> *People feel they need to promote microcredentials because they are deeply dissatisfied with the status quo*

GAVIN **MOODIE**

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP, HIGHER AND ADULT EDUCATION OISE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

defined, need to be qualified as terms relating to recognising a 'basket' of specified learning achievement and not be posited as a universal term to recognise formally certified qualifications and parts thereof.

In the current fast-moving digital era, how do you see people getting their skills and knowledge better recognised?
As a strong believer in lifelong learning, I am an activist for making all learning – formal, informal and non-formal/self-learning – visible so that it might be recognised and have currency for the learner in terms of their livelihood and other pursuits. To me the recognition of learning does not necessarily have to be formally quality-assured and assessed to be recognised and have currency. We must guard against commodifying all learning and its recognition, and prescribe what learning gets recognised and by whom.

'MINOR ADVANCE'
Professor Gavin Moodie, of the University of Toronto, looks at the role of microcredentials from a more sceptical point of view.
Comparing microcredentials

with the MOOC boom of the early 2000s, you argue that they have both been 'hyped extravagantly'. Why is that?
The claims that microcredentials will transform post-secondary education far exceed their likely impact, and indeed their impact so far. At best they may be a minor advance on longstanding practice, which may be valuable but is far more modest than the ambitious claims for them. People feel they need to promote microcredentials because they are deeply dissatisfied with the status quo and believe strongly in the change(s) they ascribe to microcredentials.

In your opinion, what is the role microcredentials can play in the current educational landscape?
Inasmuch as 'microcredentials' is a new label for what post-secondary education has been doing for decades, it is redundant and diverts from the steady progress that is being made. Inasmuch as the advocates for microcredentials seek to push post-secondary education in a new direction, that new direction would damage education and its students.

How can we make microcredentials work as more than a simple tool that serves the completion of a specific task? Can they, as part of a person's overall education and training, enrich what they know and do?
Microcredentials can't enrich what people know and do because they just give a new name to what people know and do, a new name which adds nothing to what people know and do. If they are to be educational credentials, it would be necessary to adopt a view on whether they report a volume of learning or the demonstration of a competence. If they state a volume of learning, it would be necessary to adopt a unit in which the volume would be measured, such as percentage of a year's study of a normal full-time student. If microcredentials are to state the demonstration of a competence, it would be necessary to adopt a view on how that competence was evaluated, the level of its performance, and how it may be expressed as a proportion of the competence demonstrated; for example, by someone who has completed an apprenticeship. ■