Fall 2008 Member Summit

Plans for our Fall 2008 Member Summit are well underway. We'll be meeting at the Hyatt Regency in Crystal City on Monday and Tuesday October 6 - 7, 2008.

The tentative schedule is on page 4 and includes meetings of: the Steering Committee of the Standards Forum for Education, the Change Control Board (CCB), the Technical Advisory Board (TAB), the EA2 Task Force, the Seal of Approval Group, and the PESC Board of Directors. Additionally, PESC is launching a USER GROUP for Transcript Processing and a PDF Transcript Workgroup.

For the Transcript User Group, Members are encouraged to submit issues, problems, and requested enhancements to the PESC office prior to the Summit. All issues will be compiled and then presented to the User Group for review. All issues from the high school, college, XML and EDI transcripts are welcome.

User Groups will serve as the development vehicles for future releases once a standards (v 1.0) has been established. PESC is pleased to offer participation in User Groups free of charge for Members of PESC. Non-members interested in participating should contact PESC Executive Director Michael Sessa at 202.261.6516 or at michael.sessa@pesc.org.

New PESC Member Dues

PESC is pleased to announce its new membership dues schedule effective July 1, 2008. Colleges, universities, and smaller-sized software and service providers will see a small decrease in dues while larger commercial organizations will experience a small increase in dues. PESC attempts to keep the cost of dues as minimal as possible and compared to other similar standards-setting bodies, maintains a very competitive dues schedule.

Whether your organization wants to be part of the development and decision-making process or looks to use the standards being developed, there's a role for your organization in PESC. Benefits of standards and of being a member in PESC include:
Dues, from Page 1

For Service Providers
- Reduced cost
- Simplified integration
- ROI
- Reliability
- Voice at the table
- Influence on how standards get built

Software Providers
- One interface
- Cost/benefit
- On top of what’s going on in the industry
- Costs of not participating
- Enhanced services to customer
- Lower TCO over prospect
- Long term investment
- Cost savings/ROI
- Delivering value
- Brand/marketing recognition

States
- Costs savings
- Degree completion/completion rates
- Economic Development
- Transfer and retention w/in the state
- Transition from high school to college
- Unit record systems
- Graduating in time
- Workforce development
- Data quality
- Performance and accountability

Colleges/Universities
- Cost savings
- Voice in the process
- Influence in how standards get built
- Time savings

- Alignment with industry
- Streamlined processes
- Risk aversion
- Coordination of activities
- Competitive advantage
- Ability to compare
- Time to degree

Join PESC now! Review our dues and benefits online at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=84 or complete the forms on page 6 to join.

Summit, from Page 2

Registration for the Summit is available by completing the registration form on page 5 and submitting it along with a check for $150 (for Members).

PESC Member Summit
October 6 - 7, 2008
Hyatt Regency Crystal City

Group Name: Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council - PESC

Group Rate: $189 single/double

Hotel Cut-Off: September 13, 2008

Phone: 703 418 1234

Address: Hyatt Regency Crystal City at Reagan National Airport
2799 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia, USA 22202
The Minnesota state college system recently launched an Accountability Dashboard. The service is based on a Web site that displays a series of measures-tuition rates, graduates' employment rates, condition of facilities—that use speedometer-type gauges to show exactly how the Minnesota system and each of its individual colleges is performing. For more information, visit http://www.mnscu.edu/board/accountability/index.html.

OASIS announced that Laurent Liscia became the new OASIS Executive Director, effective June 23, 2008. Laurent has more than 12 years experience as CEO or COO of various IT companies. He speaks English, French, Spanish, and Italian. He holds a doctorate from the Sorbonne University and has worked in France, Canada, Italy, Ecuador, Morocco and the United States. He holds dual US and European citizenship, and currently lives in the San Francisco Bay Area of California.

The OASIS international standards consortium recently announced a new XML.org online community web site dedicated to supporting the Security Assertion Markup Language (SAML). The site (http://saml.xml.org) will serve as the official information resource for the SAML OASIS Standard.

Liberty has announced the first public release of the protocol independent Liberty Identity Assurance Framework (IAF). The IAF details four identity assurance levels to ease and speed the process of linking trusted identity-enabled enterprise, social networking and Web 2.0 applications together based on standardized business rules and security risks associated with each level of identity assurance. Liberty Alliance will launch an IAF identity assurance accreditation and certification program during 3Q 08. http://www.projectliberty.org/liberty/news_events/press_releases/liberty_alliance_releases_identity_assurance_framework.

EDI Data Exchange Statistics
June 2008 - UT Austin Server

Total Transcript: 102,280
Total Admission Application: 85,752
Total Test Score: 22,479
Total Transcript Request: 17,801
Total Acknowledgement: 46,624
Total Functional Acknowledgment: 28,532
Total transaction sets: 302,390
## Fall 2008 PESC Member Summit
### Washington DC
### October 6 – 7, 2008

### Sunday October 5, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am - 5:00 pm</td>
<td>SPEEDE Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monday October 6, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am - 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am - 8:30 am</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am - 10:00 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Transcript USER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Steering Committee Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Board Subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am - 10:15 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am - 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Transcript USER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Steering Committee Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Board Subcommittee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm - 1:30 pm</td>
<td>Lunch on Your Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 pm - 3:00 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Transcript USER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change Control Board (CCB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm - 3:15 pm</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 pm - 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Transcript USER GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technical Advisory Board (TAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30 pm - 6:30 pm</td>
<td>PESC Member Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tuesday October 7, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am - 5:00 pm</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 am - 8:30 am</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am - 10:00 am</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PDF Transcript Workgroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EA2 Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am - 10:15 am</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 am - 12:00 pm</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. PDF Transcript Workgroup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seal of Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Registration Form

Attendee Full Name

Title and Organization

Street Address

City, State and Zip

Phone    Fax    E-mail Address

REGISTRATION FEE

☐ $150  PESC Member

☐ $350  Non Member

Please complete this form and send it along with a check payable to:

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

To pay by credit card, please contact Jennifer Kim, Membership Services Manager, at 202-261-6514.
Greetings from PESC!

On behalf of the Board of Directors, I am pleased to provide you with PESC's 2008 Membership brochure.

PESC is working to become the voice for the efficient, qualitative, and secure exchange of student data from initial access of the student from high school into the college environment through to completion of one or more degrees from multiple colleges and universities.

PESC drives data systems alignment across sectors and the elimination of incompatible interfaces and processes that present barriers to students and that inflate costs for public and private institutions struggling to keep up with the demands of technology and real-time data exchange while maintaining competitive tuition rates.

PESC's strength is derived from the actions and involvement of its membership and collaborating within the higher education community continues to bring us closer to our mutual goals. By joining PESC, you join the rest of the technology and standards community in this mission.

Please review this brochure and return all completed forms and information. If you have questions or concerns, please contact Jennifer Kim, Membership Services Manager, at 202-261-6514 or at Jennifer.Kim@PESC.org.

Sincerely,

Michael Sessa

Michael D. Sessa
Executive Director
Membership Benefits
Valid through June 30, 2009

- Unlimited, active participation available in:
  - all PESC User Groups
  - all national, standards-setting development initiatives
  - the PESC Standards Forum for Education and all PESC workgroups

- Organizational representatives are qualified to serve:
  - as Chair of initiatives and/or workgroups
  - on the Steering Committee of the Standards Forum for Education
  - on the Board of Directors

- Right to vote on:
  - issues proposed by the Membership
  - changes to PESC by-laws
  - elections of the Steering Committee of the Standards Forum for Education
  - elections of the Board of Directors

- Eligible to:
  - propose workgroup topics to the Board of Directors for standards development and/or research
  - submit articles & press releases for inclusion in PESC’s monthly newsletter “The Standard”

- Discounted rates:
  - at PESC meetings & conferences
  - for Seal of Approval Program

- Free access to all PESC conference calls

- Linked as a Member on PESC website [with a link to your website], in certain publications, and in promotional materials

- Networking and collaboration with other Membership organizations that support data exchange standardization
Association “Umbrella” Policy

For associations that are members of PESC, payment of dues enables both unlimited staff participation in PESC and extension of PESC member benefits to its membership as well. The first five (5) representatives from an association’s membership can participate at no extra charge. After five (5), a $500 per person fee is assessed. Associations are required to identify and submit the names and contact information for those representatives designated under the umbrella policy on an annual basis. As the association is the member though, official voting remains the sole responsibility of the association.

Referral discounts

For existing members that refer new members, PESC will reduce the existing member’s membership fee by 25% to a maximum of $2,000. The discount is provided once, at the time the new member joins PESC.

Membership Sponsors

Please note that members and affiliates may pay the membership costs for another organization. Such sponsorships are important for those organizations, especially colleges and universities, that have a vested interest in joining PESC but have budgetary restrictions.
2008 Membership Form

Organization Name

Organization Website Address

Voting Member (or Official Contact) Name and Title

Street Address

City, State and Zip

Phone     Fax    E-mail Address

Membership Category

☐ Member
☐ Affiliate

Organizational Type

☐ College or University
☐ Non-Profit Association
☐ Non-Profit Organization
☐ State Government Agency
☐ Bank, Lender, or Servicer
☐ Commercial Organization
☐ Federal Government Agency

Membership Fee

$ ____________

Refer to Fee Structure on Following Page

Referring Organization
(if any)

__________

Signature    Name (please print)    Date

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 TIN#: 52-2179499
## Membership Dues

Valid through June 30, 2009

### College or University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Campuses</th>
<th>Dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 campus</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 10 campuses</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+ campuses</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Profit Association

- Dues $5,000

### Non-Profit Organization with Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues Range</th>
<th>Dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10 million</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 million ≤ $100 million</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 million +</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Government Agency

- Dues $5,500

### Bank, Lender, or Servicer

- Dues $10,000

### Commercial Organization with Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues Range</th>
<th>Dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$1 million</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 million ≤ $10 million</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 million ≤ $100 million</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 million +</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Federal Government Agency

- Dues $20,000
Who We Are

Established in 1997 and located in Washington, D.C., the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC) is a non-profit, community-based, umbrella association of colleges and universities; professional and commercial organizations; data, software and service providers; and state and federal government agencies.

Our Mission

PESC’s mission is to lead the establishment and adoption of data exchange standards in education. The goals of the mission are to enable the improvement of institutional performance and foster collaboration across educational communities in order to lower costs, improve service, and attain system interoperability.

Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20036
+1.202.261.6516 phone
+1.202.261.6517 fax
Info@PESC.org
Public Comments and Responses
Common Origination & Disbursement (COD)
June 20, 2008

Common Origination & Disbursement [COD] is a streamlined method for processing, storing, and reconciling Academic Competitiveness Grant [ACG], National Science and Mathematics Access To Retain Talent Grant [National SMART Grant], Federal Pell Grant [Pell Grant], and William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan [Direct Loan] financial aid data with the U.S. Department of Education.

Schools, third party servicers, and software developers can obtain information about current production issues, news, and COD System functionality through various channels such as the COD Web site and the IFAP Web site. To view Frequently Asked Questions about COD, click here.

On January 23, 2008, Federal Student Aid (FSA) of the U.S. Department of Education notified the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC) that it wished to submit COD as a PESC approved standard.

With the development work completed and submitted on May 22, 2008, the COD specification was made available for public comment. The complete submission was posted at www.PESC.org and the thirty (30) calendar day public comment period began on Thursday May 22, 2008. Public comment period expired at the close of business on Friday June 20, 2008.

Within 30 calendar days after the close of the public comment period, the Change Control Board (CCB) of the Standards Forum for Education will address and consider all public comments and make, in consultation with FSA any necessary revisions. All public comments will be posted to the PESC website during the review process. The CCB's consideration/revision period expires on Monday July 21, 2008 unless extenuating circumstances exist which require further deliberation.

When public comments have been successfully addressed, COD is then presented to the PESC Members for a Vote of Approval. The voting period for PESC Members is 10 business days.

Public Comment 1

Issue: The hierarchy of:

Reporting School
   Attended School
      Student
The above hierarchy implies that Attended Schools are unique within Reporting Schools and that Students are unique only within Reporting and Attended Schools. Each Reporting and Attended school should establish their own student identifiers and other Reporting and Attended schools would not affect them.

Reason: Actually, the Student identifier is unique at COD. One school can establish a student’s identifier and another school can change this identifier. This can cause the original school’s submitted records to be rejected because COD changed the student’s identifier.

Proposed Solution: Have the Student be the highest block and have reporting and attended Schools be elements within the student. This would make it clear that the student identifier transcended all schools and would match the underlying COD database.

Response:

Public Comment 2

Issue: Generating the summary block is difficult to develop, and time consuming to maintain. There is no benefit derived from having it. Some would argue that this is an additional verification check to make sure the data is correct. However, this is like requesting a spreadsheet and requiring the sender to put a calculated cell at the end that sums up all the cells, and then using this as verification.

Reason: Others would argue that summary block is to make sure that the entire file is received. However, since this is an XML document one can be assured that if they received the document they received the entire document.

Proposed Solution: Eliminate the summary block. (Or at least make it optional). This would increase performance and reduce complexity.

Response:

Public Comment 3

Issue: COD will not accept an actual disbursement unless the disbursement sequence number is one higher than the sequence number they have on file. This makes it difficult to keep systems in sync. And once the systems get out of sync it is very difficult to get them back in sync. The use of the Disbursement Sequence Number makes it very risky to send additional data if the response from the previous send is not received and processed, because any rejected disbursement will cause all subsequent disbursements to be rejected until the disbursement sequence number is back in sync.

Reason: Also with the Disbursement Sequence Number, when a change, which generates the next disbursement sequence number, is made on the COD web site then the school’s system’s sequence number is no longer in sync with COD’s sequence number.
Proposed Solution: Eliminate the Disbursement Sequence Number. Since any submitted disbursement represents the current state of the disbursement, any system that does not contain the same data as COD could send the new data and not have to determine what Disbursement Sequence Number to use. If necessary a Date and Time field could be put on the disbursement to identify which record is more recent.

Response:

Public Comment 4

Issue: Whenever funds are given to a student, a new disbursement number is to be used to record this. Currently COD only allows 20 disbursement numbers for a Direct Lending Loan. With a school's system that integrates Financial Aid, Student registration, Accounts Receivable, and General Ledger, the funds given to a student is very volatile.

Reason: Even though a school may schedule only 4 or 5 disbursements on a loan, the actual disbursements can easily exceed the 20 limit.

Proposed Solution: Increase the disbursement number field for 2 digits to 3 digits which will increase the limit to accommodate a volatile student.

Response:

Public Comment 5

Issue: The use of Routing ID is very beneficial. However, there are still fields in the XML document that requires the use of additional IDs for schools.

Reason: This increases the difficulty of keeping track of these IDs, and in reconciling school's data.

Proposed Solution: Change the fields that use school IDs other than the Routing ID to use the Routing ID. These include the FinancialAwardIDs of ACG, SMART, TEACH, PELL and Direct Lending loans.

Response:

Public Comment 6

Issue: Many Required fields should be optional if the data has not changed. The XML document is cluttered with data that is not changing and thus makes it more difficult to understand the document.
Reason: Many fields are only included if they are being changed, so seeing a field on a document can indicate that the field is changing. But with so many “exceptions” one is hard pressed to interpret the document.

Proposed Solution: Change some of the required fields to optional, and only required if the data is changing. Some of these fields are:
- The Student’s Address
- The Student’s Dependency Status <DependencyStatusCode>
- The Student’s Citizenship <Citizenship>

Response:

**Public Comment 7**

Issue: The construct of an Award Key to contain shared data between loans and awards of the same student, is confusing, and complex to implement.

Reason: The reduction of repeated data is minimal and not worth the extra complexity.

Proposed Solution: Remove the Award Key structure; just populate the data in the appropriate block. If the data is required to be the same between loans (for example combined loans) then create a block between the student and the loan to contain shared data. This data should then always be located in this new block and be removed from the loan block.

Response:

**Public Comment 8**

Issue: Some fields are use for multiple purposes. Sometimes these purposes clash with each other.

Reason: This prevents schools from being able to create an XML document that conveys all the information that is required.

Example: Field1 – Transaction number. `<CPSTransactionNumber>`

The CPSTransactionNumber is at the award level. This is used to identify the transaction number used by the school to justify the award/loan. This is a proper use of this field. COD also uses this field to validate a student’s identifier. This sometimes creates cross purposes. Sometimes a loan or award is given to a student based on a transaction. The student may have a name change that causes the identifier to change. When this occurs there is no way that the XML document can convey both pieces of information. COD sometimes rejects the record because they use the transaction number on the XML document to valid the person identifier by checking with CPS, and sometime they reject this record because they check the transaction number against the highest transaction number on CPS.
**Proposed Solution:** Use the CPSTransactionNumber at the award level to identify the transaction associated to that award. Add the CPSTransactionNumber at the student level to identify the transaction number used to confirm the student’s identifier with CPS.

**Response:**

**Public Comment 9**

**Issue:** Many of the fields on the schema are redundant with the information on CPS.

**Field 1 –**
- Student Address
- DriversLicenseState
- DriversLicenseNumber

The student’s address, driver’s license number and state are already on the student’s CPS record. COD is already accessing CPS’s database.

**Reason:** Requiring the student address to be sent in on every XML document is unnecessary overhead and requires multiple places for the schools to maintain the student’s address and driver’s license information.

**Proposed Solution:** Remove the student address, driver’s license state, and driver’s license number from the XML document. COD should get this information from CPS.

**Response:**

**Field 2 – Dependency Status <DependencyStatusCode>**

The student’s dependency status is required in the award blocks. The CPS Transaction number is already a required field in that block. The school is using the dependency status on the CPS Transaction number.

**Reason:** So since the school is reporting the CPS transaction number used to support the award/loan, they are required to use the dependency status on that transaction number.

**Proposed Solution:** Remove dependency status from the XML schema. COD should use the CPS Transaction number to get the dependency status.

**Response:**

**Public Comment 10**

**Issue:**

<MPN>
The MPN information is inside the Loan block. This information is not loan specific. When a student submits a valid MPN this affects all existing loans.

Reason: The information within each loan becomes invalid. And updated MPN information that can affect all loans is sent to the school attached to a specific loan. Also COD can and does send schools MPN data inside of a loan block that has no loan ID.

Proposed Solution: Create an MPN block under the student level at the same level as loans and awards. This would represent more accurately how MPNs are to be applied.

Response:
FFEL Business Process and Data Standardization - Project Update
04/01/2008

Project Update:
Since January 7, 2008, Federal Student Aid has conducted eight conference calls with the FFEL community workgroup. Calls are generally conducted weekly. In addition, on March 10, 2008 the FFEL external workgroup met in the Washington D.C. area for an all-day session. During the all-day session, the group broke out into two subgroups to cover a wide range of concepts relating to existing and potential future processes and the corresponding data elements that pertain to the various FFEL program areas throughout the financial aid lifecycle.

Subgroup 1 covered data elements pertaining to the reporting of:
- Interest rates
- Financial awards
- Disbursements
- Cancellations
- Financial award status
- Deferments
- Aging status
- Aid award responsibility changes
- Repayment plans
- Balances
- Capitalized interest
- Guaranty agency collections
- Consolidation

Subgroup 2 covered data element pertaining to the reporting of:
- Master promissory notes
- Lender claims
- Reinsurance
- Assignments
- Guaranty agency forced collections

The subgroups then reconvened to share summaries of their discussions and plan next steps. The groups made significant progress through these discussions, but due to the high number of data elements discussed in the subgroups there are still many data elements that need to be vetted with the entire FFEL workgroup.
The subsequent weekly conference calls, of the FFEL workgroup to be held in April, are dedicated to reviewing the data elements that the individual subgroups approved and to resolve outstanding differences. With a strong foundation set during the all-day session, we anticipate that during the April calls we will make significant progress towards our goal of standardizing FFEL data.

**Current Status:**
To date the workgroup approved 27 data elements. The embedded file presents the data elements approved by the external workgroup as well as the definition, field length (FL) and field type (FT).

![Workgroup Approved Data Elements]

**Comments and responses:**
Questions regarding this report or companion documents referenced above can be directed to DataStrategy@ed.gov.

**Reviewed by:**
All external communication has been reviewed by the communication subgroup of the FFEL Data Standards Workgroup, presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Bennett</td>
<td>Federal Student Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Way</td>
<td>Federal Student Aid Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Putman</td>
<td>NCHELP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Balogh</td>
<td>NCHELP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Draeger</td>
<td>NASFAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: External Communication Subgroup

**Reference Materials:**
Workgroup participant list

![FFEL Data Standards Workgroup_v1.0.doc]

**Revision History:**
Created: April 1, 2008
FFEL Business Process and Data Standardization - Project Update  
05/06/2008

**Project Update:**
Federal Student Aid continues to conduct a series of conference calls with the FFEL community workgroup. Calls are generally conducted weekly. This month the FFEL community workgroup continued to review the data elements discussed in the March 10 in-person meeting. The workgroup made significant progress and approved 17 additional data elements in the month of April.

As a result of some lengthy discussions during the FFEL Data Standards initiative, the workgroup decided to develop subgroups to focus on two specific topics. The first subgroup will focus on payment history and collection data. They will concentrate on Federal Student Aid’s business needs for receiving lender payment and collection histories, guarantors’ ability to provide lender payment history and collection data for loans where claims have been paid, and propose solutions to meet Federal Student Aid’s business needs.

The Payment History Subgroup conducted its first meeting to establish their scope of work, and to review Federal Student Aid’s business needs, the Common Claim Initiative (CCI) and associated data elements. The workgroup reviewed the current requirements for providing payment history during assignment and how the requirements were incorporated into the CCI process that was approved by the Department in December 2005. Subgroup members were asked to follow up with their respective organizations and return with suggestions for achieving the discussed payment history information needs and to determine the most appropriate sources for this information. The next meeting for the Payment History Subgroup will be the week of 5/12.

The second subgroup will concentrate on FFEL lender financial reporting. This subgroup will discuss ways to reduce the burden of lender financial reporting through the collection of aid-level data elements. The first meeting of this subgroup is planned for mid-May.

**Current Status:**
To date the workgroup approved 44 data elements. The embedded file presents the data elements approved by the external workgroup as well as the definition, field length (FL) and field type (FT).
Comments and responses:
Questions regarding this report or companion documents referenced above can be directed to DataStrategy@ed.gov.

Reviewed by:
All external communication has been reviewed by the communication subgroup of the FFEL Data Standards Workgroup, presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
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Project Update:
Federal Student Aid continues to conduct a series of conference calls with the FFEL community workgroup. Calls are generally conducted weekly. This month the FFEL community workgroup continued to review the data elements discussed in the March 10 in-person meeting. The workgroup made significant progress and approved 13 additional data elements in the month of May.

As a result of some lengthy discussions during the FFEL Data Standards initiative, the workgroup decided to develop subgroups to focus on two specific topics. The first subgroup will focus on payment history and collection data. The second subgroup will focus on lender financial reporting. The overall purpose of both subgroups is to work collaboratively with the FFEL Community to meet Federal Student Aid’s business needs (e.g., substantiation) without causing an undue reporting hardship on the FFEL Community. The remainder of this section details the progress and work to date for each of the subgroups.

In May, the Payment History Subgroup conducted its second meeting. The subgroup’s discussions center on Federal Student Aid’s business needs for receiving lender payment and collection histories, guarantors’ ability to provide lender payment history and collection data for assigned loans and propose solutions to meet Federal Student Aid’s business needs. Federal Student Aid’s business need for payment history and collection data at the time of assignment is to substantiate principal and interest amounts outstanding for borrowers with data that is not collected on the assignment form. In the first meeting, subgroup members were asked to follow up with their respective organizations and return with suggestions for achieving the discussed payment history information needs and to determine the most appropriate sources for this information. In the subsequent meeting, the subgroup members reviewed the Common Claim Initiative (CCI) approved by ED on 12/19/2005 as well as the Claim Form. The CCI captures summary-level information provided on the Claim form:

- The total borrower payment amount
- Number of months satisfied by payments
- Capitalized interest
- Total amount applied to principal
- Payments received during due diligence

During the second meeting, the subgroup members brought back a suggestion to provide Federal Student Aid with summary-level information from the CCI when a loan
is assigned and snapshots of pertinent data for lender payment history provided on the Claim form. Additionally, NSLDS or its successor will receive guarantor collection data (e.g., treasury offsets, wage garnishments and voluntary payments) at the aid-level and will pass the collection history to Federal Student Aid’s Debt Collections Group at the time of an assignment request.

The second subgroup is concentrating on FFEL lender financial reporting. This subgroup will discuss ways to:
- Reduce the burden of lender financial reporting through the collection of aid-level data elements;
- Substantiate invoices
- Budget forecasts and expenditures by cohort.

At the end of May the subgroup conducted its first meeting. During the first meeting, the participants reviewed the purpose, objectives and next steps for the subgroup. The group discussed Federal Student Aid’s business needs for capturing lender financial information that is not provided on the LaRS (ED Form 799). Subgroup members were asked to follow up with their respective organizations and return with suggestions in mid-June with a proposed solution that meets the Department of Education’s need to forecast the total cost of a loan. Subsequent meetings will focus on proposed solutions to provide Federal Student Aid with data to substantiate invoices.

**Current Status:**
To date the workgroup approved 57 data elements. The embedded file presents the data elements approved by the external workgroup as well as the definition, field length (FL) and field type (FT).
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**Comments and responses:**
Questions regarding this report or companion documents referenced above can be directed to DataStrategy@ed.gov.
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June 16, 2007

The Honorable David Obey
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
B-300 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Obey:

The organizations below urge you to support the president’s proposed increase of funding for statewide data systems grants through the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) in the FY 2009 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill. In FY 2008, this crucial program was funded at $48.3 million. In his FY 2009 budget proposal, President Bush requested a $51.7 million increase for the statewide data systems grants, which brings funding up to $100 million. In a budget proposal that includes few increases, this request is evidence of the significant support for this investment.

This funding is essential to help states improve student achievement and to meet the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act. When states collect the most relevant data and have the ability to follow individual student records from year to year, they can answer the questions at the core of educational effectiveness. In addition to focusing on individual student improvement, longitudinal data makes it possible to determine the effectiveness and quality of specific schools and programs; measure and report accurate graduation rates; identify consistently high-performing schools so that educators and the public can learn from best practices; and evaluate the effect of teacher preparation and training programs on student achievement.

Unfortunately, according to the Data Quality Campaign, only a few states—Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, and Utah—currently have a data system in place with the necessary elements to be of full use to educators and policymakers. Even these states do not have all of the elements for a truly complete P–16 longitudinal data system. The good news is most states are committed to taking the critical steps to develop a strong, practical system; forty-nine states have applied or sent letters of intent for the IES grants. However, funding limitations have only allowed a little over half of all of the states to receive them. The additional $52 million of support requested by the president would help more states to receive larger awards, enabling them to truly diagnose the problems affecting student learning and then lead students to higher academic achievement.

We know that given the right instruction and opportunity, every child can learn. We hope that you agree that this investment in the future of millions of young Americans is critical to the economic and social future of our country. Please help make this possible by funding the statewide data systems grants at $100 million in FY 2009.

Sincerely,

ACT, Inc.
Alliance for Excellent Education
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Council of Chief State School Officers
Education Commission of the States
Education Trust
Knowledge Alliance
Learning Point Associates
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Center for Educational Achievement
PESC - Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council
Schools Interoperability Framework Association
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA)
State Higher Education Executive Officers