones can be integrated into campus basketball culture through activities such as "Level Challenge Days," situational simulations, and group competitions during interdepartmental tournaments (Tang, 2025). Inviting certified evaluators to conduct demonstration assessments and provide placement recommendations can further validate instructional outcomes.

Finally, inter-university collaboration can be promoted through informal partnerships, including friendly matches and the exchange of referees or observers. Such initiatives diversify competitive environments and evaluation standards, enabling students to test their skills under varied conditions and thereby reinforcing the robustness of the "competition–assessment–practice" closed-loop system.

5. Conclusion

In summary, the grading system established by the Chinese Basketball Association should not be understood merely as an additional certification mechanism. Rather, through its twelve-tier progression and six core competency dimensions, it constructs a transparent, verifiable, and traceable developmental pathway for basketball skill acquisition.

The integration of competition-driven assessment and level-based skill development embeds this pathway into the operational logic of university public physical education basketball courses. Instructional games bring evaluation back into authentic competitive contexts, while the grading framework renders training objectives explicit and operationalizable. Consequently, instructors shift from being mere supervisors of practice to designers of training interventions and providers of structured feedback.

When skill progression is anchored in objective benchmarks, when self-directed practice is supported by clearly defined milestones and opportunities for demonstration, and when assessment is grounded in accumulated process evidence, basketball instruction can be transformed into a sustainable physical activity practice that students are able to carry beyond the classroom and into their long-term lifestyles.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest in this work.

Acknowledgement

The author received no financial support for this research.

References

Cheng, D. M., Guo, Y. B., & Zuo, J. S. (2008). Construction of basketball training philosophy in China. *Journal of Beijing Sport University, 31*(5), 704.

Jin, H. Z., Fan, H. W., & Liu, W. L. (2010). Reflections on teaching reform in university basketball curriculum. *Journal of Sport Science, 17*(8), 69.

Ma, D. P. (2019). Study on the "dynamic stratified teaching model" and optimization strategies in university basketball elective courses. *Sports Goods and Technology, 3*(17), 151.

Qi, B. W. (2025). Research on the application of stratified teaching model in university basketball courses. *Contemporary Sports Technology, 15*(22), 41.

Tang, Y. (2025). Research on reform pathways of university basketball teaching under the concept of "competition-driven teaching". *Contemporary Sports Technology, 15*(36), 33.

Wang, F., Wang, X. C., & Wang, C. (2013). Research on the construction and development of excellent basketball courses in local universities: A case study of Xiangnan University. *Sports Science and Technology, 34*(1), 120.

Wang, W. (2014). Application of diversified teaching methods in the university basketball curriculum. *Contemporary Sports Technology, 4*(28), 94.

Zhang, Z. J., & Zhou, Y. C. (2023). Value analysis and application of the sport education model in university basketball elective courses. *Sports Teacher, 46*(1), 7.

How to Cite: Cheng, F., & Huang, Y. (2026). Driving Evaluation through Competition and Training through Grading: Integrating CBA Standards into College Basketball Curriculum Reform. *Contemporary Education and Teaching Research, 07*(06), 168-173.
https://doi.org/10.61360/BoniCETR262020220602