CROSS-STATE COLLECTIVE INQUIRY PROJECT
Micro-Credential Quality Criteria

Version 1.0

SEPTEMBER 2019

GREAT LAKES
Comprehensive Center
at American Institutes for Research ■

MIDWEST
Comprehensive Center
at American Institutes for Research ■

Acknowledgments

The development of *Exploring Micro-Credentials With Stakeholders: A Conversation Guide* represents the collective efforts of multiple states, organizations, and individuals, including the following:

Background and Purpose

During the 2018–19 academic year, four states in the Midwest and Great Lakes region—Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio—engaged in a collective inquiry project designed to deepen states' collective understanding of the potential benefits and challenges associated with expanding access to professional learning through micro-credentials.

Micro-credentials represent a new approach to professional learning that recognizes the learners' mastery of specific competencies when they provide evidence to meet rubric-based performance criteria associated with the application of the specific skill.

Representatives from the four states organized themselves into three workgroup and met in a series of virtual and in-person meetings during the period October 2018–September 2019 to craft tools that could be used to support states interested in advancing the use of micro-credentials. These tools included a micro-credential participant survey and a set of draft micro-credential quality criteria.

This document represents the micro-credential quality criteria tool. The development of this tool included establishing six structural categories[1] associated with micro-credential development and implementation and identifying potential quality criteria relative to each of these categories by drawing from available quality standards, research, and other resources. The group engaged in multiple rounds of review and revision and solicited formal reviews by outside experts.

This quality criteria version 1.0 document has three purposes:

1. To establish a consistent set of structural features and categories that can be included in micro-credential profiles enabling states to create, describe, assess, and compare micro-credential opportunities available within and across states.

2. To establish a set of preliminary criteria that can be piloted by states to help gauge the quality of micro-credentials being proposed or offered and potentially help to ensure more consistent quality in the micro-credentials being offered within and across states.

3. To solicit input from stakeholders regarding these draft quality criteria to inform a future, refined set of quality criteria for micro-credentials that reflects the priorities of an expanded number of states and facilitates greater portability of micro-credentials.

---

[1] The collective inquiry micro-credential structural elements are adapted from roles in the micro-credential ecosystem work presented to the Midwest Comprehensive Center Cross State Conversation series April 2017. See Kabaker, J. (2017). *Building educator capacity through micro-credentials.* Redwood City, CA: Digital Promise.

This document is referred to as "Version 1.0." As noted in purpose 3 above, it is the intent of the four state members of this collective to pilot use of this document within the four states as well as to solicit reviews and feedback from additional states and stakeholders. For further information on providing feedback on this document please contact Wendy Surr (wsurr@air.org).

Five Structural Components of Micro-Credentials

Structural Component	Description
Developers	• The organization(s) or individuals that identify and establish the expected knowledge and skills to be recognized through the micro-credential
Deliverers	• The organization(s) or individuals that provide earners with learning opportunities and supports designed to help them gain knowledge and skills and prepare them to earn the micro-credential
Evaluators	• The organization(s) or individuals that review evidence submitted by earners and apply criteria to assess and determine each earner's proficiency
Issuers	• The organization(s) or institution(s) that formally issue the micro-credential to earners who have successfully met the proficiency criteria
Recognizers	• The organization(s) or institution(s) that recognize and give currency or value to the micro-credentials and allow them to be used by earners for various purposes

Each of the five structural components is comprised of multiple subcomponents. The following pages provide a guiding question for each subcomponent that education stakeholders can address by applying the set of draft quality criteria for that subcomponent. The quality standards, research, and other resources used to develop the draft quality criteria for each subcomponent are included in the appendix to this document.

It is important to note that the ways in which micro-credential opportunities are offered vary. In many cases, the provision of a microcredential opportunity involves the participation and coordination of multiple stakeholder groups, digital partners and state and local organizations. Therefore, it is likely that any group using this quality criteria document to assess the quality of a microcredential opportunity will need to examine more than a microcredential description (e.g., profile provided for an online microcredential syllabus, rubrics used to score evidence, state policies or regulations) to fully assess its quality. Groups using these criteria may need to collect information from multiple sources and review a range of documents, policies and other artifacts when applying the criteria in all five structural components outlined in this document.

Icon Key Criteria

Guiding questions: Each subcomponent is prefaced with the question or questions that education stakeholders can answer about the quality of the micro-credential using the quality criteria in each of these areas.

Draft Quality Criteria: Each subcomponent is defined by a set of criteria that reflects what "good quality" design or implementation would look like in each of these areas.

Additional Desired Criteria: In addition to the set of criteria that reflects "good quality" design or implementation—some subcomponents also identify additional desired criteria representing exemplary practices in that area.

Related quality standards, research, and resources: Each set of quality criteria was developed based on related quality standards, research, and other resources. A list of these specific sources for each subcomponent is provided in the appendix.

1 Developers

The organizations that establish the expected knowledge and skills to be recognized through the micro-credential[2]

A. Title and description of micro-credential

? Guiding Question

What is the title of the micro-credential? Can you provide a brief description?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Clearly references a specific content and competency area.

- Reflects a narrow focus, references a single competency area.

- Clearly describes the competency area and rationale for its use (e.g., articulates its role in improved teaching and student learning).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

B. Developer

? Guiding Question

What is the name of the organization that developed the micro-credential?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Developer is reputable (known in the specific field as having expertise in the content area (e.g., based on published work or track record of successful implementation).

And/or

- Developer is recognized as a quality micro-credential developer in other states.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

---

[2] Developers establish the criteria that will be used to define proficiency. In addition, developers often design other aspects of the micro-credential, including how earners will access opportunities to gain knowledge and skills, how they will be objectively evaluated, and which organizations will recognize and value the micro-credential.

C. Competency area

Guiding Question

What specific competencies are addressed by this micro-credential?

States are encouraged to organize this section by domains that reflect current professional learning frameworks or priority areas.

Draft Quality Criteria

- Competency area references alignment with specific professional teaching standards.

- Competency area is based on research and/or best practices.

Additional Desired Criteria

- References competency area along an educator learning progression toward more complex demonstration of the competency area (e.g., a developmental learning framework developed or adopted by the state).

- Has criterion that prompts earners to connect competency areas to their professional development goals.

- Competency area aligns with state priority areas (e.g., linked to strategic plan).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

D. Competency context

Guiding Question

Is this micro-credential part of a system or "stack" of micro-credentials that compose a broader area of expertise?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Indicates whether the micro-credential is part of a stack of micro-credentials that enable the earner to develop a broader competency.

- The micro-credential is stackable, meaning the micro-credential is either part of an established stack,

OR

- The micro-credential could be combined and linked to other competencies and micro-credentials to enable the earner to develop a more complex teaching practice.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

E. Definition of proficiency

Guiding Question

How is proficiency in this competency area defined and objectively measured?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Clearly describes what a successful earner will know, understand, and be able to do upon completion.

- Clearly describes what the competency looks like "in practice."

- Proficiency is defined within an aligned rubric that describes the competency in measurable terms along a performance continuum.

- Clearly describes what evidence needs to be submitted (i.e., how educators must demonstrate proficiency).

- Requires that evidence includes artifacts demonstrating application of the new skill).

- Clearly describes how that proficiency is determined and measured.

- Requires application of competency in practice in order to demonstrate proficiency.

- Provides information to earners prior to enrolling/registering for the micro-credential.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

F. Learning resources

⊙ *Guiding Question*

What other unfacilitated resources are available to support earner preparation? (Options might include research articles, tools, videos, exemplars, blogs, other).

⚙ *Draft Quality Criteria*

- Provides a listing of all materials available or recommended for use when preparing for the micro-credential.

- Every aspect of the micro-credential is visible to the user, including the instructions for each activity, the requirements for the evidence to be submitted, and the rubric that will be used to score the evidence

- The activities and evidence to be submitted build on each other inside an individual micro-credential

- There is evidence that the micro-credential has **content validity** and includes the right activities in the right balance. Also, the content is aligned with the goals.

- A bibliography shows the resources provided within the micro-credential including URLs, if applicable.

- List of resources indicates which items potentially require purchase (books, etc.) versus those readily available online.

- List of resources includes recommendations for resources that should be used, versus those provided as suggestions or for those desiring more information.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

G. Evidence of benefit

? *Guiding Question*

How does this educator practice benefit students based on one of the four tiers of evidence outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act ?

Draft Quality Criteria

- The micro-credential is based on research and/or best practices.

Additional Desired Criteria

- The micro-credential reflects a practice that meets the ESSA Tier III promising practice level, or above.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

H. Development Process (optional)

? *Guiding Questions*

How was the micro-credential developed to meet state or local priorities? Was it developed in collaboration with representatives from the intended audience?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Indicates whether the micro-credential was developed in collaboration with the intended audience.

Additional Desired Criteria

- The micro-credential was developed in partnership with its intended audience.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

2 Deliverers

The organization(s) or individuals that provide earners with learning opportunities and supports[3]

A. Availability of learning opportunities

Guiding Question

Are learning opportunities offered to support and prepare earners to be successful?
If yes, continue. If no, skip to "Evaluators," below.

Draft Quality Criteria

- Indicates whether learning opportunities that are aligned with micro-credential are available.

- Learning opportunities aligned with micro-credential are available to earners.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Written guidance.

- Dynamic supports associated with how to successfully engage in and learn through micro-credentials are provided.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

B. Support organization

Guiding Question

Which organizations are offering these learning opportunities? Specify names of organizations.

Note: The organization providing learning supports may be the same organization that developed the micro-credential.

---

[3] Deliverers are the organization(s) or individuals that provide earners with learning opportunities and supports designed to help them gain knowledge and skills and prepare them to earn the micro-credential.

Draft Quality Criteria

- Name of organization is listed and includes its association with other roles (e.g., issuers, recognizer).

- The organization (and/or the approaches used by the organization) align with the state's requirements for determining qualifications of approved PD providers.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Support organization offers earners practical supports to enable efficient access for educators with varying backgrounds, preparation, and/or prior credentials.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

C. Types of learning opportunities and supports offered

Guiding Question

What types of facilitated learning opportunities are offered to specifically support learning for the micro-credential?

(Options such as in-person/online training sessions; in-person/virtual coaching-mentoring; in-person/online community of practice or discussion groups; in-person/online learning modules/courses.)

Draft Quality Criteria

- Clearly describes the learning opportunities available, indicating type of support (e.g., in person, online, coaching, etc.).

- More than one type of learning opportunity and/or activity type is offered to support earners (can be synchronous or asynchronous).

- Learning opportunity strategies are based in research/best practices for educator learning

- Learning opportunities include earners engaging with a facilitator, mentor, or coach to support their learning of the content and its application to their practice (two-way interaction, which includes feedback).

- Learning opportunities include application and job-embedded learning and support (e.g., coaching).

Additional Desired Criteria

- In addition to content-support, earners can engage with a facilitator about the process of learning through micro-credentials and the decisions and learning management skills they will need to be successful.

- Facilitation and support includes observation and feedback from a mentor or coach).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

D. Timing of learning supports

Guiding Questions

Are supports offered during specific scheduled times and locations (synchronous)? Are supports posted online and available for access by earners on a flexible basis (asynchronous)? Are both types of learning supports available?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Information clearly indicates when and how supports can be accessed.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Both synchronous and asynchronous supports are available on a flexible basis to enable earners to access support regardless of schedules (i.e., allows choice by earners regarding when they learn) (Kuriacose & Warm, CCE).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

E. Learner groupings

Guiding Question

Are learning supports offered to cohorts, individuals, or both?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Response clearly indicates if there is an opportunity to engage with other earners pursuing the same micro-credential.

- Enables earners to interact with and engage in learning exchange and peer support activities with other earners (e.g., within a learning community).

Additional Desired Criteria

- Indicates if the groupings are created by facilitator, created by earner, and whether they are across the nation, within the state, or locally contained.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

F. Estimated time for learning opportunities

Guiding Question

What is the total estimated number of hours of planned, scheduled (synchronous) learning opportunities offered to earners to help prepare them to earn the micro-credential?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Specifies the estimated amount of time a typical earner would need to engage with all the recommended materials, resources and participate in learning support activities.

- Breaks down the estimated amount of time for synchronous and asynchronous learning and includes any applicable dates clearly.

- Allows earners to decide which learning supports they will access, and how much time they will invest in their learning (i.e., does not require participation in any learning supports).

- Allows earners to decide when they will invest time in their learning and application of new learnings in their practice.

- There is equity of access to synchronous and asynchronous learning opportunities.

- Provides information to help the earner gauge the "grain size" of the micro-credential in comparison with traditional professional learning (e.g., graduate course).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

3 Evaluators

The organization(s) or individuals that review evidence submitted by earners[4]

A. Evidence requirements

? Guiding Question

What evidence do candidates need to submit to demonstrate proficiency? (e.g., describe evidence type and specific requirements: complete project/product, create video, write paper, develop sample curriculum, create instructions for a project or module, other.)

Draft Quality Criteria

- Established criteria clearly describe the scope, depth, and guidelines for final evidence submissions.

- Instructions specify the evidence form, type, and requirements (e.g., create a project/product, make a video, write a paper, develop a sample curriculum).

- The level of rigor and depth included in evidence requirements reflect minimum standards established by the SEA or other organizations within the state such as regional offices of education or professional associations.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Aligns with or builds upon professional development evidence requirements established by other state or state affiliated organizations (e.g., Illinois Administrator Academy).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

---

[4] Evaluators are the organization(s) or individuals that review evidence submitted by earners and apply criteria to assess and determine each earner's proficiency.

B. Profile of evaluators

Guiding Questions

Who are the evaluators? What are their professional roles, affiliations, qualifications? What are the specific evaluator training requirements and who provides this evaluator training?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Evaluators have completed state-recognized "evaluator" training **or** have met state-established criteria for serving as an objective and reliable evaluator.

- Evaluators are "independent."

- Evaluators have expertise in the competency area.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Evaluators have earned a state-recognized "evaluator" micro-credential showing that they have mastered the skills needed to be a reliable, objective evaluator of evidence for micro-credentials across multiple content/skill areas.

- Evidence submissions are reviewed by more than one evaluator

- Any evaluator expected to review evidence for specific advanced content areas may need to meet additional content-related expertise criteria established by the state.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

C. Proficiency definition

Guiding Question

What criteria and rubrics are used by evaluators to assess proficiency?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Rubric used by evaluators to review evidence submissions has data to show strong interrater reliability across raters and a minimum of rater bias.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Rubric used by evaluators includes sub domain scores that are combined to form a final score reflecting an array of skills that comprise the competency.

- Design of the rubric aligns with rubrics adopted by national groups.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

D. Submission procedures

Guiding Question

What are the procedures used by earners when submitting evidence? Where and how must earners submit their evidence?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Instructions for submission are stated clearly and are applied consistently for all earners submitting evidence.

- Instructions for submission of evidence are provided to potential earners in advance.

- Submission technology is accessible to all earners.

- Earner submissions are confidential.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

E. Evaluator feedback

Guiding Question

Do evaluators provide feedback to potential earners? What is the nature of and delivery mechanism for this feedback?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Determinations of proficiency made by evaluators are provided to earners.

- Evaluator's determination of proficiency is accompanied by a rationale that explains the earner's performance in relation to the rubric.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Evaluator feedback is provided formatively to enable earners to use feedback to strengthen their learning and quality of their evidence submission.

- Written evaluator feedback is constructive, rather than critical, and includes references to rubric criteria to help the earner recognize strengths as well as understand how to improve and be successful.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

F. Resubmission

Guiding Questions

Are earners allowed to revise and resubmit their evidence if their first submissions are not successful? What are the resubmission guidelines?

Draft Quality Criteria

- Earners are allowed to revise and resubmit evidence multiple times.

Additional Desired Criteria

- Resubmission policies require that resubmissions include earners addressing feedback showing how they improved.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

4 Issuers

The organization(s) granting the micro-credential to earners[5]

A. Issuer

? Guiding Question

Which organization issues the micro-credential?

Draft Quality Criteria

Issuer is one or more of the following:

- An accredited institution of higher education.

- A nationally recognized organization that sets standards that are adopted by multiple states and subject areas.

- A state-approved institution (e.g., approving body or committee) that may include departments outside of education.

- An industry organization or association that issues professional certifications.

State has some type of verifying body that validates the micro-credential—confirming for the recognizer that the micro-credential comes from a reliable source. An official record of micro-credential verification is entered directly into the participant's learning record.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

---

[5] Issuers are the organization(s) or institution(s) that formally issue the micro-credential to earners who have successfully met the proficiency criteria.

B. Micro-credential form

Guiding Question

What form does the awarded micro-credential take?

Draft Quality Criteria

- The micro-credential could take varying forms (e.g., digital certification, endorsement, transcripts, digital badges, designation on a license, and micro-credentials).

- Awarded micro-credentials are accompanied by a verified URL that shows the evidence that the recipient had to submit to receive the micro-credential (e.g., this helps ensure that educators cannot falsify badges).

- The form follows a state-recommended format and protocol (i.e., different platforms can be used that still meet the same state-approved protocol).

The form will include reference to how it can be verified by a third party.

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

5 Recognizers

The organization(s) or institution(s) recognizing the microcredential to give it currency[6]

A. Formal currency

Guiding Question

What formal currency is associated with the micro-credential?

Draft Quality Criteria

Micro-credential has a currency within the state or district systems and is able to be recognized for one or more of the following:

- Required professional development hours or Carnegie Units.

- Professional development or continuing education credit (CEU)

- Credit toward relicensure.

- Financial compensation, such as salary increase.

- Graduate credit.

Awarded currency indicates its equivalence in traditional measures or PD hours.

- **Important Note:** Earners would not necessarily need to spend the same number of hours to complete the micro-credential (e.g., some participants might already have strong knowledge of the content before starting the micro-credential). However, earning the micro-credential would be deemed as "equivalent to" an agreed-upon number of professional development hours.

Additional Desired Criteria

Earners who complete a stack of micro-credentials earn additional currency reflecting this accomplishment (e.g., certification, endorsement on his/her license, credit toward relicensure, and/or a digital badge).

Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

---

[6] Recognizers are the organization(s) or institution(s) that recognize and give currency or value to the micro-credentials and allow them to be used by earners for various purposes.

B. Other recognitions

What other benefits and recognitions are provided to earners upon receipt of the micro-credential (e.g., used in hiring decision, salary increase/bonus, or promotion)?

Draft Quality Criteria

- The record of the earned micro-credential is available in the earner's official learning record.

- Other state (or district) benefits associated with earning the micro-credential are clearly listed (e.g., salary increase or bonus, professional promotions).

- Please refer to the appendix for quality standards, research, and resources related to the quality criteria for this subcomponent.

Appendix: Quality Criteria With Corresponding Sources

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
1. Developers	The organizations that establish the expected knowledge and skills to be recognized through the micro-credential.[7]		
a. Title and description of micro-credential	What is the title of the micro-credential? Can you provide a brief description?	• Clearly references a specific content and competency area. • Reflects a narrow focus, references a single competency area. • Clearly describes the competency area and rationale for its use (e.g., articulates its role in improved teaching and student learning).	Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual* (pp. 12, 15). Springfield, IL. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf
b. Developer	What is the name of the organization that developed the micro-credential?	• Developer is reputable (known in the specific field as having expertise in the content area (e.g., based on published work, or track record of successful implementation). And/or • Developer is recognized as a quality micro-credential developer in other states.	SEA may have established quality standards for content and author of content to be delivered as part of approved professional development (PD) National Education Association (NEA) suggests a peer review process and has partnered with Digital Promise to ensure quality of micros endorsed by NEA. National Education Association. (2018). *Micro-Credential Guidance.* Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Micro-credential-guidance-pdf-june18.pdf

---

[7] Developers establish the criteria that will be used to define proficiency. In addition, developers often design other aspects of the micro-credential, including how earners will access opportunities to gain knowledge and skills, how they will be objectively evaluated, and which organizations will recognize and value the micro-credential.

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
c. Competency area	What specific competencies are addressed by this micro-credential? States are encouraged to organize this section by domains that reflect current professional learning frameworks or priority areas.	• Competency area references alignment with specific professional teaching standards. • Competency area is based on research and/or best practices. **Additional Desired Criteria** • References competency area along an educator learning progression toward more complex demonstration of the competency area (e.g., a developmental learning framework developed or adopted by the state). • Has criterion that prompts earners to connect competency areas to their professional development goals. • Competency area aligns with state priority areas (e.g., linked to strategic plan).	• Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A Resource for Ongoing Teacher Development*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf • Jobs for the Future, & The Council of Chief State School Officers. (2015). *Educator Competencies for Personalized, Learner-Centered Teaching*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future. Retrieved from https://jfforg-prod-prime.s3.amazonaws.com/media/documents/Educator-Competencies-081015.pdf • Content standards. For example: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (n.d.). *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Retrieved from https://www.nctm.org/Standards-and-Positions/Principles-and-Standards/. • Crow, T., & Pipkin, H. (2017). *Micro-Credentials for Impact: Holding Professional Learning to High Standards*. Oxford, OH, and Washington, DC: Learning Forward and Digital Promise. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/micro-credentials-for-impact.pdf • National Education Association. (2018). *Micro-Credential Guidance*. Retrieved from

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
			http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Micro-credential-guidance-pdf-june18.pdf • ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro-Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf • "Ideally, the micro-credentials a teacher pursues reflect the specific pedagogical needs of that teacher, based on feedback about his or her current practice" (p. 2). • Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018*). Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual* (p. 7). Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf
d. Competency context	Is this micro-credential part of a system or "stack" of micro-credentials that compose a broader area of expertise?	• Indicates whether the micro-credential is part of a stack of micro-credentials that enable the earner to develop a broader competency. • The micro-credential is stackable, meaning the micro-credential is either part of an established stack, OR • The micro-credential could be combined and linked to other competencies and micro-credentials to enable the earner to develop a more complex teaching practice.	• Digital Promise. (2016). *Developing a System of Micro-Credentials: Supporting Deeper Learning in the Classroom.* Retrieved from https://digitalpromise.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/mc_deeperlearning.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
e. Definition of proficiency	How is proficiency in this competency area defined and objectively measured?	• Clearly describes what a successful earner will know, understand, and be able to do upon completion. • Clearly describes what the competency looks like "in practice." • Proficiency is defined within an aligned rubric that describes the competency in measurable terms along a performance continuum. • Clearly describes what evidence needs to be submitted (i.e., how educators must demonstrate proficiency). • Requires that evidence includes artifacts demonstrating application of the new skill. • Clearly describes how that proficiency is determined and measured. • Requires application of competency in practice in order to demonstrate proficiency. • Provides information to earners prior to enrolling/registering for the micro-credential.	• Kuriacose, C., & Warn, A. (n.d.). *A Movement Towards Personalized Professional Learning: An Exploration of Six Educator Micro-Credential Programs.* Boston: MA: Center for Collaborative Education. Retrieved from https://www.cce.org/files/CCE-Micro-credentials-White-Pape.pdf − "[MC]…requires that [earners] demonstrate their learning through artifacts that show their mastery of a single skill with a given topic." (p. 3) • ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro-Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf • Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual.* Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
f. **Learning resources**	What other unfacilitated resources are available to support earner preparation? (Options might include research articles, tools, videos, exemplars, blogs, other).	• Provides a listing of all materials available or recommended for use when preparing for the micro-credential. • Every aspect of the micro-credential is visible to the user, including the instructions for each activity, the requirements for the evidence to be submitted, and the rubric that will be used to score the evidence . • The activities and evidence to be submitted build on each other inside an individual micro-credential. • There is evidence that the micro-credential has **content validity** and includes the right activities in the right balance. Also, the content is aligned with the goals. • A bibliography shows the resources provided within the micro-credential including URLs, if applicable. • List of resources indicates which items potentially require purchase (books, etc.) versus those readily available online. • List of resources includes recommendations for resources that should be used, versus those provided as suggestions or for those desiring more information.	• Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual.* Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf • Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013*). InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0: A Resource for Ongoing Teacher Development.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf • Crow, T., & Pipkin, H. (2017). *Micro-Credentials for Impact: Holding Professional Learning to High Standards.* Oxford, OH, and Washington, DC: Learning Forward and Digital Promise. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/micro-credentials-for-impact.pdf • Nelson, J., Cowart, J., Hurst, S. & Weber, G. (n.d.). *Momentum in Micro-Credentialing: The New Era of Educator Growth and Advancement* [Webinar]. Retrieved from https://bloomboard.com/resource/webinar-momentum-micro-credentials/?utm_campaign=wbr-momentum-1901&utm_source=email&utm_medium=persistiq.

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
g. **Evidence of benefit**	How does this educator practice benefit students based on one of the four tiers of evidence outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act ?	• The micro-credential is based on research and/or best practices. **Additional Desired Criteria** • The micro-credential reflects a practice that meets the ESSA Tier III promising practice level or above.	• ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro-Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf • Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual.* Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf
h. **Development Process (optional)**	How was the micro-credential developed to meet state or local priorities? Was it developed in collaboration with representatives from the intended audience?	• Indicates whether the micro-credential was developed in collaboration with the intended audience. **Additional Desired Criteria** • The micro-credential was developed in partnership with its intended audience.	

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
2. Deliverers	The organization(s) or individuals that provide earners with learning opportunities and supports.[8]		
a. Availability of learning opportunities	Are learning opportunities offered to support and prepare earners to be successful? If yes, continue. If no, skip to "Evaluators," below.	• Indicates whether learning opportunities that are aligned with micro-credential are available. • Learning opportunities aligned with micro-credential are available to earners. **Additional Desired Criteria** • Written guidance. • Dynamic supports associated with how to successfully engage in and learn through micro-credentials are provided.	• Nelson, J., Cowart, J., Hurst, S. & Weber, G. (n.d.). *Momentum in Micro-Credentialing: The New Era of Educator Growth and Advancement* [Webinar]. Retrieved from https://bloomboard.com/resource/webinar-momentum-micro-credentials/?utm_campaign=wbr-momentum-1901&utm_source=email&utm_medium=persistiq. • Great Schools Partnership. (n.d.). *Research Supporting the Ten Principles: Assessment Practices.* Retrieved from https://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/proficiency-based-learning/research-evidence/research-supporting-ten-principles-assessment-practices/
b. Support organization	Which organizations are offering these learning opportunities? Specify names of organizations. *Note.* The organization	• Name of organization is listed and includes its association with other roles (e.g., issuers, recognizer). • The organization (and/or the approaches used by the organization) align with the state's requirements for determining qualifications of approved PD providers.	• Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual* (p. 18). Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf

---

[8] Deliverers are the organization(s) or individuals that provide earners with learning opportunities and supports designed to help them gain knowledge and skills and prepare them to earn the micro-credential.

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
	providing learning supports may be the same organization that developed the micro-credential.	**Additional Desired Criteria** • Support organization offers earners practical supports to enable efficient access for educators with varying backgrounds, preparation, and/or prior credentials	
c. **Types of learning opportunities and supports offered**	What types of facilitated learning opportunities are offered to specifically support learning for the micro-credential? (Options such as in-person/online training sessions; in-person/virtual coaching-mentoring; in-person/online community of practice or discussion groups; in-person/online learning modules/courses.)	• Clearly describes the learning opportunities available, indicating type of support (e.g., in person, online, coaching, etc.). • More than one type of learning opportunity and/or activity type is offered to support earners (can be synchronous or asynchronous). • Learning opportunity strategies are based in research/best practices for educator learning • Learning opportunities include earners engaging with a facilitator, mentor, or coach to support their learning of the content and its application to their practice (two-way interaction, which includes feedback). • Learning opportunities include application and job-embedded learning and support (e.g., coaching). **Additional Desired Criteria** • In addition to content-support, earners can engage with a facilitator about the process of learning through micro-credentials and the decisions and learning management skills they will need to be successful.	• Crow, T., & Pipkin, H. (2017). *Micro-Credentials for Impact: Holding Professional Learning to High Standards.* Oxford, OH, and Washington, DC: Learning Forward and Digital Promise. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/micro-credentials-for-impact.pdf • ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro- Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf • The National Education Association recommends that "Achieving micro-credentials should be job-embedded and rooted in classroom practice." National Education Association. (n.d.). *Micro-credential Guidance.* Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Micro-credential-guidance-pdf-june18.pdf • Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual* (pp. 12–13, 15–17). Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
		• Facilitation and support includes observation and feedback from a mentor or coach	• https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf • Brown, D. (2019). *Research and Educator Micro-Credentials*. Retrieved from http://digitalpromise.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/researchandeducatormicro-credentials-v1r2.pdf • Nelson, J., Cowart, J., Hurst, S. & Weber, G. (n.d.). *Momentum in Micro-Credentialing: The New Era of Educator Growth and Advancement* [Webinar]. Retrieved from https://bloomboard.com/resource/webinar-momentum-micro-credentials/?utm_campaign=wbr-momentum-1901&utm_source=email&utm_medium=persistiq.
d. Timing of learning supports	Are supports offered during specific scheduled times and locations (synchronous)? Are supports posted online and available for access by earners on a flexible basis (asynchronous)? Are both types of learning supports available?	• Information clearly indicates when and how supports can be accessed. **Additional Desired Criteria** • Both synchronous and asynchronous supports are available on a flexible basis to enable earners to access support regardless of schedules (i.e., allows choice by earners regarding when they learn) (	• Kuriacose, C., & Warn, A. (n.d.). *A Movement Towards Personalized Professional Learning: An Exploration of Six Educator Micro-Credential Programs.* Boston, MA: Center for Collaborative Education. Retrieved from https://www.cce.org/files/CCE-Micro-credentials-White-Pape.pdf • Crow, T., & Pipkin, H. (2017). *Micro-Credentials for Impact: Holding Professional Learning to High Standards.* Oxford, OH, and Washington, DC: Learning Forward and Digital Promise. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/micro-credentials-for-impact.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
e. Learner groupings	Are learning supports offered to cohorts, individuals, or both?	• Response clearly indicates if there is an opportunity to engage with other earners pursuing the same micro-credential. • Enables earners to interact with and engage in learning exchange and peer support activities with other earners (e.g., within a learning community). **Additional Desired Criteria** • Indicates if the groupings are created by facilitator, created by earner, and whether they are across the nation, within the state, or locally contained.	• Kuriacose, C. & Warn, A. (n.d.). *A Movement Towards Personalized Professional Learning: An Exploration of Six Educator Micro-Credential Programs.* Boston, MA: Center for Collaborative Education. Retrieved from https://www.cce.org/files/CCE-Micro-credentials-White-Pape.pdf • Crow, T., & Pipkin, H. (2017). *Micro-Credentials for Impact: Holding Professional Learning to High Standards.* Oxford, OH, and Washington, DC: Learning Forward and Digital Promise. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/micro-credentials-for-impact.pdf • Nelson, J., Cowart, J., Hurst, S. & Weber, G. (n.d.). *Momentum in Micro-Credentialing: The New Era of Educator Growth and Advancement* [Webinar]. Retrieved from https://bloomboard.com/resource/webinar-momentum-micro-credentials/?utm_campaign=wbr-momentum-1901&utm_source=email&utm_medium=persistiq. • Brown, D. (2019). *Research and Educator Micro-Credentials.* Retrieved from http://digitalpromise.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/researchandeducatormicro-credentials-v1r2.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
f. Estimated time for learning opportunities	What is the total estimated number of hours of planned, scheduled (synchronous) learning opportunities offered to earners to help prepare them to earn the micro-credential?	• Specifies the estimated amount of time a typical earner would need to engage with all the recommended materials, resources and participate in learning support activities. • Breaks down the estimated amount of time for synchronous and asynchronous learning and includes any applicable dates clearly. • Allows earners to decide which learning supports they will access, and how much time they will invest in their learning (i.e., does not require participation in any learning supports). • Allows earners to decide when they will invest time in their learning and application of new learnings in their practice. • There is equity of access to synchronous and asynchronous learning opportunities. • Provides information to help the earner gauge the "grain size" of the micro-credential in comparison with traditional professional learning (e.g., graduate course).	• Illinois State Board of Education, Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual*. Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf – Specifies minimum of six hours, three of which must be "direct, synchronous contact" time to qualify as a "course" for credit (p. 13). • Kuriacose, C. & Warn, A. (n.d.). *A Movement Towards Personalized Professional Learning: An Exploration of Six Educator Micro-Credential Programs.* Boston, MA: Center for Collaborative Education. Retrieved from https://www.cce.org/files/CCE-Micro-credentials-White-Pape.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
3. Evaluators	The organization(s) or individuals that review evidence submitted by earners.[9]		
a. Evidence requirements	What evidence do candidates need to submit to demonstrate proficiency? (e.g., describe evidence type and specific requirements: complete project/product, create video, write paper, develop sample curriculum, create instructions for a project or module, other.)	• Established criteria clearly describe the scope, depth, and guidelines for final evidence submissions. • Instructions specify the evidence form, type, and requirements (e.g., create a project/product, make a video, write a paper, develop a sample curriculum). • The level of rigor and depth included in evidence requirements reflect minimum standards established by the SEA or other organizations within the state such as regional offices of education or professional associations. **Additional Desired Criteria** • Aligns with or builds upon professional development evidence requirements established by other state or state affiliated organizations.	• National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (n.d.) *The Network to Transform Teaching: Advancing Equity and Accelerating Improvement with Board-Certified Teachers Where They Are Needed Most*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/programs/edseed/2015/nbptsnarr.pdf.

---

[9] Evaluators are the organization(s) or individuals that review evidence submitted by earners and apply criteria to assess and determine each earner's proficiency.

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
b. Profile of evaluators	Who are the evaluators? What are their professional roles, affiliations, qualifications? What are the specific evaluator training requirements and who provides this evaluator training?	• Evaluators have completed state-recognized "evaluator" training **or** have met state-established criteria for serving as an objective and reliable evaluator. • Evaluators are "independent" • Evaluators have expertise in the competency area **Additional Desired Criteria** • Evaluators have earned a state-recognized "evaluator" micro-credential showing that they have mastered the skills needed to be a reliable, objective evaluator of evidence for micro-credentials across multiple content/skill areas. • Any evaluator expected to review evidence for specific advanced content areas may need to meet additional content-related expertise criteria established by the state.	• ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro-Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf
c. Proficiency definition	What criteria and rubrics are used by evaluators to assess proficiency?	• Rubric used by evaluators to review evidence submissions has data to show strong interrater reliability across raters and a minimum of rater bias. **Additional Desired Criteria** • Rubric used by evaluators includes sub domain scores that are combined to form a final score reflecting an array of skills that comprise the competency. • Design of the rubric aligns with rubrics adopted by national groups.	• ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro-Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
d. Submission procedures	What are the procedures used by earners when submitting evidence? Where and how must earners submit their evidence?	• Instructions for submission are stated clearly and are applied consistently for all earners submitting evidence. • Instructions for submission of evidence are provided to potential earners in advance. • Submission technology is accessible to all earners. • Earner submissions are confidential.	• Illinois State Board of Education. Educator Effectiveness Division. (2018). *Illinois Administrators' Academy: Policies and Practices Manual.* Springfield, IL: Author. Retrieved from https://www.isbe.net/Documents/A-A-Policies-Practices-Manual.pdf
e. Evaluator feedback	Do evaluators provide feedback to potential earners? What is the nature of and delivery mechanism for this feedback?	• Determinations of proficiency made by evaluators are provided to earners. • Evaluator's determination of proficiency is accompanied by a rationale that explains the earner's performance in relation to the rubric. **Additional Desired Criteria** • Evaluator feedback is provided formatively to enable earners to use feedback to strengthen their learning and quality of their evidence submission. • Written evaluator feedback is constructive, rather than critical, and includes references to rubric criteria to help the earner recognize strengths as well as understand how to improve and be successful.	• Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research, 77*(1), 81–112. Retrieved from http://www.columbia.edu/~mvp19/ETF/Feedback.pdf
f. Resubmission	Are earners allowed to revise and resubmit their evidence if their first submissions are not successful? What are the resubmission guidelines?	• Earners are allowed to revise and resubmit evidence multiple times. **Additional Desired Criteria** • Resubmission policies require that resubmissions include earners addressing feedback showing how they improved.	• Digital Promise. (2016). *Developing a System of Micro-Credentials: Supporting Deeper Learning in the Classroom.* Retrieved from https://digitalpromise.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/mc_deeperlearning.pdf

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
4. Issuers	The organization(s) granting the micro-credential to earners.[10]		
a. Issuer	Which organization issues the micro-credential?	Issuer is one or more of the following: • An accredited institution of higher education. • A nationally recognized organization that sets standards that are adopted by multiple states and subject areas. • A state-approved institution (e.g., approving body or committee) that may include departments outside of education. • An industry organization or association that issues professional certifications. State has some type of verifying body that validates the micro-credential—confirming for the recognizer that the micro-credential comes from a reliable source. An official record of micro-credential verification is entered directly into the participant's learning record.	• National Education Association. (n.d.). *Micro-credential Guidance.* Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Micro-credential-guidance-pdf-june18.pdf – Recommends that "approver" (i.e., issuer of the micro-credential) be determined by a joint committee that includes educators, district representatives, and union representatives. See "Approval Process" at http://www.nea.org/home/micro-credentials.html • Advance CTE. (n.d.). *Measuring Secondary CTE Program Quality: Recognized Postsecondary Credential Attainment.* Retrieved from https://cte.careertech.org/sites/default/files/resources/Measuring_Program_Quality_Credentials_2019.pdf

---

[10] Issuers are the organization(s) or institution(s) that formally issue the micro-credential to earners who have successfully met the proficiency criteria.

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
b. Micro-credential form	What form does the awarded micro-credential take?	• The micro-credential could take varying forms (e.g., digital certification, endorsement, transcripts, digital badges, designation on a license, and micro-credentials). • Awarded micro-credentials are accompanied by a verified URL that shows the evidence that the recipient had to submit to receive the micro-credential (e.g., this helps ensure that educators cannot falsify badges). • The form follows a state-recommended format and protocol (i.e., different platforms can be used that still meet the same state-approved protocol). The form will include reference to how it can be verified by a third party.	IMS Global has an open protocol list (Open Badge 2.0) that includes the information that would be on an issued micro-credential form. This is established and was created in conjunction with major technological partners (e.g., Microsoft). IMS Global Learning Consortium. (n.d.). *Advancing Digital Credentials and Competency-Based Learning.* Retrieved from https://www.imsglobal.org/initiative/advancing-digital-credentials-and-competency-based-learning.
5. Recognizers	The organization(s) or institution(s) that recognize and give currency.[11]		
a. Formal currency	What formal currency is associated with the micro-credential? (	Micro-credential has a currency within the state or district systems and is able to be recognized for one or more of the following: • Required professional development hours or Carnegie Units • Professional development or Continuing education credit (CEU). • Credit toward relicensure.	• ExcelinEd. (2019). *Micro-Credentials: A Game Changing Opportunity for States to Support the Professional Growth of Teachers.* Retrieved from https://www.excelined.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/ExcelinEd.Quality.Micro-credential.Brief_.June2019.pdf • National Education Association. (n.d.). *Micro-credential Guidance.* Retrieved from

---

[11] Recognizers are the organization(s) or institution(s) that recognize and give currency or value to the micro-credentials and allow them to be used by earners for various purposes.

Category	Guiding Questions	Draft Quality Criteria	Quality Standards, Research, or Resources
		• Financial compensation, such as salary increase. • Graduate credit. Awarded currency indicates its equivalence in traditional measures or PD hours. • **Important Note:** Earners would not necessarily need to spend the same number of hours to complete the micro-credential (e.g., some participants might already have strong knowledge of the content before starting the micro-credential). However, earning the micro-credential would be deemed as "equivalent to" an agreed-upon number of professional development hours. **Additional Desired Criteria** Earners who complete a stack of micro-credentials earn additional currency reflecting this accomplishment (e.g., certification, endorsement on his/her license, credit toward relicensure, and/or a digital badge).	http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/Micro-credential-guidance-pdf-june18.pdf – The National Education Association recommends that educators be "compensated for earning micro-credentials." See "Compensation" and "Professional Advancement" sections (p. 2). • Advance CTE. (2018). *Credential Currency: How States Can Identify and Promote Credentials of Value.* Retrieved from https://cte.careertech.org/sites/default/files/resources/Credential_Currency_report.pdf
b. Other recognitions	What other benefits and recognitions are provided to earners upon receipt of the micro-credential (e.g., used in hiring decision, salary increase/bonus, or promotion)?	The record of the earned micro-credential is available in the earner's official learning record. Other state (or district) benefits associated with earning the micro-credential are clearly listed (e.g., salary increase or bonus, professional promotions).	IMS Global Learning Consortium. (n.d.). A*dvancing Digital Credentials and Competency-Based Learning.* Retrieved from https://www.imsglobal.org/initiative/advancing-digital-credentials-and-competency-based-learning *Note.* IMS is working with other partners to create an open learning record system.

GREAT LAKES
Comprehensive Center
at American Institutes for Research ■

https://greatlakes-cc.org

MIDWEST
Comprehensive Center
at American Institutes for Research ■

https://midwest-cc.org

AIR®
AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

www.air.org
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
800.634.0503