TURNING COLLEGE LEARNING INTO RECOGNIZABLE SKILLS

Certifying what students learn even when they do not complete

By: Gregory Stoup, VP Institutional Progress and Effectiveness
Cuyahoga Community College

The untranslated value of learning outcomes

Community colleges have spent decades building curricular and assessment structures around clearly articulated learning outcomes. These outcomes, often framed in terms such as written communication, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, and cultural awareness, are intended to clarify what students should know and be able to do across programs and courses. They appear in syllabi, program review, institutional assessment plans, and accreditation materials, and they reflect a longstanding effort to make student learning more intentional, visible, and improvable.

Yet a persistent limitation remains. For many students, the learning outcomes that organize academic life within the institution remain weakly translated beyond it. A student may complete multiple semesters of coursework, strengthen their writing, develop greater analytical capacity, become more effective in collaborative settings, and demonstrate growth in judgment and problem solving. But if that student leaves prior to completing a degree or certificate, little of that learning is rendered in a form that employers can readily interpret. The institution may have reason to believe that meaningful learning occurred. The student may know that it occurred. The publicly portable evidence of it is often thin.

This raises a consequential question about the function of learning outcomes themselves. If institutions are willing to define, assess, and report these outcomes internally, should they also be willing to express at least some of them in ways that carry value beyond the academic setting? The issue is not whether learning outcomes are pedagogically worthwhile. It is whether they can be translated into credible signals of capability for students whose educational pathways do not culminate in a completed credential.

This question is controversial, and understandably so. Many faculty and academic leaders will worry that any attempt to convert broad educational outcomes into public-facing certifications risks narrowing the meaning of learning itself. Higher education has long resisted the idea that its most important forms of intellectual development can be fully captured in discrete, externally marketable units. That hesitation should be respected. It reflects a serious concern that educational depth, transfer, and judgment may be diminished when institutions feel compelled to certify only what can be easily named and counted. Even so, the question remains difficult to avoid in sectors where a substantial share of students leave with meaningful learning that is not easily legible beyond the transcript.

Partial pathways and invisible achievement

The urgency of this issue becomes clearer when viewed against the enrollment realities of community colleges. These institutions serve large numbers of students whose pathways are frequently shaped by employment, caregiving, transportation, finances, and health. Some students enter with a clear intent to complete a degree. Others arrive with more exploratory or bounded goals, hoping to build skills, test a field of study, or improve their employment prospects without necessarily anticipating uninterrupted progress to completion. In either case, stop-out, part-time attendance, and early departure are common features of the educational landscape.

What is often obscured in institutional discourse is that non-completion does not imply an absence of learning. Students who attend for even a limited period frequently complete substantial academic work. They write arguments, analyze evidence, solve problems, revise drafts, interpret quantitative information, and participate in collaborative tasks that require accountability and judgment. In many cases, they leave with capacities that are educationally meaningful and potentially consequential in the labor market.

The difficulty is that these gains are rarely translated into portable forms of recognition. The transcript remains the primary record of partial attendance, but it is a blunt instrument for communicating demonstrated capability. It records courses, credits, and grades, but it does not specify what a student can actually do. Course titles offer only broad hints. Grades compress multiple dimensions of performance into a single mark that is often difficult to interpret outside academic settings. As a result, students may possess real capabilities developed through coursework yet lack any recognized way to communicate them to employers.

This is not a minor issue of documentation. It shapes the practical value students derive from time spent in college. Students who complete a degree or certificate leave with a publicly intelligible marker that organizes and validates their learning. Students who leave earlier often do not. Their progress is therefore more likely to be interpreted as incomplete rather than partially achieved, even when the underlying learning is substantial. The problem is not simply that these students did not finish. It is that the institution lacks a robust way to acknowledge what they did accomplish.

Employer demand and the signal problem

This matters in part because employers continue to emphasize the value of the very capacities colleges tend to place in their learning outcomes. Written communication, problem solving, collaboration, adaptability, and judgment remain central to work across a wide range of sectors. These are not ornamental qualities. They are part of how work is actually performed in environments marked by incomplete information, shifting expectations, and cross-functional coordination.

The challenge is that these capacities are only imperfectly signaled by conventional academic records. A completed degree may imply exposure to them, but it does not specify the degree of proficiency or the contexts in which that proficiency was demonstrated. Course grades do not isolate particular competencies, and even detailed transcripts require a level of interpretive familiarity that many employers do not possess. This creates a familiar but insufficiently resolved signaling problem. Colleges produce learning that employers say they value, yet the mechanisms through which that learning is made visible remain weak.

Employers therefore rely on proxies that are easier to interpret, including prior work experience, institutional prestige, and social referrals. Those proxies may sometimes be rational, but they also have the effect of obscuring classroom-based learning, especially for students whose academic pathways are partial. Without a completed credential, the learning students have accumulated becomes difficult to verify in ways that shape hiring decisions. It exists, but it does not travel well.

The result is a deeper form of misalignment than is often acknowledged. Colleges increasingly articulate learning in competency-like language. Employers continue to call for the same broad capacities. Yet the translation layer between the two remains thin. The issue is less about disagreement over what matters than about the weakness of the signals through which those valued capacities are communicated.

Emerging models of skill certification

In response, a growing set of practices has begun to explore whether these capacities can be made more visible and verifiable through micro-credentials and related forms of skill certification. These approaches begin from the premise that broad outcomes can, at least in some cases, be decomposed into more specific competencies that can be demonstrated through structured performance. Rather than treating communication or critical thinking as diffuse educational aspirations, they identify constituent behaviors and require students to provide evidence of proficiency in those behaviors.

The assessments associated with these models differ in meaningful ways from traditional course grading. They rely more heavily on portfolios, performance tasks, simulations, and structured demonstrations tied to explicit criteria. A student might be asked to construct a written argument for a specific audience, solve a problem using incomplete or ambiguous data, or participate in a collaborative task with clearly defined expectations. When the evidence meets the stated standard, the student receives a credential that represents a specific claim about demonstrated capability.

These models are significant not because they solve the problem entirely, but because they suggest that more precise and portable signals can be created. They also introduce a different theory of progression. Rather than waiting for completion at the end of a program, they allow learning to be recognized incrementally as competencies are demonstrated. For students

whose paths are interrupted or nonlinear, that incremental recognition may matter considerably.

From existing practice to systematic translation

For community colleges, the relevance of this work lies in the fact that much of the underlying infrastructure already exists. Institutions have defined learning outcomes. Faculty have designed assignments that call those outcomes into practice. Courses routinely generate artifacts of student thinking, from essays and presentations to applied projects and collaborative work. Assessment processes already exist to evaluate such work, even if they have primarily been designed for internal improvement, accreditation, or curriculum refinement rather than external signaling.

What is missing is a systematic process for translating these existing elements into public-facing recognition. Student work is typically assessed within the course and then absorbed into the summary logic of the final grade. The evidence itself is rarely curated, validated, and translated into a credential that can operate beyond the institution. In that sense, colleges may already be asking students to demonstrate the very capabilities employers value, but they are not consistently converting those demonstrations into portable signals.

Creating such a system would require more than simply issuing badges. It would require identifying where key competencies are meaningfully taught and assessed, specifying the threshold for proficiency, establishing reliable evaluation processes, and determining how different credentials relate to one another developmentally. The challenge is therefore less about inventing new learning than about building a more coherent translation structure around learning that is already occurring.

Institutional tensions and practical constraints

None of this removes the genuine tensions involved. Faculty may reasonably worry that breaking complex learning into certifiable units will flatten what matters most in education. Critical thinking, communication, and intercultural judgment do not always manifest in standardized ways, nor do they develop evenly across students or contexts. Their significance often lies in transfer, depth, and the quality of judgment exercised under variable conditions. A poorly designed certification regime could lead institutions to privilege what is most easily documented rather than what is most educationally significant.

This concern should be understood as a substantive academic critique, not as mere resistance to innovation. It reflects an important protective instinct within higher education, namely that some of the most valuable forms of learning are not reducible to simple external signals. Any serious effort to certify recognizable skills would therefore need to proceed with a high degree of epistemic modesty. The aim should not be to claim that all meaningful learning can be certified, but rather to identify which forms of learning can be responsibly and credibly rendered more visible.

There are also substantial practical burdens. Competencies would need to be more clearly specified. Scoring criteria would need to be developed and calibrated. Systems for evidence capture, validation, storage, and credential issuance would have to be created or adapted. Employers would need guidance in how to interpret the resulting signals. In already stretched institutions, any certification architecture that is experienced as administratively additive rather than educationally integrative is unlikely to gain durable support.

Credibility presents an additional constraint. New credentials do not automatically generate trust simply because institutions issue them. If colleges produce a proliferation of badges without consistent standards, meaningful assessment, or external intelligibility, the result may be more noise than signal. The viability of any such effort depends not only on institutional enthusiasm but on whether the certifications are specific enough, rigorous enough, and interpretable enough to matter beyond campus.

At the same time, the existing system is hardly cost-free. It leaves large numbers of students with learning that is real but weakly legible. It places the burden of translation on students themselves, often advantaging those with prior work experience, stronger social capital, or greater fluency in how to narrate their own capabilities. In that respect, the current arrangement may conceal inequities that institutions have grown accustomed to treating as normal.

Reframing the purpose of learning outcomes

Taken together, these considerations point toward a possible reframing of the role of learning outcomes. Rather than serving only as internal guides for curriculum, assessment, and improvement, they might also function, in limited and carefully designed ways, as the foundation for more public forms of recognition. This would not mean abandoning their educational purpose. It would mean asking whether some outcomes can bear a second function as credible claims about what students can do.

Such a shift would not displace the importance of degrees and certificates. Those credentials remain meaningful markers of sustained study, breadth, and completion. The question is whether they should remain the only forms through which learning is publicly recognized. If students develop meaningful capabilities before reaching program completion, institutions may have reason to acknowledge those capabilities more directly.

For community colleges, this possibility is especially salient. These institutions serve students whose pathways are often nonlinear and whose engagement with postsecondary education may be intermittent, pragmatic, or interrupted. In that context, a completion-only model of recognition may understate the educational value that has in fact been produced. A more layered recognition structure, if carefully designed, may offer a way to align institutional practice more closely with the actual patterns of student learning and movement.

Conclusion

The question, then, is not whether completion should continue to matter. It should. The question is whether completion should remain the only publicly intelligible marker through which learning is recognized. If students engage in serious academic work and demonstrate capabilities that colleges and employers alike regard as valuable, there is a reasonable argument that at least some of that learning should become more visible, even when a formal award is not completed.

The emerging interest in micro-credentials, durable skills, and competency verification should therefore be understood less as a settled solution than as an invitation to reconsider the terms on which college learning becomes legible outside the institution. The challenge is not merely technical. It is intellectual and organizational. Colleges would need to decide what kinds of learning can be responsibly certified, what standards of evidence are sufficient, and how to do so without diminishing the educational depth they are trying to preserve.

For community colleges, this may become one of the more important questions at the intersection of learning, equity, and economic mobility. If large numbers of students continue to acquire meaningful capabilities without reaching a formal endpoint, then institutions will increasingly face a choice. They can allow that learning to remain largely locked inside the partial transcript, or they can explore whether some portion of it can be translated into recognizable, credible, and publicly useful forms. The controversy surrounding that question is real. So is the need to consider it seriously.

Sources

Aspen Institute. (2025, October 27). Durable skills, strong starts: What employers really want from early-career talent. UpSkill America and Economic Opportunities Program. https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/durable-skills-strong-starts

Ceccato, D. (2023, July 12). Creating relevant and marketable microcredentials requires employers to play a role. WGU Labs. https://wgulabs.org/creating-relevant-and-marketable-microcredentials

Credential Engine. (2025). Counting credentials 2025 report. Credential Engine. https://credentialengine.org/report/2025-counting-credentials

Education Design Lab. (n.d.). The Lab's durable skills micro-credentials. Education Design Lab. https://eddesignlab.org/durable-skills-micro-credentials

Mapademics. (2026, April 20). Skills intelligence for education and workforce; AI-powered skills mapping for higher education. https://mapademics.com/skills-intelligence

National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2024, November). Job outlook 2025. NACE. https://www.naceweb.org/job-outlook-2025

Daugherty, L. (2024). Stackable credentials: Making college work for more students. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1234.html

Tulsa Community College. (2025, August 15). TCC micro-credentials give students career edge. Tulsa Community College News & Stories. https://www.tulsacc.edu/news-stories/tcc-micro-credentials-career-edge