PESC is pleased to announce that the Fall 2006 Workgroup Summit will be held Monday, October 23 through Tuesday, October 25, 2006 at the Kona Kai Resort in San Diego CA.

Online registration for the Fall 2006 Workgroup Summit is available online at www.PESC.org. Hotel reservations can be made by contacting the hotel directly at 800-566-2524. Please use the group name “PESC” to ensure you receive the discounted hotel rate of $139. The hotel cut-off date is Friday, September 22, 2006.

Our tentative meeting schedule which includes the Fall 2006 Workgroup Summit, AACRAO’s SPEEDE Committee, the PESC Board of Directors and PESC Membership meeting is as follows:

**Saturday 10/21/06**
- SPEEDE meets from 8am – 5pm in the Del Mar Room.

**Sunday 10/22/06**
- SPEEDE meets from 8am – 5pm in the Del Mar Room.

**Monday 10/23/06**
- Registration opens at 8:30am in the foyer.
- The PESC Membership Meeting runs from 9:30am – 11am in the Coronado Room.
- A general introduction to PESC, its workgroups and process will be provided for first-time participants from 11am – 11:30am in the Coronado Room.
- The PESC Membership Luncheon will be held from 11:30am – 1pm in the Point Loma 2 Room.
- The Fall 2006 Workgroup Summit kicks off from 1pm – 5pm with concurrent meetings held in Point Loma 1 and Point Loma 2.

1:00pm – 3:00pm  Admission Application
Data Transport
Degree Audit - Request and Response

The Degree Audit Workgroup has completed 2 of its 3 tasks. The core components have been approved by the Change Control Board and the corresponding schema has been developed. Now the Workgroup needs to focus on completing its 3rd task: The Implementation Guide. Workgroup Chair Jason Elwood of DARS – Miami University believes that with 4 or 5 conference call meetings, the Implementation Guide could be completed and he is looking for volunteers to help in this last task. If you are interested in participating to help draft and review the Implementation Guide, please contact Jason directly at elwoodj@muohio.edu.

Please remember that the degree audit response does include a payload. The payload is pre-formatted text based on the corresponding vendor’s system. Once approved, the workgroup will analyze another schema that contains a breakdown of the payload in a DegreeAuditResults schema.

PESC Fall 2006 Membership Meeting

Please be advised that a meeting of the PESC Membership has been scheduled for Monday, October 23, 2005 at 9:30 am - 11a.m. This meeting will be held at the Kona Kai Resort immediately before PESC’s Workgroup Summit which kicks off on the same day at 1:00pm.

Tentatively scheduled for the agenda at this time:

- Board of Directors Update
- Elections for the Standards Forum for Education Steering Committee
- Standards Forum for Education Update

Also note that PESC is hosting a Membership Luncheon immediately following the Membership Meeting. If you are planning on attending the Membership Meeting and Luncheon, please register online as well at www.PESC.org.

Summit, From Page 1

3:15pm – 5:00pm  Test Score Reporting
                  Data Transport

- The PESC Board of Directors meets from 1pm – 5pm.
- The PESC reception will be held 5:30pm – 6:30pm at the hotel bar.

Tuesday 10/24/06

- Continental Breakfast opens at 7:30am in the Point Loma 1.
- Registration opens at 8:30am in the foyer.
- The Fall 2006 Workgroup Summit continues from 8:30am – noon with concurrent meetings held in the La Jolla and Coronado Rooms.

8:30am – 10:00am  Data Transport
                   Change Control Board

10:15am – 12:00pm  Student Aid Inquiry
                    Admission Application

- Lunch is on your own from noon – 1:30pm.
- A general session takes place from 1:30pm – 5pm in the Point Loma 3 Room and includes:
  - PESC Update
  - Launch of Taxonomy and Course Catalog Workgroups
  - Launch of Certification and E-Authentication Task Forces
  - Steering Committee Update
  - Workgroup Updates
Steering Committee Nominations Now Open

As elections for the Steering Committee will be held during the Membership Meeting, we are now accepting nominations for the Steering Committee, which is a 7-member body that leads and provides oversight for the Standards Forum for Education.

Those interested in nominating or in serving should complete the form on page 8, including the nominee's name, title, organization, and a brief bio to the attention of Michael Sessa, PESC Executive Director, One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 520, Washington DC 20036. Representatives from MEMBER organizations (with dues paid current) are eligible to serve on the Steering Committee. When nominating, please ensure that the nominee is aware that a nomination is being made.

The term of service is one year and runs January 1, 2007 – December 31, 2007.

Elections will be held during PESC’s Membership Meeting scheduled for Monday October 23, 2006 from 9:30 am – 11:00 am EST at the Kona Kai Resort. Membership meetings are open to all PESC Members and Affiliates, and with prior notification, other interested parties.

The schedule for elections will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, September 8, 2006</td>
<td>Nominations Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 27, 2006</td>
<td>Nominations Closed, Proxy Ballots Issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 18, 2006</td>
<td>If not attending the Membership Meeting in person, this is the date by which Proxy Ballots must be received in PESC’s offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday October 23, 2006</td>
<td>Elections held ~ 9:30 am PST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: If attending the Membership Meeting in person, Proxy ballots can still be submitted and then can either be replaced with an official vote on Monday, October 23, 2006 or remain as the official vote. We encourage all PESC members and affiliates to attend as Membership Meetings are your chance to influence the direction of your organization. If you have yet to register for the free Workgroup Summit in San Diego, please visit www.PESC.org.
The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Technology (OET) is centered on maximizing technology's contribution to improving education. OET develops national educational technology policy and implements that policy department-wide supporting the goals of No Child Left Behind and other initiatives. In January 2005, the OET released a national technology plan entitled, Toward a New Golden Age in American Education: How the Internet, the Law and Today's Students Are Revolutionizing Expectations, which is part of the No Child Left Behind Act. This plan (available online at http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/technology/techreports.html) establishes a national vision and strategy that supports the effective use of technology to improve student academic achievement and prepare them for the 21st century.

Educational Technology Facts from OET

Statistics:
• In 2003, the ratio of students to computers in all public schools was 4.4 to 1.
• 48 states included technology standards for students in 2004-2005.
• In 2003, 8 percent of public schools lent laptop computers to students. In those schools, the median number of laptop computers available for loan was 5.
• Schools in rural areas (12 percent) were more likely than city schools (5 percent) and urban fringe schools (7 percent) to lend laptops.
• In 2003, 10 percent of public schools provided a handheld computer to students or teachers.
• 16 states had at least one cyber charter school operating in 2004-2005.
• 22 states had established virtual schools in 2004-2005.
• 56 percent of 2- and 4-year degree-granting institutions offer distance education courses, with 90 percent of public institutions offering distance education courses.
• The gender divide in computer use has been essentially eliminated, as there is no overall difference between boys and girls in overall use of computers. Girls however are slightly more likely than boys to use home computers for e-mail, word processing and completing school assignments than playing games.

Distance Learning
• 36% of school districts and 9% of all public schools have students enrolled in distance education courses.
• There were an estimated 328,000 enrollments in distance education courses by K12 students during the 2001-2002 school year.
• 68% of the enrollments were in high school with an additional 29% in combined or ungraded schools.
• 45,300 enrollments in distance education were Advanced Placement or college-level courses.
• A greater proportion of rural area districts had students enrolled in distance education courses than did urban and suburban districts.
• 42% of districts that have students enrolled in distance education courses are high poverty districts.
• When small districts offer distance learning, they are more likely to involve a greater proportion of schools.
• 80% of public school districts offering online courses said that offering courses not available at their schools is one of the most important reasons for having distance education.
• 50% of public school districts offering online courses cited distance learning as very important in making Advanced Placement or college-level courses available to all students.
• 92% of districts enrolled in online distance education courses had students access online courses from school. 24% of districts with students accessing online courses from home provided or paid for a computer for all students, while an additional 8% did so for some students.
PESC Seeks Systems Readiness Information

We know a number of organizations across the country are developing the XML College Transcript, the Data Transport Standard (DTS), the XML High School Transcript, and Common Record: CommonLine (CRC) – all PESC approved national education community standards – for use and implementation.

While part of PESC’s responsibility is to lead the development and establishment of standards, we must also ensure that we promote and ensure standards implementation and adoption as well. By promoting your efforts, we create a concerted and unified approach and a critical mass. Momentum picks up, adoption spreads, and the use of the standard solidifies a standard as the standard. With unity and momentum, we preclude other subversive efforts that could introduce confusion in the market and take additional time, money, and effort.

With that in mind, we are looking to collect the following information:

1. Organizations: Organizations interested in communicating adoption and/or production dates of the XML College Transcript, the Data Transport Standard (DTS), the XML High School Transcript, and Common Record: CommonLine (CRC)

2. Dates: If yes, the date(s) or date range(s) or whatever information needs to communicated about an organization’s readiness

3. Number of Transactions: To understand how far reaching standards are and how they serve the education community, we are also looking to identify the number of transactions processed by each system on a monthly and/or annual basis.

Reporting this information is voluntary and we’ve attached a Form for organizations to report this information on page 21.

We hope that as organizations develop and implement PESC approved national education community standards that we communicate and promote our efforts either on the website or through the Standard.

We look forward to hearing from you. In the meantime, if you have questions or concerns, please contact Michael Sessa, PESC Executive Director, directly at 202-293-7383.

SAVE THE DATE FOR
THE 4TH ANNUAL
CONFERENCE ON
TECHNOLOGY & STANDARDS

April 23-25, 2007 at the Wyndham Washington in downtown Washington DC.

“This was the most interesting and useful conference I have ever attended. The combination of industries on the speaker panels provided the necessary diverse aspects to make the information valuable and applicable. I am learning what systems [our partners] have in place in addition to the procedures we have here then determining how we can make improvements or integrate programming to benefit the students and the schools. Again, the conference provided me with a lot of information to help answer those questions as well as which direction to go in to ask more questions.”

- Conference Attendee, 3rd Annual Conference on Technology and Standards
Technology Tidbits and Standards Snippets

- U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Federal Student Aid’s 2006 fall conferences take place in Orlando (Oct. 30-Nov. 2) and Las Vegas (Nov. 28-Dec. 1). The conferences center around changes to policies and procedures within the Title IV programs, provide you with the latest legislative activities and enhancements to FSA’s electronic systems and information on the new National SMART and Academic Competitiveness Grants as well as other changes due to the Higher Education Reconciliation Act of 2005. They will also cover topics ranging from information system technologies to improved practices and new regulations for dealing with aid applicants and recipients. Registration for either conference is available at http://fsaconferences.ed.gov/index.html.

- The final report for assessing community interest in an open source Student Services System (SSS) is now complete. The report is posted on the http://student.osnext.org site in the Public Documents folder. The project spoke with staff from dozens of colleges, universities, companies, and professional organizations.

- The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is working to revitalize the patent process with the help of wikis. IBM is designing software that would let patent applications be reviewed by anyone on the interactive Web sites, and the patent office appears to be interested in the project, according to Fortune. The new process could address critics’ concerns that examiners are overworked and quality control is low.

- Laptops, PDA’s, and other personal technology devices can be addictive, say researchers from Rutgers University. In a new study, the researchers argue that employees who constantly check their cell phones and Blackberrys can become addicted to the stimulation that those devices provide. The report indicates

UT Austin Internet Server ‘SPEEDEs’ Along

July 2006 volume included:

- 51,889 TS130 transcripts
- 38,275 TS131 acknowledgements
- 14,215 TS997 Functional acknowledgements
- 16,171 TS189 Admission Applications
- 3,879 TS138 test score reports
- 145,142 total transactions
that employers who promote use of high-tech communication tools could end up being liable for encouraging addiction among their staff members.


- Computer scientists are urging members of Congress to proceed cautiously in their effort to enact legislation that would require computer manufacturers to design machines according to standards that inhibit copyright infringement. In a letter last month to Sen. Ted Stevens, an Alaska Republican and chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Association for Computing Machinery said that people who want to infringe on copyright-protected material will find a way to do so, regardless of any equipment mandates.

- Eighty percent of senior enrollment managers at both public and private research institutions said their top priorities included managing tuition cost and affordability, meeting diversity goals, and handling enrollment strategies, such as predicting “yield” — the percentage of accepted students who enroll, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education.

- Fall is the most challenging time of year for college network administrators, in large part because new students — and returning students who took their laptops home for the summer — return to school and connect their own virus-ridden computers with thousands of other machines through the schools’ network. Some institutions, such as Wellesley College, require students to download antivirus software when they log onto the network.

- The Department of Education released its final regulations limiting the application of the 50-percent rule, which prevented institutions that enrolled more than half their students through distance education from participating in federal financial-aid programs. Congress made an exception to the rule earlier this year for institutions that provide instruction through telecommunications, such as online education, and the new Education Department rules simply reflect that change. The department did clarify that the technology used for telecommunications must involve a significant amount of interactivity. The department estimates that the change in the 50-percent rule could increase the number of students eligible for federal student aid by 30,000 in 2006 and 2007, and that 17,000 of those students will be eligible for Pell Grants each year, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education.
NOMINATION FORM

STANDARDS FORUM FOR EDUCATION
Steering Committee

Elections to be held:
October 23, 2006
9:30 am – 11:00 am EDST
Kona Kai Resort
San Diego CA

Nominee Full Name

Title and Organization

Street Address

City, State and Zip

Phone  Fax  E-mail Address

Please complete this form and return it to PESC:

Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council
One Dupont Circle NW
Suite 520
Washington DC  20036
Fax: 202-872-8857
Email: Sessa@PESC.org

www.PESC.ORG
The need for high school graduates who are adequately prepared for postsecondary education is well documented. Heeding those calls, most states and districts already are implementing P–16 initiatives to raise standards in high schools so that our students will be better prepared for the demands of postsecondary education when they graduate. These initiatives focus on aligning P–12 and college standards, assessments and accountability policies to ensure smooth student transitions.

We know that these plans must stem from solid data, but a coherent system that can provide this information does not exist in every state. In addition to aligning their policies, states must align their P–12 and postsecondary data systems as part of the important structural changes to better prepare students for higher education and the changing global economy.

Educators and policymakers are recognizing the need for a longitudinal system that will allow P–12 and postsecondary officials to track high school graduates through higher education and into the workplace. Such systems would give schools much-needed clarity about academic strengths and weaknesses, allow schools to administer assessments early enough that they can intervene when students have gaps in their learning, and locate barriers to success within systems.

SUR systems contain an individual electronic record for each student enrolled in a postsecondary institution or school for each term or year. These systems collect a wide range of demographic and performance data at regular intervals, which allows records to be merged with other longitudinal files to investigate student success and behavior over time and across settings and treatments. They also can be analyzed to examine progress made and impacts on particular populations.

Postsecondary unit record systems offer an additional benefit: They can be used to answer questions that take accountability discussions to higher levels. For example, how effective are college-entry curriculums, remediation or early-collegiate programs in furthering P–16 objectives? What is the impact of particular state financial aid strategies on the postsecondary success rates of low-income students? What is the impact of particular kinds of educational programs on local labor markets? These policy questions cannot be answered in any other way.

Higher Education SUR Systems
According to a recent inventory, there are 46 higher education SUR databases in 39 states. Most contain records only of students enrolled in public postsecondary institutions; however, some also include data on students enrolled in independent colleges, and more states are considering moving in this direction. Collectively, such systems contain basic information on 73 percent of the students enrolled nationwide in colleges and universities.

All of the higher education SUR systems have been in place at least long enough to track students to the point of earning a degree (six years), and many have much longer histories. However, the records are not consistent among states, and most do not contain sufficient transcript-level detail to answer questions about course-taking patterns or how well curricular requirements are being met.

Linking Systems
States are in different stages of developing coordinated data systems, but some data already are being shared across systems. Many postsecondary systems contain admissions information, including a student’s final high school grade point average, and certain systems keep track of work attempted prior to postsecondary admission, such as transfer credits or prior college-level work. With this information, some states have been able to develop feedback systems that allow high schools to receive information about their graduates’ postsecondary performance.

Examples from Texas, Florida and California are included in the complete downloadable copy of the Issue Brief at www.DataQualityCampaign.org/Activities, where you can also view video and PowerPoint presentations from the DQC quarterly meeting in June.
Education Commission of the States (www.ecs.org)
The Education Commission of the States (ECS) helps state leaders shape education policy. ECS is the only national organization that brings together a cross-role constituency – governors, legislators, chief state school officers, high education officials, business leaders and others - to work side by side to improve education. As a non-profit interstate compact, ECS is the nation's preeminent nonpartisan source of information, ideas and leadership on education policy.

National Association of State Boards of Education (www.nasbe.org)
The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) is the only national organization giving voice and adding value to the nation’s State Boards of Education. A non-profit organization founded in 1958, NASBE works to strengthen state leadership in educational policymaking, promote excellence in the education of all students, advocate equality of access to educational opportunity, and assure continued citizen support for public education.

Partner Highlights: Schools Interoperability Framework Association

SIF: The Vertical Reporting Solution

The Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA) is a unique, non-profit collaboration composed of over 350 schools, districts, states, national and international government entities, and software vendors who collectively define the rules for educational software data interoperability. The SIF Specification enables diverse school software applications to share data efficiently, reliably, and securely regardless of the platform or vendor.

The number of districts and states that use SIF for data interoperability has grown exponentially over the past three years – SIF interoperability is currently supplying information to over 5 million students and teachers. States and districts that are implementing SIF now see it as a practical way to address any number of vertical reporting, data quality and data transmission issues.

SIF Implementation Activities – Local Level

The most common reason districts give for implementing SIF is local data interoperability. School districts often find it burdensome for their staff to manage multiple disparate software applications, numerous discrete data entry processes, and the resulting inconsistent data. Moving to a SIF solution allows for a single data entry point, saving time entering and troubleshooting the data. Other efficiencies enable districts to direct more efforts toward their most important mission: that of educating children. SIF’s key benefits to districts include:
- Better data interoperability
- Improved student achievement
- Increased identification of state and federal funding opportunities
- Improved services to staff and students

SIF Implementation Activities - State Level

Each state now consumes many hours of manual data manipulation to convert district information into a format it can present in federal reports. But SIF can make the process significantly easier. SIF vertical reporting benefits include automated, real-time data collection, local control over data, accuracy, increased data quality, reliability and security, and significant state-wide time and cost savings.

SIF state-wide implementations are now underway in five states, with over a dozen additional states in the final planning for SIF implementations. Other states included SIF in successful State Longitudinal Data System Grant applications. Several federal agencies and programs have recommended utilizing applications adhering to the SIF Specification. Numerous states have become SIFA members, showing leadership in being part of establishing the PK-12 Data Standard.

Campaign activities – Welcome New Managing Partners

National Association of System Heads (www.nashonline.org)
NASH is a membership organization of Chief Executive Officers of 52 public higher education systems in 38 states and Puerto Rico. The goal of the association is to improve the governance of public higher education systems. Its member systems enroll the lion's share of college students nationwide. A major commitment of NASH is to work with P-12 systems and civic leaders to build statewide P-16 vehicles to promote and carry out a coordinated, standards-based education reform strategy.
The Power of Using Longitudinal Data to Calculate Graduation and Dropout Rates

Graduation Rate vs. Dropout Rate – Not Exact Opposites

The power of using longitudinal data in calculations of graduation and dropout rates lies in the ability to know exactly how many graduates there are and what is actually happening to all students – which ones graduate, where the students who don’t graduate go, and how many actually graduate with which type of diploma. Up to now, graduation and dropout rates have typically been estimates based on the number of students in particular grades in specific years. With longitudinal data and the NGA graduation rate, we will have more accurate rates and know far more information about graduates and dropouts than before.

When considering graduation and dropout rates, it should be noted that they are not necessarily the inverse of each other; that is, the dropout rate for a state is rarely the number of students minus the number of graduates. Put another way, it is easy to assume that if a state has a graduation rate of 83% it will also have a dropout rate of 17%, but that is not the case. The two terms are often used interchangeably, but they are two distinct events and not the only two educational outcomes for students.

The power of longitudinal data (the ability to follow individual students across years) makes clear that the image of students starting and finishing their high school careers at one campus – moving from 9th grade through 12th grade – is not as accurate today as in years past. The American population in the late 20th and early 21st centuries has become very mobile, for a variety of reasons, and this mobility has a huge impact on the educational experience of students. Student mobility occurs frequently both during and between school years, making it difficult to accurately account for transfers and dropouts.

In order to accurately track students who transfer in and out of a state or local education agency, a state must have student-level data (a unique ID assigned to each student and enrollment records collected to track membership and attendance at every campus and district in the state). Ideally, the state will also maintain an exit or “leaver” data system (that is, a set of codes that identify the reason each student left a particular district or campus). Graduated and dropped out are only two of many reasons for which students leave a school system. States that already maintain exit data systems provide their districts with a wide variety of codes. States that already maintain exit data systems provide their districts with a wide variety of codes (sometimes 30 or more) with which to identify students’ exit reasons. These codes include events such as marriage, death, transfer out of state, transfer to a home school, transfer to another country, transfer to a private school, incarceration, General Educational Development (GED) certificate, hospital-bound, and so on. Many of these categories are such that a student cannot be counted as either a graduate or a dropout by a particular campus, district, or state, and yet the student is no longer enrolled and receiving an education by that education agency. The students who are no longer enrolled and yet are neither graduates nor dropouts are often referred to as non-graduates or “leavers” in some states. The non-graduates and students who are still enrolled after four years of high school must be taken into consideration when comparing graduation and dropout rates.

The degree of detail and accuracy with which these exit codes are reported and used can affect the degree of reliability of the graduation and dropout rates reported by the state, particularly at the campus and district level where just a few students can significantly affect the denominator and thereby change the graduation and dropout rates. Depending on the size of the campus or district and the number of non-graduates, there can be a significant difference between the graduate and dropout rates for that institution.

The National Forum on Education Statistics produced an excellent document that outlines the need for an exit code data system and provides recommendations for how to establish a classification system of exit codes. This document and the suggested guidelines came from a task force of district, state and federal representatives with many years of experience in data collection, analysis and reporting who felt that the quality of education data in general, and the calculation of graduation and dropout statistics in particular, could best be improved by standardizing the way exit data are defined and collected.
The Data Quality Campaign is a national, collaborative effort to encourage and support state policymakers to improve the collection, availability, and use of high-quality education data, and to implement state longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement. The campaign aims to provide tools and resources that will assist state development of quality longitudinal data systems, while also providing a national forum for reducing duplication of effort and promoting greater coordination and consensus among the organizations focusing on improving data quality, access and use.

The DQC is supported by The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Data Quality Campaign Recognition Program: The DQC will be recognizing data directors at the state and/or district level who have shown outstanding insight and initiative in the area of designing, developing, implementing, and/or changing longitudinal data systems. Please send your nominations to Nancy Smith at nancy@just4kids.org.

Next Quarterly Issue Meeting: Using Data in the Central Office and in the Classroom to Improve Student Achievement, Sept 25th, 2:30-5:00pm, Washington, DC
ESC Accomplishments 2005-2006
Brian Allison, USA Funds
Bob King, Citibank

Over the last year, the Electronic Standards Committee Advisory Teams had a lot to get done and got a lot done! The following are a few of the highlights:

Origination Standards Advisory Team
- Updated the CL4 and 5 standards for HERA, esign and other items.
- Gained approval of CommonRecord:CommonLine (CRC) as an official Education Community standard through PESC. Completed a Beta Test of the CRC standard which effort won the PESC Best Practices Award for 2006.

School Advisory Team
- Identified the issue of using data directly from service provider systems and gaining safe harbor.
- Progress on NSLDS and permission gained from ED to ignore unallocated amounts on consolidation loans.
- Presented on Meteor at NASFAA.

Testing and Certification Team
- Updated the testing tools for all published changes to CommonLine and CRC standards.
- Established samples that can be used to support and facilitate testing efforts.
- Supported the Beta Test and continuously updated the testing tool to reflect the results of the testing.

Electronic Exchange Advisory Team
- Set its own work aside to focus on DTS.
- DTS was approved as an official Education Community standard via the PESC process.

Continued on page 2
ESC Accomplishments 2005-2006
Continued on from page 1

Communication and Training Team
• Accomplished key goal – get out the good word of CR:C:
• Presented at over a dozen state, regional, and national conferences, including NASFAA and was one of only two FFEL sessions at the EAC conferences last fall.
• Updated and distributed survey results for ESC, as well as Program Ops.

General Account Maintenance Advisory Team
Updated the CAM standard for HERA changes, including: Federal Default Fee, Grad PLUS, Elimination of Joint (Spousal) Consolidation, addition of the new Military Deferment code

Default Aversion & Claims Advisory Team
• Updated documentation on CAM for HERA changes.
• Worked closely with DACS from Program Ops to coordinate activities.

Upcoming for 2006-2007
• CRC bring to the forefront and pursue as many implementations as possible
• New regulatory changes – we do expect more.
• Begin to retire CL 4 and 5

School Advisory Team Update
Nancy Ninaz
University of Wisconsin - Stout

The School Advisory Group met with Department of Education regarding a number of issues. The first was the unallocated loans on NSLDS. Schools had been charged with trying to figure out the composition of the unallocated amount. Jeff Baker and Pam Eliadis reviewed a sampling of data. The end result of which was that they told school they could disregard the unallocated amount when calculating eligibility for new loans.

We advised ED that for spousal consolidation – in some instances, funds are being reported under one spouse and not the other and this is currently being worked on.

Due to the differences between borrower based and academic based loan periods, a chapter in the student aid handbook was completely rewritten for the school.

The School Advisory group is currently working on School Profiles and the importance of updating when moving from CLR4 to CRC.

OSAT Team Update
Kristi Blabaum, Great Lakes

All updates to documents are posted to the elibrary on the NCHELP website. Changes include:
• CLR4: HERA changes, esign source code, fees paid and direct disbursement to borrower.
• CLR5: HERA changes, fees paid and direct disbursement to borrower.
• CR:C: HERA changes, all the examples are updated and posted to the document.
• Appendix H: layout for Alternative loans in the custom extension. This document is to be used between the lender and the service provider. Not to be sent to the school.

We are in the very early stages of working on documentation for standards in the CDA process.

Also meeting with School Advisory Team to assist with documentation for the school to promote CR:C.
EEAT Team Update  
Nathan Chitty, Nelnet

EEAT is actively working on a new version of the technical manual. We hope to have the new version completed at the beginning of the 4th quarter of 2006. Major revisions to the manual include the “Push-Pull” FTP implementation model (completed) and the Data Transport Standard (DTS) v1 element definition and implementation.

The EEAT will work to ensure that DTS provides more flexibility and more potential for enhancements than either FTP or POP3. We are currently seeking assistance for the process of element definition and implementation of DTS for the ESC process. Now is a great time to participate, to help ensure that information from the various business processes is included in this initial definition. While all help is greatly appreciated; ideally, new participants for this endeavor would have knowledge of your business process including how transport works.

There are minor changes to file name and subject line standard conventions. The maximum length for each was increased. The increase in length is to accommodate a strong revised recommendation for the creation and format of the unique message identifier detailed in the manual.

We are also working with ESC to have a DTS training session and/or EEAT meeting focusing on DTS late in 2006 or early in 2007, after the completion of the technical documentation. Stay tuned!

Testing and Certification Team Update  
Darwin Peiffer, AES

Testing and Certification has released instructions on “How to Create a Generic CRC file”. This functionality is available in the latest release of the Testing Tool, which is posted to the NCHELP website.

CRC sample test files were also released to the NCHELP website in June.

Currently, beginning to review the tasks needed for all of the HERA changes. We will start with CLR5, and once that Testing Tool is released, then move to CR:C. It is expected that this will take between 2 and 4 months to complete.

Also the team is working on an integrated version of the CommonLine (4 and 5) documentation with all the release addendum documents included. The expectation is to have this completed in the next 4 -5 months.

GAMAT Team Update  
Michelle Fosnot, Sallie Mae & Rob Boisen, Great Lakes

GAMAT has completed documentation updates related to HERA. Revised CAM documentation was published on 8/7/06. A summary of the changes is included below:

Expansion of the PLUS Loan Program to Graduate/Professional Students. The HERA expands the PLUS Loan program to include graduate and professional students. Based on this change CAM Release 1 layouts were modified as follows:

- Addition of a new loan type code of (GB). This additional code is being adopted to allow service providers and software providers to electronically exchange, identify and process the new Graduate/Professional PLUS loans appropriately on their systems.
- When appropriate, references to Federal PLUS loans were expanded to include reference to Federal PLUS/Federal Graduate/Professional PLUS loans.
Fields to report Federal Graduate / Professional PLUS underlying loans were added to record CAM Consolidation record type 17 and 18.

For Grad PLUS loans, borrower information must be provided in both the student and borrower fields on all relevant CAM transactions.

This notation was added to the introductory text related to CAM Consolidation Loan Record types 17 and 20.

Addition of new Military Deferment Type Code
A new deferment type code of MO (Military Operations) was added to the list of valid codes in Appendix A.

Edits related to deferment were modified to take the new code into account.

Federal Default Fee (formerly Guarantee Fee)
The HERA includes a change to the Higher Education Act 428(b)(1)(H) that establishes a federal default fee equal to 1 percent of the principal amount of the loan that guaranty agencies must collect and deposit into the Federal Fund. Based on this change CAM Release 1 layouts will change as follows:

Default fees will be supported through 3 different flows (the model flow diagrams are on the NCHELP web site).

Elimination of joint (Spousal) Consolidation
The HERA eliminates the ability of a married couple to consolidate their eligible student loans in a joint FFEL or Direct Consolidation Loan. This change is effective for Consolidation Loan applications received on or after July 1, 2006.

We welcome your feedback! What would you like to see in a future issue? Any suggestions or issues with existing articles, please contact Erin Rose at:

erin_rose@keybank.com

ESC MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2006-2007
(Please note 2007 dates/locations are subject to change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Rate (+ Tax)</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 16-18, 2006</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>OMNI Charlotte Hotel</td>
<td>$154 S/D</td>
<td>10/01/2006</td>
<td>Electronic Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 29-31, 2007</td>
<td>San Diego*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Electronic Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2-4, 2007</td>
<td>San Antonio*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Electronic Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11-13, 2007</td>
<td>Washington, DC*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Electronic Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15-17, 2007</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Electronic Standards Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note all locations subject to change based on rates on hotel availability.
Summary of Meetings and Conference Calls of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee

Months of June and July 2006

This is an update for interested members of the AACRAO membership about the ongoing activities of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee. SPEEDE is a committee that is more active year round than many of the other AACRAO standing committees.

Face to face meetings held (with number of participants): Before the AACRAO Technology Conference in Denver on 7/22/06 (7).

AACRAO SPEEDE Committee conference calls held (with number of participants): 6/1/06 (6), 6/8/06 (6), 6/22/06 (6), 6/29/06 (6), and 7/20/06 (5).

Activities related to PESC: AACRAO is a founding member of, and an active participant in the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council. Much of the real work of PESC is accomplished in workgroups.

PESC workgroups of interest to AACRAO SPEEDE include:

**XML High School Transcript** - The XML High School Transcript was approved as a PESC standard by the PESC voting membership in June 2006. The Implementation Guide and the three .xsd files needed to view it in a tool such as Altova’s XML Spy (HS Transcript v 1.0.0, Academic Rec. v 1.1.0, and Core Main v 1.2.0) are located on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/info/approved/hs-transcript.asp.

**XML Request for Transcript and Response** - This workgroup is developing the XML equivalent to the EDI TS146 and TS147. Bruce Marton, Clare Smith-Larson and Tom Stewart are officially members of the workgroup. Doug Falk of the National Student Clearinghouse is chair of the workgroup. No report from this workgroup during this period.

**XML College Transcript** - This schema was approved in 2004 and the first major effort to implement it has occurred in the State University System of Georgia. SunGard Higher Education has incorporated this standard into its Banner product and is included in version 7.3 which was released at the end of May 2006. All of the Georgia SUS schools are in various stages of implementation. The Ohio Board of Regents has also mandated use of the XML standard for its member schools and the implementation process is beginning.
June and July 2006 Report from AACRAO SPEEDE Committee

XML Student Transcript Acknowledgment - The use of an acknowledgment of a student transcript received is an important part of the security advantage gained by the electronic exchange of student records. In EDI, this was accomplished by the use of Transaction Set 131. Not only can the sender of the transcript be assured that the transcript was received with no alterations, but the receiver can be certain that the transcript did originate from the sender indicated in TS130. This information may also be relayed to the student who originated the request.

At this time, this workgroup is composed of two members of the Georgia Board of Regents, several members of the Ohio Board of Regents, and the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee. A draft schema and a draft Implementation Guide have been approved by the workgroup. If anyone is interested in a copy of these, please contact Tom Stewart at stewartj@aol.com. The next step is to submit these documents to PESC for approval.

Batch Transmittal Schema - A draft of this schema has been prepared by Bruce Marton from the University of Texas at Austin and a member of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee. It will enable a school to bundle multiple XML documents for transmission to the Texas Internet Server or to other institutions or agencies. It will also allow the Texas Internet Server to bundle multiple XML documents for transmission to schools and agencies such as the American Medical Colleges Admissions Service (AMCAS). The next step is to submit this to the PESC Change Control Board for approval.

Course Inventory - Rick Skeel has volunteered to chair this new PESC workgroup, with Anne Valentine from SmartCatalog as co-chair. The kick off meeting is scheduled for October at the PESC Workgroup Summit in San Diego.

In addition, the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee prepared an Implementation Guide for the ANSI ASC X12 EDI Transaction Set 188 and it is now posted on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/info/implementation-guides.asp

Application for Admission: This workgroup is now holding weekly conference calls each Thursday at noon Eastern Daylight Savings Time. Five calls were held in June and July. The workgroup is chaired by Adriana Farella of Xap Corporation and co-chaired by Tom Stewart of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee. The workgroup has spent most of its time so far on the characteristics needed for the applicant as a person, including ID numbers, birth information, name, and ways to contact the applicant.
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The next few calls will be spent on race/ethnicity data and information required for the SEVIS program for international applicants. Anyone interested in joining the workgroup, please contact Tom Stewart at stewartj@aol.com.

National Test Score Reporting: Information on this newly created workgroup is located on the www.pesc.org website under the tab for PESC workgroups. It will develop the PESC XML standard that serves essentially the same purpose as the EDI Transaction Set 138.

Degree Audit: An existing workgroup chaired by Jason Elwood of the DARS project in Ohio is nearing completion of its first phase. This is to develop an XML standard for the request of a degree audit to be created, and the response to that request. The second phase of the work of the workgroup is to develop standards for the display of a completed degree audit.

Other SPEEDE Activities in June/July:

AACRAO Student Services Technology Conference: The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee met the Saturday (July 22nd) before the Conference July 23-25, 2006 at the Grand Hyatt Hotel in Denver, Colorado. As is the custom, each member of the Committee also participated with one or more program presentations.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Data Conference: Bruce Marton and Tom Stewart of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee were invited to meet with the Technology Committee of the NCES Forum on July 26th in Washington, DC to discuss the PESC XML High School Transcript. They also presented a program session on the same subject later in the day to the Conference. Barbara Clements of the National Transcript Center moderated the session. Barbara was a member of the ExPRESS group that developed the EDI version of the high school transcript and is a participant in the Schools Interoperability Framework (SIF) project to develop a national format for the transfer of student records among K12 schools.

Future Meetings: The following are future events at which the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee plans to attend, meet, and present sessions:

PESC Fall Workgroup Summit: This will be held October 23rd and 24th in San Diego. The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee plans to participate with PESC as each member of the Committee also participates with one or more of the PESC Workgroups. The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee will meet October 21 and 22 prior to the PESC Summit.
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**AACRAO 2007 Conference in Boston:** The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee has submitted ten proposals for program sessions and round tables for this wintry conference.

**PESC Annual Technology and Standards Conference:** This will be held at the Wyndham Washington Hotel in Washington, DC April 23-25, 2007.

**AACRAO Student Services Technology Conference:** To be held at the Hilton in Minneapolis July 15-17, 2007.

**AACRAO SPEEDE Committee Members for 2006-2007:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clare Smith-Larson</td>
<td>Chair, SPEEDE/Project EASIER Coordinator, Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Billing</td>
<td>Business Analyst, Ontario (Canada) Colleges Application Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuan Anh Do</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Student Systems Support &amp; Development, San Francisco State University (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Marton</td>
<td>Associate Director, Student Information Systems, Office of Admissions/Registrar, University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Sather</td>
<td>Information Technology Manager, Office of the Registrar, Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Skeel</td>
<td>Director of Academic Records, University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Snowden</td>
<td>Director of Information Technology, Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. “Tom” Stewart</td>
<td>Retired College Registrar from Miami Dade College (FL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anyone who is a voting member of AACRAO or can attain that status from their institution is welcome to submit a formal application on-line on the AACRAO Committees website for SPEEDE Committee membership for 2006-2007 and for 2007-2008. This application will be routed to Jerald Bracken, AACRAO VP-Information Technology and Clare Smith-Larson, AACRAO SPEEDE Committee chair for further consideration.

And that’s the news for the past two months from the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee.
# Systems Readiness Form

Name: ________________________________

Title: ________________________________

Organization: __________________________

Phone: _______________ Email: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version or Release Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions:</td>
<td>(please indicated monthly, quarterly, annually, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed_________________________ Date ____________________

Please email, fax or mail to:
PESC
One Dupont Circle NW, Suite 520
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone 202-293-7383  Fax 202-872-8857  Sessa@PESC.org