Harmonisation, Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Africa

HAQAA3

Global Gateway

Co-funded by the European Union

African Union

ACTS Pilot Phase

MODULE 1

Academic Credits and Curricula

obreal

ASSOCIATION OF AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES
ASSOCIATION DES UNIVERSITES AFRICAINES
اتحاد الجامعات الأفريقية

DAAD Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service

enqa.
European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

MODULE 1

Academic Credits and Curricula

Supporting Written Document

How to use this document

This document is designed as a reading companion of Module 1. It can be read before your participation in the synchronous session (as a conceptual primer) or after (for deeper engagement with the key arguments). It also includes self-reflection prompts to help you connect the content to your own institutional context.

Module 1 at a Glance

Module 1 focuses on the relationship between academic credit systems and curriculum design, which is the foundational layer on which any mobility and recognition framework must rest. Before credits can be transferred, compared or recognised, they need to mean something coherent: something tied to learning, to workload, and to the academic logic of a programme of study.

This module explores what academic credits are, how they function within curricula, how African and European experiences with credit system reform have evolved, and what all of this means for the practical use of ACTS at the institutional level.

Learning outcomes for Module 1

- Understand what academic credits are and what they measure, distinguishing between contact-hour based and workload-based approaches.
- Recognise how curricula design and learning outcomes interact with credit allocation and transfer.
- Situate African credit system experiences (ACTS, ACQF, regional frameworks) in relation to global lessons from ECTS and Tuning.
- Identify concrete entry points for translating your institution's curricula into ACTS-compatible structures.

Section 1. Academic Credits: Concept, Workload and the ACTS Framework

1.1 What is an academic credit? Unpacking the concept

The academic credit is one of the most widely used yet least understood instruments in higher education governance. At its most basic, a credit is a unit of measurement — but the question of what a credit measures — and what that measurement is supposed to communicate — varies considerably across institutions, national systems, and historical periods.

Two fundamentally different logics underpin existing credit systems worldwide:

Logic	What is measured	Implication
Input-based	Time the teacher spends teaching (contact hours)	Credits reflect teaching provision, not learning achievement. Common in Carnegie-derived systems.
Output-based	Total effort the student invests to achieve defined learning outcomes	Credits reflect student workload. Adopted by ECTS and ACTS. Shifts focus to the learner.

ACTS adopts an output-based logic. This has significant implications for curriculum design: it means that the credit value of a module must be derived from the estimated total workload required for a student of average preparation to achieve the stated learning outcomes — not from the number of hours the lecturer teaches.

1.2 What credits do — and what they cannot do

Credits perform several distinct functions in a higher education system. Understanding these functions separately is important, because confusion between them is one of the most common sources of misalignment in credit transfer and recognition processes.

Function	Description	Implication for recognition
Progression tracking	Credits certify that a student has completed a required portion of a programme	Credits earned at Institution A may not automatically count towards Institution B's progression requirements
Workload communication	Credits signal how demanding a course is in terms of student effort	A 3-credit course at one institution may demand more or less effort than at another, even with the same label
Mobility facilitation	Credits provide a common currency to compare what students have done across institutions and countries	This is the function ACTS is primarily designed to support — but it requires prior agreement on what the credit represents
Quality signalling	In some systems, credit values implicitly communicate academic level or rigour	ACTS is not a quality assurance instrument; it works best when paired with robust quality assurance frameworks (ACQF, national QA agencies)

Key insight	Credits can facilitate mobility and recognition — but only when there is sufficient mutual trust and transparency between systems. A credit is not a guarantee of equivalence; it is a starting point for dialogue about equivalence.

1.3 Credits and learning outcomes: an essential connection

One of the most significant conceptual developments in higher education over the past three decades has been the shift towards learning outcomes as the primary basis for curriculum design

and credit allocation. Rather than asking 'how many hours does this course last?', the learning outcomes approach asks 'what will the student be able to know, understand and do upon completion?'

This shift has several implications for credit systems:

- Credits should reflect not just the time invested, but the learning achieved. A well-designed credit framework assigns credit values to courses based on the breadth and depth of intended learning outcomes, not merely on contact hours.
- Learning outcomes make recognition more transparent. When an institution can specify clearly what a course achieves in terms of competences, it becomes easier for another institution to assess whether a student's prior learning is relevant to their new programme.
- Tuning methodology makes this connection operational. The Tuning approach, developed initially in Europe and subsequently applied in Africa, provides a systematic way to express programme-level and course-level learning outcomes in terms of subject-specific and generic competences.

Credit calculation divorced from learning outcomes risks becoming a mechanical administrative exercise. The conceptual integrity of ACTS depends on the alignment between three elements: what the student is expected to achieve (learning outcomes), what they must do to achieve it (activities and assessment), and how long that realistically takes (workload and credits).

This is the principle of constructive alignment (Biggs, 1999) applied to the credit dimension. A well-designed module satisfies three conditions simultaneously:

- Vertical coherence: every learning outcome is covered by at least one activity and at least one assessment.
- Horizontal coherence: activities and assessments are aligned with each other — students practice what they are assessed on.
- Workload coherence: the total hours required are consistent with the credit value declared — neither over-burdening nor under-challenging students.

Key insight	A credit is a container. What matters for recognition is what is inside: the learning outcomes, the level of study, and the academic context. ACTS provides the container; curricula design and learning outcomes specification fill it with meaning. Without the latter, credit transfer remains a bureaucratic formality rather than a genuine academic bridge.

1.4 Components of student workload under ACTS

ACTS aligned with the ECTS definition, identifies three categories of student workload that together constitute the total hours to be credited:

Component	Definition	Examples
Scheduled learning and teaching	Direct interaction between students and academic staff, whether synchronous or asynchronous.	Lectures, seminars, tutorials, laboratory sessions, field work, studio work, online synchronous classes.
Guided independent study	Student work carried out independently but structured by the	Assigned readings, problem sets, online learning modules, case study preparation, group project work.

Component	Definition	Examples
	instructor through assignments, tasks or directed reading.	
Assessment preparation and completion	Time spent preparing for and completing all forms of summative and formative assessment.	Exam revision, essay writing, project completion, oral presentation preparation, portfolio assembly.

In many African institutions, formal credit calculations have historically counted only scheduled teaching hours. The ACTS reform requires institutions to reconceptualise workload as a student-centred measure, which typically reveals significant divergences between declared credit values and actual student effort.

1.5 The ACTS credit reference value and its rationale

ACTS establishes that **1 credit represents 20 to 25 hours of total student workload**, with the **full academic year corresponding to 60 credits** (**approximately 1,200 to 1,500 hours**). This reference value is deliberately aligned with the ECTS standard to facilitate international recognition, particularly under the Addis Convention framework.

The range rather than a fixed value is intentional. It acknowledges:

- Variation in institutional contexts: different disciplines, delivery modes and student populations may reasonably require different intensity levels within the range.
- National calibration: individual countries may adopt a specific point within the range for consistency within their NQF.
- Methodological uncertainty: workload estimation is inherently approximate and depends on assumptions about student preparation and study efficiency.

Key insight	The 20-25 hours range is a reference value, not a fixed rule. What matters is that institutions use it consistently and transparently as the basis for credit allocation — and that they can justify the values they assign.

1.6 ACTS: design principles and what makes it distinctive

The African Credit Transfer System (ACTS) is not Africa's first attempt at credit system harmonisation. Several regional systems predate it — including the East African Credit Accumulation and Transfer System (EACATS) under IUCEA, the credit frameworks within the CAMES zone, and the SADC Qualifications Framework (SADCQF). ACTS is designed to complement, not replace, these existing frameworks.

Several design principles distinguish ACTS from a simple numerical conversion tool:

- **Voluntary and cooperative:** ACTS is not imposed as a regulatory obligation. Institutions and systems that use it do so because they see value in the shared reference framework it provides.
- **Continental reference, not continental uniformity:** ACTS does not require all African institutions to adopt identical credit systems. It provides a common reference point — 1 ACTS credit = 20–25 hours of student workload — against which different national and regional definitions can be mapped.
- **Compatibility over replacement:** The ACTS framework explicitly recognises existing regional credit systems and seeks articulation with them, not absorption of them.

- **Trust-building through use:** The credibility of ACTS grows through practice. Each successful credit transfer conducted under the ACTS framework builds the institutional trust that makes the next transfer easier.

1.7 Self-reflection

Consider the following elements for reflection:

1. What credit system does your institution currently use? Is it based on contact hours, workload, or a combination of both?
2. Does your institution express course and programme objectives in terms of learning outcomes? If so, how are these used in practice (in syllabi, in recognition decisions, in quality reviews)?
3. When a student arrives from another institution or country, what information do you actually use to assess their prior learning? Does the number of credits they bring play a role? What else matters?

Section 2. History and Evolution of Academic Credit Systems

2.1 The Carnegie Unit: the original input-based model

The modern academic credit has its origins in the Carnegie Unit, introduced in the United States in 1906 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It was designed not primarily as a measure of learning, but as an administrative instrument to standardise secondary and post-secondary education for the purpose of pension eligibility for college teachers.

The Carnegie Unit defined one credit as the equivalent of one hour of classroom instruction per week over an academic year (approximately 120 hours of contact over a year, or the equivalent of one 15-week course meeting three times per week). This definition was fundamentally input-based and teacher-centred: it measured time in the classroom, not outcomes achieved.

Despite its origins as a pension-system artefact, the Carnegie Unit spread rapidly across US higher education and, through the influence of American educational models, to many other parts of the world — including several African countries. Its legacy is visible in the many institutions that still define credit value primarily by lecture hours.

The Carnegie Foundation itself has, in recent years, called for the replacement of the Carnegie Unit with outcome-based measures of learning. The ACTS in Africa is part of a global movement away from seat-time definitions of academic credit.

2.2 The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS)

The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System was developed in the late 1980s as part of the ERASMUS programme and formalised through the Bologna Process (1999). It represented a decisive shift from the input-based Carnegie model to a student workload-based approach.

The key design principles of ECTS are:

- Student-centredness: credits measure what the student does, not what the teacher does.
- Workload basis: 1 ECTS credit = 25 to 30 hours of total student workload (contact + independent + assessment).

- Full-year reference: 60 ECTS credits = one full academic year = approximately 1,500 to 1,800 hours.
- Outcome linkage: credit allocation must be referenced to learning outcomes and their associated assessment.
- Transferability: credits earned at one institution can be recognised and accumulated at another within the system.

For further information, please watch the following videos:

- What is ECTS? European Commission - Jun 24, 2015
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dmhtl2n1YVs
  (3.21 minutes)

- ECTS for course design European Commission - Jun 24, 2015
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lgfZvXtdiTE
  (3.32 minutes)

ECTS has become the dominant credit framework in Europe, adopted by over 50 countries, and has served as the primary model for subsequent regional credit systems including ACTS and other regional initiatives.

Feature	Carnegie Unit	ECTS	ACTS
Origin	USA, 1906	Europe, 1988/1999	Africa, 2000s–present
What is measured	Teacher contact hours	Total student workload	Total student workload
1 credit =	~1 h/week contact (15 weeks)	25–30 h total workload	20–25 h total workload
Full year	Variable (30–36 credits typical)	60 credits	60 credits
Learning Outcomes linkage	Not required	Required	Required
Design logic	Input-based	Output-based	Output-based
Regional scope	North America & influenced systems	50+ countries (Europe)	Pan-African framework

2.3 The development of ACTS: from Tuning Africa to HAQAA3

The development of a specifically African credit transfer system has been a gradual process spanning more than two decades, shaped by the broader agenda of African higher education reform and regional integration under the African Union.

Early foundations: Tuning Africa (2011–2015)

The Tuning methodology, originally developed in Europe, was adapted for the African context through the Tuning Africa project (2011–2015), co-funded by the European Commission. This

project piloted learning outcome-based curriculum design in five disciplines across African universities, establishing the conceptual foundation for outcome-referenced credit allocation on the continent.

Key lessons from Tuning Africa that directly inform ACTS implementation:

- Learning outcomes need to be defined at multiple levels: programme level, cycle level (undergraduate, postgraduate) and module level.
- Workload estimation is context-sensitive: academic cultures, student preparation levels and delivery modes differ significantly across African sub-regions.
- Faculty development is a prerequisite: credit reform requires widespread capacity building, not just policy adoption.

HAQAA1 and HAQAA2: building the ACTS architecture

The Harmonisation of African Higher Education Quality Assurance and Accreditation (HAQAA) initiative, funded under the EU-AU higher education cooperation, produced the foundational policy documents for ACTS implementation:

- HAQAA1 (2015–2018) developed the Pan-African Quality Assurance and Accreditation Framework (PAQAF) and established the principles linking quality assurance, qualifications recognition and credit transfer.
- HAQAA2 (2018–2022) produced the ACTS Roadmap, which operationalises the credit framework with reference values, implementation guidelines for institutions, and alignment protocols with national qualifications frameworks.

HAQAA3: the current phase — advancing implementation

HAQAA3 (2022–present) focuses on moving from policy development to institutional practice. The state-of-the-art report commissioned for this phase documents the current status of credit system adoption across African HEIs and identifies persistent barriers including:

- Institutional inertia: many universities continue to use Carnegie-derived, contact-hour-based credit definitions despite formal policy adoption of ACTS at national or regional level.
- Capacity gaps: limited expertise in workload estimation methodology and learning outcome design at the faculty and department level.
- Data poverty: absence of reliable data on actual student workload makes evidence-based credit calibration difficult.
- Regulatory fragmentation: national credit frameworks in Africa vary significantly in their alignment with ACTS, creating recognition barriers even within the same regional economic community.
- Trust deficits: without shared quality assurance mechanisms, institutions are reluctant to recognise credits from partner institutions even when formal frameworks exist.

Please for further information, see the following documents:

- HAQAA3 (2025). State-of-the-art report: credits and recognition in Africa (full version and executive summary). https://haqaa3.obreal.org/advancing-the-acts/
- HAQAA3 (2025). ACTS regional consultation and national policy visit reports. https://haqaa3.obreal.org/advancing-the-acts/

2.4 ACTS in the context of African regional integration

ACTS does not exist in isolation. It is embedded in a broader political economy of African higher education reform linked to the African Union Agenda 2063 and the vision of a Continental Education Strategy for Africa (CESA 2016–2025). The credit system is understood not merely as a technical instrument for academic administration, but as an enabler of four interrelated continental goals:

- Student mobility: enabling students to move between institutions across Africa without losing academic progress.
- Qualifications recognition: providing a common language for comparing and recognising qualifications across different national systems.
- Joint programme development: facilitating the creation of collaborative degree programmes that award jointly-recognised qualifications.
- Labour market integration: supporting the free movement of skilled workers across Africa by making educational credentials more legible and comparable.

This political context distinguishes ACTS from a purely technical reform. Credit calculation is not merely an administrative detail — it is a dimension of the broader project of African higher education integration and continental identity. Its effective use depends on a broader ecosystem of quality assurance and qualifications recognition that is being built simultaneously through the African Continental Qualifications Framework (ACQF) initiative under ACQF II.

The relationship between ACTS and ACQF is complementary:

ACTS	ACQF
Facilitates credit transfer for student mobility	Provides a reference for comparing qualification levels
Operates at the level of courses and study periods	Operates at the level of full qualifications and awards
Supports short-term and partial mobility	Supports recognition of completed qualifications
Requires workload definition and learning outcomes	Requires level descriptors and qualification standards

For university staff working on mobility and recognition, the practical implication is that ACTS and ACQF work together: a well-functioning ACTS transfer requires knowing the level of the qualification from which a student is transferring (ACQF dimension) and the content and outcomes of the courses they completed (ACTS dimension).

For further information about the link of credits with National Qualification Frameworks, please watch the following video:

- How NQFs & Credit Systems Are Changing Education Forever - World of TVET - Jul 8, 2024
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VR109EDFRlg
  (11.15 minutes)

Section 3. Translating Curricula into ACTS: A Practical Pathway

3.1 The translation challenge

Translating existing curricula into ACTS-compatible structures is not a purely technical exercise. It requires both a conceptual recalibration (understanding what ACTS credits measure) and a practical process (working through existing programmes course by course to assign workload values and articulate learning outcomes).

The good news is that this process does not require institutions to redesign their programmes from scratch. In most cases, the existing curriculum is the starting point; what changes is the language and documentation used to describe it.

The translation process typically involves three steps:

Step 1 — Establishing the workload baseline

The first step is to estimate, for each course in a programme, the total number of hours a typical student devotes to it. This includes:

- Scheduled contact time (lectures, seminars, laboratory sessions, studio time)
- Directed study (assigned readings, problem sets, preparatory exercises)
- Self-directed study (revision, background reading, exploratory work)
- Assessment preparation and completion (including examinations, essays, projects, presentations)

In practice, this estimation is rarely straightforward. Institutions that have never measured student workload systematically will need to rely on academic staff estimates, student surveys, or benchmark data from comparable institutions. The ACTS framework does not require precision to the hour; what matters is a reasonable and consistent approximation across the programme.

The following items should be considered for each course workload estimation:

- Identify all the activities required to achieve those outcomes. List every form of scheduled teaching, guided study and assessment associated with the module.
- Estimate the time required for each activity.
- Sum all estimated hours to obtain total workload.
- Divide total hours by the ACTS reference value (e.g. the institutionally adopted value within the 20-25 range) to obtain the credit value.
- Round to the nearest whole credit and verify that the resulting credit value is coherent with the programme structure and the NQF level descriptor for that type of module.

A worked example:

Activity	Weekly hours	Total (16-week semester)
Lectures (2 sessions × 1.5 h)	3 h	48 h
Seminar/tutorial participation	1 h	16 h
Assigned reading and case prep.	2.5 h	40 h
Group project work	1.5 h	24 h
Assessment preparation & completion	—	22 h (total across semester)
TOTAL	—	150 h → 150 ÷ 25 = 6 ACTS credits

Common error	Institutions that count only lecture hours (48 h in this example) and assign 2 credits (48 ÷ 25 = 1.9) are significantly under-crediting the module. This creates a formal burden on students that is invisible in official records and undermines the comparability that ACTS is designed to achieve.

Step 2 — Articulating learning outcomes

Once workload baselines have been established, the next step is to ensure that course and programme learning outcomes are documented in a form that supports recognition decisions. A well-formulated learning outcome:

- Uses an active verb that describes an observable or demonstrable capability (e.g., 'analyse', 'design', 'evaluate', 'apply' — not 'understand' or 'appreciate', which are not directly observable).
- Specifies the subject matter or context to which the capability applies.
- Implicitly or explicitly signals the level of complexity (introductory, intermediate, advanced).

For institutions that already have learning outcomes documented in course syllabi, the task at this stage is primarily one of review and standardisation. For institutions that do not yet work systematically with learning outcomes, this step represents an investment in curriculum documentation infrastructure that will benefit the institution far beyond ACTS compliance.

For further information about the link of credits to Learning Outcomes, please watch the following video:

- How are ECTS credits linked to Learning Outcomes? Dr. Declan Kennedy - Oct 5, 2022
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvcXrKOvIWE
  (14.51 minutes)

Step 3 — Mapping to the ACTS credit value

With workload estimates and learning outcomes in place, each course can be assigned a provisional ACTS credit value. The ACTS framework recommends:

Total student workload (hours)	Approximate ACTS credits
20–25	1
40–50	2
60–75	3
80–100	4
100–125	5
120–150	6

A full-time academic year is expected to represent 60 ACTS credits (1,200–1,500 hours of total student workload). A three-year undergraduate degree programme would therefore carry 180 ACTS credits; a four-year programme, 240 ACTS credits.

At programme level, the credit map provides a structural overview of the degree: how many credits are allocated to core courses, electives, practical placements, and final-year projects. This structural information is extremely useful for receiving institutions trying to assess a transfer student's prior learning.

3.2 Common pitfalls to avoid

Pitfall	Why it matters	How to avoid it
Assigning ACTS credit values without workload estimation	Credits become arbitrary numbers that do not communicate meaningful information to receiving institutions	Always ground credit values in a documented estimate of total student workload, however approximate
Treating credit translation as a purely administrative task	Academic staff disengage; credits become bureaucratic labels rather than academic communication tools	Involve academic staff in the credit allocation process, particularly in formulating learning outcomes
Ignoring existing regional frameworks	ACTS translation that is inconsistent with EACATS, CAMES or SADCQF creates confusion rather than clarity	Map ACTS credits to existing regional frameworks as part of the translation process; document compatibility explicitly
Assuming credit equivalence implies content equivalence	A 3-credit course at one institution is not automatically interchangeable with a 3-credit course at another	Use learning outcomes to communicate content; use credits to communicate workload — and distinguish between the two in all recognition communications
Attempting institution-wide implementation all at once	Overwhelming scope leads to superficial compliance rather than genuine adoption	Pilot ACTS translation in one or two programmes or faculties, document the experience, and build outward from there

3.3 Self-reflection

Consider the following questions for reflection:

1. Choose one programme at your institution. Roughly how many total hours of student effort does a full academic year in that programme involve? How does that compare to the ACTS benchmark of 1,200–1,500 hours per year?
2. Does your institution have standardised course syllabi that include learning outcomes? If not, what would it take to introduce this as a systematic practice?

3. What is the relationship between your institution's credit system and the relevant national or regional framework (EACATS, CAMES conventions, SADCQF, or your national qualifications framework)? Is this relationship formally documented?

Preparing for the Live Session and Tasks

Before Live Session

We suggest that, once you have read this document and using the reflection questions provided as a guide, each participant completes **Task 1** individually and shares their work prior to the Live Session.

During Live Session

What to expect in the Module 1 live session

The live session for Module 1 is organised by regional cluster. It is designed as a practice-sharing and discussion forum, not a lecture. The conceptual content has been delivered through the asynchronous materials; the live session is the space to test those concepts against real institutional and regional experience.

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

- Critically apply the ACTS workload calculation methodology to an existing academic module to determine its technical credit value.
- Deconstruct and quantify the three core components of student workload, providing evidence-based estimates for contact hours, independent study, and assessment-related activities.
- Evaluate the degree of alignment between the calculated ACTS credit value and the current credit allocation established by their respective home institutions.

Come prepared to share one concrete example from your institution: either a successful credit transfer or recognition case, or a case where the process proved difficult and why. These real-life illustrations are the most valuable input for the session.

During the session, we will work in small groups using **Task 2.**

Key References and Further Reading

The following materials are part of the Module 1 asynchronous resources. They are listed here with brief annotations to help you prioritise your reading.

Essential reading

Document	Relevance to Module 1
HAQAA3 State-of-the-Art Report: Credits and Recognition in Africa	Comprehensive mapping of how credit systems and recognition practices currently function across African

Document	Relevance to Module 1
(short version and executive summary) https://haqaa3.obreal.org/advancing-the-acts/	higher education systems. The conclusions of the study present the revised ACTS proposal

Supplementary reading

Document	Relevance to Module 1
HAQAA3 ACTS Regional Consultation and National Policy Visit Reports https://haqaa3.obreal.org/advancing-the-acts/	Country-specific and regional evidence on credit system implementation challenges and enabling factors.
European Commission (2015). ECTS Users' Guide. https://education.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document-library-docs/ects-users-guide_en.pdf	It is the official document setting out the guidelines for the implementation of the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA)
Tuning Africa (2014). Tuning and Harmonisation of Higher Education: The African Experience. University of Deusto and University of Groningen. http://www.deusto-publicaciones.es/deusto/index.php/es/tuning-es/tuning-africa-2015-es	It is a publication documenting the results of the first phase (pilot phase) of the Tuning Africa project, which examined learning outcomes and academic credits. This work laid the foundations for the creation of ACTS
Wagenaar, R. (2019). A History of ECTS, 1989-2019: Developing a World Standard for Credit Transfer and Accumulation in Higher Education. International Tuning Academy. https://pure.rug.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/111591811/A_History_of_ECTS_1989_2019_PDF.pdf	It documents the evolution of the ECTS from a mobility tool into a global standard for student-centered curricular design. It outlines ECTS's transition from a pure transfer mechanism to a system focused on workload-based accumulation and learning outcomes.
ACQF (2022) A Brief Handbook on the African Continental Qualifications Framework https://acqf.africa/resources/policy-guidelines/brief-acqf-handbook	It offers a compact presentation the ACQF: rationale, objectives and principles, and the ten Synthesis Guidelines. The Handbook is conceived for various user groups, from policy institutions to teacher training institutes, qualifications agencies and experts.

Document	Relevance to Module 1
AUREA Consortium (2025) Report on the Current State of Automatic Credit Recognition https://www.eua.eu/news/member-and-partner-news/aurea-project-report-on-the-current-state-of-automatic-credit-recognition.html	It is a report by the Erasmus+ co-funded Automatic Recognition Assessment (AUREA) project which presents a comprehensive analysis of the current state of automatic academic recognition for credit mobility within the European Higher Education Area.