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What do we mean by: Quality of Micro-Credentials?

By no means:

• the quality of the course;
• the quality of the Institution;
• the “quality” of the learner.

The quality refers more to:

• the data content of credential;
• the security of the credential;
• the exchangeability of credential;
• the revocability of credential;
• the ownership of credential;
What have we done towards the quality system

- We have developed a concept paper on quality assurance of credentials
- Collected more than 100 credentials to analyse
- We set up a typology and a classification system to test the quality assurance concept
- We analysed the collected credentials upon the typology and classification system.
- We invented an easy to read label system to demonstrate this complex quality system.
- We develop recommendations in the light of the piloting and peer review of the quality system
Classification and Typology of digital credentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Content sectoral, specific</th>
<th>Technical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>• Formal qualifications</td>
<td>• digitális tanúsítvány</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0, 1, 2</td>
<td>• Non-formal certificates</td>
<td>• Nyílt (digitális) kitűző</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recognition of skills</td>
<td>• ???:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Records of experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurable indicators
- Learning Outcomes
- Quality system of learning
- Level of learning
- Workload of learning
- Identity of learner
- Identity of HE institution

Technical indicators to Statement and Medium
- Distinct
- Authentic
- Accessible
- Exchangeable
- Portable
Technical typology

- Digital certificates: 50%
- Open badges: 46%
- Other: 4%
Statement indicators

- Distinct: 20 (Fully met), 10 (Partly met), 1 (Not met), 21 (Not able to classify)
- Authentic: 28 (Fully met), 12 (Partly met), 2 (Not met), 10 (Not able to classify)
- Accessible: 25 (Fully met), 5 (Partly met), 2 (Not met), 22 (Not able to classify)
- Exchangeable: 9 (Fully met), 3 (Partly met), 6 (Not met), 34 (Not able to classify)
- Portable: 44 (Fully met), 3 (Partly met), 5 (Not met), 5 (Not able to classify)
Conclusion

• The system is meaningful and can be used.
• Due to the rapid technological change regular revision of the system is required
• As outside evaluator it is nearly impossible to make classification and judgement of indicators.
• The categories and types require deep technical and educational theory knowledge and understanding, therefore can be done only by professionals who were trained for that classification and evaluation process.
• Categories and terms should be more precisely defined, examples should be given to avoid ambiguity.
• Due to the above mentioned complexity it is recommended, to plan more than one evaluator’s opinion (maybe discussed and harmonised) for credential classification at each of the cases.
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