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$199 “PESC”
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The PESC Spring 2013 Data Summit takes place Wednesday May 1-3, 2-13 and includes PESC’s Annual Spring Membership Meeting and Annual Spring Reception.

Data Summits focus on open, collaborative, community development, implementation and integration, maintenance & exchange of data and data standards. Access, overall connectivity, data quality and political factors that drive education systems and technology are also discussed.

All Concurrent and General Summit Sessions and events are open to all registered attendees and dress code is business casual. Transparent collaboration, engaging discussions, awareness of technical resources & best practices, identification of emerging technologies, new business contacts and tips from experts of leading community organizations can be expected.

In continuing its mission of leading and governing community-based collaboration, the Spring 2013 Data Summit is held in partnership with AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) Initiative & Consortium, InCommon & the US Department of Education.

Sessions at the Spring 2013 Data Summit will be held on the following efforts and topics. Please check the PESC website for program and agenda updates and for General Session speakers.

**Development Efforts**
- Academic ePortfolio
- Common Data Services Task Force & EDexchange
- EA2 Task Force, InCommon & CommIT
- Student Loan Data Reporting Workgroup

**Board, Committees & User Groups**
- Canadian PESC User Group
- CEDS User Group
- Student Aid User Group
- Education Record User Group
- Seal of Approval Board
- Technical Advisory Board (TAB)
- Change Control Board (CCB)

PESC thanks DIAMOND Sponsors:
- Common Application
  www.CommonApp.org
- ConnectEDU
  www.ConnectEDU.com
- National Student Clearinghouse
  www.StudentClearinghouse.org
- ORACLE
  www.Oracle.com
- Parchment
  www.Parchment.com
- SCRIP-SAFE
  www.SCRIP-SAFE.com
- USA Funds
  www.USAFunds.org
- XAP
  www.XAP.com
NEW PESC MEMBERS

ASA
www.ASA.org

Career Cruising
www.CareerCruising.com

iDATA Incorporated
www.iDATAinc.com

Memorial University of Newfoundland
www.MUN.ca

NASFAA
www.NASFAA.org

NCHER
www.NCHER.org

PHEAA
www.PHEAA.org

SSD Technology Partners
www.SSDEL.com

SHEEO
www.SHEEO.org

“**At ConnectEDU, we are passionate about adopting, maintaining and promoting industry best practices to benefit our customers, specifically around the use of data,**” stated Jeffrey Alderson, Senior Director of Product Innovation, ConnectEDU, Inc. & PESC board member.

“**Parchment is committed to driving industry standards for the exchange of credentials data among educational and professional organizations because it improves efficiencies from all sides,**” said Matthew Pittinsky, Ph.D., CEO, Parchment.

PREMIER PESC PARTNERS
* OUR HIGHEST MEMBERSHIP LEVEL *

National Student Clearinghouse
www.StudentClearinghouse.org

Parchment
www.Parchment.com

SCRIP-SAFE International
www.Scrip-Safe.com

USA Funds
www.USAfunds.org

SEAL OF APPROVAL PROGRAM

Please be advised that the following organizations have been approved for transcript processing under PESC’s Seal of Approval Program:

– **ConnectEDU**
  www.ConnectEDU.com

– **Parchment**
  www.Parchment.com

The PESC Seal of Approval Program is a voluntary service offered by PESC for implementers of PESC Approved Standards to indicate a uniform level of implementation. Implementers must formally apply to PESC for the Seal of Approval using the official application and must submit a small, non-refundable fee to PESC. The service was designed to communicate to the community at-large that a certain implementation of PESC Approved Standards has been uniformly implemented according to the original intent and spirit of the PESC Approved Standard. A Seal of Approval can be used by implementers to market products and services to demonstrate alignment and interoperability.
For users, a product or service with a PESC Seal of Approval indicates that the product or service is in alignment and uniform with the original intent of the PESC Approved Standard. For providers of products and services, a PESC Seal of Approval indicates value in that the product or service was reviewed, analyzed and confirmed to be in alignment and uniform with the original intent of the PESC Approved Standard.

For PESC, ensuring that products and services are in alignment and uniform with the original intent of PESC Approved Standards fulfills its mission and improves the level of awareness and need for interoperability across the education landscape.

Moreover, a Seal of Approval can be part of organizational RFP’s, can be marketed by the organization receiving the Seal of Approval in materials and on websites, and the organization receiving the Seal of Approval must link directly to the PESC website whereby the validity of a Seal of Approval can be confirmed.

The Seal of Approval Application and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) are both available and posted on the PESC website at www.PESC.org.

"Systems must be designed to meet the standards and guidelines of NCES including the schemas of PESC."
- Grant RFA for Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems, American Recovery & Reinvestment Act of 2009

PESC CELEBRATES 15th YEAR ANNIVERSARY

To commemorate PESC’s 15th Year Anniversary, we’ve upgraded our business plan from PESC 2.0 whereby we focused on Unlocking the Power of Data Across the Education Lifecycle to PESC 3.0 in which we Unify the Education Domain Around Interoperability to Improve Student Achievement.

PESC 3.0 announced at the Fall 2012 Data Summit includes a number of enhancements:

- Member upgrades to Premier Partner (our highest Member status)
- New Membership Categories (for schools and/or LEA’s)
- Common Intellectual Property (IP)
- Limited Memberships (distributed by non-profit organizations & associations, and commercial organizations)
- Permanent User Groups (a Student Aid User Group will be added to the PESC lineup)
- And a change to the name of the organization!

MEMBERSHIP UPGRADES NOW AVAILABLE

BECOME A PREMIER PARTNER IN PESC

**IT’s FREE TO UPGRADE**

For commercial Members, non-profit association Members and non-profit organization Members:

In an effort to thank these Member organizations for their continued support of PESC over the years, PESC is pleased to announce the establishment of a new membership benefit which allows current PESC Members (limited to non-profit organizations, non-profit associations and commercial organizations only) to pass on at their discretion, free Limited PESC Memberships to other organizations. This new benefit is available effective immediately for Members current in their PESC dues and is automatically included in your current dues.
Limited PESC Membership includes all Member benefits including external reference as a PESC Member except internally:

- The number of representatives that can participate in PESC is limited to one representative.
- All designated representatives are ineligible to serve on the PESC Board of Directors.

Organizations with Limited PESC Memberships that are interested in having more than one representative participate in PESC or interested in serving on the PESC Board of Directors, must upgrade their Membership from Limited to Member.

PESC Members that take advantage of this benefit and bring in at least one Limited PESC Member will be upgraded to Premier Partner and this exclusive status will be reflected by PESC in all marketing materials, presentations and on the membership page of the PESC website. Check www.PESC.org for more information.

**EDUCAUSE TOP 10 IT ISSUES 2012**

For 2012, the top IT Issues:

1. Updating IT professionals’ skills and roles to accommodate emerging technologies and changing IT management and service delivery models
2. Supporting the trends toward IT consumerization and bring-your-own device
3. Developing an institution-wide cloud strategy

For more information, visit http://www.educause.edu/research-and-publications/research/it-issues-panel.

**1998 Amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965**

P.L. 105-244

**Sec 101---Revision of Title I**

**PART D---ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS FOR DELIVERY OF STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**

**SEC. 143. ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLIFICATION OF STUDENT AID DELIVERY.**

`(a) IN GENERAL- In order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the student aid delivery system, the Secretary and the Chief Operating Officer shall encourage and participate in the establishment of voluntary consensus standards and requirements for the electronic transmission of information necessary for the administration of programs under title IV.

`(b) PARTICIPATION IN STANDARD SETTING ORGANIZATIONS-

`'(1) The Chief Operating Officer shall participate in the activities of standard setting organizations in carrying out the provisions of this section.

`'(2) The Chief Operating Officer shall encourage higher education groups seeking to develop common forms, standards, and procedures in support of the delivery of Federal student financial assistance to conduct these activities within a standard setting organization.

`'(3) The Chief Operating Officer may pay necessary dues and fees associated with participating in standard setting organizations pursuant to this subsection.

**INTEROPERABILITY** from Wikipedia

Interoperability is a property referring to the ability of diverse products, systems and/or organizations to work together (inter-operate). The term is often used in a technical systems engineering sense, or alternatively in a broad sense, taking into account social, political, and organizational factors that impact system to system performance.

For systems interoperability specifically organizations communicate through interfaces which are completely understood...each can work with the other’s products or systems without any restricted access or implementation.
Registration is now available for the **PESC SPRING 2013 DATA SUMMIT!**

The PESC Spring 2013 Data Summit takes place Wednesday May 1–3, 2013 and includes PESC’s Annual Spring Membership Meeting and Annual Spring Reception.

Use this form for registration or visit us online at www.PESC.org.

For hotel reservations, please contact the hotel directly:

**OMNI San Diego Hotel**
675 L Street
San Diego, CA 92102
1-800-THE-OMNI

$199 per night single/double in “PESC” Group. Hotel cut-off date for group rate is April 1, 2013.

Data Summits focus on open, collaborative, community development, implementation and integration, maintenance & exchange of data and data standards. Access, overall connectivity, data quality and political factors that drive education systems and technology are also discussed.

All Concurrent and General Summit Sessions and events are open to all registered attendees and dress code is business casual. Transparent collaboration, engaging discussions, awareness of technical resources & best practices, identification of emerging technologies, new business contacts and tips from experts of leading community organizations can be expected.

In continuing its mission of leading and governing community-based collaboration, the Spring 2013 Data Summit is held in partnership with the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) Initiative & Consortium, InCommon & the US Department of Education.
Sessions at the Spring 2013 Data Summit will be held on the following efforts and topics. Please check the PESC website at www.PESC.org for the program and agenda.

**Development Efforts**
- Academic ePortfolio
- Student Loan Data Reporting
- Common Data Services Task Force and EDexchange
- EA2 Task Force, InCommon and CommIT

**Board, Committees & User Groups**
- Change Control Board
- Seal of Approval Board
- Technical Advisory Board
- Canadian PESC User Group
- CEDS User Group
- Education Record User Group
- Student Aid User Group

**General Session Topics**
- To Be Announced

---

Please register for the PESC Spring 2013 Data Summit!

**YES, please register me:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PESC MEMBER</th>
<th>NON MEMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Registration Name

Title and Organization

Street Address

City, State and Zip

Phone

Fax

Email Address

Payment Amount

To register, please complete this form and send it along with a check payable to:

*Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council*
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW ~ Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
Fax: 202-261-6517
PESC’s tax ID# is 52-2179499

*Early Bird Rates listed*
# PESC Leadership Team

PESC’s cornerstone principle, transparent and direct community participation, is never more apparent when the entire list of PESC’s leadership team is viewed. We thank all representatives and organizations that help lead the PESC Community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOARD OF DIRECTORS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair</strong> Francisco Valines, Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vice Chair</strong> Jeffrey Alderson, ConnectEDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong> David Moldoff, AcademyOne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary</strong> Brian Allison, USA Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kristi Blabaum</strong>, Great Lakes Educational Loan Services, representing NASLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuan An Do</strong>, San Francisco State University, representing AACRAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doug Falk</strong>, National Student Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mark Jones</strong>, Ellucian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Knepper</strong>, Xap Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlie Leonhardt</strong>, Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael Sessa</strong>, PESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Andrew Wood</strong>, Oracle Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BOARD OF DIRECTORS COMMITTEES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee Chair</strong> Francisco Valines, Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Committee Chair</strong> David Moldoff, AcademyOne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TASK FORCES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Authentication/E-Authorization (EA2) (CommIT) Co-Chairs</strong> Charlie Leonhardt, Georgetown University Arnie Miles, Georgetown University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Data Services (EDexchange) Co-Chairs</strong> Rick Blaisdell, ConnectEDU Tim Calhoon, California Community College System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Standards Forum for Education

| **Steering Committee Chair** Susan McCrackin, College Board |
| **Change Control Board (CCB) Chair** Kristi Blabaum, NASLA |
| **Technical Advisory Board (TAB) Co-Chairs** Michael Morris, ACT Gideon Sanstra, Ellucian |
| **Seal of Approval Board (SAB) Chair** Jeffrey Alderson, ConnectEDU |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STANDARDS FORUM DEVELOPMENT WORKGROUPS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic ePortfolio Co-Chairs</strong> John Ittelson, State of California Don Phillips, Xap Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Inventory Co-Chairs</strong> Rick Skeel, Kuali Foundation Anne Valentine, SmartCatalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPEDS Chair</strong> Christine Rasmussen, IPEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment &amp; Enrollment Co-Chairs</strong> Jeff Alderson, ConnectEDU Joshua Aversa, Ellucian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Loan Data Reporting Co-Chairs</strong> Brian Allison, USA Funds Kristi Blabaum, NASLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>USER GROUPS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian PESC User Group Chair</strong> Bill McKee, OCAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEDS User Group Co-Chairs</strong> Hans L’Orange, SHEEO Tony Romano, National Student Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Record User Group (ERUG) Co-Chairs</strong> Tuan An Do, San Francisco State University Mark Cohen, Parchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Aid User Group Chair</strong> Peter Hurley, University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A CONSUMER INTERNET PRIVACY BILL OF RIGHTS

The Obama Administration believes America must apply our timeless privacy values to the new technologies and circumstances of our times. Citizens are entitled to have their personal data handled according to these principles.

**Individual Control**
Consumers have a right to exercise control over what personal data companies collect from them and how they use it.

**Access and Accuracy**
Consumers have a right to access and correct personal data in usable formats, in a manner that is appropriate to the sensitivity and risk associated with the data.

**Transparency**
Consumers have a right to easily understandable and accessible information about privacy and security practices.

**Focused Collection**
Consumers have a right to reasonable limits on the personal data that companies collect and retain.

**Respect for Context**
Consumers have a right to expect that companies will collect, use, and disclose personal data in ways that are consistent.

**Accountability**
Companies should be accountable to enforcement authorities and consumers for adhering to these principles.

**Security**
Consumers have a right to secure and responsible handling of personal data.

LEARN MORE AT WHITEHOUSE.GOV
High School and College Transcripts

- Data specifications, available free of charge from PESC.org, designed and approved through PESC for implementation in various technologies used by secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, state agencies, and software vendors who use & exchange current and historical student academic records and/or transcripts.

- As various sectors in education modernize their data systems, use of PESC Approved Standards emerges as the long-term, sustainable solution for interoperability due to their benefits: improved data quality & research, simplification of data access and significant cost-reduction.

- As a result PESC Approved Standards are being implemented across the United States of America and throughout Canada by secondary & postsecondary educational institutions & systems, state agencies & software vendors.

For more information about PESC High School and College Transcripts being implemented throughout the United States of America and Canada, please visit www.PESC.org.

©PESC 2013. All rights reserved.
PESC is pleased to announce the release of updated reporting components under IPEDS - the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. The new versions of these reporting components include:

- **12 Month Enrollment 4 Year (v 2.1.0)**
- **Fall Enrollment 4 Year (v 1.2.0)**
- **Fall Enrollment Less Than 4 Year (v 1.2.0)**
- **Completions (v 2.0.0).**

Correspondingly with this update, the Education Statistics and Core Main XML Schemas are updated as well to versions 2.1.0 and 1.12.0, respectively.

PESC’s development, approval & maintenance process is led by a diverse constituency of technical and non-technical stakeholders and managed by PESC’s Standards Forum for Education, comprised of the Change Control Board (CCB), Technical Advisory Board (TAB), Steering Committee and development workgroups.

The entire process is documented and available online at [www.PESC.org](http://www.PESC.org) as PESC’s Policies and Procedures Manual v 1.0, comprised of PESC’s Guidelines for Data Modeling and XML Architecture and the User Guide to the XML Registry and Repository for the Education Community.

The Seal of Approval program allows implementers the opportunity to communicate to all education stakeholders that its implementation of a PESC Approved Standard was implemented and functions appropriately and according to the spirit and purpose to how the standard was developed and intended to be used.

PESC Members approving the updated IPEDS reporting components include:

- AACRAO - American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
- AcademyOne
- ACT
- CSIS - California School Information Services
- College Board
- ConnectEDU
- Ellucian
- Florida International University
- Georgetown University
- NASLA - National Association of Student Loan Administrators
- NCHER - National Council of Higher Education Resources
- National Student Clearinghouse
- Oracle
- Parchment
- SCRIP-Safe International
- University of Denver
- University of Northern Iowa
- University of Oklahoma
- University of Phoenix
- US Department of Education
- USA Funds
- Xap Corporation

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN TO PARTNER WITH NATIONAL STUDENT CLEARINGHOUSE ON ELECTRONIC STUDENT RECORDS INITIATIVE

*National Student Clearinghouse to Assume Operation of SPEEDE Server*

The University of Texas at Austin will partner with the nonprofit National Student Clearinghouse® to provide expanded and secure electronic student record exchange services for academic institutions and employers nationwide.
Under this partnership, the National Student Clearinghouse will assume operating responsibility for and invest in the university’s service, known as the Standardization of Postsecondary Electronic Education Data Exchange or SPEEDE Server. The University of Texas at Austin will continue its role as a leader in promoting national standards for electronic data exchange and improving higher education services and operations.

“UT Austin has devoted close to two decades developing and supporting a national model for the electronic transfer of educational records. This partnership with the National Student Clearinghouse will allow for the expansion of the technology and services developed at The University of Texas at Austin into a truly national platform,” said university Vice Provost and Registrar Shelby Stanfield.

“Expanded electronic data exchange based on national standards as well as services available through the Clearinghouse will permit comprehensive research about higher education enrollment trends and improve efficiency at institutions across the country.”

SPEEDE was started by the university in 1995 and processed more than 4.3 million documents last year alone for nearly 300 institutions. In addition to electronic transcripts, SPEEDE delivers electronic admissions applications for all public Texas universities through ApplyTexas as well as transcript acknowledgements, test scores and other educational records.

The National Student Clearinghouse, founded in 1993, provides educational reporting, verification and transcript services to more than 3,300 postsecondary institutions; most are available at no cost.

The nonprofit also offers a research service, StudentTrackerSE, which enables educational institutions and researchers to study postsecondary enrollment and success nationwide. SPEEDE will be added to the complement of services offered by the Clearinghouse and, as part of the partnership, the university and the Clearinghouse will work together to expand the use of electronic data exchange among institutions of higher education as well as to achieve the benefits that automation can bring to address institutional goals.

The National Student Clearinghouse was chosen by the university as a partner in this effort because of the Clearinghouse’s ongoing commitment to improving efficiency for higher education with low-cost solutions, its deep research capabilities and its commitment to information security. The Clearinghouse receives insight and guidance from the Clearinghouse Advisory Committee, which is comprised of leaders from several institutions of higher education. In addition, the Clearinghouse is a long-time member of the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC), helping to develop communications standards to enable secure electronic data exchange by institutions.

“We are honored that UT Austin has chosen to partner with the Clearinghouse and to trust us to continue its work developing this important national educational resource. As a trusted and neutral nonprofit organization with a proven commitment to and track record of serving higher education in facilitating the secure exchange of student information, the Clearinghouse is uniquely positioned to help evolve and expand SPEEDE to meet the growing needs of institutions,” said President and CEO of the Clearinghouse Rick Torres.

“Our goal is to continue to provide the SPEEDE service to colleges and universities for free, just as we have most of our services for the past 20 years.

“In addition, our commitment to safeguarding data and information, in tandem with the Clearinghouse’s unique role in higher education,
The University of Texas at Austin has been a leader in developing national standards for the secure and efficient electronic transfer of educational records, including student transcripts, admission applications and test scores through the SPEEDE Initiative.

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), a nonprofit professional organization of more than 11,000 higher education admissions and registration professionals, will continue to have an active leadership role in SPEEDE throughout the transition.

**SPEEDE SERVER WILL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE FREE AND OPEN ACCESS, SAYS NATIONAL STUDENT CLEARINGHOUSE®**

*Clearinghouse Will Also Maintain Server’s Compliance with Industry Standards*

Following the October 31 announcement that the National Student Clearinghouse® will assume operation of the SPEEDE Server from the University of Texas at Austin, the Clearinghouse announced its commitment to continue to make the SPEEDE Server available for free in an open-access environment. It will also ensure that the SPEEDE Server continues to meet the electronic data exchange standards recommended by PESC as well as nationally and internationally recognized standard-setting bodies.

The Clearinghouse is a long-time PESC member; its CIO, Doug Falk, serves on PESC’s board of directors. The SPEEDE Server, which was started in 1996, processed more than 4.3 million documents in 2011, including electronic transcripts, for nearly 300 institutions.

SPEEDE stands for Standardization of Postsecondary Education Electronic Data Exchange, which is a national effort coordinated by the SPEEDE Committee of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) to enable institutions to efficiently and securely exchange student and other data electronically in adherence with industry standards. The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, which was formed in 1988, released the first SPEEDE format for electronic transcripts in 1990 and continues to develop and promote student electronic data standards.

“The Clearinghouse believes and supports the fundamental principles upon which the University of Texas has developed and supported the SPEEDE Server for the last 16 years. We are committed to continuing to operate the SPEEDE Server as a free and open platform serving all educational institutions and their solution providers,” said President and CEO of the Clearinghouse, Rick Torres.

“The Clearinghouse’s commitment to and investment in the SPEEDE Server will enable us to take the platform to the next level, in step with emerging technologies and standards. We look forward to collaborating closely with University of Texas at Austin during the transition as well as with our long-time partner, AACRAO, the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, and PESC to ensure that the SPEEDE Server meets the evolving technological needs of the education community and their students.”

“We are excited about this transition and are pleased that the founding principles of the SPEEDE
Server will be maintained by a trusted entity such as the Clearinghouse, one that has served higher education for nearly 20 years,” said University of Texas at Austin Vice Provost and Registrar, Shelby Stanfield.

LEADING E-TRANSCRIPT SERVICES AVOW, CREDENTIALS SOLUTIONS, AND DOCUFIDE ANNOUNCE OPENSPEEDE COLLABORATION

Consortia-Supported OpenSPEEDE Server to Succeed “Texas Server” as Shared, Multi-Service Gateway for Electronic Transcript EDI Exchange

Leading e-Transcript service providers Parchment (operator of Docufide and Avow), and Credentials Solutions recently announced a joint collaboration to implement OpenSPEEDE, an AACRAO SPEEDE compliant Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) gateway.

The goal of OpenSPEEDE is to ensure the operation and availability of a vendor-independent SPEEDE server following the University of Texas at Austin’s decision to conduct a 12-month assessment of transition options of the operation of the “Texas Server”.

The SPEEDE EDI standards, which represent the first standardized transcript schema, were developed by the AACRAO Committee for Standardization of Postsecondary Education Electronic Data Exchange (SPEEDE) starting in 1988. The first standards were released in 1991, helping to establish and grow the adoption of electronic student records. Today, approximately 300 colleges a month utilize the server.

A SPEEDE EDI server provides a variety of “hub” technical services necessary to facilitate the exchange of EDI records, including acting as a value-added-network (VAN) to provide a single address to deliver to multiple recipients, registration and vetting of cooperating vendors/institutions and support for encrypted file delivery.

As such, the operation of a SPEEDE EDI server by University of Texas at Austin provided a valuable resource to the academic and vendor community by keeping these “hub” responsibilities separate from any one organization’s e-Transcript services.

Building on this tradition, OpenSPEEDE will provide more options to colleges in how they send and receive transcripts through EDI or XML standards regardless of their vendor organization. More than 2,000 postsecondary institutions send or receive e-Transcripts through one of the collaborating organization’s services.

In addition to supporting the exchange of transcripts in the EDI data format, OpenSPEEDE will interface with EDexchange, a federated exchange network being developed by the Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force within Postsecondary Education Standards Council (PESC). Tim Calhoon, director of the California Community Colleges Technology Center and co-chair of the CDS task force, describes EDexchange as making it possible for "any provider using these standards and registered in the service network to communicate directly with the appropriate exchange host for a targeted institution."

This announcement follows the recent news that the University of Texas at Austin has chosen to assess transition operations of the EDI exchange server, which they had hosted for nearly two decades, in collaboration with the National Student Clearinghouse, which operates a proprietary e-Transcript service.

“We welcome the National Student Clearinghouse to use this assessment period to join in this effort, unifying the major e-Transcripts vendors in an open and collaborative process around operating SPEEDE EDI,” said Matthew Pittinsky, Ph.D, Parchment CEO.

Current plans call for the OpenSPEEDE gateway to be running in the summer of 2013, along with
support for the Edexchange network. “This will provide more options to high schools, states and colleges in how they send and receive standards-based transcripts whether as EDI or XML, unifying the network that was built through the work of the SPEEDE committee with the growing adoption of the standards being developed within PESC,” said Michael Sessa, PESC president and CEO. Learn more about OpenSPEEDE at http://www.openspeede.org.

SCRIP-SAFE® INTERNATIONAL ENDORSES PESC’S EDXCHANGE AND ANNOUNCES CREATION OF EDI/XML EXCHANGE SERVER AS A FUTURE NODE

SCRIP-SAFE Funded Server to Provide Customers a More Robust and Customer Friendly Solution for EDI and XML Delivery Following the Privatization of the “Texas Server”

SCRIP-SAFE International formally endorses a nationwide transcript exchange. Specifically, this support centers around the ongoing planning, development and implementation of Edxchange, a federated exchange network being developed by the Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force within PESC. SCRIP-SAFE is an active member of PESC and Jim Wager, SCRIP-SAFE CIO and Vice President serves on this Task Force.

In making this endorsement, SCRIP-SAFE also realizes its first commitment is to its vast network of customers. Accordingly, Joseph E. Orndorff, founder and CEO of SCRIP-SAFE International announced the commitment to fast track the creation of an EDI/XML exchange capability within eSCRIP-SAFE, America’s largest college and university electronic transcript network.

Orndorff stated, “After a detailed review of the privatization of the Texas Server and the impending creation of an Open SPEEDE server by other eTranscript providers, it was determined that eSCRIP-SAFE customers and their daily transactions are best served by an EDI/XML server existing within our infrastructure and network. It is our further intention that this service will become an important node on the Edxchange network.”

Orndorff further stated, “The addition of the EDI/XML exchange within the eSCRIP-SAFE network provides added value to our 400 sending and 1600 receiving institutions by:

- Utilizing the processing workflows of eSS to provide the same user experience for EDI/XML transcripts as is currently available for PDF transcripts.
- Simplifying the identification of the receiver, using the same key-value as currently used by the Texas Server. The recipient information is extracted from the data schema.
- Integrating management reporting for all transcripts regardless of delivery format.
- Providing real-time capability to track the delivery status of EDI/XML transcripts.
- Eliminating the sender/receiver burden of acknowledging delivery confirmation status.
- Positioning the entire network and not just individual schools to be an active member of Edxchange.

SCRIP-SAFE is committed to the principle that the expanded eSS capabilities will utilize PESC standards to leverage the data mapping schools may have already completed for use with the “Texas Server”.

In the new configuration, sending schools push transactions to eSS and receiving schools pull transactions from eSS. Cycle times are flexible and are determined by the school.”
ENHANCED SERVICES BENEFIT STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS WHILE IMPROVING DATA INTEGRITY

In celebrating PESC's 15th Year Anniversary and the release of PESC 3.0 | Unifying the Education Domain Around Interoperability, the Board of Directors is taking this opportunity to re-confirm PESC's foundational guiding principles.

In following these principles, PESC has created a unique and valuable environment that is vendor-neutral, that provides access to leading developer communities, which is comprised of both end users and providers, and one that is based on an open democratic process with a P20w perspective. The successful end result has been widely adopted PESC Approved Standards (EDI, PDF and XML) and a number of community-based services like EdUnify and CommIT.

Transparent collaboration is PESC’s cornerstone principle. In working together, the PESC community increases the value of existing and future investments in IT, maximizes the integrity of education technology, enables the portability of education data, and expands public/private and market choices. Ultimately the greater common good of collaboration within the PESC community is improved student achievement.

PESC equally supports all community-based initiatives, partnerships and collaborations, especially best practices that focus on data exchange, that simplify access, improve data quality and reduce cost through adoption and implementation of community-sourced data standards.

As Education’s only data standards-setting body, PESC does not and will not endorse any particular service provider solution over any other(1). Membership in PESC also satisfies long-standing, statutory participation requirements in standards-setting bodies for all federal agencies. While PESC promotes the implementation and usage of data exchange standards, PESC does not set (create or establish) policies related to privacy and security. Organizations and entities using PESC Approved Standards and services should ensure they comply with FERPA and all local, state, federal and international rules on privacy and security as applicable.

In its 15th year, PESC is proud to have many of the leaders in education technology among its membership and participating in its Common Data Services Task Force - leaders that are driving not only the adoption and implementation of data standards, but improved interoperable products and services that directly benefit students, schools, parents and states across all of Education. For more information, please visit www.pesc.org.

(1) any prior perception inadvertently created is hereby corrected with this announcement

SUPPORT THE EDUCATION COMMUNITY THROUGH PESC ANNUAL SPONSORSHIP

It's definitely an exciting time in PESC right now. The momentum we've created with Internet2 through our CommIT Collaborative is unprecedented, as is the number of organizations that are dedicated to and working aggressively on that project.

Our Academic ePortfolio Workgroup, after several years of intense analysis and outreach, is nearing the end of its initial development cycle while our Student Loan Data Reporting Workgroup has set a new record within PESC for highest participation in history. Of course with Common Record and Enrollment Reporting - also PESC Approved Standards - PESC is already being used in every college and university in the country that processes federal student aid (grants and loans).
The recent successful launch of several user groups (Canadian, CEDS and Student Aid) prove that stakeholders are happy organizing under a neutral PESC umbrella. Lastly, as demonstrated at our latest Data Summit in Vancouver, our High School and College Transcripts are being implemented and supported in 29 states and 3 provinces.

With the strength of our Members and with the relationships we've nurtured and supported with organizations like AACRAO, FSA, NCES, SIFA, DQC, SHEEO and Internet2 among many others, together we've influenced not only the technology market but the overall Education sector.

We have also proven that success is greater when we all work together on one common mission. Maintaining this mission requires many person hours and most importantly, the financial support of our Sponsors. We know that PESC already benefits from the many resources and volunteer hours contributed by member staff. This year though we are asking for much needed additional support.


Our Annual Program allows your organization to sign up once for every event and activity performed by PESC in 2013, rather than managing sponsorship a la carte. As a major stakeholder in PESC, we believe a sponsorship presents your organization as strong leader in education technology and standards.

With an Annual Sponsorship we'll promote your organization as a leading partner in the mission along with DIAMOND Sponsors: Common Application, ConnectEDU, National Student Clearinghouse, Oracle, Parchment, SCRIP-SAFE, USA Funds and XAP.

We know that budgets are especially tight this year. An investment in PESC though not only helps in the overall mission of interoperability, but promotes your organization to the tens of thousands of stakeholders that work and communicate through PESC.

While you can join in as a Sponsor at any time, to maximize your sponsorship and provide PESC with enough time to ramp up this program, we're asking folks to let us know asap. An application form with all relative details is posted online at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=206.

If you have questions or concerns, or if you have other ideas for sponsorship, please contact Jennifer Kim directly at 202.261.6514 or via email at jennifer.kim@pesc.org.

### COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS OFFICIAL IDENTIFIERS AND XML REPRESENTATION

As states, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity move from widespread adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to implementation, there is a need to appropriately identify and link instructional materials, assessment items and other learning assets using a shared system of identifiers and a common XML representation.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center), working closely with the standards authors, have released an official approach for publishing identifiers and XML designation to represent the standards, consistent with their adopted format and now available on www.corestandards.org.

States and organizations that are planning to digitally align existing or new education resources to the Common Core State Standards should carefully consider the degree of alignment necessary for their work. States and other organizations are strongly encouraged to employ
the official NGA-CCSSO identifiers. For specific implementations involving a finer level of granularity of the Common Core State Standards, it may be beneficial to include the optional extensions being developed under the Granular Identifiers and Metadata for the Common Core State Standards (GIM-CCSS) project. To learn more about the GIM-CCSS project, please visit www.setda.org.

The NGA Center and CCSSO appreciate the feedback provided throughout the project to develop identifiers and metadata and hope that these help when implementing the Common Core State Standards.

At PESC’s Fall 2012 Data Summit in Vancouver October 17, 2012, Parchment’s Mark Cohen announced the release of a compelling white paper

**Eduventures White Paper:**
**Postsecondary Benefits of Electronic Transcripts**

Decision-makers looking to migrate to electronic processing need quantifiable data from a variety of sources, including from their peers and stakeholders, on its value and benefits. This paper produced in collaboration with PESC illustrates the value & benefits and therefore compels leaders to embrace electronic processing. Parchment and PESC are pleased to make this white paper available to the public free of charge.

[http://info.docufide.com/HE.Eduvent_dwnld.html](http://info.docufide.com/HE.Eduvent_dwnld.html)
The Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) Initiative is a coalition of education stakeholders that includes state, PK12, higher education, non-profit and service provider organizations.

CEDS creates common definitions and formats for a subset of the most important and most frequently used data elements that span from early childhood to elementary and secondary, to postsecondary and labor and workforce.

Developed with the guidance, participation and input of a broad range of stakeholders, the goal for CEDS is voluntary adoption and implementation and wide acceptance within and across PK12, postsecondary and labor/workforce sectors.

http://CEDS.ed.gov
Common Core State Standards Official Identifiers and XML Representation

As states, territories, the District of Columbia, and the Department of Defense Education Activity move from widespread adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to implementation, there is a need to appropriately identify and link assets using a shared system of identifiers and a common XML representation. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center), working closely with the standards authors, are pleased to announce the release an official, viable approach for publishing identifiers and XML designation to represent the standards, consistent with their adopted format, as outlined below.

1. **Canonical identifiers for individual standards** - Rather than force a decision among three competing options, the NGA Center and CCSSO have decided that the following three options have distinctive values and should be published together simultaneously.

   Unique identifiers are needed for humans and technology to refer to individual standards in a consistent manner. Three sets of canonical identifiers, as detailed below and now readily available [here](http://corestandards.org) on [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org), will maintain fidelity to the published and adopted documents, while acknowledging the wide variety of use cases, users, and systems needing to reference the standards:

   - **Dot notation** including those from the published and adopted standards documents, e.g. Math.6.EE.1, useful for conversation and displayed with the text of a standard. Published identifiers will necessarily follow a different nomenclature in mathematics than in English Language Arts (ELA) and literacy, because the standards documents themselves follow a different system in each discipline. These differences have been adopted by states.

   - **De-referenceable Uniform Resource Identifier (URIs)** at the corestandards.org domain, e.g. [http://corestandards.org/2010/math/content/6/EE/1](http://corestandards.org/2010/math/content/6/EE/1) or [http://corestandards.org/2010/math/practice/MP7](http://corestandards.org/2010/math/practice/MP7). Matching the published identifiers, these deferenceable URIs allow individuals and technology systems to validate the content of a standard by viewing the web page at the identifier’s uniform resource locator (URL). The NGA Center and CCSSO strongly recommend that [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org) remain the address of record for referring to standards.

   - **Globally unique identifiers (GUIDs)**, e.g. A7D3275BC52147618D6CFEE43FB1A47E. These allow, when needed, to refer to standards in both disciplines in a common format without removing the differences in the published identifiers. GUIDs are unwieldy for human use, but they are necessarily complex to guarantee uniqueness, an important characteristic for databases, and are intended for use by computer systems. There is no need for educators to decode GUIDs.

   All individual standards and lettered sub-items; all anchor standards in ELA; and all practice standards in math, as well as cluster headings in math, have received identifiers. We have not provided numbers for reading headings such as “craft and structure” or “key ideas,” since these headings were intentionally left un-numbered and since they do not strictly define different domains in reading. In math, however, cluster headings have an important design function in organizing the subject matter and in adding important meaning to the individual content standards; math cluster headings are also proving crucial in implementation efforts. Therefore math cluster headings have been given identifiers (such as A, B, C, for example). By this means, the identifiers preserve links between standards and clusters, which is necessary to ensure that applications using the
system can preserve the meanings that arise from considering the cluster headings and the individual content standards in conjunction with one another.

In the process to develop the identifiers, key clarifications were made and are briefly summarized below. A memo with full details of the changes made during the identifier development process is available here.

**Naming the ELA/Literacy framework**

There is a tendency in the field to shorten *The Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects* to "ELA" and this term does not properly encompass the *Standards for Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Studies*. Thus, the standards framework as a whole is referred to as "ELA/Literacy," and the field is strongly encouraged to adopt this entire phrase.

**Different hierarchies**

The Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects are different in many ways, and the hierarchies from the framework to the component level reflect some of those differences. Clusters are part of the hierarchy in Math but not ELA/Literacy. A single level in the identifiers represents strand and domain for ELA/Literacy, whereas strands do not exist in Math. To require conformance in the hierarchical structures in the two frameworks would ignore the fundamental organizational characteristics of the two standards documents and would compromise the integrity of the architecture of each set of standards.

The official hierarchical nomenclature is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math</th>
<th>ELA/Literacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set</td>
<td>Set (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Strand+Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Component (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component (optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In ELA/Literacy, the Domains, such as Reading Standards for Literature (RL) fully reflect the Strand (Reading), so this level of the hierarchy reflects the Strand and Domain combination.

In Math, Set refers to the sets of content and practice standards. In ELA/Literacy it is an optional designation for the anchor standards.

**Framework names and Revisions**

To differentiate the Common Core State Standards from state standards (in other domains or as part of the optional, up to 15 percent standards additions), CCSS is now added to the front of the dot notation identifiers. For example, what appears
in the PDFs as RL.2.1 is officially CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RL.2.1. It is assumed that educators will continue to use the shorter RL.2.1 in conversation, but the official dot notation identifier will contain the CCSS component.

The publication year of 2010 is provided in the metadata and XML for the standards but is not included in identifiers. Any future refinements to the CCSS will be appended with a revision number, for example CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.4.4r2, or http://corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RF/4/4r2, reflects the second revision, or third version of CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RF.4.4.

2. **XML and metadata** - The XML representation of the standards and the embedded metadata within the HTML pages is available at [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org). To access the XML and metadata, append "XML" to any of the identifier URLs. The XML and metadata represent the intent and language of the standards and go no further. Hierarchies and relationships that exist in the adopted documents are reflected in the data files, but other data points not specifically codified are not. The corestandards.org XML file follows the Common Education Data Standards (CEDS) schema, also used by Schools Interoperability Framework Association (SIF). To incorporate the three identifiers, minor changes will need to be made to the CEDS schema, and those will be submitted to the CEDS Stakeholder Group for consideration in CEDS version 3.0. We leave it up to individuals and organizations to decide whether to keep or replace their current data files.

3. **Granularity** - The Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) and the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA)— working in partnership with CCSSO— have launched a collaborative, state-centric project ("Granular Identifiers and Metadata for the Common Core State Standards" or GIM-CCSS) to facilitate the long-term technical implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in a digital format that meets the diversity of stakeholder needs in the field, while preserving the conceptual and structural integrity of the standards.

The project is designed to offer a more fine-grained digital mapping that is needed to fulfill the goals and objectives of the multi-state assessment consortia, as well as for other purposes including the digital alignment of instructional materials and professional development resources.

The technical work to be undertaken by GIM-CCSS is very specifically limited in scope to developing digital references to the conceptual statements already contained within the CCSS documents and to preserving the logical structure dictated by the standards authors. It will build on the prior work of CCSSO and the NGA Center, and with their input, describe and publish more detailed, digital, machine-readable identifiers and metadata for the Common Core. More information on this project can be found at [www.setda.org](http://www.setda.org).

**Future Action:**

The NGA Center and CCSSO will submit the metadata vocabulary to Creative Commons and [www.schema.org](http://www.schema.org).

Student Achievement Partners has agreed to collaborate with the NGA Center and CCSSO on a webinar for states and information on this will be forthcoming.

The NGA Center and CCSSO appreciate the feedback provided throughout the project to develop identifiers and metadata and hope that these help when implementing the Common Core State Standards.
I. Introduction

I.A. Purpose of Study

The United States Department of Education (ED) requires a large, complex data collection as part of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) program at the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), a part of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). This data collection is designed to continue a series of cross-sectional data collections mandated by the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as amended). The method for the data collection shall be a web-based survey. Each collection shall culminate in a tabular report, documented data files, and release of data through online dissemination and analysis tools.

I.A.1. Legislation

NCES is authorized by law under the Section 153 of the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-279). Accordingly, NCES “shall collect, report, analyze, and disseminate statistical data related to education in the United States and in other nations…”

The completion of all IPEDS surveys, in a timely and accurate manner, is mandatory for all institutions that participate in or are applicants for participation in any Federal financial assistance program authorized by Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The completion of the surveys is mandated by 20 USC 1094, Section 487(a)(17) and 34 CFR 668.14(b)(19).

I.A.2. Program Overview

IPEDS is the Department’s core postsecondary education data collection program. It is comprised of institutional-level data used to describe trends in postsecondary education at the institutional, state, and national levels, as well as to provide students and families with consumer information about colleges and universities. For example, IPEDS is used to provide information on:

- Characteristics of postsecondary institutions, including admissions information, tuition charges, programs offered, etc.;
- Enrollments of undergraduate and graduate students by race/ethnicity and gender;
- Financial aid (grants and loans) awarded to undergraduate students;
- Degrees and certificates conferred by type of program, level of award, and race/ethnicity and gender of recipient;
- Institutional retention and graduation rates for undergraduate student cohorts;
- Institutional revenue and expenditure patterns by source of income and type of expense;
- Salaries of full-time instructional faculty by academic rank; and
- Other issues of interest.
The current contract number is EDIES09C0006 and the contractor is RTI International.

The IPEDS universe contains over 7,600 institutions. Institutions with a program participation agreement with the Office of Federal Student Aid to participate in the Title IV federal financial assistance programs are required to respond (approximately 7,400 institutions). For non-Title IV institutions, responding to IPEDS is voluntary. IPEDS currently includes approximately 200 degree- or certificate-granting non-Title IV institutions. These institutions must have a primary mission of the provision of postsecondary education and be open to the public. Postsecondary education is defined as the provision of formal instructional programs the curriculum of which is designed primarily for students who have completed the requirements for a high school diploma or its equivalent. This includes academic, vocational, and continuing professional education programs, but excludes avocational and adult basic education programs.

The following types of institutions are included in the IPEDS universe: 4-year (baccalaureate or higher degree- and certificate-granting institutions), 2-year institutions (associate granting institutions, generally community and technical colleges), and less-than-2-year institutions (institutions that grant awards that typically result in terminal occupational awards or are creditable toward a formal 2-year or higher award). Each of these categories is further disaggregated by control (public, private nonprofit, private for-profit) resulting in nine institutional sectors. Specialized, but compatible, reporting formats have been developed for these nine sectors of postsecondary education providers. This design feature accommodates the varied operating characteristics, program offerings, and reporting capabilities that differentiate postsecondary institutional sectors while yielding comparable statistics for all sectors. In some instances, specialized reporting formats have been developed for nondegree-granting and degree-granting institutions as well.

The IPEDS web-based data collection is conducted annually, typically over a 10-month period (August to May) during three different collection cycle periods (fall, winter, and spring). Each collection cycle has unique opening and closing dates and uses web-based survey procedures. Further information concerning IPEDS and the design of the web-based collection is available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/.

This study will begin with the 2013-14 data collection and continue through the 2016-17 collection, covering four (4) full data collection cycles. All data shall be collected using a web-based system. In addition to including data in tabular reports that includes methodology information, the data for each responding institution are to be displayed within the College Navigator system (see http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/) and in the IPEDS data dissemination systems.

IPEDS will be a 24-month base contract with three 24-month option periods. The total period of performance of the contract and option period is 60 months. Each option period corresponds with a complete survey cycle for a period of about 24 months, from initial preparation of survey screens and edits through adjudication of the final report and documentation. Each subsequent option period will overlap for a period of 12 months. The government shall decide whether to extend this contract for the additional 60 months.

I.B. Quality Control

ED is firmly committed to determining how well each project meets the project goals, the quality of data collected, and implications for future projects. Project quality control should be integrated into every phase of the project. For instance, potential problems should be identified early so that possible solutions may be tested. Survey methodology is to be presented in detail for use by all data users. Thus, in this, as in other Center projects, statistical quality control shall be incorporated into each stage as appropriate (see Section I. C).
I.C. NCES Standards

All work conducted under this contract must at a minimum meet NCES standards and guidelines. NCES has developed and implemented a set of standards that set guidelines to ensure the quality of NCES’ work. These standards are to be followed by NCES staff and their contractors in performing the day-to-day work of NCES. Copies of the current standards are available at http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/.

II. Scope of Work

Independently and not as an agent of the United States Government, the contractor shall provide all personnel, materials, services, and facilities necessary for the project and perform the tasks as described below.

II.A. Base Contract Tasks:

- **Task 1 — Management**
  Provide all initial management and review tasks, including overall project quality control, reporting, preparing and updating the RIMG/OMB Forms Clearance package for submission, and preparing and updating all necessary IT and Security documentation as part of the OMB 300 reporting process.

- **Task 2 — Technical Review Panel**
  Establish and administer the Technical Review Panel process to advise the contractor on issues related to postsecondary education and the conduct of IPEDS.

- **Task 3 — Web-based Data Collection System**
  Update and prepare the web-based data collection system software for the data collection within each survey cycle.

- **Task 4 — Data Collection and Data Use Training**
  Train IPEDS data providers on the preparation, submission, and use of IPEDS data and train the higher education community on access to and use of IPEDS and other NCES postsecondary datasets.

- **Task 5 — Data Collection Administration**
  Conduct the data collection, including institutional report mapping, updating the coordination tree, communications with CEOs, keyholders, and coordinators, providing reports on issues and challenges, conducting a data quality review, and migrating data to the data dissemination system.

- **Task 6 — Help Desk for Data Provider and Data User Support**
  Support keyholders, coordinators and data users with a help desk, assist institutions without adequate web resources, prompt nonrespondents, and assist with the use of online tools and data requests.

- **Task 7 — Reporting and Publications**
  Prepare imputations, develop data files, reporting methodology, produce First Look reports, compendium and state tables, Web Tables and Descriptive Reports.

- **Task 8 — Online Data Dissemination System and Analysis Tools**
  Update, maintain, and provide enhancements to the IPEDS data dissemination system and online tools.

- **Task 9 — Outreach at Conferences**
  Present at conferences to provide critical information to IPEDS data providers and users.
Note: Each of these tasks relates to work required during each survey cycle (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17). Further explanations regarding these tasks that are among those needed to adequately complete this IPEDS project are provided in Task Descriptions below. While this list is not exhaustive, when coupled with the detailed specifications for milestones and deliverables, it should serve to illuminate the complexity of the overall study and provide guidance in its conduct.
II.B. Optional Task

The Government may choose to exercise any of the following two options. The decision of whether to exercise these optional tasks or not will be based on several factors including available funding and staffing resources.

If Option A or Option B is exercised, the contract length will not be extended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Exercise Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional Task A</strong></td>
<td>Integrate the Campus Crime survey and the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act survey into the IPEDS web-based data collection system</td>
<td>Exercise by December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optional Task B</strong></td>
<td>Redesign and develop the College Navigator website</td>
<td>Exercise by December 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task Descriptions

Task 1. Management

The contractor shall manage this IPEDS project in an efficient manner that fosters communications with staff, the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR), and potential users of the data.

Subtask 1.1 Post Award Conference Package

Within the ten days after contract award (or funding in subsequent years), the contractor’s project director and other key project staff as identified in the proposal shall meet with the Contracting Officer, the Contract Specialist, the COR, and other appropriate ED staff to review the overall contract tasks, to identify potential problems and possible solutions, and to discuss areas of concern related to the proposed project staffing plan and other management requirements. The primary purpose of this meeting is to refine the management, staffing, and scheduling plans. These refinements are not to alter the specifications of the contract, but to provide management information for use by both the contractor and the government in monitoring the work to be performed. This conference is also to help the contractor to make use of the experience and materials that ED staff has gained over the years and assist the contractor in developing a quality control plan for the help desk activities. In addition, due to the uncertainties of large data collection projects, the contractor shall develop and maintain a detailed schedule for all activities of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/Scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Award Conference Package including report, schedule, and quality control plan</td>
<td>Two weeks after post award conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 1.2 Monthly Reports

The contractor shall report monthly on the progress made in accomplishing the project tasks, the consumption of funds, problems encountered, and plans for the next month. The progress reports shall also include quality control data according to the quality control plan developed in Subtask 1.1 and updates to the schedule.

Vouchers shall also be submitted to ED electronically according to ED requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/Scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Reports</td>
<td>Monthly (on or before) 15th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 1.3 Major IT Management Reporting

The contractor shall manage necessary reporting for ED’s IT investments (both hardware, software, and service) related to this contract. As such, the contractor shall develop and execute an IT management plan to address:

- management processes;
- requirements documentation, execution, testing, and implementation (e.g. a Requirements Traceability Matrix);
- cost and schedule management;
- quality management;
- risk management;
- performance management;
- operational analysis; and
- security & privacy.

The contractor shall respond to an IT project assessment program, set goals in the above areas, and develop corresponding measures to track progress in improving the Department's IT investment related to this contract. In addition, the contractor shall track all investments in information technology and split out costs and schedule for defined IT activities in accordance with the Department's and OMB's guidance. Offerors should note that the projected value of the IT investment in this contract requires additional reporting than was the case in previous contracts. Recently, reporting requirements have changed annually and may require adapting to changing circumstances. The attached Excel spreadsheet displays criteria reviewed in past assessments (Program_Assessment_Template_FY12.xls).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/Scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Reports</td>
<td>Monthly (on or before) 15th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 1.4  RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance

The RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance package for the 2013-14 collection cycle has been approved by OMB and the package for the 2014-15 – 2016-17 data collection cycle has been submitted for clearance. Contractor shall prepare, in its entirety, the RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance package for future survey cycles for submission (including SF 83) when OMB clearance is due to expire or other changes to IPEDS are needed to be requested. The next OMB clearance package will need to be developed in Fall 2015 for the 2017-18 data collection. While this process typically is only required every three years, it can sometimes occur more frequently when Congress requires changes be made to IPEDS or other changes to IPEDS are occurring (e.g. if Option A is exercised).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/Scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance Package</td>
<td>November 30 (in applicable years)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 2. Technical Review Panel

The contractor shall establish a Technical Review Panel (TRP) of approximately 60 higher education experts and conduct three (3) meetings during the conduct of each data collection year in order to obtain peer review of plans for improvement to IPEDS data collection and products and to foster communications with data providers and users. TRP members should be representative of the Title IV universe (e.g. by region, institutional sector, state agencies, researchers and data users, etc.). Meetings of the IPEDS TRP will be 2-day meetings held in the Washington, DC area. Each of the three meetings of the TRP shall be coordinated with a one-day meeting of the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) on a day either before or following the meeting of the TRP.

The contractor shall consult NPEC to identify possible meeting topics related to IPEDS data collection requirements and products. The core of the TRP shall include the 15 members of NPEC. Then, based on the topic and their areas of expertise, an additional subset of the TRP (approximately 15), will attend these meetings. The contractor shall pay for all associated expenses, including travel
and per diem for non-Federal members/attendees.

The contractor shall prepare logistical information packets to provide to meeting participants, prepare and provide meeting agendas and materials, prepare detailed minutes and summaries of TRP meetings, post the summary for public comment, and summarize comments received as a result of a public comment period. The TRP is designed to advise and work with the contractor to improve IPEDS data collection and products, data quality, and user-friendliness; the TRP does not report to or advise the Department.

For each meeting, the contractor shall deliver both a pre-meeting and post-meeting package. The pre-meeting package shall consist of a list of invitees, agenda, and meeting materials, including a preliminary copy of the paper to be presented at the meeting. The post-meeting package will include the participant list, a copy of all finalized meeting materials, meeting minutes, summary of TRP discussions and suggestions for posting, and summaries of public comments in response to posting. As part of the post-meeting package, the contractor shall also prepare a document outlining any recommendations they have for NCES based on the outcome of the TRP meeting and subsequent public comment periods. In addition, when appropriate, the contractor shall prepare a final action report that details any changes made to IPEDS or action taken by NCES as a result of the suggestions of a meeting of the TRP. A final action report may not be required of each meeting of the TRP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/Scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full list of Potential TRP members</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Meeting Packages</td>
<td>4 weeks before each meeting of the TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Meeting Summary Packages</td>
<td>12 weeks after each meeting of the TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Action Reports</td>
<td>June 1 (when appropriate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 3. Web-based Data Collection System**

The contractor shall update the web-based registration and data collection system software, including any additions of new survey data items to current components and the development of the new survey components as required by new reporting requirements issued by Congress or the Department. The software shall:

- allow differing levels of permissions (view, update, lock; user, coordinator, administrator) and multiple institution access;
- display registration and data entry screens;
- allow entry of data both manual (key entry) and file upload (.txt and xml);
- contain range, prior year, and other edit checks;
- allow for updating of prior year data;
- provide for communication with IPEDS keyholders, coordinators, survey specific contacts, and institutional CEOs;
- allow for efficient migration of data from collection into data files for display and analyses;
- operate smoothly on NCES equipment;
- require user ids and password for entry as required by NCES standards; and
- allow for 500 or more users to operate the system at once.

The resulting software shall meet all IES Web standards and IES requirements and expectations for broad compatibility and ease of access and use. All software shall ultimately be operational on the NCES servers located at 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, DC.
Subtask 3.1  Development of Data Collection Software

The contractor shall update the web-based software system for the collection of data. Screens, edits and system functions shall be operational according to the agreed upon schedule. Item addition and changes to the current component as well as the creation of new survey components necessary to fulfill new reporting requirements issued by Congress or from other sources shall be included. This shall also include all system menus, user maintenance, Help maintenance, SQL Editor, Glossary maintenance, CIP code maintenance, and FAQ maintenance. The software shall be designed, tested and documented as functional. The IES environment for development and operation of the software is currently as follows: Windows Server 2003, IIS6, SQL Server 2005, ASP.NET 1.1 - 4.5, and MVC 3. However, over the life of the contract, the environment may change; thus the contractor shall be prepared to match all upgrades as they are implemented. The contractor shall provide software and documentation for screens, edits, and all other system functions. The testing site on the contractor’s servers shall be made available at least 4 weeks prior to the survey cycles opening. This will allow for the review of preliminary data screens and collection edits, as well as the testing of functions of the system prior to survey cycles opening.

The functions of the data collection system software shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Identification number assignment
- Institution information and status update
- Edit resolution
- Universe maintenance routines
- Report generation
- Follow-up queries
- Migration

To develop the system, at least three (3) months prior to a survey opening for data collection, the contractor shall discuss edit changes with the survey director for the related component. Edit programming shall be available for testing at least four (4) weeks prior to data collection and these shall be functional on the contractor’s web site. Two (2) weeks after the date the survey closes, documentation of all final edit specifications and related error messages shall be delivered. The specifications shall detail all range checks, excluded values, reserve codes, preload/recursive comparisons, warning message text, and error message text for each variable identified within a screen. In addition, contractor shall discuss the current collection screens with NCES staff and make suggestions for changes/clarifications if warranted. Any screen changes suggested by the TRPs and presented in the final actions memo are to be incorporated into the data collection. Other changes required by changes in law or statute must also be incorporated as needed. All preliminary screens, instructions, and other data collection items shall be delivered to NCES staff for testing six (6) weeks prior to registration opening. Any preview screens, which show data to be collected in the future, should be received no later than two (2) weeks before the Fall data collection period begins. Final screens with any changes requested by NCES staff must be delivered and available on the data collection website when registration opens.

All software developed shall comply with the accessibility standards published by the U.S. Access Board pursuant to Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act as amended by Congress in 1998. The Assistive Technology Team in the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) will evaluate the system for compliance. The data collection systems software will be modified annually to reflect any changes to the data collection items or components as suggested by the IPEDS Technical Review
The contractor shall request that the data collection system be moved to the NCES production site for data collection opening before the agreed upon data collection opening date for each survey cycle (Fall, Winter, Spring). Prior to having it migrated to production, the contractor shall have the data collection system software moved to the NCES development server during the development period allowing for IES/NCES personnel to provide feedback to the contractor about system requirements. The contractor shall provide the COR and up to 40 other persons, specified by the COR, access to the software during the development and testing period, the training period, and the data collection period. Help Desk staff shall be trained on the system at least one week prior to the opening of each data collection. The contractor shall ensure complete functionality and compatibility with the NCES production environment during the testing period. Documentation shall include structure and content of all databases and program code complete with the calling relationship of code modules and function entry points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection software installation</td>
<td>On NCES development server: 2 weeks prior to data collection opening date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete documentation of data collection system functions, edits, screens</td>
<td>On NCES production server: 1 week prior to data collection opening date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 month after data collection opening date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 4. Respondent Training, Research, and Dissemination Activities

The contractor shall create and operate a system to increase the number of personnel in postsecondary institutions trained in the skills necessary for reporting institutional data to IPEDS and for increasing the number of skilled users of the web-based system to analyze the condition of postsecondary education.

#### Subtask 4.1 Oversight of IPEDS Training Program

The contractor shall provide oversight and logistics for all components of this task, including coordination of activities with consultants, other organizations, and subcontractors; logistical support for training, including planning, securing resources, and staffing training programs at meetings and other locations throughout the US; and development and dissemination of web-based training opportunities. The contractor shall make available to the higher education community in an easily accessible format, information about the IPEDS training program, a list of IPEDS trainers, an IPEDS training schedule, downloadable training materials, and information about how to request a training session. The contractor shall also produce an evaluation report of the entire IPEDS training program that includes (1) a summary of all face-to-face training events held, including data on
evaluations by participants; (2) statistics on the use of online training options; (3) metrics on the effectiveness of training and grant activities; and (4) a plan for improvements for the next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Training Report</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 4.2 National Data Policy Institute**

The contractor shall be responsible for all tasks associated with the conduct of the annual National Data Institute held in the Washington, DC area.

The Institute occurs over 5 to 7 days and is designed for institutional researchers, faculty, graduate students, and other postsecondary researchers interested in studying higher education through use of federal datasets. Up to sixty (60) individuals shall be accommodated annually, including covering transportation to Washington, D.C., training center accommodations, a fixed per diem reimbursement for meals and incidental expenses for the duration of the Institute.

The purpose of the Institute is to provide researchers, institutional decision-makers and others with opportunities to gain access to and experience with the IPEDS data and some of the most comprehensive education data resources in the nation. The Institute aims to achieve four major objectives: (1) stimulate interest in using IPEDS and other federal data to address current and future research questions in institutional research, education, and the social sciences; (2) instruct participants in the methods of collecting and using IPEDS and other federal data to conduct analyses; (3) enhance understanding about methodological and technological issues relevant to IPEDS and national sample survey data collections; and (4) improve future NCES data collection and analysis, specifically IPEDS.

The contractor shall disseminate information about the Institute; organize and operate an application announcement and review process; make applicant decisions and communicate them to the candidates; make all travel arrangements needed to get participants to and from the Institute; develop and carry out reimbursement procedures; negotiate and contract for meeting and accommodation space; provide for telecommunications and computer equipment and support; provide on-site logistical support; provide on-site support to participants; and recruit leading national policy researchers as speakers for policy seminars. Contractor shall develop the training agenda for the Institute and work with, and provide logistical support to, NSF personnel and the ED COR to develop and deliver the instructional package. The COR shall provide final approval for all speakers, materials, including related announcements/web postings/brochures, and the agenda.

Within six (6) weeks following the Institute, the contractor shall deliver the final data policy institute package, which shall include an evaluation report and copies of the call for proposals, institute agenda, and any training materials made available to the attendees at the sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Data Policy Institute Package</td>
<td>September 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 4.3 Development of Curricula and Training Trainers**
The contractor shall update current curricula and training materials addressing changes in IPEDS and the needs of the national institutional research community. The contractor shall also conduct a workshop for IPEDS trainers. Curricula, training materials, and training protocols for the provision of data and the use of the web-based IPEDS data tools shall be covered. Training at this workshop shall also deal with the impact of data systems and technology changes on postsecondary organizational relations, and internal institutional training needs. The contractor shall make all training materials available for download and use by the trainers electronically.

The contractor shall recruit up to fifty (50) institutional researchers, registrars, and other data experts from the higher education community to serve as IPEDS trainers. The contractor shall select a subset of trainers (up to 20) to serve as core to the training program and assist in the development of content and materials and deliver face-to-face workshops. The remaining trainers shall use their knowledge to assist in outreach to IPEDS data providers and users and increasing awareness of IPEDS and NCES as rich sources of data.

The contractor shall conduct annual train-the-trainers sessions prior to the opening of each data collection cycle (typically in the summer), with the assistance of ED staff, in the Washington, D.C. area. The contractor shall provide site selection, logistical support and training materials, and the COR shall approve these. In each 2-3-day session, up to fifty (50) trainers shall be trained in skills and knowledge development related to IPEDS and the delivery of training. From this group, the contractor shall select, with COR approval, trainers to develop training materials and conduct workshops (with honoraria and expenses paid) at the state and regional levels and serve as instructors for online courses. (see subtasks 4.4-4.6 below). The contractor shall perform an evaluation of the train-the-trainer meeting to assess its effectiveness and identify areas for improvement; the findings from this evaluation should be included on the overall annual training report included in Subtask 4.1.

In addition, the contractor shall prepare a Train-the-Trainer package including agenda, list of trainers, and meeting materials, and the COR shall review and approve this package. This package shall be made available to participants at the session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train-the-Trainer package</td>
<td>One week prior to train-the-trainer session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 4.4 IPEDS Workshops for Training of Institutional Personnel**

The contractor shall provide training on the provision and use of IPEDS data and other national databases to institutional research personnel in face-to-face training programs. The face-to-face sessions may be offered as part of professional development programs of institutional research or other professional associations. The contractor shall provide site logistics. The contractor shall prepare all curriculum and materials.

The training shall be done in a series of twenty (20) – thirty (30) one-day workshops that cover the technical aspects of IPEDS data collection and tools. Targeted clients for these training sessions are the institutional personnel who supply data to IPEDS or use the data for institutional purposes. A minimum of twenty (20) people and up to fifty (50) shall be trained in each face-to-face workshop.

The contractor shall pay for all associated expenses, including travel and per diem for all participants. A summary of evaluations from workshops shall be included as part of the annual training report in...
Subtask 4.1.

**Deliverable(s):**
See Subtask 4.1

**Subtask 4.5  Online Training Materials**

The contractor shall develop and make available for download online training and instructional modules for (a) new keyholders, (b) each of the IPEDS survey components that provide details about how to report data using the data collection system, (c) each of the IPEDS data use tools, and (d) up to ten (10) other topics of interest to IPEDS data providers and data users using a combination of technologies such as Webinars, web tutorials, online streaming video and audio, and online courses. Training materials for data collection shall be available for download when the corresponding data collection opens and shall be approved of by the IPEDS Team Leader and relevant survey director prior to release. Training materials for data dissemination and tools shall be available within three months after any significant changes are made to the tools and must be approved by the COR prior to release. Information about the usage and developments of these materials, and whether they were delivered prior to data collection opening date or within three months of tools update, shall be included in the annual training report discussed in Subtask 4.1.

In addition, the contractor shall develop and make available a Webinar version (or use of other technologies) of a training for IPEDS data providers detailing upcoming changes to the IPEDS data collection or other (e.g. IPEDS Update) training which may be made available to regional and other conferences when NCES personnel cannot be present. This may be updated as new topics are discussed in the IPEDS Update. The contractor shall work closely with the COR and IPEDS staff to develop and deliver this training.

**Deliverable(s):**
See Subtask 4.1

**Task 5. Data Collection**

The process of data collection for each institution consists of coordination tree updates, institution and coordinator communication, registration of coordinators and institutional keyholders (allows them access to the system in order to enter and lock data), data entry (with optional file import), adjustments of entries for edit conditions, and locking of data. Coordinators participate in data collection in many ways, including any combination of the following: the provision of import files, viewing partially complete cases, editing entries of institutions, and locking data. Once cases are completed, that is, properly closed and locked by institutions and/or coordinators, data shall be reviewed by the contractor and then migrated from the collection server to a data dissemination server.

**Subtask 5.1  Coordination and Collection Communications**

The contractor shall develop a coordinator and pre-collection communication package. This package shall include a (1) coordination tree e-mail; (2) draft of CEO letters; and (3) drafts of keyholders emails.
Updates to the coordination tree may occur at any time during the collection cycles. Many updates, however, occur on an annual basis prior to each academic year data collection. The contractor shall update the coordination efforts required for each institution. The contractor shall use e-mail, telephone calls, and mail to contact and to adjust, as needed, the coordination flow for each institution’s data. The contractor shall begin with the existing coordination tree provided by the COR and work through coordinators to the institutions. Following COR approval, the contractor shall load all modifications of the coordination tree into the web-based data collection system.

The postsecondary institutions (CEOs and previous keyholders) and coordinators shall be contacted through mail, e-mail and telephone prior to and during the collection cycles.

At the time registration opens, the contractor shall mail an alert letter to the CEO of IPEDS institutions with no registered keyholder concerning the upcoming data collection. These letters shall include collection schedule information, specify requirements for Title IV institutions, and instruct the CEO on how to select an institutional keyholder. The contractor shall prepare letters for COR review and approval. The letters shall be developed for the signature of the Associate Commissioner, Postsecondary Studies Division, National Center for Education Statistics.

Initial e-mails shall be sent to all keyholders and coordinators notifying them of the collection schedule and providing the URL, institution identification number and password for annual registration and the toll-free number for the help desk.

As part of a post-collection opening package, the COR shall approve copies of additional e-mails to be sent throughout the data collection period, according to a schedule developed by the contractor and approved by the COR, notifying coordinators of progress and prompting nonresponding institutions. New keyholders should also be targeted for additional follow-ups. These e-mails will be developed for signature of the IPEDS Program Director, National Center for Education Statistics. Also as part of the post-collection opening package, the contractor shall draft the text for “thank you” notes that will be sent automatically by the system following registration confirmation and survey locking. Notifications shall also be sent to the next locking level when an institution locks its data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Collection Coordination and Communication Package</td>
<td>2 weeks prior to distribution of usernames and passwords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Collection Opening Communication Package</td>
<td>2 weeks after the data collection period has opened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 5.2 Outreach Plan

The contractor shall develop an outreach plan on how it will keep IPEDS data providers and users informed of developments throughout the collection year. Communications may include a weekly electronic newsletter (for example, “This Week In IPEDS,” see http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/news_room/) and the IPEDS listserv (http://ipedslistserv.rti.org/), through which data providers and users can communicate with each other regarding reporting to IPEDS and using IPEDS data and that the help desk staff and IPEDS survey directors can use to monitor questions and potential problems during the data collection.

As part of this outreach plan, the contractor shall develop and enhance a social media presence for IPEDS through outlets such as Facebook and Twitter to allow for the possibility of quicker and more immediate communication.
The contractor shall deliver the plan four weeks prior to the opening of keyholder registration. All communications included in the plan from the contractor to IPEDS data providers and users shall be drafted by the contractor and shall be approved by the COR before being sent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach plan</td>
<td>4 weeks before registration opens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 5.3  Migration Data Review**

During data collection, as cases are completed, they shall be reviewed by the contractor prior to migration from the collection server to the analysis server. The contractor shall make available migration review specifications no more than one week after data collection period begins. Migration review shall include visual review of cases to ensure that they are complete and consistent prior to moving the data to the distribution database. If problems or inconsistencies are discovered, the contractor shall contact the institution or coordinator to resolve the problem(s). The contractor shall complete all data review and migration of the data to the distribution database within 4 weeks of the date data collection closes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data migrated to distribution database</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks of data collection close dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 6  Help Desk**

At any step throughout the data collection process, institution staff and coordinators may need help in providing IPEDS data. The contractor shall staff a Help Desk to provide answers to questions and administrative support throughout the collection year for using the data collection system. In addition, with the growing use of the IPEDS online tools, data users frequently require assistance with data requests and/or in use of the various IPEDS and other NCES online data analysis tools. A subset of help desk staff shall be dedicated to support data users’ data requests and use of the IPEDS data dissemination system and tools.

**Subtask 6.1  Training for Help Desk Operations Staff**

The contractor shall develop/update training materials and conduct training of help desk staff to prepare them for each data collection period. Staff shall be trained on use of the web-based system features, the help desk software application, and specifics for each of the surveys. Training shall take place at least one week prior to the opening of each data collection period. A subset of help desk personnel shall also be trained in use of the IPEDS data dissemination systems and tools. This training may be held in conjunction with data collection training or over the summer or at other times as needed. Separate training materials shall be developed for this training session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help Desk Training Materials</td>
<td>1 week prior to data collection opening (at Help Desk training)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 6.2  Data Collection Support**
During the period of data collection, the contractor shall have help desk staff available to answer questions from respondents, help with data entry problems, review responses in preparation for migration, and provide general data collection support. The contractor shall establish a toll-free help desk number and an email address to handle calls received and email requests. At a minimum, while data collection is open, the help desk hours will be weekdays 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern time. During the final 10 days before a collection period closes, the help desk shall be open extended hours, at a minimum: 8:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekdays; 10 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays; and 1:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays (all Eastern time).

The contractor shall provide enough help desk staff to adequately handle the anticipated phone call and email volumes. Based on the last three years, there has been an average of approximately 70,000 total inbound and outbound phone calls and approximately 9,000 email exchanges per survey year.

The contractor shall also report various production indices (such as number of completes and call volume) on a daily basis by making such a report available through the Help Desk Application software system (Subtask 6.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual report on Help Desk Activities</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks after final collection closes for data collection year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 6.3  Data Dissemination/Tools Support

Throughout the entire year, the contractor shall have help desk staff during normal business hours (weekdays 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Eastern time) available to answer questions from data users, assist with use of IPEDS and other NCES online tools, and provide general data user support. The contractor shall establish a toll-free help desk number and an email address (separate from the data collection number and email address) to receive calls and email requests. The contractor shall also report various production indices (such as number of completes and call volume) on a daily basis by making such a report available through the Help Desk Application software system (See Subtask 6.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual report on Tools Help Desk Activities</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks after final collection closes for data collection year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 6.4  Development and Maintenance of Help Desk Application Software

The Higher Education Amendments of 1992 made the reporting of IPEDS data mandatory for all institutions that have a Program Participation Agreement (PPA) with the ED. Institutions that have a PPA are eligible to have their students participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs such as Pell grants and Stafford loans. In order to maintain their eligibility, institutions must complete ALL of the IPEDS surveys. Otherwise they are subject to fines and they may even lose their eligibility to participate in the program. In order for ED to monitor compliance, NCES must provide a list of nonrespondents to each of the IPEDS surveys AND a complete package of copies of all correspondence with the institutions (including dates sent) to the office of Federal Student Aid and the Administrative Actions and Appeals Division (AAAD).
As part of this subtask, the contractor shall develop the Help Desk Application software system for the collection of data related to contacts with the institutions. The system shall track correspondence and calls with the CEOs, coordinators and keyholders, and other data providers and users. The contractor shall provide software and documentation for Help Desk screens and all other system functions. The system shall allow call note identification of nonrespondents to each of the surveys and produce documentation for all contacts with these institutions such that a full package of contacts can be created for nonresponding Title IV schools. The system shall also differentiate calls from data providers and data users, and track calls and requests accordingly. The Help Desk Application shall also include a tracking system that maintains records of all data requests received through the tools help desk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functioning Help Desk Application &amp; Documentation</td>
<td>July 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 7. Reporting**

The contractor shall prepare data files (including imputation for nonresponse) and three descriptive *First Look* reports including the methodology used based on the collected data for the data collection year. The contractor shall provide support capabilities for updating the IPEDS online tools, which are features of the IPEDS system that require input from the data collection system. The contractor shall also create tables from IPEDS data to be included in the NCES College and Career Tables Library (http://nces.ed.gov/datalab/tablelibrary/home.aspx). All deliverables and milestones under this task shall conform to NCES Standards.

**Subtask 7.1  First Look Analysis Materials**

The contractor shall deliver a set of draft materials for each First Look publication (Fall, Winter, Spring). The draft materials must include:

- *First Look* Outline
- Imputation Specifications
- Derived Variable Specifications
- Table Shells

The format for a *First Look* report will be:

- An introduction (limited to 2 pages maximum containing information about the history and purpose of the data collection and the data collection’s target population, time and geographic coverage);
- One page of purely descriptive bullets – perhaps called “selected findings”;
- 3-8 text pages of tables;
- An appendix of 1 to 2 pages containing a standard description of the sample design, data collection and methodology, along with information regarding such things as population size and survey frame, sample size, and response rates and their derivations.

For the imputation specifications, the contractor shall identify key variables within the completed data, compare methods for imputation of missing data (both instrument and item nonresponse), and propose specifications for imputations for the key variables.

For the Derived Variable Specifications for the tables within the *First Look*, the contractor
shall create up to 40 derived variables, based upon computations using the collected data and other IPEDS data. Included with the specifications for these derived variables, the contractor shall include the distributions of these variables based on the first 2,000 completed cases.

The contractor shall create up to 10 different table shells. Table shells that describe each proposed table shall detail the columns, rows, spanners, and the subsample (if any) used as well as the planned table title. Included within the body of these table shells, the contractor shall include the table values based on the first 2,000 completed cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Look Analysis Plan and Draft Materials</td>
<td>1 week before each data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 7.2 Data Files**

The contractor shall create the data files. Pre-imputed data files created from the data collection system shall be verified by the contractor to ensure that they add check, that all derived variables are accurately developed, that all status codes are correct, and that data are in the correct format. These clean files will be used for the Preliminary version of the First Look.

After the data file is fully edited, the contractor shall develop imputation programs and run them against the data file to impute for missing critical items and/or survey nonresponse. These fully edited and imputed files will be used to produce the Provisional version of the First Look. Also as part of this process, the contractor shall verify that the data are reasonable and prepare tables/analysis of the imputation process that indicates the impact of imputations on the database. The contractor shall follow all guidelines and standards for IES/NCES publications in effect at that time including nonresponse bias analysis if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean Data Files (pre-impute)</td>
<td>Fall - 12 weeks after data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winter - 8 weeks after data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring - 8 weeks after data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Edited and Imputed Data Files</td>
<td>4 weeks after the clean data file is delivered for each data collection period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imputation impact and bias analysis report</td>
<td>2 weeks after approval of fully edited and imputed files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 7.3 First Look Reports, Methodology Report, and Tables**

The contractor shall prepare three (3) *First Look (Preliminary)* reports based on the preliminary data files, and three (3) *First Look (Provisional)* reports based on the provisional data files for each data collection cycle. There will also be one (1) annual Methodology Report, issued in conjunction with the Fall First Look. These reports are subject to various levels of review as described later in this document. The contractor shall follow all guidelines and standards for IES/NCES publications in effect at the time including nonresponse bias analysis, if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methodology Report</td>
<td>3 weeks after approval of Fall clean pre-impute files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary First Look</td>
<td>3 weeks after approval of clean pre-impute files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Subtask 7.4  IPEDS Compendium Tables and State Tables**

The contractor shall prepare additional sets of IPEDS tables including the IPEDS Compendium Tables and IPEDS State Tables (see IPEDS Tables Library for current versions). These tables will be created based on the Final data. The Final data is based on revised prior year data that may be submitted by respondents in the current year. These tables will actually be run the year after the provisional data for that same survey year has been released. The tables shall be prepared according to IES/NCES standards, including the style guide. These will be prepared in various formats required by IES/NCES, such as Excel, PDF, and ASP/HTML. These tables are subject to various levels of review as described later in this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS Compendium Tables &amp; State Tables</td>
<td>8 weeks after public release of corresponding Final Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtask 7.5  Statistics in Brief Reports and Web Tables**

In addition to the *First Look* reports necessary for data release, the contractor shall develop and write one (1) Statistics in Brief or Web Tables publication for each IPEDS data collection year, focusing on issues relevant to the postsecondary research community. Specific topics will be based on suggestions from either NPEC, the IPEDS TRP, and IPEDS or NCES staff, and approved by the COR. These reports may include trend analysis. The contractor shall create composite or derived variables and update the IPEDS data dissemination system with these files, as appropriate.

All reports shall contain technical appendices that describe all variables used in the report including new variables and composites created for tables and figures in accordance with IES/NCES standards, including the style guide. The format and contents of this report are subject to publications standards (see http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/Standards.asp and http://nces.ed.gov/StatProg/style.asp) and to the formal review procedure at NCES (see VI. INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURES). The report shall comply with these standards and the consensus of the reviewers.

The contractor shall prepare and deliver analysis plans for the publication and upon NCES COR approval, submit table shells, and report outline.

The contractor shall prepare an analysis report in accordance with the analysis plan, as amended by the TRP. The format and contents of this report are subject to publications standards (see http://nces.ed.gov/statprog/Standards.asp and http://nces.ed.gov/StatProg/style.asp) and to the formal review procedure at NCES (see VI. INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURES). The report shall comply with these standards and the consensus of the reviewers.

Within two months following agreed upon outline and table shells and/or chart/graph ideas, the contractor shall submit the draft report as a Word file, along with associated tables, spreadsheets, output from the IPEDS online tools in electronic form. During the IES/NCES publication review (up to 12 months), contractor shall revise each draft to reflect the concerns of (A) Program Director, (B) Division statistician review, (C) Associate Commissioner review, (D) outside expert review, (E)
Chief Statistician review, (F) Commissioner review, and (G) Institute of Education Sciences (IES). After each reviewer, the contractor shall submit a revised report taking into account reviewer recommendations within three (3) weeks after receipt of comments. Contractor shall also provide a memo detailing how each comment in the review process was addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Approved Descriptive Analysis Report or set of Web Tables – Provisional Version</td>
<td>Within 12 months after data collection closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Approved Descriptive Analysis Report or set of Web Tables – Final Version</td>
<td>Within 4 months after PY Revision data collection is closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 7.6  Data Feedback Report

The IPEDS Data Feedback Report (DFR) is an annual report that is sent out to the approximately 7,500 Title IV postsecondary institutions that participate in the IPEDS web-based data collection. These reports return IPEDS data to the reporting institutions to provide them with institutional peer analysis; to facilitate discussions between institutional executives and survey respondents; and to contribute to the improvement of IPEDS data quality. Samples of current and past DFRs are available through the IPEDS Executive Peer Tool at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/Expt/SelectComparisonInstitution.aspx.

Beginning with the 2013-14 data collection (2014 Data Feedback Report), the contractor shall provide support for the development, updating, and maintenance of annual Data Feedback Reports that will be delivered in November to the CEOs of all Title IV institutions in the IPEDS universe. To carry out this work, the contractor shall undertake the following activities: (1) update the report layout, indicator definitions, and other requirements specifications; (2) incorporate new design requirements into the application software; (3) produce Data Feedback Reports and related materials; and (4) develop a mechanism for post-production support.

In any year, revisions to report figures and optional figures may be required. Additionally, some revisions to the report format may be required. Comparison groups will need to be regularly redefined. Once all variables for the Data Feedback Reports have been designed, tested, and approved by NCES, they shall be incorporated into the IPEDS web-based data analysis tools. In addition, the .pdf files shall be made available through the IPEDS web-based data analysis tools when the .pdf files are emailed to keyholders. All changes to the data dissemination tools must be made according to NCES Standards for electronic release. The changes shall be made available on the NCES development server. ED may also require small changes to the applications software to ensure that it includes design elements that make it compatible with the appearance and functionality of the other IPEDS online analysis tools.

The related IPEDS data analysis tools within the data analysis system shall be updated and available to coincide with the date that .pdf versions of the report are emailed to keyholders and coordinators. The IPEDS data dissemination system shall also allow for the creation of customized data feedback reports in the full report format in .pdf form. Finally, the contractor shall have all reports delivered on or before November 15. pdfs of the reports shall have been emailed to keyholders and coordinators two weeks prior to the CEO mailing. Updates to the IPEDS online data dissemination system shall be functional on the ED/IES/NCES website by the date the pdfs are
emailed to keyholders and coordinators.

Once the new software and variables are available on development, the contractor shall arrange for full testing of the tools and updated variables. Results of any testing will be provided (in an email) to NCES. When testing is complete and ED staff and the IT team approve the system, it shall be moved to the production server.

The schedule for this subtask should include the following milestones:

Twelve (12) weeks prior to report delivery, the contractor shall produce several iterations of reports to test the new software and other enhancements to the Data Feedback Reports, including the generation of comparison groups. Because the purpose of the first draft of the reports is to determine layout, size, content (text placement/table placement), it need not conform to IES/NCES standards; however, any subsequent drafts that are to be reviewed for actual wording and table/chart formatting must conform to IES/NCES Statistical and Publication standards.

Eight (8) weeks prior to report delivery, the contractor shall develop the software to create comparison groups as modified by the ED COR. Tests of the software shall be provided to the task leader and the COR for review and approval. Once approved, the tables shall be populated.

At least two (2) weeks prior to the delivery of the report to CEOs, the contractor shall send electronic (.pdf) versions of the individual reports to each Title IV institutional keyholder and coordinators, where applicable.

Undeliverable mail shall be reported to the ED COR for updating and/or researched by the contractor within two (2) weeks after the undeliverable mail is received. Reports shall be redistributed where possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports delivered to CEOs</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 8. Data Dissemination System/Web Tools and Activities**

**Subtask 8.1 Maintenance and Updates of IPEDS Website**

The contractor shall periodically be required to enhance the IPEDS website located at [http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/](http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/). Typical ongoing maintenance would include the creation and deployment of the web pages through the web database and updates to the IPEDS Newsroom.

Additional activities would include periodic updates to the website regarding year-to-year changes, adapting to changing ED/IES/NCES web standards, which could include wholesale changes, as well as creation of PDF files each year for the Archived Surveys page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual creation of survey form PDF files for Archived Surveys page</td>
<td>2 months after data collection closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual log of updates made to the IPEDS website</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subtask 8.2  Support and Updates to IPEDS Web-Based Data Dissemination System and Analysis Tools

The contractor shall periodically enhance the IPEDS data dissemination system and web-based data analysis tools. Enhancements to the tools may be required to include new features, new or changed data items, new tools, or new methods of display. In addition, data from each collection shall be migrated to the distribution database and shall include the perturbed data, when necessary, to allow access by the public. The contractor shall provide the software and support to migrate the data and programming support to enhance the utility of these features. The web-based data dissemination system and online data analysis tools shall allow users to at least:

- Download a single institution’s data
- Conduct institutional peer comparisons using automatically generated peer groups or custom peer groups
- Create ranking reports
- Create custom data files
- Create statistical reports
- Use report templates to create pre-designed reports
- Perform trend analysis across data years
- Create customized data feedback reports and figures

### Deliverable(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtask 8.3  Support and Updates to IPEDS Table/Trend Generator

The contractor shall maintain and enhance the IPEDS table generator, a web-based application that allows users to produce tables from the IPEDS data with features specific to the IPEDS data providing flexibility, versatility, and user-friendliness. The contractor shall maintain the IPEDS table generator and upgrade the table generator code, as needed; update the table generator for each data year to include most recent data; and perform quality control tasks. The contractor shall allow for review by NCES staff prior to any major enhancements being deployed.

### Deliverable(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 9. Conferences

The contractor shall attend and present, in some cases on behalf of NCES, at up to four national/regional conferences per year (e.g. AIR Forum). The purpose is to provide critical information to IPEDS data providers and to gather feedback from them to assist with modification for future collection cycles. The contractor shall provide a report for each individual conference attended that includes a summary of feedback from IPEDS data providers and any areas of concern for data providers or particular challenges they are facing meeting IPEDS reporting requirements. The contractor shall also submit an annual summary of all conferences attended.
Deliverable(s): | Due/scheduled date
--- | ---
Individual Conference Report | 2 weeks after close of conference
Annual Trip Report | June 30

**Option 1. Integration of Campus Crime and Equity in Athletics surveys**

If exercised, the contractor shall integrate the Campus Crime survey and the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act survey into the IPEDS web-based data collection system as a new component. The contractor shall integrate this into IPEDS within 12 months of the option being exercised.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of Campus Crime and Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act surveys into IPEDS data collection system</td>
<td>12 months after exercising of option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Option 2. Redesign and development of the College Navigator website**

If exercised, the contractor shall redesign the College Navigator website, including the creation of a summary profile page for each institution, improvements in functionalities such as search and the ability to tailor the site to more specific audiences. Another enhancement would be the development of a mobile application for the College Navigator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable(s):</th>
<th>Due/scheduled date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of the College Navigator website</td>
<td>12 months after exercising of option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Deliverable Specifications

The specifications for all deliverables to be generated by the tasks described in Section II are presented below. Unless otherwise specified, deliverables shall be electronically delivered to the ED COR via e-mail. For a summary and timeline of all milestones and deliverables, turn to the table on pages 29-30.

III.1 Post Award Conference Package (Subtask 1.1)

To document the Post Award Conference, a report of the conference proceedings shall be delivered. The report shall document all concerns and agreements, as well as any clarifications and refinements made as a result of the conference and shall be delivered to the CO and the COR. In addition, it shall include a schedule. For all activities within the project, the schedule shall detail the key staff assigned, the projected start and end dates, and completion dates. The schedule shall be updated monthly.

For the schedule, keyholder and coordinator registration will open no later than the first Wednesday in August. The first of three (Fall, Winter, Spring) data collection periods will open no later than the first Wednesday in September. Data collection will extend in period over the next 9 months so that all data are collected by the final Wednesday in May of the following year.

In addition:
- Initial contact with CEOs and keyholders for distribution of IDs and passwords shall begin at least 3 weeks prior to registration.
- Help Desk training shall be conducted no less than one week prior to the opening of data collection.
- The first draft of the First Look shall be delivered no more than 4 weeks after receiving approval of the imputed data files from NCES for each data collection.
- Data Feedback Reports shall be mailed to CEOs no later than October 30, and emailed to keyholders and coordinators two weeks prior to mailing them to CEOs.

The post award conference package shall also include the quality control plan for help desk (such as call volume and call length) and data collection activities (such as how problems with the data collection system will be identified, communicated to the ED COR and assigned ED staff, and resolved).

Delivery specifications:
- Within two weeks after the Post Award Conference, in a Word file electronically delivered to the COR

III.2 Reports (Subtasks 1.2)

The monthly report shall detail the progress made in accomplishing the project tasks, problems encountered, and plans for the next month. By attachment, the financial status of the project shall be described; including detailed monthly charges by named staff. In addition, all costs associated with the project must be broken out by IT versus Non-IT expenses. The definition is as follows:

ED’s definition of “Information Technology Project” is based on the definitions of
"Information Technology" found in the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 and OMB Circular A-11. The purpose of this definition is to identify ED’s IT projects subject to the Information Technology Investment Management (ITIM) Process.

An "Information Technology Project" (or initiative) includes activities and services related to planning, developing, purchasing, configuring, testing, maintaining, enhancing, deploying or retiring any technology for the automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. More specifically, an ED IT project meets this criterion and any of the following:

- An automated activity or service resulting in a product or technology that is either:
  - owned by ED (including those residing in contractor facilities),
  - resides on an ED platform (including contractor owned systems), or
  - contains data essential to the conduct of program activities whether on an ED or contractor platform.
- An activity or service related to the maintenance, enhancement or replacement of ED’s platforms
- Contractor services whereby the primary purpose of the contract is to provide an information technology solution or advisory services
- Estimated to have a useful life of two years or more

ED’s platforms include any equipment, or interconnected system(s) or subsystem(s) of equipment that consists of computers, peripheral equipment, telecommunications, software, firmware and similar procedures, services (including support services), and related resources owned, leased or controlled by ED. This also includes equipment used by ED or government-owned equipment used by its contractors in the performance of a contract with ED. This does not include any equipment that is acquired by a contractor incidental to a contract.

Examples of projects subject to ED’s Information Technology Investment Management Process:
1. Acquisition, installation, testing and maintenance of hardware, software applications, and telecommunications equipment.
2. Technical support services for IT systems, such as validation testing and automated systems technical “help desk” services used to resolve failures, errors or problems.
4. IT Investment Management, Enterprise Architecture or Information Assurance support services.
5. Technical training for IT personnel and users necessary for the implementation, operation and/or enhancements of hardware, telecommunications and software products or services.
6. Business process reengineering support services focused on software applications, IT infrastructure support, or e-government solutions.
7. Development of automated web-based systems that would collect, store, and process data over the web.
8. Development of a new system or application to support the collection, analysis and/or reporting of research and survey information.
9. Electronic imaging of documents, including the physical storage and transportation of these documents between ED and the contractor work site.
10. Simple web page related activities such as development of web page content, hosting, and posting of information to the web.

The contractor shall include the following accepted earned value management (EVM) calculations in the monthly report for:

- Cost variance (CV)
- CV percentage
- Cost Performance Index (CPI)
- Schedule variance (SV)
- SV percentage
- Schedule Performance Index (SPI)
- Two independent Estimates at Completion (EAC)
- Variance at Completion (VAC)
- VAC Percentage
- Estimated Cost to Compete (ETC)
- Expected Completion Date

The contractor shall also include a performance curve graph plotting planned value (PV), earned value (EV), and actual cost (AC) in the monthly report.

The contractor shall include a section specifically titled Small Business Subcontracting Plan and indicate the name of the small business, contact information, type of small business, work that was subcontracted including what task the work falls under and the dollar amount subcontracted for that month.

The contractor shall also include in the monthly progress report updates to the schedule and quality control data on the help desk activities and data collection system problem resolutions.

Delivery specifications:
Progress and financial reports by task shall be delivered as Word files. Vouchers shall be submitted electronically to the CO and the COR and shall conform to ED requirements for processing within the receipts system. By attachment, an updated schedule shall also be included.

III.3 RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance Package (Subtask 1.6)

The RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance Package shall include an introduction, project justifications, purpose and uses of data, descriptions of collection methods, descriptions of efforts to identify duplication, descriptions of the suitability of existing data, methods used to minimize burden, frequency of data collection, adherence to guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.6, consultations, confidentiality, sensitive questions, estimates of costs, estimates of response burden, publication plans and schedules, statistical methodology, data elements and justifications, and sample notifications.

Delivery specifications:
On or before November 30 for the following data collection year when OMB approval is required, the contractor shall deliver the RIMS/OMB Forms Clearance Package (including Standard Form 83) for the next three IPEDS cycles as a Word file. During the 120-day clearance period, the contractor shall allow for two (2) revisions to address RIMS and OMB.
III.4 List of Potential TRP members (Task 2)

Sixty (60) potential panelists shall be listed. Names, addresses, telephone numbers, affiliations, prior IPEDS TRP and National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) memberships, and annotated resumes shall be included for each. Panelists for each meeting shall be selected by contractor from the list of potential members, and approved by COR.

Delivery specifications:
By June 1, the list of potential TRP members shall be delivered as a Word file.

III.5 TRP Summary Package (Task 2)

The contractor shall prepare both a pre-meeting and post-meeting package. The pre-meeting package will consist of: (1) a list of invitees; (2) agenda; and (3) meeting materials, including a preliminary copy of the paper to be presented at the meeting. The post-meeting TRP summary package to be delivered to the COR shall include (1) the participant list; (2) detailed minutes that document the IPEDS TRP discussions; (3) a memorandum that summarizes any suggestions made by the TRP that may impact content of the IPEDS forms or survey conduct; this memorandum shall be suitable for posting to the IPEDS web page following COR review and approval and may elicit comments from the field; (4) a summary of public comment; and (5) contractor recommendations. In addition to the summary package, the contractor shall provide a final action report (if necessary).

Delivery specifications:
The pre-meeting package shall be delivered as a Word file(s) within 4 weeks before the TRP meeting.

The post-meeting TRP Summary Package shall be delivered as a Word file(s) within 12 weeks after a meeting of the TRP, having allowed for at least 30 days of public comments and two revisions to documents by the COR.

III.6 Data Collection Testing Site (Subtask 3.1)

The contractor shall make available a fully functional data collection system for testing by ED staff and other designees on the contractor’s own server. Prior to making available the system for testing, the contractor shall have gained approval by the COR and ED staff of the data collection screens and edits in the system.

Delivery specifications:
The contractor shall notify the COR and ED’s IPEDS staff (team leaders and relevant survey directors) by email of availability of the testing site on the contractor’s server at least four (4) weeks prior to data collection period (Fall, Winter, Spring) opening.

III.7 Data Collection Software Installation (Subtask 3.2)

Delivery specifications:
Two (2) weeks prior to data collection opening, the contractor shall request that the data collection system shall be moved to the NCES development server. One week
prior to data collection opening, the contractor shall request the data collection
system shall be installed on the NCES production server.

III.8 Data Collection System Documentation (Subtask 3.2)

Documentation shall include structure and content of all databases and program code complete with
the calling relationship of code modules and function entry points.

Delivery specifications:
Within one month after the data collection system is moved to the NCES production
server, the data collection system documentation shall be delivered in Word and/or
Excel format to the COR and ED’s IPEDS staff (team leaders).

III.9 IPEDS Annual Training Report (Subtask 4.1)

Delivery specifications:
On or before June 1 of each year, the contractor shall deliver an annual report in
Word format that summarizes all training activities from the previous data collection
year, evaluations of the effectiveness of those activities, and plans for improvements
in the next data collection year.

III.10 IPEDS Annual Data Policy Institute Report (Subtask 4.2)

Delivery specifications:
On or before September 1 of each year, the contractor shall deliver an annual report in
Word format that summarizes the data policy institute activities and budget,
evaluations of the effectiveness of those activities, and plans for improvements in the
next summer institute.

III.11 Train-the-Trainer Package (Subtask 4.3)

Delivery specifications:
Train-the-Trainer Packages shall be made available to the COR and ED’s IPEDS
Team Leader for review one-week prior to the “train-the-trainer” session and shall be
provided to all participants at the train-the trainer session on or before the first day of
the session.

III.12 Collection Coordination and Communication Package (Subtask 5.1)

Delivery specifications:
Pre-Collection:
Updated coordination tree e-mail and drafts of templates for all pre-collection
communications shall be delivered to the COR for review in Word format at least
two weeks prior to the mailing of usernames and passwords for the system.

Post-Collection Opening:
Drafts of all follow-up e-mails as well as draft text for “thank-you” notes sent out
through the system following on-time survey locking. This shall be delivered within
2 weeks after the opening of the data collection period.

III.13 Outreach Plan (Subtask 5.2)

Delivery specifications:
Four weeks prior to keyholder registration opening, contractor shall deliver plan for ongoing communications with data users and providers in Word format. Upon approval of plan from COR, the contractor shall implement the plan for outreach throughout the data collection year.

III.14 Data Migrated to Data Distribution Database (Subtask 5.3)

The contractor shall complete all data review and migration of the data to the distribution database within four (4) weeks of data collection period closing date.

Delivery specifications:
Upon successful completion of migration of data to data distribution system, the contractor shall send an email verification to the COR, ED’s IPEDS Staff, and relevant IPEDS survey directors.

III.15 Help Desk Training Materials (Subtask 6.1)

Delivery Specifications:
Within one week prior to each data collection period opening (Fall, Winter, Spring), the contractor shall deliver, in hardcopy format, a set of the training materials to ED’s IPEDS staff and Help Desk staff who are attend the training.

III.16 Annual Help Desk (Collection and Tools) Reports (Subtasks 6.2 & 6.3)

Delivery Specifications:
Within four (4) weeks after the spring collection closes, the contractor shall deliver in Word or PowerPoint format, a report on the year’s help desk activities, including call and contact metrics, average response time, types of calls/contacts, etc.

III.17 Functioning Help Desk Application and System Documentation (Subtask 6.4)

Delivery Specifications:
By July 1, the contractor shall deliver a functioning Help Desk Application accessible by help desk staff and ED’s IPEDS staff. The contractor shall send an email confirmation the application is operational. In addition, the contractor shall provide functions documentation as a Word file at that time.

III.18 First Look Analysis Materials (Subtask 7.1)
Delivery Specifications:

No later than one week prior to each data collection closing (Fall, Winter, Spring), the contractor shall deliver in Word or other appropriate electronic format, the First Look Draft package (approved analysis plan, table shells, imputation specifications, and perturbation/suppression specifications) to the COR, ED’s IPEDS Team Leaders, and relevant survey directors.

III.19 Data Files & Final Imputation and Bias Analysis Report (Subtask 7.2)

Eight (8) weeks after a data collection period closes (twelve (12) weeks for Fall), the contractor shall deliver a clean pre-imputed data file. Four types of cases will populate the data files: migrated cases, completed cases, partial response cases, and nonresponse cases. The migrated and completed cases may require minimal manipulations for “Don’t know” responses. Partial cases require the construction of flags that describe item nonresponse, method of imputation, and the imputed data. Finally, the nonrespondent cases require the construction of an overall flag as well as imputation flags and imputed data.

Delivery specifications:

Twelve (12) weeks after the Fall data collection period closes and eight (8) weeks after the Winter and Spring data collection periods close, the contractor shall deliver to the COR and designated ED IPEDS staff a clean data file; that is, all errors are resolved for completed cases and no imputations have been performed.

Four (4) weeks after the clean data file is delivered, and following imputation, the contractor shall deliver to the COR and designated ED IPEDS staff all final imputed data files. The data files shall be delivered as ASCII text files. The maximum record length for any record shall be 1,024 characters or less.

Two (2) weeks after approval of imputed data files, the Imputation Impact Report and Bias Analysis Report shall be delivered to the COR and designated ED IPEDS staff as a Word file.

III.20 First Look Reports (Subtask 7.3)

As specified in the accepted First Look outline and using the accepted Table Shells, the First Look shall be developed.

Delivery specifications:

Three (3) weeks after approval of the imputed data files from ED IPEDS staff for each data collection, the First Look shall be delivered to the COR and designated ED IPEDS staff as a Word file. During the approximately four-month period of IES/NCES publication review, this report shall be revised to reflect the concerns of (A) IPEDS Program Director review, (B) Associate Commissioner review, (C) Chief statistician review, and (D) IES review. Two (2) weeks following adjudication, the First Look shall be delivered as a Word file with associated HTML and PDF files. If adjudication review indicates substantial changes are necessary, this period will be adjusted by the COR.

III.21 IPEDS State and Compendium Tables (Subtask 7.4)
Delivery Specifications:
The IPEDS State and Compendium tables shall be delivered to the COR and designated ED IPEDS staff for posting to the NCES website. The contractor shall deliver each set of tables “web-ready” for posting and meeting all IES/NCES standards within eight (8) weeks of the public release of the corresponding IPEDS Final Data.

III.22 Statistics in Brief Reports and Web Tables (Subtask 7.5)

Delivery Specifications
The contractor shall deliver a provisional version of one approved Descriptive Analysis Report or set of Web tables within 12 months of the data collection closing. A final version will be due 4 months after the PY Revisions data collection is closed.

III.23 Data Feedback Hard Copies Mailed to CEOs (Subtask 7.6)

Delivery specifications:
No later than October 30, the contractor shall verify by email to the COR that final hard copies of the data feedback report have been printed and mailed to all CEOs.

III.24 Log of Updates to IPEDS Website (Subtask 8.1)

Delivery Specifications:
An annual log of all updates and changes made to the IPEDS website shall be delivered to the ED COR as a Word or Excel file by June 30 of each year.

Also, on an annual basis, the contractor shall create PDF files of all of the survey forms for the Archived Surveys page. These will be completed within 2 months of the close of data collection.

III.25 Data Updated on IPEDS Data Dissemination System (Subtask 8.2)

Delivery Specifications:
The contractor shall update online data tools as requested by the COR for public use within two weeks after data are migrated to the data distribution database. Contractor shall send an email to the COR and IPEDS Team Leaders verifying that updates on the web are completed.

III.26 Updates to IPEDS Dissemination System/Online Tools (Subtask 8.2)

Delivery Specifications:
The contractor shall deliver as a Word document to the ED COR and designated ED IPEDS staff an annual report of enhancements made to the online tools in a Word document or PowerPoint presentation by June 30.

III.27 Support and Updates to IPEDS Table/Trend Generator (Subtask 8.3)

Delivery Specifications:
An annual log of all updates and changes made to the Trend Generator shall be delivered to the ED COR as a Word or Excel file by June 30 of each year.

III.28 Annual Trips Report (Task 9)

Delivery Specifications:
Within 2 weeks after a specific conference, the contractor shall submit a report to the COR regarding contractor staff activities at conference, including which contractor staff attended and what presentations were made on IPEDS, the web collection, or results of the surveys. The report shall be in Word format.

By June 30 of each year, the contractor shall also submit a year-end summary report of all conferences/trips attended throughout the year.

Deliverables for Optional Tasks

III. 29 Integrate the Campus Crime survey and the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act survey into the IPEDS web-based data collection system (Optional Task 1)

Delivery specifications:
Within 12 months of the exercising of this option, the contractor shall integrate the Campus Crime and Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act surveys into a new component as part of the IPEDS data collection system.

III. 30 Redesign and develop the College Navigator website (Optional Task 2)

Delivery specifications:
Within 12 months of exercising this option, the contractor shall redesign and enhance the College Navigator website, including the creation of a summary profile page for each institution as well as increased functionalities. A mobile application of the College Navigator will also be created.
## Summary and Timeline of Deliverables

Some due dates associated with the timeline and schedule of deliverables in the table are anchored by the contract award date OR other activities within the contract.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due/Scheduled Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Post Award Conference Package</td>
<td>2 weeks after post award conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Updated schedule and progress reports</td>
<td>Monthly on (or before) 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>RMG/OMB Clearance</td>
<td>November 30 (for following data collecting year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>List of potential TRP members</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pre-Meeting Package</td>
<td>4 weeks before each meeting of the TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRP Summary Package</td>
<td>12 weeks after each meeting of the TRP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Data collection system testing site</td>
<td>2 weeks prior to data collection opening: on NCES development server: 1 week prior to data collection opening: on NCES production server</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Data collection system documentation</td>
<td>1 month after the opening of the data collection system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Annual Training Report</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Annual Summer Data Policy Institute Report</td>
<td>September 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Train-the-Trainer Package</td>
<td>1 week prior to “trainer the trainer” session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Pre-Collection Coordination and Communication Package</td>
<td>2 weeks prior to distribution of usernames and passwords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Outreach Plan</td>
<td>4 weeks before registration opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Data migrated to Data Distribution System</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks of data collection close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Help Desk training Materials</td>
<td>1 week prior to data collection opening (at Help Desk training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Help Desk Application and Documentation</td>
<td>Within 4 weeks after spring data collection closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Help Desk Annual Reports</td>
<td>July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>First Look Analysis Materials</td>
<td>1 week before data collection closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Clean data files (Pre-impute)</td>
<td>Fall - 12 weeks after data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Fully Edited and Imputed data files</td>
<td>Winter - 8 weeks after data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Imputation impact and bias analysis report</td>
<td>Spring - 8 weeks after data collection period closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Methodology Report</td>
<td>2 weeks after approval of imputed files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Preliminary First Look</td>
<td>3 weeks after approval of clean pre-impute files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>IPEDS State and Compendium Tables</td>
<td>8 weeks after public release of corresponding Final Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Final Descriptive Analysis Reports and Tables</td>
<td>Provisional - 12 months after data collection closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>DFR copies delivered to CEOs</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Annual Log of Updates to IPEDS website</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Data updated on online IPEDS tools</td>
<td>2 weeks after data are migrated to data distribution database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Annual Report on Data Tools</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>Due/Scheduled Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Annual log of all updates and changes to the Trend Generator</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Annual Trip Report</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Integration of Campus Crime and Equity in Athletics surveys into IPEDS data collection system</td>
<td>Within 12 months after option is exercised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Redesign and develop the College Navigator website</td>
<td>Within 12 months after option is exercised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Inspection and Acceptance Procedures

The contractor shall consult with the ED COR before making any major decisions or developing the required deliverables. To facilitate this communication, the contractor shall make frequent phone calls and visits to ED to discuss potential project problems and progress. The contractor shall set up an electronic system for transferring information via electronic mail and microcomputers. Preliminary drafts of all products shall be provided to the COR at the earliest possible time to assure the final products will meet expectations with minimal revision. It is expected that the COR will require one or more revisions of each product prior to approval for the next level of review or implementation, and that each level of review will require revision before approval. Time for these reviews and revisions shall be included in the proposed schedule.

The contractor shall prepare all reports following the guidelines referenced by IES/NCES' standards. The IES/NCES review process will take 5 months. It is paramount that schedules for the First Look and data file releases be kept and that IES/NCES standards for all phases of survey design, data collection, and report production be followed. All materials must be approved before release. The contractor shall not release any data in raw or derived form to anyone without IES/NCES's review and COR approval.
A New, Single Home for ED Data

Posted on September 28, 2012 by Guest Blogger

Starting today, the data sets and content you’re used to seeing on data.ed.gov can be found on education.data.gov.

(Developers: Please note that the 16 available education data APIs were already hosted by data.gov. These URLs did not change and existing applications using these APIs should not be affected.)

Why the move?

In addition to saving the costs associated with hosting and maintaining a separate education data website, merging the information on data.ed.gov into the existing Data.gov Education Community will allow researchers, developers, and interested members of the public to meet all their education data needs in one central location.

Originally, we created the separate data.ed.gov portal because we wanted to provide the public with advanced features and visualization tools that were not yet available on Data.gov. Today, the Data.gov Education Community not only fully supports visualization and mapping technologies, but it benefits from the continual addition of new enhancements, tools, and features. A key new tool is an API “wizard” that will make it faster and easier to create APIs for existing and upcoming open datasets, increasing the ways developers can interact with this data.

Additionally, as part of the government-wide Digital Government Strategy and the Education Data Initiative, an increasing number of developers and data enthusiasts are looking to Data.gov as the central source for finding, analyzing, and working with government data. Ensuring that all education-related open data lives on Data.gov, instead of on a separate website, ultimately means that more people can find and interact with it, and that we can nurture a larger, stronger community of individuals focused around education data.

What moved?

Prior to today, the following 14 datasets lived exclusively on data.ed.gov. You can now find them on the education.data.gov developer page:

- Broadband Availability for U.S. Schools
- American Jobs Act: Modernizing America’s Schools and Putting Teachers Back to Work
- School Improvement 2010 Grants
- Investing In Innovation 2010 Applications
- Investing In Innovation 2010 Highest Rated
What did not move?

As mentioned above, the URLs for existing education data APIs did not change. They were originally based off of data.gov and will continue to live there.

Currently, a developer page will continue to be hosted by ED.gov. Even as additional developer resources are added to the Data.gov Education Community, we will continue to maintain a presence at www.ed.gov/developers specifically for developers who work with education data.

What’s next for ED data?

In the coming months, look for new developer resources, including tutorials for beginners and one-pagers for those hosting app-building events and contests to inform participants about what open educational data is available and how to use it.

We will also continue to add new data sets, including FY12 grant information, to the Data.gov Education Community as it becomes available.

Do you have ideas for the types of educational data you’d like to see on Data.gov? Or developer resources you wish were available? Let us know in the comments!

*Marina Martin is Entrepreneur-in-Residence at the U.S. Department of Education*
This report focuses on the college and career readiness levels of the ACT®-tested US high school graduating class of 2012. The report represents 52 percent of all 2012 graduates in the United States.

Findings in the report suggest that for this cohort of tested students, the condition of college and career readiness has slightly improved over the past several years, specifically in the subject areas of math and science.

While encouraging, far too many students are graduating from high school ill-prepared for the academic rigors of college and career. The results again indicate that the US education system must do better at helping our young people to compete with their peers in other nations for meaningful jobs and careers in the 21st century global economy.

As a trusted, not-for-profit leader in research on college and career readiness, ACT is committed to continuing our efforts to provide data and information to help solve the daunting problems faced by our nation. In future years, ACT research and data will be designed to provide insights not only on academic achievement but on student behavior and goals, which when combined will help individuals better prepare for success throughout their lives, from kindergarten through career. These new efforts will broaden and extend our core mission: Helping people achieve education and career success.

The data in this report provide continued insights that will help inform and guide our collective efforts to improve college and career readiness for the next generation of young people now making their way through the US education system.
ACT research gives some insight into how to improve college and career readiness. Three key suggestions are provided below.

**Early Student Monitoring and Intervention.** ACT research continues to show the importance of early monitoring of student achievement and appropriate interventions. ACT research also supports the use of integrated, longitudinal, data-driven systems to inform and encourage coherence in school, district, and state efforts to prepare all high school graduates for college and career. Schools must provide rigorous courses aligned with college and career readiness standards. Students must be prepared for and have the opportunity to take these core courses. Educators must provide systematic guidance and feedback early and often to students about their progress.

**Use of Student Growth Models in Early Monitoring.** As states and districts implement college and career readiness standards, metrics aligned to those standards are needed to gauge individual and school progress toward this goal. Using these metrics, growth modeling has strong potential to help stakeholders measure progress—for individual students and for school systems. Growth model results can serve a variety of purposes.

**A Comprehensive Framework of Best Practices.** Key practices for increasing readiness can be implemented as part of a comprehensive framework of best practices. Empirically developed and validated, the Core Practice™ Framework outlines the evidence-based educator practices at each level of a school system—district, school, and classroom—that help all students master high standards. The Framework focuses on five themes: 1) Curriculum and Academic Goals, 2) Staff Selection, Leadership, and Capacity Building, 3) Instructional Tools: Programs and Strategies, 4) Monitoring Performance and Progress, and 5) Intervention and Adjustment. Included in the Framework are critical actions—steps on how to implement the 15 core practices.
Since 1959, ACT has collected and reported data on students’ academic readiness for college. This report provides a college and career readiness snapshot of the ACT-tested high school class of 2012.¹

**What does ACT mean by “college and career readiness”?**
ACT has long defined college and career readiness as the acquisition of the knowledge and skills a student needs to enroll and succeed in credit-bearing first-year courses at a postsecondary institution (such as a 2- or 4-year college, trade school, or technical school) without the need for remediation.

**How does ACT determine if students are college ready?**
Empirically derived, ACT’s College Readiness Benchmarks are the minimum scores needed on the ACT subject area tests to indicate a 50% chance of obtaining a B or higher or about a 75% chance of obtaining a C or higher in corresponding credit-bearing first-year college courses. (See Notes for more information.)

Measuring academic performance in the context of college and career readiness—focusing on the number and percentages of students meeting or exceeding the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks—provides meaningful and compelling information about the academic readiness of students. *The Condition of College & Career Readiness* highlights that information.

¹The data in this report are based on the ACT Profile Report—National: Graduating Class 2012, available at [www.act.org/readiness/2012](http://www.act.org/readiness/2012). Except for the graphs on pages 9 and 14, data related to students who did not provide information or responded “Other” to questions about gender, race/ethnicity, high school curriculum, etc., are not presented explicitly. Race/ethnicity categories changed in 2011 to reflect updated US Department of Education reporting requirements; trends to previous reports may not be available for all race/ethnicity categories.
The Condition of College & Career Readiness is organized into seven sections:

**College Readiness**—the percentage of students meeting the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks in each subject area ..................... 1

**Educational/Career Aspirations & Economic Development**—the extent to which student aspirations match workforce demands. ............. 9

**Access & Preparation**—the number of graduates exposed to college entrance testing and the percent of students pursuing a core curriculum.......................................................... 12

**Academic Performance**—student test performance and the impact of rigorous coursework on achievement ........................................... 16

**Academic Achievement & Academic Behaviors**—the impact of academic behaviors on high school performance .......................... 19

**Looking Back at the Class of 2011**—college readiness and enrollment patterns of ACT-tested 2011 high school graduates ............. 20

**Policies & Practices to Increase Readiness**—policies and practices states and schools can implement to improve the college readiness of students............................................. 22

ACT encourages educators to focus on trends (e.g., 3, 5, 10 years), not year-to-year changes, which can represent normal—even expected—fluctuations. Trend lines offer more insight into what is happening in a school, district, state, or the nation than can data from any single year.
In 2012, 67% of all ACT-tested high school graduates met the English College Readiness Benchmark, while 25% met the College Readiness Benchmarks in all four subjects. Fifty-two percent of graduates met the Reading Benchmark and 46% met the Mathematics Benchmark. Just under 1 in 3 (31%) met the College Readiness Benchmark in Science.
Between 2008 and 2012, Benchmark attainment percentages remained relatively stable in English: 68% to 67% of ACT-tested graduates met the English Benchmark over this period. Benchmark attainment for Reading also was relatively stable, from 53% to 52%. Slightly higher percentages of students met the Mathematics or Science Benchmark in 2012 than in 2008.

The percent of students meeting all four Benchmarks increased slightly between 2008 and 2012. About 1 in 4 ACT-tested high school graduates met all four ACT College Readiness Benchmarks in 2012, compared to 22% doing so in 2008.

Graph reads: Between 2008 and 2012, the percentage of ACT-tested high school graduates who met the College Readiness Benchmark in English decreased from 68% to 67%.
About 9% to 15% of graduates were within 2 scale points of meeting an ACT College Readiness Benchmark in 2012, depending on subject area. This represents approximately 150,000 to 250,000 additional students who were close to being college ready within a subject area.

In 2012, 46% of graduates met the Mathematics Benchmark, while another 9% were within 2 scale points of doing so. The percentages of students within 2 scale points of the respective College Readiness Benchmark in the other subject areas were the same or greater, including 9% of graduates in English, 11% in Reading, and 15% in Science.

Graph reads: In 2012, 67% of ACT-tested high school graduates met the College Readiness Benchmark in English, while 9% scored 1 or 2 points below the Benchmark, and 24% scored 3 points or more below the Benchmark.

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Number of College Readiness Benchmarks Attained

About 72% of all 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates met at least one of the four College Readiness Benchmarks in English, Reading, Mathematics, or Science.

Fully 28% of all graduates did not meet any of the College Readiness Benchmarks, while 47% met between 1 and 3 Benchmarks. Twenty-five percent of all 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates met all four College Readiness Benchmarks, meaning that 1 in 4 were academically ready for college coursework in all four subject areas.

Graph reads: In 2012, 25% of ACT-tested high school graduates met all four College Readiness Benchmarks, 15% met 3 Benchmarks, 17% met 2 Benchmarks, 15% met 1 Benchmark, and 28% met none of the Benchmarks.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
College Readiness

College Readiness Benchmarks by Race/Ethnicity

Just over 4 in 10 (42%) Asian graduates met all four College Readiness Benchmarks in 2012, more than graduates from all other racial/ethnic groups. African American graduates were least likely to meet the Benchmarks—5% met all four.

Students from most racial/ethnic groups were most likely to meet the English Benchmark, followed in order by the Reading, Mathematics, and Science Benchmarks. In three of the four subject areas, Benchmarks were met by at least 50% of Asian and White students, while one was met by at least 50% of Pacific Islander students. None of the Benchmarks were met by at least 50% of African American, American Indian, or Hispanic students.

Graph reads: In 2012, 36% of ACT-tested African American high school graduates met the College Readiness Benchmark in English, while 22% did so in Reading.

Note: Race/ethnicity categories changed in 2011 to reflect updated US Department of Education reporting requirements.
Within a subject area, graduates who took at least a core curriculum in high school were more likely to meet the corresponding ACT College Readiness Benchmark in 2012 than graduates who took less than a core curriculum (defined as 4 years of English and 3 years each of mathematics, science, and social studies).

The largest curriculum-based difference in Benchmark attainment rates was in Mathematics. Graduates who completed 3 or more years of mathematics were more likely to meet the Mathematics Benchmark than graduates who took less than 3 years of mathematics, by 40 percentage points.

Graph reads: In 2012, 68% of ACT-tested high school graduates who took at least a core high school curriculum in English met the College Readiness Benchmark in English, whereas 41% of graduates who took less than a core curriculum in English did so.

Note: Data reflect subject-specific curriculum. For example, English “Core or More” results pertain to students who took at least 4 years of English, regardless of courses taken in other subject areas.
Of the 28 states where at least 40% of all 2012 high school graduates took the ACT, in only 1 state did more than half of the graduates meet at least three of the four College Readiness Benchmarks. In another 9 states, 40%–49% of graduates met three or four Benchmarks.

In 15 of the 28 states, 30%–39% of graduates met at least three of the four College Readiness Benchmarks in 2012, while less than 30% of graduates did so in 3 states. In no state did more than 55% of ACT-tested graduates meet three or four Benchmarks.

Graph reads: In 2012, less than 30% of ACT-tested high school graduates in 3 states (e.g., Kentucky) met three or four College Readiness Benchmarks. Results are not shown for 22 states (e.g., California) within which less than 40% of graduates took the ACT.
College Readiness
Benchmarks—On Target and Attained

For all subjects, the percentages of 10th graders meeting the Benchmarks were higher than the corresponding percentages of 8th graders. With the exception of English, the percentages of high school graduates meeting the Benchmarks were equal to or higher than the corresponding percentages of 10th graders.

A quarter (25%) of 2012 ACT-tested graduates met all four College Readiness Benchmarks, while only 20% of 2011–12 PLAN®-tested 10th graders and 12% of 2011–12 EXPLORE®-tested students did so. Across the grade levels, only the English Benchmark was met by more than 50% of all tested students.

Note: Data here are cross sectional and not longitudinal, reflecting three different groups of students.

Graph reads: In 2012, 65% of 2011–12 EXPLORE-tested students met the College Readiness Benchmark in English, while 70% of 2011–12 PLAN-tested students and 67% of 2012 ACT-tested graduates did so.

Note: Data here are cross sectional and not longitudinal, reflecting three different groups of students.
Educational/Career Aspirations & Economic Development

Educational Aspirations by Race/Ethnicity

About 87% of all 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates aspired to attain at least a 2-year postsecondary degree, regardless of race/ethnicity.

About 83% of Asian graduates aspired to earn at least a bachelor’s degree, with 54% aspiring to continue their formal education beyond a 4-year degree. American Indian graduates (30%) were the least likely to aspire to a graduate or professional degree; 34%–37% of African American, Hispanic, Pacific Islander, or White graduates aspired to a graduate or professional degree.

Graph reads: In 2012, 34% of ACT-tested African American high school graduates aspired to a graduate or professional degree, 46% to a bachelor’s degree, 7% to an associate’s or voc-tech degree, and 13% to another degree type (or provided no response).

Note: Columns may not sum to 100% due to rounding. Race/ethnicity categories changed in 2011 to reflect updated US Department of Education reporting requirements.
Career Interests & Projected Job Openings

The five fastest-growing career fields based on 2010–20 annual projected job openings account for 55% of the demand for jobs calling for at least a 2-year degree. The percentage of 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates interested in careers in these fields was less than the projected demand.

In three fields—Education, Computer/Information Specialties, and Marketing/Sales—the projected demand was more than twice the potential supply.

Graph reads: In 2012, Education was projected to be one of the five fastest-growing career fields, accounting for 17% of all job openings in 2020. About 7% of all 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates indicated a career interest in Education.

Note: 2010–20 projected job openings data are from the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Educational/Career Aspirations & Economic Development

Percent of ACT-Tested High School Graduates Meeting ACT College Readiness Benchmarks by Career Field, 2012

College Readiness Benchmarks by Career Field

For each of the 2020 projected five fastest-growing career fields, less than half of the 2012 high school graduates interested in careers in these fields met the ACT College Readiness Benchmark in Science, and in only one field, Computer/Information Specialties, did 50% or more meet the Mathematics Benchmark. For none of the five career fields did at least 50% of the 2012 graduates meet all four Benchmarks.

Across all five career fields, graduates were most likely to meet the English Benchmark, followed by meeting the Reading and Mathematics Benchmarks, respectively. Graduates were least likely to meet the Science Benchmark in all five career fields.

Graph reads: In 2012, 68% of all ACT-tested high school graduates who indicated a career interest in Education met the College Readiness Benchmark in English.
About 52% of all 2012 high school graduates in the United States took the ACT during high school, or about 1.66 million graduates.

From 2008 to 2012, the number of high school graduates who took the ACT increased by approximately 17%. This represents a 9 percentage point increase in the percent of all US high school graduates who took the ACT.
At least 60% of all 2012 high school graduates took the ACT in 26 states. In 15 states, at least 80% of their high school graduates took the ACT.

In 2 states, between 40% and 59% of their 2012 high school graduates took the ACT during high school, while another 17 states saw between 20% and 39% of their high school graduates take the ACT. Less than 20% of 2012 graduates took the ACT in 5 states.

Graph reads: In 2012, less than 20% of the high school graduates in 5 states (e.g., Pennsylvania) took the ACT test at least once during their sophomore, junior, or senior year.
Access & Preparation

Number of Graduates Who Took the ACT by Race/Ethnicity

About 244,000 more high school graduates completed the ACT in 2012 than in 2008, an increase of about 17%.

In 2012, about 59% of all ACT-tested graduates were White, 13% were African American, 14% were Hispanic, 4% were Asian, 3% were of Two or More Races, 1% were American Indian, less than 1% were Pacific Islander (about 5,000), and 5% were No Response. From 2008 to 2012, the number of ACT-tested high school graduates increased from 1.422 million to 1.666 million students. Substantial numerical increases occurred for Hispanic students (increase of about 120,000), White students (88,000), African American students (44,000), and students of Two or More Races (26,000). Proportionally, the largest increases were by Hispanic students (about 104%) and students of Two or More Races (86%).

Graph reads: In 2008, about 1,422,000 US high school graduates had taken the ACT test at least once during their sophomore, junior, or senior year; of which, about 178,000 were African American students and 14,000 were American Indian students.

Note: Counts by race/ethnicity might not sum to total counts due to rounding. Race/ethnicity categories changed in 2011 to reflect updated US Department of Education reporting requirements.
Seventy-six percent of all 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates took at least a minimum core high school curriculum to prepare them for college.

Asian students (81%) were most likely to complete a core curriculum, while 74% of Pacific Islander and 77% of White students did so. Smaller percentages of African American (72%), American Indian (66%), and Hispanic (73%) students completed a core curriculum.

Graph reads: In 2012, 72% of all African American high school graduates who had taken the ACT test had completed, or had planned to complete, at least a core curriculum.

Note: Race/ethnicity categories changed in 2011 to reflect updated US Department of Education reporting requirements.
Academic Performance

ACT Scores Over Time

Test scores remained essentially the same between 2008 and 2012 even though about 17% more high school students took the ACT over this period and the tested population of students became more diverse.

Composite score averages ranged between 21.0 and 21.1 points during this time. The four subject score averages (English, Reading, Mathematics, and Science) showed similar changes in absolute value.

Graph reads: Between 2008 and 2012, the average ACT Reading score for all high school graduates decreased slightly from 21.4 to 21.3.
Academic Performance

ACT Scores Over Time by Level of High School Preparation

For each year from 2008 to 2012, ACT Composite and subject scores were higher for students who took a core curriculum or more in high school than for students who did not.

On average, high school graduates who completed at least a core curriculum earned Composite test scores 2.5 to 3.1 points higher than the scores of students who did not take a core curriculum. Similar ranges of higher scores for core or more curriculum completers are noted for each subject test: English (2.8 to 3.5 points), Reading (2.4 to 3.0), Mathematics (2.6 to 3.0), and Science (2.2 to 2.7).

Graph reads: Between 2008 and 2012, the average ACT Reading score for high school graduates who had completed or had planned to complete at least a core curriculum remained about the same and was higher than that of graduates who had not completed or had not planned to complete a core curriculum.
**ACT Scores Over Time by Race/Ethnicity**

Average ACT Composite scores for African American, Asian, Hispanic, and White graduates increased between 2008 and 2012. That of American Indian graduates declined by 0.6 scale point.

Asian graduates had the highest average ACT Composite scores and the largest score increase (+0.7 scale point). Average ACT Composite scores for White graduates increased by 0.3 point. These score changes have occurred as more students from each racial/ethnic group have taken the ACT.

Graph reads: Between 2008 and 2012, the average ACT Composite score for Asian high school graduates increased from 22.9 to 23.6.

Note: Race/ethnicity categories changed in 2011 to reflect updated US Department of Education reporting requirements.
Impact of Academic Behaviors on High School Persistence

ACT research illustrates how the combination of academic achievement and behavior yields more information than either measure alone when differentiating students for high school persistence. Most importantly, this information is available in 8th grade—allowing for early identification of students at risk of not completing high school.

Across all EXPLORE Benchmark attainment levels, students with higher ENGAGE Graduation Index scores, which are based on a combination of ENGAGE scale scores and other self-reported student information, had higher high school persistence rates than students with lower Graduation Index scores.

Note: Data are based on 2,986 8th graders in 24 middle schools across the country who took EXPLORE and ENGAGE Grades 6–9, an assessment of academic behavior. High school persistence is defined as having graduated high school or being on track to graduate within four years of starting 9th grade. These data do not reflect the entire 2012 ACT-tested high school graduate cohort.
Looking Back at the Class of 2011

Number of College Readiness Benchmarks Attained

About 72% of all 2011 ACT-tested high school graduates met at least one of the four College Readiness Benchmarks in English, Reading, Mathematics, or Science.

Fully 28% of all graduates did not meet any of the College Readiness Benchmarks, while 47% met between 1 and 3 Benchmarks. Twenty-five percent of all 2011 ACT-tested high school graduates met all four College Readiness Benchmarks, meaning that 1 in 4 were academically ready for college coursework in all four subject areas.

Graph reads: In 2011, 25% of ACT-tested high school graduates met all four College Readiness Benchmarks, 15% met 3 Benchmarks, 17% met 2 Benchmarks, 15% met 1 Benchmark, and 28% met none of the Benchmarks.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Fall 2011 College Enrollment Status

More than half of the 2011 ACT-tested high school graduates who enrolled in a 4-year college met three or more of the College Readiness Benchmarks (about 54% of public college enrollees; about 64% of non-public college enrollees).

About 20% of the graduates who enrolled in a 2-year college met at least three of the College Readiness Benchmarks; 41% of 2-year enrollees met none of the Benchmarks. At least 10% of the 4-year college enrollees met none of the Benchmarks.

Graph reads: In fall 2011, 48% of the 2011 ACT-tested high school graduates whose status was Other/Unknown met none of the College Readiness Benchmarks; 12% of this group met 4 Benchmarks.

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
Policies & Practices to Increase Readiness

How to Increase Readiness

Approximately 28% of all 2012 ACT-tested high school graduates did not meet any of the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks, meaning they were not prepared academically for first-year college courses in English Composition, College Algebra, Biology, and social sciences. There are steps that states, districts, schools, and classrooms can take to increase student readiness for college-level work.

State Policy Recommendations

Implementing College and Career Readiness Standards. Since ACT released its policy report Making the Dream a Reality in 2008, we have called for states to adopt education standards that prepare all students for college or career training programs. With the adoption of the Common Core State Standards by 45 states and the District of Columbia, most states have taken a first step in ensuring all students pursue real-world benchmarks for their college or career success. Implementing the standards must now be a catalyst for aligning all aspects of state and local systems to college and career readiness. Promising practice research shows that systemic alignment of key policies and school activities empowers educators to make notable gains in student achievement. An integrated, systemic approach to education delivery is essential for every state and would include the actions outlined on the following pages.
Infusing a Culture of Postsecondary Success. All states—especially those that have adopted the Common Core State Standards—should align college and career readiness standards to a rigorous core curriculum for all high school students whether they are bound for college or work. The levels of expectation for college readiness and workforce training should be comparable in rigor, clarity of purpose, and completion. An educator’s vision, attitudes, and motivation have lasting impact on student achievement. Securing a high-quality education is vital to the success of all students in a rapidly changing world.

Expanding Rigorous High School Courses. Appropriate and aligned standards, coupled with a core curriculum, can prepare students only if the courses are truly challenging. It is more important for students to take the right kinds of courses rather than the right number of courses. ACT supports a high school core curriculum consisting of at least four years of English and three years each of mathematics, science, and social studies. Students who take a rigorous core curriculum are much more likely to graduate high school ready for credit-bearing first-year college courses without remediation.

Ensuring Early Monitoring and Intervention. Our data show that students who take challenging curricula are more likely to graduate high school ready for college or career training opportunities. Longitudinal data systems enable educators to identify students in need of academic intervention at an early stage, when problems are still solvable, giving teachers and students more time to strengthen these skills before graduation. In order for students to plan their high school coursework, age-appropriate career assessment, exploration, and planning activities that encourage them to consider personally relevant career options should be used regularly. Empowering teachers and administrators with currently available tools is essential for modern instructional practice to monitor student achievement against appropriate benchmarks in core academic subjects throughout elementary, middle, and secondary school.
Policies & Practices to Increase Readiness

Setting Clear Performance Standards. In addition to a consistent, rigorous set of essential K–12 content standards, states must define performance standards so that everyone knows “how good is good enough” for students to have a reasonable chance of success at college or on the job. Based on decades of student performance data, ACT defines “college readiness” as students having a 50% chance of earning a B or higher or about a 75% chance of earning a C or higher in first-year college English Composition, College Algebra, Biology, and an introductory social science course. Longitudinal, real-world data and research on what constitutes student success are now available to virtually every state and district, as are standards and benchmarks against which the performance of students and schools can be measured and state progress marked.

Implementing Policies and Practices for Data-Driven Decision Making. States have been hard at work developing longitudinal P–16 data systems—this work must continue. To ensure their students are prepared for the 21st century, states must have systems that allow schools and districts to closely monitor student performance at every stage of the learning pipeline, from preschool through college. Teacher and administrator preparation and professional development must include developing skills to use data appropriately to improve the practices of teaching and learning. Absent good data, opinion can overly influence key decisions.

District, School, & Classroom Practices

The Path to Readiness: It Takes a System

Research by the National Center for Educational Achievement (NCEA)—a department of ACT—shows that no single program or isolated reform can be a substitute for a coherent, long-term, systemwide approach
to improving teaching and learning. We all want our students to graduate prepared to take on future opportunities with success. So, what are consistently higher performing schools doing to place more students on the path to college and career readiness?

The Core Practice Framework, built upon the study of more than 550 schools across 20 states, identifies the core practices that distinguish a higher performing school from its average performing counterparts. NCEA studies the practices of those schools and school systems that have more success in preparing their students for college and careers than their peers who serve similar student populations. Our ongoing research supports the Framework and adds content and information to each of the core practices below.

The 15 Practices of Higher Performing School Systems
The Core Practice Framework outlines the evidence-based educator practices at each level of a school system—district, school, and classroom—that will help all students master high standards. The Framework focuses on five themes:

Theme 1: Curriculum and Academic Goals
District Practice: Provide clear, prioritized learning objectives by grade and subject that all students are expected to master.
School Practice: Set expectations and goals for teaching and learning based on the district’s written curriculum.
Classroom Practice: Study and use the district’s written curriculum to plan all instruction.
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Theme 2: Staff Selection, Leadership, and Capacity Building
District Practice: Provide strong principals, a talented teacher pool, and layered professional development.
School Practice: Select and develop teachers to ensure high-quality instruction.
Classroom Practice: Collaborate as a primary means for improving instruction.

Theme 3: Instructional Tools: Programs and Strategies
District Practice: Provide evidence- and standards-based instructional tools that support academic rigor for all students.
School Practice: Promote strategies and build structures and schedules to support academic rigor.
Classroom Practice: Use proven instructional tools to support rigorous learning for students.

Theme 4: Monitoring Performance and Progress
District Practice: Develop and use student assessment and data management systems to monitor student learning.
School Practice: Monitor teacher performance and student learning.
Classroom Practice: Analyze and discuss student performance data.

Theme 5: Intervention and Adjustment
District Practice: Respond to data through targeted interventions or curricular/instructional adjustments.
School Practice: Use targeted interventions to address learning needs of teachers and students.
Classroom Practice: Use targeted interventions or adjustments to address learning needs of students.

Another layer behind the Framework, the Critical Actions, provides additional support for educators by outlining how to successfully implement the key components of each core practice.
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The Core Practice Framework

Reading from bottom to top, the path to readiness begins with ACT’s College and Career Readiness Standards, Common Core State Standards, and district learning objectives. Applying the 15 core practices of teaching and learning leads to high-quality instruction, which in turn creates the opportunity for all students to reach ACT’s College Readiness Benchmarks and to be ready for college.

To learn more, please visit www.nc4ea.org.
The ACT® test, one component of ACT’s College and Career Readiness System that also includes EXPLORE® and PLAN®, measures students’ academic readiness to make successful transitions to college and work after high school. Like EXPLORE (typically taken in 8th and 9th grades) and PLAN (typically taken in 10th grade), the ACT is first and foremost an achievement test. It is a measure whose tasks correspond to recognized high school learning experiences, measuring what students are able to do with what they have learned in school. The ACT is the most widely accepted and used test by postsecondary institutions across the United States for college admission and course placement.

ACT National Curriculum Survey®. Every three to four years, ACT conducts its National Curriculum Survey, in which we ask more than 20,000 educators nationwide across grades 7–14 to identify the knowledge and skills that are important for students to know to be ready for college-level work. We also examine the standards for instruction in grades 7–12 for all states. We then analyze the information to refine the scope and sequence for each section of the ACT. In this way, rather than imposing a test construct without empirical support, the ACT is able to represent a consensus among educators and curriculum experts about what is important for students to know and be able to do. ACT also uses these data to identify and define for educators and policymakers the content and skill alignment gaps that currently exist in the important transition from high school to college. For example, the most recent ACT National Curriculum Survey revealed that what postsecondary instructors expect entering college students to know is far more targeted and specific than what high school teachers view as important.
**ACT's College Readiness Benchmarks.** Benchmarks are scores on the ACT subject area tests that represent the level of achievement required for students to have a 50% chance of obtaining a B or higher or about a 75% chance of obtaining a C or higher in corresponding credit-bearing first-year college courses. These college courses include English Composition, College Algebra, Biology, and an introductory social science course. Based on a nationally representative sample, the Benchmarks are median course placement values for these institutions and as such represent a *typical* set of expectations. The ACT College Readiness Benchmarks are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Course</th>
<th>Subject Area Test</th>
<th>EXPLORE Benchmark</th>
<th>PLAN Benchmark</th>
<th>ACT Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Algebra</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACT’s College Readiness Standards™ are precise descriptions of the essential skills and knowledge that students need to become ready for college and career, beginning in grade 8 and continuing through grade 12. Informed by the ACT National Curriculum Survey, the College Readiness Standards are validated by actual student academic performance data through their alignment with the College Readiness Benchmarks. With the Benchmarks, the College Readiness Standards represent a single academic expectation for all students, regardless of whether they go on to college or career after high school.

Career Fields and Projected Job Openings. Data on the 2010–2020 projected job openings come from the US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. The following are example occupations for the five highest-growth career fields, nationally:

- Education—secondary school teachers, secondary school administrators
- Computer/Information Specialties—computer programmers, database administrators
- Community Services—social workers, school counselors
- Management—hotel/restaurant managers, convention planners
- Marketing/Sales—insurance agents, buyers

For more information on interpreting data in this report, or to learn how ACT can help your students increase their readiness for college and the workplace, go to www.act.org/readiness/2012.
ACT Research

As a not-for-profit educational research organization, ACT is committed to producing research that focuses on key issues in education and workforce development. Our goal is to serve as an information resource. We strive to provide policymakers with the insight they need to inform education and workforce development policy and to give educators the tools they need to lead more students toward college and career success. What follows are some of ACT’s recent and most groundbreaking research studies. To review these studies, go to www.act.org/research/summary.

The 20 Non-Negotiable Characteristics of Higher Performing School Systems
Discover the 20 hard-hitting characteristics that make school systems successful at preparing students for college and careers.

A Better Measure of Skills Gaps
This report proposes a simple definition to describe the increasing mismatch between labor market supply and demand in America and sets forth detailed and specific measures to analyze skills gaps in four major industry sectors.

The Core Practice Framework: A Guide to Sustained School Improvement
This report provides an overview of the Core Practice Framework, an evidence-based approach schools or districts can use to develop a long-term and systemic strategy for improving student performance.
A First Look at the Common Core and College and Career Readiness
Forty-five states have adopted the Common Core State Standards. Now, efforts to implement the standards take on primary importance. ACT provides this first look at student performance relative to the Common Core State Standards and college and career readiness.

The Forgotten Middle
This report examines the factors that influence college and career readiness. The percentage of 8th graders on target to be ready for college-level work by the time they graduate from high school is so small that it raises questions not just about the prospect that these students can eventually be ready for college and career but also about whether they are even ready for high school.

Implementing the Common Core State Standards:
Progress at Higher-Performing High Schools
This one-page information brief provides results of a fall 2011 study that surveyed teachers and administrators from higher performing high schools and assessed the timeline for key implementation tasks for the Common Core State Standards.
ACT is an independent, not-for-profit organization that provides assessment, research, information, and program management services in the broad areas of education and workforce development. Each year, we serve millions of people in high schools, colleges, professional associations, businesses, and government agencies, nationally and internationally. Though designed to meet a wide array of needs, all ACT programs and services have one guiding purpose—helping people achieve education and workplace success.

A copy of this report can be found at www.act.org/readiness/2012
Career/Technical Education Statistics Website Updated

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) within the Institute of Education Sciences has updated the Career/Technical Education (CTE) Statistics website.

The CTE Statistics website includes tables describing CTE at three levels: (1) secondary/high school CTE, (2) postsecondary/college career education, and (3) adult education for work. These tables are updated periodically to incorporate new CTE-related topics and data from new surveys. In this update, two tables were added to the secondary/high school tables, with one table updating information on CTE high schools as of school year 2007-08, and one new table summarizing CTE teachers’ perceptions of and satisfaction with their jobs. Six tables were added to the postsecondary/college tables, replacing tables on student persistence and attainment as of 2001 with updated tables on persistence, attainment, and labor market outcomes as of 2009.

To view the CTE site, please visit:
http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ctes/
NCES Releases New Data on Postsecondary Enrollment, Graduation Rates, and Student Financial Aid

By extending the time students were tracked for program completion from within 100 percent of normal time to within 200 percent of normal time, graduation rates for undergraduates who were full-time, first-time students in 2007 increased from 21 percent to 37 percent at 2-year institutions and from 46 percent to 69 percent at less-than-2-year institutions, according to new data released by the National Center for Education Statistics. *Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2011; Financial Statistics, Fiscal Year 2011; and Graduation Rates, Selected Cohorts, 2003-2008* presents preliminary findings from the spring 2012 data collection of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) from the National Center for Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences.

Other findings include:

- In fall 2011, Title IV institutions enrolled 18.6 million undergraduate and 2.9 million graduate students. Of the 18.6 million undergraduates, 57 percent were enrolled in 4-year institutions, 41 percent in 2-year institutions, and 2 percent in less-than-2-year institutions.

- In fiscal year 2011, public 4-year institutions and administrative offices received 19 percent of their revenues from tuition and fees, compared with 29 percent at private nonprofit entities and 90 percent at private for-profit entities. Additionally, 29 percent of expenses at public 4-year entities were for instruction, compared with 42 percent at public 2-year entities and 54 percent at public less-than-2-year entities.

- Approximately 59 percent of full-time, first-time students at 4-year institutions in 2005 who were seeking a bachelor’s or equivalent degree completed a bachelor’s or equivalent degree within 6 years at the institution where they began their studies.

NCES releases national and state revenues and expenditures for public elementary and secondary education for School Year 2009-10 (FY 10)

Current expenditures per pupil for public elementary and secondary education were $10,652 on a national level in FY 10. Adjusting for inflation, per pupil state and local revenues decreased by 1 percent or more in 35 states and increased by 1 percent or more in 9 states from FY 09 to FY 10. Per pupil current expenditures decreased by 1 percent or more in 16 states and increased by 1 percent or more in 23 states from FY 09 to FY 10.

State and local governments provided $521.5 billion, or 87.3 percent of all revenues; and the federal government contributed $76.0 billion or 12.7 percent of all revenues. Adjusted for inflation, local revenues remained level, state revenues decreased by 7.7 percent, and federal revenues increased by 24.6 percent for FY 10 compared to FY 09.

This First Look report presents state-level data on revenues by source and expenditures by function for public elementary and secondary education for school year 2009-10. State education agencies in the 50 states and the District of Columbia provide the data to the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.

To view the full report please visit

...CONNECTING RESEARCH, POLICY AND PRACTICE
Comprehensive Center Evaluation RFP to be released end of November 2012

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) intends to award a contract to evaluate the Comprehensive Center Technical Assistance Program. The contract will provide a formative and summative evaluation of the Centers to explore the nature, quantity, quality, relevance, and utility of the Comprehensive Centers' services and products. The anticipated timeframe for release of Request for Proposals (RFP) is the end of November 2012. More details can be found at the following link:

http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ccp.asp
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Request for Proposals for the Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

On November 30, 2012, the U.S. Department of Education released the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers. The contract will be administered by the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) within the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). The evaluation will have two main objectives: (1) to provide ongoing feedback to the Department and to the Comprehensive Centers in order for the Centers to adjust plans and improve their ability to enhance state capacity and meet intended outcomes throughout the grant period; and (2) to provide information on the overall quality, relevance, and usefulness of Comprehensive Centers’ work in order to advance knowledge on effective ways in which to build state capacity. These objectives will be achieved through a 5-year study that includes formative and summative evaluation components. Proposals are due January 3, 2013.

More details can be found at the following link:
http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ccp.asp
NCES Releases New Data on Postsecondary Enrollment, Graduation Rates, and Student Financial Aid

By extending the time students were tracked for program completion from within 100 percent of normal time to within 200 percent of normal time, graduation rates for undergraduates who were full-time, first-time students in 2007 increased from 21 percent to 37 percent at 2-year institutions and from 46 percent to 69 percent at less-than-2-year institutions, according to new data released by the National Center for Education Statistics. *Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2011; Financial Statistics, Fiscal Year 2011; and Graduation Rates, Selected Cohorts, 2003-2008* presents preliminary findings from the spring 2012 data collection of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) from the National Center for Education Statistics within the Institute of Education Sciences.

Other findings include:

- In fall 2011, Title IV institutions enrolled 18.6 million undergraduate and 2.9 million graduate students. Of the 18.6 million undergraduates, 57 percent were enrolled in 4-year institutions, 41 percent in 2-year institutions, and 2 percent in less-than-2-year institutions.

- In fiscal year 2011, public 4-year institutions and administrative offices received 19 percent of their revenues from tuition and fees, compared with 29 percent at private nonprofit entities and 90 percent at private for-profit entities. Additionally, 29 percent of expenses at public 4-year entities were for instruction, compared with 42 percent at public 2-year entities and 54 percent at public less-than-2-year entities.

- Approximately 59 percent of full-time, first-time students at 4-year institutions in 2005 who were seeking a bachelor’s or equivalent degree completed a bachelor’s or equivalent degree within 6 years at the institution where they began their studies.

New TIMSS 2011 Highlights Report Compares U.S. Students with Their Peers Around the World

This report from the National Center for Education Statistics summarizes the performance of U.S. fourth- and eighth-grade students on the 2011 Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), comparing their scores with their peers internationally as well as documenting changes in mathematics and science achievement since 1995. The report also describes additional details about the achievement of students within the United States, by sex, racial/ethnic background, and the poverty level of the schools they attend. It also include state-level results for public school students in Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and North Carolina.

TIMSS is sponsored by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), an international organization of national research institutions and governmental research agencies. TIMSS has been administered five times: 1995, 1999, 2003, 2007, and 2011. The United States participated in all five administrations. In 2011, 54 countries and 20 other education systems (including the 9 U.S. states) participated at grade 4 or 8, or both.

The TIMSS 2011 Highlights Report is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.

To view the full report please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013009
New PIRLS 2011 Highlights Report Compares U.S. Students with Their Peers Around the World

This report from the National Center for Education Statistics summarizes the performance of U.S. fourth-grade students on the 2011 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), comparing their scores with their peers internationally as well as documenting changes in reading achievement since 2001. The report also describes additional details about the achievement of students within the United States, by sex, racial/ethnic background, and the poverty level of the schools they attend. It also includes state-level results for public school students in Florida.

PIRLS is sponsored by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), an international organization of national research institutions and governmental research agencies. PIRLS has been administered three times: 2001, 2006, and 2011. The United States participated in all three administrations. In 2011, 40 countries and 13 other education systems (including the 1 U.S. state) participated at grade 4.

Results show that the 2011 average reading scores of U.S. fourth-grade students were higher than the PIRLS scale average. The average U.S. reading score was among the top 13 education systems (5 education systems had higher averages and 7 were not measurably different). The United States average was higher than 40 education systems. The 5 education systems with average scores above the U.S. average were Hong Kong-CHN, Florida-USA, the Russian Federation, Finland, and Singapore. Compared with 2001, the U.S. average score was 14 points higher in 2011. Also, compared with 2006, the U.S. average score was 16 points higher in 2011.

The PIRLS 2011 Highlights Report is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.

To view the full report please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013010
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IES Director John Q. Easton announced that Thomas W. Brock, nationally known for conducting rigorous evaluations and using mixed methods to understand community college reforms and other programs, has been named Commissioner of the National Center for Education Research (NCER), effective January 14, 2013.

“I am pleased to have Tom join the IES senior leadership team as the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Research,” Easton said. “His breadth of research knowledge and his experience in the postsecondary realm will serve IES well as we continue to advance and support top-notch research aimed at finding solutions to important education problems. The other Center commissioners and I look forward to working closely with Tom.”

Brock comes to IES from MDRC, where he most recently served as director of the Young Adults and Postsecondary Education Division, leading MDRC’s higher education projects focused primarily on finding ways to increase academic achievement, persistence, and completion among low-income college students.

NCER, one of four centers in the Institute of Education Sciences, supports rigorous research to meet the most critical challenges faced by the nation’s education practitioners and policymakers. The center also funds pre-doctoral and post-doctoral research training programs for the next generation of education scientists and researchers. Brock will take over from Elizabeth Albro, NCER Associate Commissioner, who has ably served as Acting Commissioner since the summer of 2011.

Click here to learn more about Thomas W. Brock: http://ies.ed.gov/ncer/aboutus/
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NCES Releases New State-Level Data on the State Education Reforms Website

New state-level data on high school exit exams, college entrance and college- and career-readiness assessments, as well as state efforts to support college- and career-readiness standards, are now available on the State Education Reforms website. The State Education Reforms website, which draws primarily on data collected by organizations other than NCES, compiles and disseminates data on state-level education reform efforts in five areas:

1. Accountability
2. Assessment and standards
3. Staff qualifications and development
4. State support for school choice and other options
5. Student readiness and progress through school

The “Assessment and Standards” section of the site had two tables updated and one table added. Two tables were updated in the “Student Readiness and Progress Through School” section. These tables can be easily located by the “Updated!” and “New!” tags next to the able titles.

To view the site, please visit: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/statereform/

The State Education Reforms website is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.
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A new report from NCES looks at what kinds of students take remedial courses, and what kinds of institutions offer remedial courses more often. This Statistics in Brief, First-year Undergraduate Remedial Coursetaking: 1999-2000, 2003-04, and 2007-08, uses data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) to measure the frequency and change of remedial coursetaking in U.S. postsecondary institutions. The results show that remedial coursetaking dropped significantly for nearly every school and student characteristic from 1999-2000 to 2003-04, but rose from 2003-04 to 2007-08 for many of the characteristics that had previously experienced a drop.

Key findings include:

- Overall, the percentage of first-year undergraduate students who reported enrollment in remedial coursework was significantly lower in 2003-04 compared to 1999-2000. However, from 2003-04 to 2007-08, the percentage of students who reported they enrolled in remedial coursework rose by approximately one percentage point. Nonetheless, there was a net drop in the overall percentage of first-year undergraduate students who reported enrollment in remedial courses from 1999-2000 to 2007-08.

- Within each year, lower percentages of White students reported taking remedial courses compared to Black and Hispanic students.

This Statistics in Brief report is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.

To view the full report please visit:

To view the site, please visit:
http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/npsas/
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You have received this message because you subscribed to a newsflash service through IES or one of its centers. Change your options or unsubscribe from this service.

By visiting Newsflash you may also sign up to receive information from IES and its four Centers NCES, NCER, NCEE, & NCSER to stay abreast of all activities within the Institute of Education Sciences (IES).

To obtain hard copy of many IES products as well as hard copy and electronic versions of hundreds of other U.S. Department of Education products please visit http://www.edpubs.org or call 1-877-433-7827 (877-4-EDPUBS).
NCES releases Projections of Education Statistics to 2021 with data on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and expenditures

Today, the National Center for Education Statistics released Projections of Education Statistics to 2021. Postsecondary enrollment rose by 46 percent between 1996 and 2010, and is projected to increase another 15 percent by 2021. The Projections of Education Statistics to 2021 provides national-level data on enrollment, teachers, high school graduates, and expenditures at the elementary and secondary school level and enrollment and earned degrees at the postsecondary level for the past 14 years and projections to the year 2021. This is the 40th edition of a publication first initiated in 1964.

Other findings include:

- Enrollment in elementary and secondary schools rose 6 percent between 1996 and 2010 and is projected to increase an additional 7 percent between 2010 and 2021.

- Reflecting actual and projected changes in the high school-age population, the number of high school graduates increased by 28 percent between 1996-97 and 2008-09, and an increase of 2 percent is projected by 2021-22.

- After adjusting for inflation, current expenditure per pupil increased by 32 percent between 1996-97 and 2008-09, and a further increase of 15 percent is projected by 2021-22.

This compendium is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.

To view the full report please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubinfo.asp?pubid=2013008
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Personal Reflections
### Factors Influencing the Founding of PESC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y2K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The advent of the new millennium created a fear that systems may be compromised when the year 1999 rolled over into 2000. In preparing for Y2K, a global awareness emerged of “COBOL” and the importance of data and standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronic Transcripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Electronic data exchange in the admissions and registrar functions (transcripts, test score, admissions application, etc.) were in the process of being developed and deployed through a partnership between AACRAO, CCSSO and NCES. Benefits of standardization were being realized and other sectors of higher education were interested in realizing benefits as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FDSLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The launch of the Federal Direct Student Loan Program (FDSL) in 1993 by the U.S. Department of Education as mandated by the U.S. Congress through Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which circumvented all bank and other private involvement in the loan process, introduced a single standard and banks found themselves needing to respond with standards as well to remain competitive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project EASI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- The U.S. Department of Education launched its Project EASI (Easy Access for Students and Institutions) “modernization” effort to reengineer their convoluted and disparate thirteen stovepipe systems. Maintenance and development costs for those systems were increasing exponentially; yet accessing those systems was difficult and obtaining accurate and reliable data took weeks and sometimes months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA)

Section 12 of the NTTAA, passed in 1995, states that “all Federal agencies and departments shall use technical standards that are developed or adopted by voluntary consensus standards bodies.”

OMB Circular NO. A-119

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued in 1998 Circular NO. A-119 which provides guidance for agencies participating in voluntary consensus standards bodies and procedures for satisfying the reporting requirements of NTTAA.

Section 143 of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Language was added in 1998 which directs the Secretary of Education and the COO [of Federal Student Aid within the U.S. Department of Education] to “encourage and participate in the establishment of voluntary consensus standards and requirements for the electronic transmission of information necessary for the administration of programs.”
The Standards Council is Founded

1992
EDI

1997
SC Founded**

1998
Bylaws Adopted

1999
1st Best Practices Competition

1999
1st Annual Conference
White Papers Issued*

1999
ANSI-X12-A Education Formed

1999
Articles of Incorporation

* PKI, XML & Student Identifiers
** AACRAO, ACT, Brigham Young University, Educause, Citibank, COHEAO, Datatel, EFC, ETS, Harbinger-Supply Tech, KPMG, Law School Admission Council, NACUBO, NASFAA, NCHelp, New York University, Pearson, Sallie Mae, Sungard SCT, SLSA, University of Oklahoma, University of Texas at Austin, U.S. Department of Education
PESC Stabilizes

- 2004: State of E-Authentication Assembly
- 2003: Technical Specification Released
- 2003: 1st Annual Conference*
- 2003: Independence from AACRAO
- 2002: Membership Enhanced
- 2002: Infrastructure Enhanced
- 2000: XML Forum

* Financial Aid
PESC Grows

- 2004: 1st Standard: College Transcript, ANSI X12 A, Dissolved
- 2006: DQC
- 2007: SIFA
- 2008: RS3G, 1st User Group: Education Record
- 2008: 1st Task Force: EdUnify
- 2009:
PESC Income and Expense

In Thousands

FY (July 1 - June 30)

Revenue
Expense
## Lost Membership Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Group</th>
<th>NASFAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford University</td>
<td>NCASI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avow Systems</td>
<td>NCHELP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>NELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Nelnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td>Neumann College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Academic</td>
<td>Ohio Board of Regents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPMorgan Chase Bank</td>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citibank</td>
<td>Pennsylvania College of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton State University</td>
<td>Prairie View A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHEAO</td>
<td>redLantern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Source</td>
<td>Regent Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>Sallie Mae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdFinancial</td>
<td>SLSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFC</td>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Marblehead</td>
<td>Triand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyland Software</td>
<td>Unisolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAPP</td>
<td>University of Alaska System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Bank</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just IQ</td>
<td>US General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School Admission Council</td>
<td>Wachovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Your Future</td>
<td>Vangent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACUBO</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PESC’s Reach

PESC Approved Standards
- Admission Application
- College Transcript
- Education Test Score Reporting
- High School Transcript
- IPEDS
- PDF Attachment
- Student Aid

Workgroups
- Academic ePortfolio
- Course Inventory
- Recruitment & Enrollment
- Student Loan Data Reporting

Task Forces
- eAuthentication/eAuthorization (EA2) Task Force
- Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force

User Groups
- Canadian PESC User Group
- CEDS User Group
- Education Record User Group
- Student Aid User Group
Building Relationships

- **ADL** – Advanced Distributed Learning (DoD)
- **ARUCC** – Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada
- **CCSSO** – Council of Chief State School Officers
- **Educause**
- **HR-XML**
- **IMS Global Learning Consortium**
- **Kuali Foundation**
- **Medbiquitous**
- **NIEM** – National Information Exchange Model
- **OET** – Office of Educational Technology
- **OPEPD** – Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development
- **SLI** – Shared Learning Infrastructure
Unifying the Education Domain Around Interoperability to Improve Student Achievement

Multiple Access Points to the Network → FEDERATED ACCESS or SINGLE SIGN-ON

EA2 Task Force in partnership with Internet2/InCommon

Standards to Transport over the Network → COMMON DATA STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT & MAINTENANCE

PESC Standards Forum for Education

Mechanism for Exchange over the Network → COMMON DIRECTORY for WEB SERVICES & EXCHANGE

PESC Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force
# PESC 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premier Partner</td>
<td>• NASLA, National Student Clearinghouse, Parchment, SCRIPSAFE, USA Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Membership Category</td>
<td>• For schools or local education agencies (LEA’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common IP</td>
<td>• Standardize IP across standards organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent User Groups</td>
<td>• Long-term sustainable governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited PESC Memberships</td>
<td>• Member outreach to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Expand Implementations        | • Student Aid  
• Transcripts |
| Technical Standardization     | • NIEM |
P20W Education Standards Council

PESC
1997 15 2012
SAVE THE DATE

SPRING 2013 DATA SUMMIT

MAY 1–3, 2013
San Diego CA | Omni Hotel
$199 “PESC”
(Hotel Cutoff: 4/1/13)

FALL 2013 DATA SUMMIT

OCTOBER 1–3, 2013
Palm Beach FL | Four Seasons
$199 “PESC”
(Hotel Cutoff: 8/30/13)