

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
UH System	no comments	<p>The definition of credential seems incomplete after the phrase institutional-based acknowledgment. Should it be "institutional-based acknowledgment of credit"?</p> <p>The definition of micro-credential includes a mention of "assessed prior learning achievements". Should this be rephrased to say "prior learning assessment" to align with the UHCC policy 5.302. Additionally the word "smaller" in this definition could be misleading. Perhaps it could be rephrased as "Credit-bearing micro-credentials are of a lesser scale (or are comprised of fewer credits) compared to degrees, majors, minors, certificates, concentrations, and other credentials."</p> <p>The digital badges definition uses "Open Badges standards" but I am unsure if these standards are widely known. Should there be a definition of "Open Badges standards"?</p>	<p>The word competency is used to describe a mastery level MC as well as a digital badge. Given that we have "Certificates of Competency" will the certificate be confused with a mastery level MC? It might be reworded as "A demonstrated skill in evaluating or creating content, determined by the accomplished level of ability".</p> <p>Same concern about Competence as a type of digital badge for non-credit give we have certificate of competence for credit bearing. Might other names for this badge be considered such as "workforce mastery, career proficiency, or professional aptitude".</p>	With the move to create a micro-credential policy I would encourage UH to also consider the comprehensive learner record.	<p>Re: 3G: The definition of credential was taken verbatim from EP 5.205. We removed the word "smaller" so that the sentence now reads, "Those that bear credit are of a lesser scale than..."(1) Re: "assessed prior learning achievements" vs. "prior learning assessment," the phrase "assessed prior learning achievements encompasses various forms of assessing prior learning achievements that may or may not include a direct assessment. RE: Open Badge standards ensure interoperability of meta data and seamless portability of digital badge content by the earner.</p> <p>Re 3H: We replaced the category of "Competence" with "Skill."(2) We replaced "achieved level of competency" with "accomplished level of ability." (3). In III.B.1 and III.B.2, we replaced "comptency" with "skill set" (4) Re 3I (data management): We agree with the respondent that "campuses have different practices," which is precisely why the policy does not prescribe which person or which campus office will be responsible for ensuring data compliance and reporting.</p>
UH Manoa				Ineligible for Title IV aid unless also meets the requirement of their degree program. Degree Program enrollment reporting should not reflect these courses if not applicable.	Re 4I: We agree with the respondent and note that nothing in this policy effects degree program enrollment numbers. Micro-credentials are not degrees.

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
UH Manoa		<p>II(2):</p> <p>'Awareness' be 'Foundation'.</p> <p>II(3):</p> <p>We question the need for this section as presently laid out. It is not clear how Academic differs from Competence. When a student earns academic credit they are already demonstrating competency over the learning outcomes/objectives for the said academic credit. Additionally, every microcredential should represent a set of competencies, with aligned assessments demonstrating achievement of those competencies and/or learning outcomes.</p> <p>We recommended that 'academic' be removed altogether and merge with 'competence' and to read as follows: Badge issued for credit and non-credit bearing courses, training, or professional development demonstrating competency in learning outcomes.</p> <p>It is also not clear what participation is. It feels like this definition needs flushed out to define what kinds of participation (i.e.: attending a conference, seminar, active participation with evaluation, field experiences) would award this badge. Recommend something written as follows: Badge issued to learners who have either actively engaged or attended a course, conference, or webinar about an area of interest.</p>	<p>Comments on III(8):</p> <p>How this section phrased could open the door for individuals to earn academic credit without paying tuition and/or fees (i.e.: Get credit for IS 101 course from non-credit work). We recommend that when academic credit is awarded that it is accompanied by tuition and/or fees.</p> <p>Additionally, ensure that no microcredentials will transfer between campuses or other institutions unless it has been awarded academic credit, including by stacking.</p> <p>Lastly, further clarification on how microcredentials may be stacked (i.e.: could they lead to a larger credential, such as towards a certificate or a degree) and what are the prerequisites for stacking could help.</p> <p>Comments on III(9):</p> <p>Clarity is needed for who will be responsible for maintaining the data on the credentials. Campuses have different practices and so having clear direction on who is responsible for recording this data will be important.</p> <p>There needs to be a central repository for where these credentials may reside. It doesn't need to reside in the Banner Student Information System, but there needs to be standard for where this student information will</p>	<p>I believe that this is an important way to acknowledge the different ways in which students learn, outside of the classroom. I am glad that UH System and other campuses are looking to scaling this for our campuses and learners. Thank you for sharing for input.</p>	<p>Re 5G: While we acknowledge that "Foundation" is a viable alternative to "awareness," we also have concerns that the use of this term could cause confusion since it is already integral to UH general education. In Section II.C, we have replaced "Academic" as a category of badge with "Academic Achievement" (5) and re-ordered the taxonomy (6).</p> <p>Re 5H: UH campuses already award students credit that is divorced from tuition and fees (e.g., AP exams, IB exams, second language back credit, and Early College, which is funded under an MOA with the HIDOE). The question of the transfer of stackable micro-credentials between UH campuses is a campus-level decision. The policy already states that "Each campus shall determine criteria and processes for the incremental stacking of micro-credentials." The ability of campuses to set degree requirements that include a mandatory number of credits earned at the home campus is already enshrined in UH policy. We have added the phrase "...including how they might lead to a credential" to Section III.H of the policy.</p> <p>Re 5I: We have inserted the phrase, "...in a central repository" (7).</p>

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
Leeward CC				<p>If/when micro-credentials are introduced on the credit side, what is the difference between micro-credentials and the many certificates of competence and achievement (or academic subject certificates) that are already being offered to students? Why not just create new certificates within the existing UH system framework rather than creating something completely new?</p> <p>Will students have to declare a micro-credential as a major? What office will be responsible for tracking and awarding micro-credentials? Who creates the digital badges and how will they be maintained? Will the micro-credentials appear on transcripts? Will hard copy diplomas be available?</p> <p>The documentation indicates that only limited resources will be required but this will be something that some office will need to be responsible for on top of whatever else they are already doing, and it really is not clear what purpose micro-credentials will truly serve or how they will differ from what the community colleges are already doing via our existing certificates.</p> <p>Even after reading through the information provided I'm not really sure that I can explain exactly what a micro-credential is or what it will be used for or whether it really be worth the time and effort that will be required by campuses to implement.</p>	<p>This policy provides campuses with the option of creating micro-credentials, which differ from certificates of competence in that they are linked to skill attainment rather than credits. Students will not need to declare a micro-credential "major" since these are not degree programs. Each campus shall decide its own process for tracking and awarding micro-credentials, in accordance with the terms of this policy. The UH Online Innovation Center currently manages the issuing of digital badges for the UH System under the 2022 guidance memo from VPAS Halbert. The micro-credentials will not appear on transcripts but may be documented through digital badging. This policy does not obligate campuses or individual programs/units to implement micro-credentials.</p>
Kapi'olani CC				<p>There needs to be a clear and thoughtful rollout plan with the announcement of any form of micro-credentials especially in the K12 community, public, charter, and private schools. High schools are pushing students to complete some kind of certificate while in high school, and I question the reasoning and through process behind it. The Taxonomy for Micro-Credentials addresses "Awareness", "Proficiency", "MASTERY". High schools and Hawai'i P20 needs to be TRAINED and EDUCATED on what this all means BEFORE they start introducing micro-credentials in their Early College/Running Start conversations. I hear people use terms such as "opportunity" and "access", which I understand but what is the journey and developmental steps that empower these students (and their families) with the understanding of their academic journey? At times, we are too quick to issue degrees at the expense of our students. My wish is to see purposeful and targeted conversations (which could take years) that creates a more mindful and collective mindset around micro-credentials.</p>	<p>The policy is silent on early college and running start programs. We have revised the taxonomy section of the policy based on feedback received during consultation. We agree with the respondent that each campus will need to develop a clear and thoughtful rollout plan, but this is not an item to be addressed in the system policy. Conversations on the establishment of a UH micro-credential policy began in 2021.</p>

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
Kapi'olani CC		<p>Regarding Competency Badges for Professional Development: Why has this been centralized? There are campuses that offer high-quality professional development to employees that should be able to establish competency assessments aligned with their PD and issue/manage badges at this level. Why would the UH System be the only body identified to issue such badges? If the UH System wishes to offer this to campuses that wish to offload this workload, that's a nice option, but individual campuses should not be restricted to going through the UH System as the ONLY option for issuing digital competency badges to employees. Kapi'olani CC used to issue badges to individuals who earned a qualifying score on the competency assessment associated with our Fundamentals of Digital Accessibility PD course, and we now offer only a digital certificate (PDF) because we do not feel we should have to hand over oversight to the UH System. This is not a UH-created, facilitated, or managed PD program, and each campus should have the ability to issues digital micro-credentials for programs they own.</p>	<p>Given the text in III.F., why would the "Competence" badges ONLY be issued by UH (as noted in Section II.C.3) and not by campuses?: "Micro-credentials shall be developed at the campus level, and it is the purview and responsibility of each campus to develop and implement procedures for the creation of new micro-credentials. Each campus shall be responsible for ensuring the integrity and effectiveness of its micro-credential offerings through appropriate processes of assessment and evaluation." (III.F)</p> <p>Please remove the restrictions on Competence-related Badges (i.e., being issued by UH) in II.C.3 so this is not in conflict with III.F.</p>	<p>Please remove the portion of Section II.C.3 "...issued by UH" which conflicts with III.F. and restricts campuses from issuing competency badges associated with their own professional development programs. Campuses should have ownership of these badges aligned with their own programs. Mahalo.</p>	<p>The policy is silent on the matter of which units (e.g., individual campuses) may issue digital badges. It only requires campuses to adhere to Open Badges standards and follow certain reporting requirements. Re II.C: We have renamed this digital badge category from "competence" to "skill." The term "UH" as specified in this section includes UH campuses. This section (II.C) does not conflict with Section III.F. The latter deals with the academic integrity of the micro-credential while the latter refers to a category of digital badge representation. This is akin to the relationship between a degree program and a physical diploma that a graduate receives.</p>

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
Leeward CC		<p>C. Categories of Digital Badges</p> <p>Comment about C-1. Participation "Not a micro-credential but can be badged."</p> <p>The EP definition of Micro-credential and Digital Badges state that:</p> <p>A-2. Micro-Credential: "all micro-credentials include an assessment based on clearly defined standards and measurable learning outcomes."</p> <p>A-3. Digital Badge: "a digital badge is the digital representation of an earned micro-credential."</p> <p>Therefore "Participation" should NOT be listed under Category of Digital Badge (C-1) as being eligible for a badge.</p>			<p>Re II.A.3, we have rephrased the definition of digital badges to eliminate the apparent contradiction cited here (7).</p>
UH Manoa		<p>Rather than defining "Digital Badge", define a UH Microcredential Badge" and eliminate "Participation" as a category. As it stands, the Participation badge category does not meet definition provided for Digital Badge.</p>	<p>III.B is not a policy statement; it should be a footnote, or maybe a first paragraph in III.A</p>	<p>III.H opens the door to earning credits from stacked noncredit microcredentials. It may be useful to debate whether tuition payment is required at that point rather than wait for the issue to arise in practice.</p>	<p>See response above. Re II.A.3, we have rephrased the definition of digital badges to eliminate the apparent contradiction cited here. We need to retain the "Participation" category of digital badges, even if it does not qualify as a micro-credential, in order to accommodate units engaging in non-credit professional development activities.</p> <p>Re the concern about III.B, we have carried out the suggestion to move it to the start of Section III.A (8).</p> <p>Re III.H, UH campuses already award students credit that is divorced from tuition and fees (e.g., AP exams, IB exams, second language back credit, and Early College, which is funded under an MOA with the HIDOE).</p>
UH Maui College				<p>Mahalo for everyone's efforts with onboarding micro-credentials. This will create a space for folks that need these as focus areas of study or upskilling plans. The Good Jobs Hawaii team work is great evidence of the need/desire for such work.</p>	<p>Thank you very much! Glad to hear it!</p>
Leeward CC	<p>I like the idea for in-house credentialing. This is a new concept for me, but will be interesting to see how it performs</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>I like the concept, and as stated it would be great for in house achievements. However, a degree can be put onto a resume. I'm not sure if this concept will hold any value toward career exploration or enhancing a resume.</p>	<p>Thank you for your positive response. And, yes, national trends suggest that micro-credentials will support skill-based hiring and enhance the employability of micro-credential earners.</p>
Kapi'olani CC	<p>I would like training on this topic as I feel that it will be useful to my program.</p>			<p>I would like training on this topic as I feel that it will be useful to my program.</p>	<p>Glad to hear about your interest in training, which campuses and programs should provide when they implement micro-credentials.</p>

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
Leeward CC	Perfect,	Perfect as well, though I'm not fully understanding the application of a digital badge. I think the badge showing credentials of academic achievement for specific fields is great and will definitely encourage students who are passionate about those fields attend those classes and try to earn these badges. Though, in the field post graduation, how to or would institutions acknowledge, accept, recognize these badges? I'm sure they can be verified through the UH system, but how much say would a digital badge really have in the eyes of a company who mainly takes credibiliity from degrees / experience? How would someone showcase (for instance on a resume) these digital badges?	Perfect, I agree that campus' should be in control of these badges and how they are earned, what is available for students, and so forth. That way, badges, programs, or other things that benefit students at university won't cause a disadvantage for those in the CC level. The student body is going to be different for each campus, and so are the opportunities and programs, so the badges being dictated by each campus is essential.	No other comments.	Thank you for your positive response. And, yes, national trends suggest that micro-credentials will support skill-based hiring and enhance the employability of micro-credential earners. Additionally, unlike transcripts, earners own their digital badges, and they can be shared on digital platforms such as job application websites or social media accounts.
UH Manoa	Please remove "taxonomy" from the I.A. statement. I give my rationale below. Other than that, I like the Purpose statement. A side note: emphasis on campus responsibilities for micro-credential development, maintenance, integrity, and verification are very important and cannot be understated.	(a) I am unclear if a "small unit of study" is different from a credit course. I think more distinction is needed between a micro-credential and a course. (b) Per the UH EP 5.205, the "scale" of a concentration is 9 credits minimum. Given that, will a credit-bearing micro-credential credits be limited to fewer than 9 credits? If no (because some micro-credentials may be 9 or more credits), a suggestion is to remove "concentration" to allow a micro-credential to be of similar scale to a concentration or greater than. (c) Item II.B Taxonomy of Micro-Credentials: My recommendation is to delete this item. First, labeling a micro-credential as one of the three options listed without context is meaningless. E.g., micro-credentials for journalism at the high school, college, entry-level professional, and professional levels will all (yes, all) have "mastery" -- it's mastery at the level of the micro-credential. If this doesn't make sense, email and I'll try to explain better. Second, a hierarchy of learning is one way (basically from the 1950s & a Eurocentric approach) and there has been limited research to support such a hierarchy. There are Indigenous taxonomies and non-hierarchical taxonomies (i.e., integrated) that could be used instead if you folks really want a taxonomy. Third, if the micro-credential has good learning outcome statements and indicates how the learning was demonstrated and in what context, the need for this taxonomy goes away. Bottom line: my suggestion is to please delete the Taxonomy. (d) I don't know why "Participation" is listed as a	(a) Item III.B. Seems like information about program policy does not belong here because III.A says micro-credentials are _not_ programs. I suggest III.B appear as related policies in the References section and not as part of this policy. (b) I like that UH campus's Chancellor/Provost has the authority. (c) Item III.F says "developed at the campus level" -- I'm not sure what that means. Does it mean that if a department develops a Data Analysis Micro-credential that credential is a _campus_ (not a program, department, or unit) credential? Does "campus level" need to be specified here? Could it be removed? I think what is important in item F are the procedures, integrity, and effectiveness statements. (d) Small suggestion: replace "2023" in item III.I with "most current" so you don't have to update the policy if the US DOE updates it's rule.	I'm glad to see this policy. I think it's needed and it will be helpful to campuses. Thank you for accepting feedback.	Thank you for recognizing the importance of delineating campus-level responsibilities. The use of the word "taxonomy" was inherited as a directive from VPAS Halbert's 2022 guidance memo. However, based on your thorough feedback, we have moved to replace the term "taxonomy" with "hierarchy" (9) . We removed the word "smaller" so that the sentence now reads, "Those that bear credit are of a lesser scale than..." Unlike concentrations (or certificates or minors), micro-credentials are based on skill acquisition rather than earned credits. We do not foresee programs creating micro-credentials of a larger scale than concentrations. Re the concern about III.B, we have carried out the suggestion to move it to the start of Section III.A. We have changed III.F (now III.E) to read "... developed at the program level, by faculty, according to procedures established by each campus" (10) . We have removed the year from the Gainful Employment comment (11) .

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
UH Maui College			<p>Section F, "...each campus to develop and implement procedures for the creation of new micro-credentials."</p> <p>Question: Will the micro-credential programs go through Curriculum before being formalized?</p> <p>Question: Will there be language to address/include accepting Micro-Credentials awarded at another UH campus? Or is the micro-credential applicable only to the campus that awards it?</p> <p>Question: Will micro-credentials be built into STAR to automatically recognize and award them or will it be a manual or other process?</p>		The policy allows each campus to develop internal approval procedures, appropriate to its own structure. This may include review by the faculty Curriculum Committee. There is nothing in the policy that either mandates that a UH campus accept a micro-credential from another UH campus or precludes the campus from doing so. Neither micro-credentials nor digital badges be recorded in STAR, but each campus will be required to record and maintain its micro-credential enrollment and achievement data.
UH Maui College			<p>"Chancellors/Provost have the authority to approve the creation of micro-credentials and the issuance of digital badges..."</p> <p>Dept. members seek confirmation that Chancellor-level approval is due to the fact that these are not "programs" and are not expected to require BOR-approved resources. Can we clarify that Chancellor approval is NOT an alternative to the department, academic senate, and curriculum committee approval process in place for other curricula?</p>	What is the timeline for us creating campus policies and procedures for this?	Yes, you are correct and that is a great question. This language merely signals that BOR approval is not required. Chancellor approval is not meant as an alternative to shared governance. We have amended III.B (formerly III.F) to read, "Micro-credentials shall be developed at the program level, by faculty, according to procedures established by each campus." We have also re-ordered the subsections of this portion of the policy (12) so that this phrase now appears in III.B, thus highlighting the faculty role. Regarding timelines for implementation, the creation of campus-level procedures falls within the campus purview.
Leeward CC	Rationale	Rationale	Rationale	None	We have read your feedback. Thank you.
UHM	Replace or add "currently" with "before the policy gets adopted" to make sense to the reader of the policy in a few years.				It is unclear what this recommendation refers to since neither of these phrases appear in the policy. Perhaps this matter has already been addressed in prior edits.
UHM	Micro-credentials should exist for a specific skill and not as a replacement for a program of study offered somewhere in the university.				Yes, that is correct. Micro-credentials are not envisioned as replacements for existing programs.
UHM			If a program adds more than 6 credit hours of micro-credentials, that program of study should undergo a review by the relevant campus.		That is a reasonable suggestion and one that the policy implicitly yet intentionally delegates to the campuses to determine through the development of their own campus processes. The policy states that, "Each campus shall be responsible for ensuring the integrity and effectiveness of its micro-credential offerings through appropriate processes of assessment and evaluation."
UHM				If the offering of micro-credentials is licensed out to a third party provider, the campus must consult with the faculty union.	The offering of micro-credentials is not licensed to a digital badging company or any third-party provider. The policy now states clearly in Section III.B that micro-credentials are developed by faculty.
UHM				While the policy probably exists to enable federal financial aid for students taking such a program of study, its creation raises many important issues, that SEC requests Financial Aid concerning student aid.	This particular piece of feedback was unintelligible. We note that we engaged financial aid officers across the UH System in an earlier phase of the consultation process.

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
UHM			<p>There is a disconnect between III. A and B: A: states that micro-credentials are "not classified instructional programs under UH policy"; B states that the "authority to approve new instructional programs is detailed in..." These two ideas need to be connected explicitly, as B has nothing to do with A. the way it's currently worded. Should someone want to, for example, change the status of a micro-credential, then it would apply. It's just a matter of wording and linking the two.</p> <p>III. H. "Each campus shall determine criteria and processes for the incremental stacking of micro-credentials." How is this to be done? Should each campus write their own micro-credential policy that details these criteria and processes? Because these are academic issues, the faculty need to determine the validity and worth of these micro credentials and badges. The faculty should be setting the standards. Stated another way, the faculty determine what is academic; therefore the faculty decide what is non-academic.</p>		<p>We have re-ordered and combined subsections III.A and III.B for purposes of clarity. Regarding the comments on III.H (now III.G), yes, rather than mandating a uniform approach to this matter, the policy authorizes each campus to develop its own stance and criteria for the stacking of micro-credentials. We are taking this approach owing to the drastically different nature of the mission and scope of UH's composite institutions. Regarding the comment about standards, yes, faculty would be the ones designing and implementing micro-credentials.</p>
UHM				<p>Glaringly absent is the faculty involvement in "approving and/or reviewing" micro-credential as the policy written is that the Provost is authorized to offer these credentials. The faculty must govern microcredentials and badging.</p>	<p>We have added the phrase "micro-credentials shall be developed at the program level, by faculty..." in III.B to address this concern. The purpose of designating approval authority to the Chancellor/Provost is to clarify that BOR approval will not be required. We have also re-ordered the subsections of this portion of the policy so that this phrase now appears in III.B, thus highlighting the faculty role.</p>
UHM				<p>What about faculty workload regarding micro-credential teaching?</p>	<p>Faculty will continue to receive credit for workload as outlined in the UHPA-BOR Contract and UH policy. This policy does not alter how courses will be measured to calculate teaching equivalencies. In the case of non-credit classes, Article XXI.E of the 2021-2025 UHPA-BOR Contract will continue to determine how instructors are compensated.</p>
UHM				<p>There should not be micro-credentials for the same thing in different units at UHM.</p>	<p>This is a reasonable position and a matter that would need to be decided at the campus level.</p>
UHM				<p>What if students want a micro-credential earned at another campus to transfer? This is going to cause problems of articulation and transfer.</p>	<p>Unlike traditional credentials, micro-credentials are not recorded on transcripts but may be recognized through the awarding of a digital badge. Any credit-based coursework, however, associated with the micro-credential would transfer into a UH campus just like any other course. Campuses would have the option of recognizing micro-credentials as a form of PLA (Prior Learning Assessment).</p>
				<p>Badging - needing to have faculty oversight, industry and expectations, budgetary implications.</p>	<p>Badges issued to represent the earning of micro-credentials all fall under faculty purview and are the products of direct faculty oversight, including the provision of meta data (e.g., learning outcomes, assessment criteria).</p>

Campus	SECTION I: Purpose Comment/Rationale	SECTION II: Definitions Comment/Rationale	SECTION III: Executive Policy Comment/Rationale	Other Comments	Admin Responses
				Where will funding for micro-credentials and badges come from? How will staffing be funded?	We expect the majority of the micro-credentials to consist of credit-based courses or portions thereof. The funding for such micro-credentials will therefore come from the same sources that funding for minors, certificates, and concentrations comes from. Students will pay tuition to enroll in classes connected to micro-credentials. Non-credit micro-credentials will be funded through the same structures that already exist for non-credit courses. The cost to UH for digital badging is roughly \$2 per badge and is currently funded by the OVPIIT.