

Policy History
Policy No. AC15
Approving Jurisdiction: Board of Governors with the advice of Senate
Administrative Responsibility: President and Vice Chancellor
Effective Date:

Micro-credentials Policy

A. CONTEXT AND PURPOSE

This policy establishes a framework for the development and approval of short, non-traditional educational offerings at Kwantlen Polytechnic University (KPU) in line with section 35.2(5) of the *University Act*. It aims to create a clear distinction between those offerings which are approved by Senate and those which are approved by the Provost.

B. SCOPE AND LIMITS

This policy applies to all educational offerings at KPU which fall outside of the jurisdiction of KPU Policy AC14 *KPU Credential Framework*. This includes a framework for the approval of Micro-credentials and Digital Badges. Micro Courses are noted for definitional purposes only, but fall under the scope of AC14. Short courses are also noted for definitional purposes.

C. STATEMENT OF POLICY PRINCIPLES

1. Micro-credentials are short, competency-based offerings.
2. Micro-credentials are represented by verifiable, portable, and shareable Open Badges that allow students flexibility in the way they articulate their competencies.
3. Micro-credentials are subject to an expedited Senate approval process to facilitate just-in-time development of new training needed by learners, employers, and the wider community.
4. Digital Badges are distinct from Micro-credentials in their content and assessment and are subject to a clear development and approval process under the oversight of the Provost and Vice President, Academic. This process should be shared with Senate and regular reports on Digital Badges sent to Senate in line with section 35.2(6)(c) of the *University Act*.

D. DEFINITIONS

Refer to Section A of AC15 *Micro-credentials Procedure* for a list of definitions in support of this Policy.

E. RELATED POLICIES & LEGISLATION

AC14 *KPU Credential Framework*

F. RELATED PROCEDURES

DRAFT

Policy History
Policy No. AC15
Approving Jurisdiction: Board of Governors with the advice of Senate
Administrative Responsibility: President and Vice Chancellor
Effective Date:

Micro-credentials Procedure

A. DEFINITIONS

1. **Digital Badge:** A KPU Digital Badge is used to represent completion-based learning through an activity offered by a KPU academic or service unit. It is not approved by Senate and is non credit-bearing. It is verifiable, portable, and shareable.
2. **Micro Course:** A KPU Micro Course is a modular version of an existing KPU course which is shorter in length and curriculum and results in less than 3 credits. It is approved by Senate through the AC14, *KPU Credential Framework Policy and Procedure*.
3. **Micro-credential:** A KPU Micro-credential is a short, flexible offering that is competency-based. It is approved by Senate, may be non credit-bearing, credit-bearing, or embedded within credit-bearing courses and programs, and is represented through an Open Badge.
4. **Open Badge:** A KPU Open Badge is used to represent competency-based learning through a KPU Micro-credential. It contains information about the competency and whether the associated Micro-credential is non credit-bearing, credit-bearing, or embedded within a credit-bearing courses and program. It is verifiable, portable, and shareable.
5. **Senate Micro-credential Committee (SMC):** A senate committee that may conduct its business synchronously or asynchronously for the purpose of expeditiously reviewing and approving micro-credential offerings at KPU.
6. **Short Course:** A KPU Short Course is a non-credit offering that is focused on knowledge acquisition in line with KPU Policy *AD4 Continuing Education and Contract Services*.

B. PROCEDURES

1. **Micro-credentials**
 - a. The Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum (SSCC) will create a subcommittee, *Senate Micro-credential Committee (SMC)*, for the purpose of reviewing and approving micro-credential offerings at KPU.
 - b. The SMC will have an elected Chair, from among the following members:
 - i. One faculty member from each Faculty
 - ii. One representative from the Office of the Provost and Vice President Academic
 - iii. One representative from Continuing & Professional Studies

- iv. One decanal representative
- c. The SMC will create and make available a Micro-credential Outline form.
- d. The SMC will oversee the following expedited approval process:
 - i. The SMC Chair receives a Micro-credential Outline form
 - ii. The SMC Chair determines if the form is complete and ready to be reviewed by the SMC. If the form is not complete, the SMC Chair will provide feedback to the proponent and await resubmission.
 - iii. The chair will assign three members of the committee to review the proposed Micro-credential over 10 working days in line with the following questions:
 - 1) Does the Micro-credential represent a duplication of offerings at KPU?
 - a) If the Micro-credential represents a duplication, the Department Chair of the department with the existing offering will be sent the proposal for review.
 - b) The Department Chair will be given 5 days to review the proposal and respond to the SMC Chair.
 - 2) Is the Micro-credential competency-based?
 - 3) Will the Micro-credential be credit-bearing or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs?
 - iv. At the end of the 10-day review, the Chair will electronically call the question on the approval of the proposed Micro-credential.
 - v. If all 3 members approve the proposal, the Chair of the SMC will sign the proposal and send to the Provost for signature.
 - vi. If less than 3 members approve the proposal, an electronic meeting will be held to discuss the proposal. At the end of the meeting a final vote will be called. If the proposal still does not have approval from all 3 members, it will be returned to the proponent for revisions.
 - 1) An appeal of the SMC decision, at the discretion of the Chair, can be made to the entire committee.
- e. Micro-credential proposals that are non credit-bearing will go through the SMC approval process. If approved by the SMC the proposal will then be submitted to the Provost for signature.
- f. Micro-credential proposals that have requested to be credit-bearing or embedded within credit-bearing courses or programs or to be recognized as a requisite for other KPU courses or degree requirements, will go through the SMC approval process. If approved by the SMC the proposal will then be submitted to the Provost for signature. Upon receipt of the signature of the Provost, the Micro-credential proposal will be sent to SSCC for review and recommendation to Senate.
 - i. An approved Micro-credential that has been signed off by the Provost may be offered as non credit-bearing while it is awaiting review by the SSCC and Senate.
- g. Micro-credentials will be reviewed annually by the relevant program area to ensure their currency and other related factors. Micro-credentials not offered for a period of 1 year will be considered by the Provost for discontinuance and sent to the SMC for action as needed.

2. Digital Badges

- a. The Provost will create a *Digital Badge Committee (DBC)* for the purpose of reviewing and approving Digital Badges.
- b. The DBC will have an elected Chair, from among the following members:
 - i. One faculty representative

- ii. One representative from the Office of the Provost and Vice-President Academic
 - iii. One non-academic administrative representative
 - iv. One decanal representative
- c. The Provost will send a regular report to SSCC listing all Digital Badges that have been approved since the last SSCC meeting.
- d. If SSCC determines that a Digital Badge has been created erroneously and should have fallen under the Micro-credential approval or other Senate approval process, the Provost will be asked to provide a more detailed explanation of the Digital Badge at the next SSCC meeting.
- e. If SSCC remains dissatisfied with the Digital Badge, it will be sent to Senate for a final decision.

C. RELATED POLICY

Refer to *Micro-credentials Policy*.

DRAFT

Backgrounder: Growth in Micro-Credentials in BC and Canada

Growth in Micro-credentials across Canada

A rapidly growing number of PSIs across Canada have moved to develop and offer micro-credentials. This includes Polytechnics Canada's 13 members, who have agreed on a [common understanding of micro-credentials](#) and are working together to develop and pilot shared micro-credentials, [22 member institutions of eCampusOntario](#) that are piloting micro-credentials, including the University of Guelph, Lakehead University, OCAD University, Ontario Tech University, Ryerson University, and the University of Toronto, as well as individual initiatives such as those at the [University of Calgary](#), [McMaster University](#), [Saskatchewan Polytechnic](#), [Conestoga College](#), [NAIT](#), [Lethbridge College](#), [Vancouver Community College](#), [Humber College](#), [Sheridan College](#), [Red River College](#), [St. Lawrence College](#), [Durham College](#), [Collège Boréal](#), and [York University](#). Many of the institutional micro-credentialing initiatives have launched or expanded since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. This is in line with federal lobbying efforts by [Universities Canada](#), [Polytechnics Canada](#), and [Colleges & Institutes Canada](#) for investments into upskilling and reskilling by providing funding for accessible short courses that develop career-relevant skills in key demand areas.

Growth in Micro-credentials in BC

The number of BC PSIs offering micro-credentials is expected to grow quickly, as in Sept. 2020 the BC Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training invited proposals from PSIs for a \$2M initiative to support the rapid development of up to 10 micro-credentials in high-demand, industry driven areas (to be launched between Nov. 2020-Jan. 2021). The Ministry is currently developing a Provincial framework for micro-credentials, a draft of which is expected in late Spring 2021.

The BC Council on Admissions and Transfer (BCCAT) recently published a [report](#) about the implications of micro-credentials for post-secondary admission and transfer practices. This report highlighted current examples of micro-credentials in BC such as [Thompson Rivers University's micro-credit transfer towards a university-level qualification](#), [Simon Fraser University's FASS Forward microcredit courses](#), and the [University of British Columbia's integration of open badges into courses and programs](#). The report also notes that 41% of Canadian institutional respondents surveyed by BCCAT reported that their institution is exploring establishing micro-credentials.

Growing Market Demand for Micro-credentials

Several recent labour market reports have identified interest and demand for micro-credentials in the Canadian marketplace. This includes reports from:

- [Higher Education Strategy Associates](#) (May 2019), which pointed to the Canada Training Benefit announced in 2019 federal budget (will pay up to 50% of training costs up to \$250 per year to encourage lifelong learning) in making a case for creating short-duration/high-value micro-credentials, with skills represented via digital badges.
- [BBC Worklife](#) (Feb 2020), which reported that human resource leaders in US companies across various industries were moving towards skills-based hiring, and that pointed to the use of micro-credentials as a supplement to core qualifications.
- [Deloitte](#) (May 2020), which forecasted scenarios for higher education over the next 3-5 years, including a greater need for institutions to work with industry to define the skills their employees will need. In ¾ of the recovery scenarios the report suggests the demand for short term, non-degree, micro-credentials that are linked to jobs and employers will be an important part of higher education's recovery. The report predicts an "uptick in enrollment at 2-year institutions as demand increases for stacked credentials and certificates and the traditional 4 year degree

becomes less sought after” and that “Tech, manufacturing, and other medium skill jobs [will] recover faster than others, driving employers to significantly shift their screening and signaling a shift from the 4-year degree to micro-credentials and certifications that allow for much more rapid skilling/reskilling to better meet their specific needs.”

- [RBC](#) (June 2020), which in a report on the future of post-secondary education pointed to the need for an inclusive and flexible approach to alternative learning, such as micro-credentials, along with efforts to modernize the credit transfer system to recognize micro-credentials towards a diploma or a degree.

Efforts to Develop Common Frameworks for Micro-credentials

Even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the exponential increase in the number and range of organizations both issuing and accepting micro-credentials had spurred several efforts at developing a common understand of and shared framework for this new currency of learning:

- In Europe, the [Common Micro-credential Framework](#) aims for greater consistency, quality and portability of micro-credentials (European MOOC Consortium 2019).
- The [New Zealand Qualifications Authority](#) introduced a micro-credential system in 2019 as part of New Zealand’s regulated education and training system.
- The US-based [Credential Engine](#)’s online registry provides scalable, system level mechanisms for supporting the quality assurance credential ecosystem.
- In 2019, [eCampusOntario](#) (eCO) published a set of principles and a framework for micro-certifications that was developed by a working group of employers and post-secondary representatives in Ontario. eCO is currently developing a common competency framework toolkit (expected by March 2021) that will provide linkages to micro-credentials and other certification pathways, including academic and industry qualifications.
- A group of senior academic officers from member institutions of Colleges & Institutes Canada developed a definition and guiding principles for micro-credentials in June 2020, and are currently working to develop pan-Canadian standards for micro-credentials.
- The recent call for proposals for micro-credentials from the BC Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training was described as forming the foundation for ongoing development in the BC post-secondary sector that will include the development of a micro-credentialing framework with BCCAT as part of a larger provincial initiative.

Given the need for a common framework for micro-credentials that will enable their transfer across institutions and define their relationship to traditional credentials, it is not surprising that the majority of micro-credentialing initiatives launched in Canada thus far have involved non credit-bearing micro-credentials. This trend is reflected in the forthcoming BCCAT report on micro-credentials, which notes that “most of these credentials are being awarded through continuing education departments, and thereby excluded from core academic transcripts” and that “most would also fall outside the scope of established institution-wide, credentialing frameworks and enterprise-level student record systems.”

Frequently Asked Questions About Micro-Credentials

1. [What is the difference between micro-credentials, open badges, and digital badges? Which may be credit-bearing vs. non credit-bearing? Who approves each?](#)
2. [What value do micro-credentials add?](#)
3. [Who are the potential audiences for micro-credentials?](#)
4. [Do employers understand micro-credentials?](#)
5. [What is the relationship of an open badge to a micro-credential?](#)
6. [What information is contained within open badges?](#)
7. [What is the relationship of open badges to the transcript?](#)
8. [Who regulates the international technical standards for open badges?](#)
9. [Why are you proposing to use the terms credit-bearing micro-credentials and non credit-bearing micro-credentials? Wouldn't it be simpler to simply refer to non credit-bearing micro-credentials as badges?](#)
10. [Are we being required to develop and embed micro-credentials in our academic courses and programs?](#)
11. [Doesn't the use of the term "badge" trivialize education?](#)

1. What is the difference between micro-credentials, open badges, and digital badges? Which may be credit-bearing vs. non credit-bearing? Who approves each?

The following table summarizes the relationships between these concepts:

	Non credit-bearing	Credit-bearing
Completion-based offering	<i>Type of recognition:</i> Digital Badge <i>Approving body:</i> Digital Badge Committee <i>Example:</i> Academic Integrity tutorial for students	N/A
Competency-based offering	<i>Type of recognition:</i> Micro-credential, represented by an Open Badge <i>Approving body:</i> Senate Micro-credential Committee <i>Example:</i> CPS/WSOD Short Course on Design Thinking	<i>Type of recognition:</i> Micro-credential, represented by an Open Badge <i>Approving body:</i> Senate Micro-credential Committee <i>Example:</i> Micro Course on Geographic Information System (GIS)

2. What value do micro-credentials add?

There are many different ways in which micro-credentials can add value for a broad range of audiences:

- **Motivation:** Offered within an existing program, micro-credentials can motivate current students to persist. A micro-credential could be issued to students after the successful development and assessment of key competencies (e.g., data collection and analysis). The open badge associated with the micro-credential gives students tangible evidence of accomplishment that they can publicly post and share. Research shows that micro-credentials that recognize that specific skills and competencies have been mastered have a positive effect on persistence (West & Randall, 2016).

- Articulation of Skills and Competencies: The meta-data contained within open badges associated with micro-credentials (learning outcomes, assessments, links to student work if an e-portfolio is used) can help students better internalize and articulate the skills and competencies they have mastered.
- Supporting Program Review: The integration of micro-credentials within academic programs would support program review efforts by providing clear data about the intra-curricular and cross-curricular competencies achieved by graduates.
- Developing Complementary Skill Sets: As an add-on to an existing degree program, micro-credentials allow students to distinguish themselves in a competitive marketplace through mastery of skills complementary to their chosen field of study. Consider the computer science major who adds a micro-credential in business communication or the computer science alumnus who needs to gain skills in the latest programming language. Consider the English major who adds a micro-credential in business analytics.
- Providing Pathways to, or Back to, Higher Education: For adult learners looking to start or return to college, micro-credentials can be used to break a degree program down into smaller sections of curriculum that stack toward a degree. After an extended period of time away from education, it can be intimidating to commit to a full degree. Allowing students to start small and build from there can provide a motivating, welcoming pathway to KPU.
- Supporting Business/Industry: Increasingly employers are looking for ways to up-skill their current employees to be able to promote from within, whether due to pending retirements, positions changes resulting from new technology, or simply overall organizational goals.
- Supporting Communities: Micro-credentials that provide professional development (e.g., basic business skills micro-credentials for QuickBooks, Excel, etc.) to small businesses and community organizations can be important extension of campus outreach.
- Life-Long Learning: Micro-credentials can be terrific tools to support life-long learning and professional development. This has applicability to business/industry and community organizations as described above. It also has significant potential for alumni and even KPU's own faculty and staff.
- Recruitment: To be *the* source for life-long learning for alumni can be part of recruitment strategy. Flexible, online micro-credentials could be developed to refresh skills, up-skill and/or prepare for a change in career. Thinking strategically about the development of these types of credentials, micro-credentials targeting alumni could stack to their next progressive degree.

3. Who are the potential audiences for micro-credentials?

Given the wide range of potential uses for micro-credentials, there are a number of different potential target audiences:

- Current students
- Prospective students
- Adult learners
- Alumni
- Business/Industry partners

- Community partners

4. Do employers understand micro-credentials?

While some employers may have heard of micro-credentials (and others like IBM and Ernst & Young are actively engaged in awarding them), we have much work to do with our local Boards of Trade to ensure that local businesses understand these new forms of recognition and how they support their need for skilled workers.

5. What is the relationship of an open badge to a micro-credential?

This relationship is similar to that of a parchment to a formal credential in that it carries information about the learning that has taken place along with features that attest to its official connection to the institution (e.g., stamps, signatures, and branding elements). However, an open badge is also verifiable, shareable, portable, and interoperable.

6. What information is contained within open badges?

Open badges include meta-data about the relevant micro-credential. An open badge clearly articulates the nature of the learning that has taken place, including what the outcomes of the learning were, whether the learning was credit-bearing or non credit-bearing, when it was completed (and whether it expires), and whether the micro-credential is one of a sequence or stacks. Open badges can even link to evidence of the learner's work if an e-portfolio is used and may contain endorsements of the value of the micro-credential from professional bodies or industry partners. It may be useful to think of this meta-data as the equivalent of a food label, but for small units of competency-based learning.

7. What is the relationship of open badges to the transcript?

Open badges would complement and augment the traditional transcript.

8. Who regulates the international technical standards for open badges?

The international technical standards for open badges were first developed by [Mozilla](#) but are now managed and sustained by the [IMS Global organization](#).

9. Why are you proposing to use the term micro-credential for both credit-bearing and non credit-bearing applications?

The term micro-credentials is used by PSIs and other organizations around the world to recognize learning that is both credit-bearing and non credit-bearing. The proposed terms follow a recommendation in a [recent comprehensive report about micro-credentials](#) from Deakin University and would also allow KPU's micro-credentialing initiatives to be consistent with the [International Standard Classification of Education \(ISCED\)](#).

10. Are we being required to develop and embed micro-credentials in our academic courses and programs?

No. The decision to develop micro-credentials within credit-bearing courses and programs rests with faculty and departments. This is not required; however, the desire to develop and offer micro-credentials has been expressed by several program areas.

11. Doesn't the use of the term "badge" trivialize education?

There have been concerns expressed about the term "badge;" however, open badges remain very prominent, powerful, and increasingly popular tools that learners can use as a reference when

describing the skills/competencies they have mastered that can also be posted on an e-resume and social media or shared via email with prospective employers or internship directors. The application of open badges with micro-credentials thus serves to enhance the value education for learners.

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
January 23, 2021	Micro-credentials Working Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a comprehensive package. I can see the care and thoughtfulness that you have put into making clear the various designations, pathways, and approvals. I think the flexibility and transparency embedded will work very well, and I am so pleased to see that you have thought through how internal facing digital badges (which we are very interested in for the writing labs) will fit within this eco-system. There are so many cross-currents here that I had wondered about, but your clear definitions have answered all of my questions about how these different definitions would work and co-exist. Looking forward to seeing the digital badges up and running! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy and procedure seem clear and reasonable to me. The background document was comprehensive, thoughtful, and answered all my questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I appreciate the fulsome background and context you've provided and of course, the careful delineation between digital badges/micro-credentials and their respective processes and procedures. This should help to alleviate some of the concerns that faculty might have, and will hopefully expedite the process for approving future badge proposals from service areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This looks very thorough and well-supported. I wondered if "non-traditional" might mislead the reader or cause some reaction? In my mind I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are indeed some groups that refer to micro-credentials as "alternative digital credentials;" however, given the various

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		thought "alternative" might be a better descriptor -- but this is not a critical point!	ways in which micro-credentials may enhance the education we provide (e.g., embedding within credit-bearing courses and programs) I would recommend against framing these new offerings as "alternative"
February 3, 2021	Senate Standing Committee on Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the definition of "Open Badge" (it currently is defined as "... used to represent a KPU Micro-credential" and how it is currently defined seems "circular" in nature. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The definitions have been revised to enhance clarity and to remove any potential circular references
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The procedures are very detailed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed procedure is an attempt to be clear and thorough
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion of a graphic (e.g. Venn diagram) that illustrates similarities and differences across the definitions and concepts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A chart has been added in the backgrounder document (New FAQ #1) to clarify the similarities and differences between the different types of offerings
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggestion of adding working examples to illustrate each category (e.g., digital badge, micro-credential, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working examples have been included in the new chart in the backgrounder document (New FAQ #1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider adding representation from service area(s) in DBC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The composition of the DBC has been expanded and now includes one non-academic administrative representative
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the sort time for approval by the SMC (5 days) realistic? Is there consideration to lengthen that 5-day turnaround time? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SMC approval timeline has been revised from 5 working days to 10 working days. This is in line with the review timeline used successfully by other cross-functional committees, such as with applications for Open Educational Resource Grants and the Teaching & Learning Innovation Fund

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
February 5, 2021	Senate Standing Committee on Academic Planning & Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to ensure all the checks and balances are done adequately when we have a 5-day turnaround time. How do we ensure we have the time and resource to make sure that the offerings reflect the university well and that the quality assurance process and controls built-in are thorough? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SMC approval timeline has been revised from 5 working days to 10 working days. This is in line with the review timeline used successfully by other cross-functional committees, such as with applications for Open Educational Resource Grants and the Teaching & Learning Innovation Fund The completing of the Micro-credential outline form will include necessary consultation before the proposal is submitted for review The members of the SMC will receive education and training about micro-credentials to deepen their expertise in this area Following SMC approval, proposals for credit-bearing micro-credentials will go on to SSCC for approval whereas proposals for non credit-bearing offered by CPS will go on to the joint KPU-KFA committee for approval In addition to the quality assurance during the development and approval process, the annual review of approved micro-credentials will help ensure that quality is maintained at a high level
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From p.2: "Given the need for a common framework for micro-credentials that will enable their transfer across institutions and define their relationship to traditional credentials, it is not surprising that the majority of micro- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We aim for a flexible policy that supports the development of both non credit-bearing and credit-bearing micro-credentials

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		<p>credentialing initiatives launched in Canada thus far have involved non-credit bearing micro credentials". Do you also foresee that most micro-credentials at KPU will be non-credit bearing?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is challenging to distinguish between a micro-credential and a digital badge based on the language in the draft, as well as competency-based vs. completion-based. The definitions are still a bit confusing. The documents read very well. We want KPU to look good. KPU needs to do this. There are lots of clinically-based opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of credit-bearing micro-credentials will be driven by faculty, programs, and departments. There has already been significant interest expressed in this across the university. The definitions have been revised to enhance clarity and to remove any potential circular references A chart has been added in the backgrounder document (New FAQ #1) to clarify the similarities and differences between the different types of offerings This is a common goal. KPU has an opportunity to innovate in this space to the benefit of our learners, programs, community, and industry partners.
February 10, 2021	Senate Standing Committee on Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that questions, comments and feedback be recorded, so there is a reference point for future discussion as this policy proceeds through the final approval process. What is the difference between an open badge and a digital badge? There is a lack of clarity in some of the proposed definitions as there are ambiguities. Is there a way we can clarify by differentiating between completion-based offerings and competency-based offerings. This is an exciting proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was already planned and is being done, as evidenced by this table. The definitions have been revised to enhance clarity and to remove any potential circular references A chart has been added in the backgrounder document (New FAQ #1) to clarify the similarities and differences between the different types of offerings We agree. KPU has an opportunity to innovate in this space to the benefit of our learners, programs, community, and industry partners.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Venn diagram would be excellent. An explanation of how different bits overlap and fit together to make something bigger (like a 3 cr hr course). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A chart has been added in the backgrounder document (New FAQ #1) to clarify the similarities and differences between the different types of offerings In the case of credit-bearing micro-credentials, one option would be to disaggregate a competency-based 3-credit course into a series of three 1-credit micro-courses. This is just one example of how a longer, more traditional course or program may be disaggregated into a series of stacked micro-credentials.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is appreciation for the nimble process built-in, but there is a concern on the 5-day turnaround time for the sort time for approval by SMC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SMC approval timeline has been revised from 5 working days to 10 working days. This is in line with the review timeline used successfully by other cross-functional committees, such as with applications for Open Educational Resource Grants and the Teaching & Learning Innovation Fund
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair of the newly proposed committee – is it the intent that the Chair be the “gatekeeper” (e.g., appeal of SMC decision)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Chair plays a supportive, rather than a gatekeeping role. The Chair of the SMC is intended to be knowledgeable enough to guide and support the developer, but it is the 3 delegated members of the SMC who are the decision-makers. Note that it takes a lack of consensus among the 3 delegated SMC members during both the initial review and during a called meeting to reach a point where an appeal to the whole SMC is even possible. The SMC Chair will work to assist the proponent in submitting a proposal that

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			addresses all of the required criteria and that anticipates the questions that the SMC members will pose.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual review: there is concern about bandwidth and workload. Once this picks up and if/when we have a long list of micro-credentials in place, will there be a bottleneck if this is done annually? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The onus to review approved micro-credentials on an annual basis falls on the offering program/department, so there is no single bottleneck for reviews. Previously-approved micro-credentials that go to the SMC for further action are only those that a) have not been offered for a period of one year and b) have been recommended by the Provost for discontinuance. It is not anticipated that we will have a larger number of approved micro-credentials that meet both of these criteria and so the discontinuance of micro-credentials is not expected to create a bottleneck at the SMC.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful to see concrete examples of a digital badge, open badge, micro-credential, credit vs. non-credit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working examples have been included in the new chart in the background document (New FAQ #1)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a major initiative and a significant Policy that will impact all faculty members in the institution, but the Policy seems to have come from top down. Why has there not been any consultations or grassroots discussions at Faculty Councils early in the process? Could the Policy be sent to all Faculty Councils for direct feedback prior it goes to the Policy Blog? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been consultation and grassroots discussions taking place across the university for more than a year (although this process was interrupted due to the onset of the pandemic). Even prior to the pandemic, both faculty (e.g., Faculty of Science & Horticulture Chairs) and staff (e.g., Student Services) groups were consulted, as were the members of the

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			<p>cross-functional Micro-credentials Working Group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More recent consultations include those with the Vice Chair of Senate, University Registrar, University Secretary, and the Senate Standing Committees on Policy Review and Academic Planning & Priorities. Members of the Senate Standing Committees were encouraged to share the draft documents with their colleagues. • Meetings have been scheduled with each Faculty Council (or in some cases Faculty Chairs and other committees) in the coming weeks, beginning with Arts Faculty Council on February 19. The Senate Standing Committees on Policy Review, Academic Planning & Priorities, and Curriculum will each be revisited a second time while the policy is on the blog, before they are visited for a third time during the approval process. • It is hoped that the six-week period on the policy blog will be taken as an opportunity for all members of the university community to review and comment on the proposal. • We agree that this policy has significant potential to advance curricular innovation across the institution. However, the development of credit-bearing micro-credentials will be driven by faculty and programs, not imposed from top down.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The growing list of interested micro-credential and digital badge developers who have been in touch with the AVP, Teaching and Learning indicates that there is strong interest across the university in advancing with this policy.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The institution needs to be responsive to the changing needs of the community we serve. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We agree. KPU has an opportunity to innovate in this space to the benefit of our learners, programs, community, and industry partners.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit-bearing micro-credentials: how many credits will they be? How small could they be in terms of the number of credits? Should there be a lower limit? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Micro-credentials exist in various sizes and the proposed policy allows for flexibility in the size of micro-credentials. However, transparency is a key element here and so the specific outcomes, the length, and other details of the training will be specified, including in the meta-data in the accompanying open badges. In the case of credit-bearing micro-credentials, one option would be to disaggregate a competency-based 3-credit course into a series of three 1-credit micro-courses.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is potential for micro-credentials to be stacked to contribute partially towards a more traditional credential. How do we safeguard the “stacking” so the micro-credentials do not undermine the viability of the existing credit-bearing programs at KPU? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal is for micro-credentials to enhance, not undermine, the value of the education we provide. For example, the pandemic has amply demonstrated the positive impact of increasing flexibility for students through remote delivery. Micro-credentials represent a different form of flexibility in learning, as these shorter

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a faculty is on a full teaching load, and also teaches a 1.0 credit-bearing micro-credential, how is that going to fit into the workload of faculty? (This is to be addressed through a discussion between the University and the KFA.) 	<p>offerings meet the needs of many learners (including working adults who are unable to enroll in KPU programs of a traditional size and structure). Micro-credentials also serve labour market needs, especially in the case of areas where there are identified skills shortages, and where individuals need to upskill or reskill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of credit-bearing micro-credentials will be driven by faculty and programs. Likewise, the decision to permit the stacking of micro-credentials into existing credit-bearing programs rests with the proponent(s) who will be the faculty in that program. Even if a learner completes a micro-credential and applies to have it considered as part of the evaluation of their prior learning and experience, PLAR assessments also remain the decision of the qualified faculty in that program. In short, every pathway from micro-credentials to existing credit-bearing programs will be controlled by faculty, who are best placed to make decisions about curricular innovation in their program area. Note: During the SSCC meeting it was noted by the Chair that this question should be addressed through a discussion between the University and the KFA.

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a possibility where someone who is not registered in a program, would go and earn a long list of micro-credentials, and return to apply for a degree based on earned/completed micro-credentials? • Where will micro-credentials be housed, and in what kind of database? Who will manage, control and provide oversight to them? Who will have access to them, and how will accessibility be managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earning and stacking micro-credentials does not overrule program/graduation requirements. • The open badges associated with micro-credentials are permanently recorded in a badging platform, which is centrally managed by the Office of Teaching and Learning. Following the one-time set up of a new open badge, the specific individuals nominated by the department or unit offering the micro-credential will be granted the delegated permission to issue the open badges to learners whom they have confirmed have met the criteria for completing the micro-credential. • KPU's current badging platform is CanCred, which adheres to the common international standards managed by the IMS Global organization. These common technical standards allow for interoperability and portability, so even if KPU changes its badging platform in the future, badges issued in the current platform may be ported into the new platform. • Open badges associated with micro-credentials are issued to learners who successfully complete a micro-credential. Thereafter, the decision to share the open badge publicly is under the control of the learner. In addition to being able to share specific open badges in social media

**Draft Policy and Procedure AC15 Micro-credentials
Consultation Feedback (January - February 2021)**

Date	Stakeholder	Feedback	Responses (from Policy Developer)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would employers have access to verify micro-credentials. 	<p>platforms (e.g., LinkedIn) or in ePortfolios, learners will also have access to their own personal registry within the badging platform.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. The open badges used to represent micro-credentials are verifiable. In practical terms this means that employers will be able to view the meta-data associated with a given open badge, including the date and time stamp from when it was issued and details concerning the competency.

Policy Sponsor: President and Vice Chancellor

Approving Jurisdiction: Board of Governors, with Senate Advice

Policy Developer: Dr. Rajiv Jhangiani, Associate Vice President, Teaching and Learning

Step(s)	Action(s)	Date(s)	Submission Deadline	
1.	Solicit feedback from stakeholder group(s) on draft policy and procedure. Finalize draft policy and procedure.	Review best practices, draft Policy and Procedures, consult with stakeholder groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Academic Council</i> • <i>SSC Policy</i> • <i>SSCAPP</i> • <i>SSCC</i> 	January 21, 2021 February 3, 2021 February 5, 2021 February 10, 2021	<i>January 18, 2021</i> <i>January 25, 2021</i> <i>January 22, 2021</i> <i>January 27, 2021</i>
2.	Provost	For approval to proceed to PUE.	February 11 – 18, 2021	
3.	PUE	For approval to proceed to public posting.	February 25, 2021	<i>February 19, 2021</i>
4.	KPU Policy Blog (6-week public posting)	6-week public posting period on KPU Policy Blog.	February 26 – April 8, 2021	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SSCAPP</i> • <i>SSC Policy</i> • <i>SSCC</i> 	March 26, 2021 March 31, 2021 April 7, 2021	<i>March 12, 2021</i> <i>March 22, 2021</i> <i>March 24, 2021</i>
5.	Finalize draft policy and procedure.	Respond to blog comment(s), if any. Finalize draft Policy and Procedure and incorporate feedback where appropriate.	April 9 – April 23, 2021	
6.	Provost (Sponsor)	For approval to proceed to PUE.	April 26 – May 6, 2021	
7.	PUE	For approval to proceed to final approval process.	May 13, 2021	<i>May 7, 2021</i>
8.	Final Approval Process (Senate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>SSC Policy</i> • <i>SSCAPP</i> • <i>SSCC</i> • Senate (for approval and recommendation to the Board for approval) 	June 2, 2021 June 4, 2021 June 16, 2021 June 28, 2021	<i>May 21, 2021</i> <i>May 21, 2021</i> <i>June 2, 2021</i> <i>June 18, 2021</i>
9.	Final Approval Process (Board)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board Governance Committee • Board of Governors (for approval) 	September 8, 2021 September 29, 2021	<i>August 27, 2021</i> <i>September 17, 2021</i>