Public Comments and Responses

The 30-day public comment period for the proposed Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, and IPEDS standards expired on May 27, 2009. A number of public comments were received, were posted to the PESC website, and routed to their respective development workgroups and to the Standards Forum for Education’s Change Control Board (CCB) for review, analysis, and response. Now that public comments have been considered and incorporated into the proposed standards, the CCB has recommended to the Standards Forum’s Steering Committee and the PESC Board of Directors that the Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, and IPEDS specifications be submitted to a vote by the PESC members.

In accordance with version 1.0.0 of PESC’s Manual of Policies and Procedures for Standards Development, the PESC office will issue electronic ballots to the official contacts of its member organizations. Completed ballots, including the reason(s) for any rejection, must be returned to the PESC office via e-mail attachment, fax, overnight delivery, or U.S. Postal Service within ten business days. PESC staff is responsible for the tabulation of the ballots; acceptance of a specification as a standard requires an affirmative vote of at least 80% of all votes cast. Once the members accept and approve the proposed standards, the PESC Board of Directors will within seven (7) calendar days ratify the vote or refer it back to the CCB with specific instructions for further work.

PESC staff will then publish/post all necessary documents and communications and implement version control on all documents. PESC approved standards are freely accessible on the PESC website (http://www.PESC.org).

Bill Gates Directs Policymakers and the Nation to Embrace Common Data Standards

Friends and Colleagues of PESC,

In these uncertain times, we’re all facing unprecedented challenges. The stakes to ensure the effectiveness of your organizational resources have never been higher. The founders of PESC believed that the root of accurate, high quality information lies in the foundation of common data standards. Over the years many organizations have joined PESC to lead and support its mission. We thank these organizations for building PESC up to its current state as a nation-
Experts from Leading Organizations Elected to PESC Board of Directors

Officers Appointed for FY2010

At their Annual Membership Meeting held in the spring, the members of PESC – the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council elected four new members to its board of directors: Jeffrey Alderson of ConnectEdu, Russell Buyse of Pearson, Manuel Dietz of unisolution, and Russell Judd of Great Lakes Education Loan Services (representing NASLA). Incumbents elected include: William Hollowsky of SunGard Higher Education and David Moldoff of AcademyOne. All were elected for two years terms which run July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011.

“We are proud to have experts from leading organizations working together in ‘co-opetition’, that is a balanced, open and trusting environment in which competitors cooperate for the greater common good,” stated Michael Sessa, PESC’s President & CEO. “PESC is unique in that it enables cross-sector participation and implementation of common data standards,” Mr. Sessa continued.

Additionally, during its first meeting of the new fiscal year, the board re-elected William Hollowsky as Chair of the board of directors, Francisco Valines as Vice Chair, Doug Falk as Treasurer and Rick Skeel as Secretary. The board of directors is now comprised as follows:

Chair       Bill Hollowsky, General Manager of Product Management, SunGard Higher Education
Vice Chair  Francisco Valines, Director of Financial Aid, Florida International University
Treasurer   Doug Falk, Vice President and CIO, National Student Clearinghouse
Secretary   Rick Skeel, Director of Academic Records, University of Oklahoma, representing AACRAO
At–Large    Jeffrey Alderson, Director of Development, ConnectEdu, Inc.
            Brian Allison, Vice President of Technology and Industry Initiatives, USA Funds, representing NCHELP
            Russell Buyse, Vice President of R & D, Edurestructures/Pearson
            Manuel Dietz, Managing Director, unisolution
            Russell Judd, Chief Industry & Government Relations Officer
            Great Lakes Educational Loan Services, Inc., representing NASLA
            David Moldoff, Founder and CEO, AcademyOne, Inc.
            Michael Sessa, President & CEO, Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council
            Andy Wood, Sr. Director of Higher Education Product Development, Oracle Corporation

To ensure balance and even representation across the various sectors of higher education, the make-up of the PESC board of directors is designated by PESC’s bylaws. The board has overall authority to set PESC policies and provides direction and guidance for all activities of PESC. For more information on PESC, please visit www.PESC.org.
PESC Promotes Its Members

To ensure that PESC is promoting its membership to the fullest extent, we are launching a new benefit for PESC members only. Effective immediately, any member organization can post a testimonial on PESC’s website free of charge. General testimonials should include a mention of why membership in PESC is valued and important and can include specific product information.

Additionally, as announcements are made for the approval of standards and other important events, members can now include a testimonial for those specific events and activities in press releases and news.

An authorization form is attached to this edition of The Standard and will be permanently posted on PESC’s website. PESC thanks its members for the wonderful support they provide to the organization and to the higher education community. For questions or concerns, please contact PESC’s Executive Director Michael Sessa at michael.sessa@pesc.org or at 202.261.6516.

---

**Fall 2009 Member Summit**

Monday, October 19 – Tuesday, October 20, 2009

Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill
400 New Jersey Ave., NW
Washington, D.C.  20001
202.737.1234
800.233.1234

Group Rate:  $219  
Group Name:  PESC 
Hotel Cut-Off:  September 18, 2009  
Registration Fee:  $195

**Spring Summit**

Thursday April 1, 2010 – Friday April 2, 2009

Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill
400 New Jersey Ave., NW
Washington, D.C.  20001
202.737.1234
800.233.1234

Group Rate:  $209  
Group Name:  PESC 
Hotel Cut-Off:  February 26, 2010  
Registration Fee:  $195

Data Exchange Statistics for Internet Server at University of Texas at Austin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Score</td>
</tr>
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<td>Admissions Applications</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Federal Student Aid Software Developers Conference will be held August 20, 2009, at the Grand Hyatt Hotel in Washington, DC.

You will be able to participate in the conference in person or remotely via conference call or webinar. FSA will post the information about participating remotely to its conference website as soon as information is available. More detailed information about the hotel, conference registration, and other logistics can be found at http://fsaconferences.ed.gov/software.html

At the end of the SDC, there will be an optional focus group that will last approximately one hour for those of you able to stay beyond the end of the Conference. The purpose of the focus group is to obtain your feedback on how FSA can improve documentation products (e.g. EDE Technical Reference, the ISIR Guide, etc.) and the delivery of these products. The documents to be discussed include the EDE Technical Reference, the Application Processing System Specifications for Software Developers, the ISIR Guide, and others as time allows.

The primary purpose for holding this informal discussion is to identify to improve documentation products and the delivery of those products. We hope to gain a better understanding of:
- which documents are useful and which are not,
- what information is looked for each year and how often is it being used,
- when is the ideal time to disseminate this information,
- how is information best formatted, and
- other insights or thoughts to consider for improvement.

If you are interested in attending this focus group, please e-mail Mary Haldane at mary.haldane@ed.gov. The attendance will be limited to the first 20 respondents.
NCES just released the Request for Applications—Fiscal Year 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) Grant:

"The purpose of grants under this program is to enable State educational agencies to design, develop, and implement statewide, longitudinal data systems to efficiently and accurately manage, analyze, disaggregate, and use individual student data. The long–term goal of the program is to enable all States to create comprehensive P–20 systems that permit the generation and use of accurate and timely data, support analysis and informed decision-making at all levels of the education system, increase the efficiency with which data may be analyzed to support the continuous improvement of education services and outcomes, facilitate research to improve student academic achievement and close achievement gaps, support education accountability systems, and simplify the processes used by State educational agencies to make education data transparent through Federal and public reporting. The grants awarded will support the development and implementation of systems that have the capacity to link individual student data across time and across databases (i.e., are "interoperable"), including the linking of teachers to students, promote the linking of data collected or held by various institutions, agencies, and States, and protect student privacy consistent with applicable privacy protection laws."

PESC supports NCES, the U.S. Department of Education, the States, the higher education community, the DQC and the SIF Association in the common vision of interoperability. PESC resources and tools are driven and built by direct community participation. We look forward to working in harmony with all stakeholders to make that vision a reality. All information related to the grant program is available at http://nces.ed.gov/programs/slds/grant_information.asp. PESC information is listed on the NCES website at http://nces.ed.gov/dataguidelines/models.asp. PESC resources are listed on page 6 of the RFA. The exact language is included below. All relative information is also posted at http://www.pesc.org.

"Systems must be designed to meet the standards and guidelines of the National Center for Education Statistics to the maximum extent feasible. These resources currently include the NCES Handbooks Online, the schemas of the Schools Interoperability Framework Association and the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council, the National Education Data Model of the National Forum on Education Statistics, the data glossary of NCES' Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, and others. Work is currently underway to create comprehensive standards and guidelines for use by States to promote data quality and interoperability of data systems both within States and across States. The NCES site will be modified, as appropriate, to include up-to-date resources, and States should plan to utilize the common standards and guidelines that are available prior to the award of grants pursuant to this competition."

PESC Members Vote on Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, and IPEDS

With public comment period over and with all corresponding responses posted on the PESC website, the Standards Forum for Education is pleased to present the XML candidates for the Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, and IPEDS to the Members of PESC for a vote as PESC approved standards. All current documentation for these three candidates is posted on the PESC website. Please review any applicable documentation, then cast your vote to either APPROVE or NOT APPROVE each of them. A voting ballot is attached and is posted on PESC's homepage. Please note that only one ballot will be counted per member organization. In order to be approved as a PESC standard, 80% of votes cast by Members must be favorable. Ballots are being issued to Members today and votes must be submitted to my attention at michael.sessa@pesc.org or fax at 202.261.6517 by 5pm PDT August 11, 2009.
Standards, from Page 1

ally and internationally recognized standards-setting body for common, higher education data standards.

Bill Gates and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation are integral stakeholders in education. At a recent meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures, Bill Gates stressed the importance of embracing common data standards. An overview of his address is available at http://www.ncsl.org/?tabid=18047 and the full text is listed below.

Higher education is complex and many common data standards are yet to be built. The status quo of proprietary interoperability is no longer acceptable and does not meet today’s or tomorrow’s need for efficiency and costs savings. Building common data standards requires cross-sector collaboration in an open and trusting environment. PESC is the only higher education organization focused on developing and implementing common data standards in an open, trusting environment.

I invite you to join PESC and its membership in the mission of developing and implementing common data standards. Open, standardized interoperability is our common vision. Please take a moment and consider joining PESC. All relevant information is posted on our website at http://www.PESC.org and I’m available to answer any questions or concerns you may have.

Best regards,

Michael
+1.202.261.6516
michael.sessa@pesc.org


Thank you for that kind welcome. And thank you for offering me this chance to talk with you as you face big decisions for your states and our country.

These are not ordinary times. We’re in a severe economic downturn — and you, as state legislators, may have a more complete picture of the impact of this recession than anyone else in the country. You are forced to balance your budgets — even as the recession increases your expenditures and cuts your revenues. Your constituents are losing their jobs, their savings, and their homes — and everywhere you go, people are asking you to make it better.

This is a painful time.

But difficult times can spark great reforms — and changes we can make now can help us come out of the downturn stronger than when we entered.

We’ve been in an economic crisis for a year or so. But we’ve been in an education crisis for decades. As a country, our performance at every level — primary and secondary school achievement, high school graduation, college entry, college completion — is dropping against the rest of the world.

In college graduation rates, we are now 10th among industrialized nations — down from number one. If that is a leading indicator, I don’t like where it’s leading. But this performance is not a fair measure of our country’s energy, effort, or intelligence. It’s a reflection of weak systems run by old beliefs and bad habits.

In these circumstances, a crisis can work as a pivot. It can give us the traction to leave behind bad habits — to start something new and better…

…. if you’re willing to do it.

You are the authorizers and appropriators of school reform in America. The president and the Congress can make recommendations — and they have passed a stimulus package with billions of dollars you can spend to advance
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school reform – but ultimately, you decide.

I hope you decide to accelerate reform – because America is changing.

African American and Hispanic American youth represent a rising share of our workforce. Success in this century will depend on how well America does what we have so far done very badly – give low-income and minority students a world-class education.

That’s what I want to talk with you about today. The $100 billion in education stimulus money should do more than stimulate the economy. It should stimulate us to rethink the way we run our schools. We need to make achievement more measurable, and the system more accountable, so we can get dramatically higher numbers of Americans to and through college.

America is a land of staggering opportunity. But if you want to make the most of this opportunity, high school is not enough, and some postsecondary is no longer enough. If you want to have the skills to build a career, or the resources to raise a family, you need a two-year or four-year degree. You need to complete college. Yet college completion rates in the U.S. have been flat since the 1970s.

Our foundation has set a goal to dramatically increase the numbers of young people who complete a postsecondary degree or credential with value in the marketplace. We hope you will set a similar goal in your states.

The first step toward this goal is to find out which colleges are doing a good job – and which innovations are making the biggest difference.

The institutions and innovations that are getting great outcomes should be expanded. Those that aren’t should be changed or ended.

To do this -- we need to measure what matters. We need to know what the students learn, and what jobs they get. We need to know why students of some community colleges do better in the job market than others. Why minority students at some colleges take longer to earn a degree than similar students elsewhere. We don’t know the answers. We’re not even asking the questions.

I understand that there are challenges in developing fair measurements – but colleges are not entitled to escape scrutiny at a time of a plunging educational performance and permanent fiscal pressure.

Without measurement, there is no pressure for improvement.

As we push to measure performance, the second step is to make an important shift in the incentive system: We should ensure that state funding, financial aid, and other incentives reward the institution when students make progress toward a degree, not just when they enroll.

Financial incentives for completion can encourage colleges to offer schedules that make more sense for students who have to work. They can encourage colleges to offer courses and counseling that guide students toward explicit job goals. They can encourage colleges to make more innovative use of technology – to use on-line lectures that students can watch anytime, anywhere. This would help colleges – many of which are facing both funding cuts and enrollment spikes – to serve more students at higher quality and lower cost.

With the right incentives, more colleges will make these changes and help many more students complete their programs.

I would urge the legislators here to start the push to greater measurement by asking the colleges and universities in your districts to publish their graduation rates. In the future, we should also be Prepared remarks for public distribution able to publish data not just on completion, but on how many of those with degrees get professional credentials and are hired into good jobs.

See Gates, Page 8
Greater measurement, more public attention, and smarter financial incentives will spark innovation that can make a dramatic difference in the number of students who get a postsecondary credential with value in the workplace. Of course, the most important step in helping students complete college is ensuring that they graduate from high school ready for college.

While the rest of the world has been raising their high-school graduation rates, U.S. rates have not improved for 40 years.

More than 30 percent of our students drop out before graduating from high school. For minority kids, it’s nearly 50 percent. Among those who do graduate, most are not ready for college.

Those statistics are appalling. If all you knew were these numbers, you’d be pretty demoralized. But this is a composite picture, and it hides some really exciting successes. In fact, whenever I get discouraged about public education, I go visit some exceptional schools to see how great they can be. I recommend you do the same thing. It will give you a burst of optimism.

Last year, I went to Texas, walked into a classroom, sat down, and thought: "What’s going on here?" The energy was so high I thought, "I must be in a pep rally or something." The teacher was running around, scanning the classroom, pulling in every kid, putting things up on the board. It was a very exciting class.

I was at a KIPP School. KIPP stands for the "Knowledge is Power Program." Eighty percent of KIPP students are low-income kids; 95% are Black or Hispanic. Among eighth graders who have gone to one of 30 KIPP middle schools for four years, average percentile scores jumped from 31 to 58 in reading; and 41 to 80 in math.

KIPP Schools are amazing, but they are not isolated examples. There are public schools and charter schools serving some of the most disadvantaged students in the country and getting astounding results.

In my experience, when you find a stunning success – you let it grow.

Unfortunately, states are putting caps on the number of these high-performing schools. Why do we want to put caps on the greatest success stories in American education?

Caps should be lifted for charter school operators who have a proven record of success – and charters should be offered the same per-pupil funding as other public schools. As you know, a relatively small percentage of schools are responsible for a high percentage of the drop outs. We can make dramatic advances by replacing the worst schools with high-performing charters -- operated by organizations with a great track record.

This is not just to benefit the students who attend charter schools; this is to benefit all students. Charter schools are where many of the new discoveries are coming from – the value of the longer day, giving teachers data on student performance, and the huge advantage from having a critical mass of effective teachers in one school.

Charter schools, in my view, have been the lead researchers in the most important recent finding in the field of school reform. Namely: The most decisive factor in student achievement is the teacher.

Our foundation has studied the variation between the teachers who get the most student achievement and those who get the least – and the numbers are absolutely unbelievable. A top quartile teacher will increase the performance of an average student -- based on test scores -- by 10 percentile points in a single year. What does that mean? That means that if the entire U.S., for two years, had top quartile teachers, the entire difference between us and Japan would vanish.
So, when you see the power of the top quartile teachers, you naturally think: We should identify those teachers. We should reward them. We should retain them. We should make sure other teachers learn from them.

But we don’t identify effective teachers and reward them. We reward teachers for things that do not identify effective teaching – like seniority and master’s degrees. And we don’t reward teachers for the one thing that does identify effective teaching – great performance.

If you guided your students to great accomplishments last year, that’s the best indication that you’re going to do it again next year.

Even in the earliest grades where the effects of class size are strongest, students get 5 times the gain from having an effective teacher as from having a small classroom. No factor advances student achievement more than an effective teacher. So a true reformer will be obsessed with one question: “What changes will improve the quality of teaching, so every student can have an effective teacher?” We need to take two enabling steps: we need longitudinal data systems that track student performance and are linked to the teacher; and we need fewer, clearer, higher standards that are common from state to state. The standards will tell the teachers what their students are supposed to learn, and the data will tell them whether they’re learning it. These two changes will open up options we’ve never had before.

We’ll be able to reward teachers for raising their students’ achievement. We’ll be able to pay the best teachers more for teaching in low-income schools. We’ll be able to see what successful teachers are doing, and use that to give targeted help to other teachers. This will increase the average quality of teaching dramatically – and that will be a fantastic thing for pupils at the top, the middle, and the bottom.

Fortunately, the state-led Common Core State Standards Initiative is developing clear, rigorous common standards that match the best in the world. Last month, 46 Governors and Chief State School Officers made a public commitment to embrace these common standards.

This is encouraging – but identifying common standards is not enough. We’ll know we’ve succeeded when the curriculum and the tests are aligned to these standards.

Secretary Arne Duncan recently announced that $350 million of the stimulus package will be used to create just these kinds of tests – next-generation assessments aligned to the common core.

When the tests are aligned to the common standards, the curriculum will line up as well – and that will unleash powerful market forces in the service of better teaching. For the first time, there will be a large base of customers eager to buy products that can help every kid learn and every teacher get better. Imagine having the people who create electrifying video games applying their intelligence to on-line tools that pull kids in and make algebra fun.

There can also be – and there should be – on-line videos of every required course, taught by master teachers, and made available free of charge. These would help train teachers. They would help students who need some review or just want to get ahead. Melinda and I have used on-line videos when we’ve helped our own kids on some of their school work. They are phenomenal tools that can help every student in the country – if we get the common standards that will encourage people to make them.

If your state doesn’t join the common standards, your kids will be left behind; and if too many states opt out – the country will be left behind. Remember – this is not a debate that China, Korea, and Japan are having. Either our schools will get better – or our economic position will get worse.

Common standards define what the students need to learn; robust data systems tell us whether they’re learning it – and they tell us a whole lot more than that.
Most data on student performance today comes in the form of a snapshot. We know only how students did on a test at the end of the year – we don’t see the progression; we don’t have much context, and the information comes too late to improve the teaching.

In post-secondary schools, our information is even worse. Current federal data systems track only graduation rates for full-time students who are enrolled for the first time – but that’s a minority of our postsecondary students. The stimulus package contains funding for longitudinal data systems; I hope you will use this funding to support systems that track student performance from early childhood education through high school and college and into the workplace. Student performance should be linked to the teacher and the curriculum and the instructional tools. It should let us know what the best schools and teachers are doing differently and what kind of teacher training promotes student preparedness for public distribution. It should help us improve college completion rates, and determine what curriculum leads to career success.

According to the Data Quality Campaign, 47 states have adopted portions of a strong data system, but we still have a long way to go. There is a big gap between the data that states are gathering and the data they need to have to answer important policy questions.

There are dozens of different data points a state could use to define aspects of student and teacher performance. That difference is compounded across 50 states and the federal government. And states use different products that manage that data in different ways – so states can’t compare their results to see what works best.

All states and districts should collect common data on teachers and students. We need to define the data in a standardized way, we need to collect all of it for all of our students, and we need to enter it in something cheap and simple that people can share. The stimulus bill includes competitive grant funding for these efforts. I hope you make use of it for the people in your state.

In the coming year, our goal is to partner with state education leaders, the Secretary of Education, and others to advance the field so that policymakers and educators demand standardized data -- not just for compliance, but for improving student achievement.

Of course, if you do build this system and get this data, you may have to deal with people who don’t want you to use it.

Last year the New York legislature passed a law that says you can’t consider student test scores when you make teacher tenure decisions. That was a strategic win for people who oppose reform – because no real reform will happen until we can evaluate teachers based on their students’ achievement.

I understand the legitimate concern of teachers who point out that, without the right design, teacher measurement systems based on student performance could seem arbitrary.

But without them, we won’t be able to identify our best teachers, reward them, help others learn from them, or deploy them where they’re most needed. We won’t be able to see what curriculum, instructional tools, and teacher training work best.

The solution is not to block teacher evaluations. The solution is to work with teachers who are eager to help build measurement systems that are transparent, that make sense, that lead teachers to say: "This works. It's fair. It helps me become a better teacher."

These systems would include test scores, but they would also involve classroom observation, parent and student surveys, and video taken in the classroom.

We’ll know we have the answer when teachers are eager to see the data, to see how their kids are doing and find out what worked. The stimulus package provides funding...
that could be used to build these kinds of measurement systems. I hope you make the most of it.

My big hope is that some states will establish these systems over the next 3-4 years, and their success will help spread them to other states. No single initiative could do more to get every student a good teacher.

Over the past ten years, Melinda and I have dedicated a large share of our foundation’s resources to the cause of school reform. We believe America’s greatest promise is in its commitment to equality — and fulfilling that promise demands strong public schools.

This responsibility — to a great extent — lies with you. I’m asking you to draw on the stimulus funding to do two things:

1. Embrace common standards and data systems so we can know where we stand and how to move forward.

2. Raise the quality of teaching by measuring teacher effectiveness, encouraging innovation, and spreading best practices.

I know you’ll face pressure if you push for reform.

But I want to ask you to consider two different schools. In one school, student achievement is low, morale is low, and nothing ever changes — because nobody expects anything better. In the other school, minority students from low-income families take the toughest classes, get the best teachers, and go on to get college degrees.

Both kinds of schools exist in America. How many of each depends on you.

You could be tempted to shrug off this responsibility if the schools in your district are pretty good. But America’s schools are not pretty good, and they’re your schools too. This is a national challenge.

It doesn’t really matter whether you are driven by an ethical commitment to equal opportunity or by a long-term economic vision for the country. Both lines of reasoning lead to the same conclusion: We need to measure progress. We need to hold teachers and schools accountable. We need to give all students a chance to make the most of their lives.
Public Comments and Responses
Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, IPEDS
July 27, 2009

The 30-day public comment period for the proposed Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, and IPEDS standards expired on May 27, 2009. A number of public comments were received, were posted to the PESC website, and were routed to their respective development workgroups and to the Standards Forum for Education’s Change Control Board (CCB) for review, analysis, and response. Now that public comments have been considered and incorporated into the proposed standards, the CCB has recommended to the Standards Forum’s Steering Committee and the PESC Board of Directors that the Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting, and IPEDS specifications be submitted to a vote by the PESC members.

In accordance with version 1.0.0 of PESC’s Manual of Policies and Procedures for Standards Development, the PESC office will issue electronic ballots to the official contacts of PESC member organizations. Completed ballots, including the reason(s) for any rejection, must be returned to the PESC office via e-mail attachment, fax, overnight delivery, or U.S. Postal Service within ten (10) business days. PESC staff is responsible for the tabulation of the ballots; acceptance of a specification as a standard requires an affirmative vote of at least 80% of all votes cast. Once the members accept and approve the proposed standards, the PESC Board of Directors will within seven (7) calendar days ratify the vote or refer it back to the CCB with specific instructions for further work.

PESC staff will then publish/post all necessary documents and communications and implement version control on all documents. PESC approved standards are freely accessible on the PESC website (http://www.PESC.org).

Admissions Application

Public Comment 1: XML transcripts will only recognize one student level (semester or quarter) because only the lowest qualifier will be recognized by the process. Thus, if your school is a semester school but was a quarter school and the school (the) student transferred from is a quarter school, the transfer credits will come in as semester.

Reason: The credit hours and quality points will not be correct.
Proposed Solution: Recognize multiple student level[s] so that credit hours and quality points will be correct.

Response: In the Student Transcript, by using multiple occurrences of "Student.AcademicRecord" or (in the Admissions Application, by using multiple occurrences of "Applicant.SelfReportedAcademicRecord"), the problem is resolved. One occurrence of "Student.AcademicRecord" is intended to be used for each school the student attended. If there had been a change in credits used at the same school, e.g., quarter credits and then semester credits, and the school did not convert the prior credits to the latest credit type, then one iteration of the academic record should be used for each time period at that school using each credit type. The Implementation Guide will be updated to clarify that 2 iterations of the academic record should used if needed.

Public Comment 2: [For] academic standing only following the PESC standard...If your school has academic standing outside of the PESC standard, then the academic standing for the student will not be reflected correctly when exporting an XML transcript. For example, we have an academic standing of Exclusion meaning students cannot be readmitted to our school or any school within the Georgia System.

Reason: Since Exclusion is not one of the PESC standard[s], we have to translate Exclusion to one of the PESC standards which is either Supervision or Probation. Thus, the true Academic Standing is lost in translation.

Proposed Solution: Provide options to add appropriate academic standing.

Response: New enumerated values of ExclusionAcademic and ExclusionDisipline will be added with the July 2009 release.

Public Comment 3: XML transcripts lack the transcript key on the back of a physical transcript which provide[s] pertinent information such as accreditation information, change of academic system (e.g.: change from quarter to semester), and legend for grade symbols, etc.

Reason:

Proposed Solution: Provide a section to display transcript key information.

Response: PESC has addressed the issue of accreditation information and it will be included in the next release (1.8.0) of the AcademicRecord Sector Library.
Accreditation information has been approved by the PESC CCB for inclusion in "TransmissionData.Source.Organization" and "TransmissionData.Destination.Organization". Once the Academic Record is updated the Admissions Application will review and possibly add it to the 1.1.0 version of their sector library. The issue of the change from quarter to semester is already handled nicely by using an additional occurrence of "AcademicRecord". Using dates available in "Student.AcademicRecord.AcademicSession.AcademicSessionDetail"; you can clearly and unambiguously indicate which type of credit was awarded for the student for each session.

The issue of grade symbols is addressed by using the "CourseAcademicGradeScaleCode" (or "CourseAcademicGradeStatusCode") for each course. For example, if a school uses a grade of "Q" for an incomplete grade, you can include the grade of "Q" and a value of "Incomplete" (or "InProgress", or "IncompleteNotResolvedFail") to more clearly indicate the type of grade "Q" represents. If you use a regular grading scale of A,B,C,D,F and A represented a 4.0, then you can use a "CourseAcademicGradeScaleCode" of 25.

**Public Comment 4:** With regard to the Admissions Application standard, would that be implemented by all organizations such as LSAC or do you have a select group that has agreed?

**Reason:**

**Proposed Solution:**

**Response:** The Admissions Application standard can be implemented by any organization that exchanges application data. PESC approved standards are posted on the PESC website and are provided free of charge.

**Public Comment 5:** See attached

**Reason:**

**Proposed Solution:**

**Response:** All known errors have been corrected.

**Public Comment 6:** I believe this should be declared as xs:decimal and not xs:float.
Reason:

Proposed Solution:

Response: The Change Control Board agrees that this should be xs:decimal and the schema will be updated.

**Public Comment 7:** First, I'll report that our University of California application does not map very nicely to the proposed PESC standard as defined. Given the number of institutions and the number of different applications, that's not surprising when generating a standard. However, having user extensions implemented as they currently are in the specification forces the institutions to either lose the relational integrity of any data with other standard elements in the standard, or results in forcing relational information into the data itself.

Reason: The standard currently forces institutions to one of several difficult choices – break the standard by using a slightly modified version or don’t use the standard at all, embed relational data into the extensions, or change their application to match a technical specification.

Proposed Solution: Including user defined extensions in each type defined would eliminate the issue.

Response: It is agreed that the draft schema will be modified to add one optional occurrence of the data element “UserDefinedExtensions" as child to each of the following complex data elements (located immediately above “NoteMessage”):

- Applicant.Person
- Applicant.Family
- Applicant.Residency
- Applicant.SelfReportedAcademicRecord.AcademicSession
- Applicant.SelfReportedTests
- Applicant.ExtraCurricularActivity
Public Comment 8: Also, the same issue affects the enumerations in the proposed standard.

Reason: This requires us to either break with the standard and use our own enumerations, or forces into creating new types as part of an extension, again causing the problem of relational integrity and user extensions mentioned earlier.

Proposed Solution:

Response: It is agreed that the draft schema will be modified as follows:

a. Add three new enumerated values (SchoolYear, Summer, YearRound) to the simple data element “Applicant.Person.Employment.EmploymentStatusCode” and make “EmploymentStatusCode” repeatable up to 3 occurrences.

b. Add four new enumerated values (NoHighSchool, TwoYearCollegeGraduate, FourYearCollegeGraduate, PostGraduateStudy) to the simple data element in CoreMain “EducationLevel” of “EducationLevelType”.

c. To capture the employment relationship of the applicant (or a family member of the applicant) to the school to which the applicant is applying for possible tuition or fee benefits, i.e., is the applicant or a family member currently employed at that school, we will add a new complex data element “EmploymentAtAppliedSchool” as child to “Applicant.Residency”. It will be located immediately below “EmploymentResidency” and be repeatable up to 4 occurrences. It will have the following 3 optional child data elements: “RelationshipCode”, “CampusName”, and “EmploymentStatusCode”.

d. It was also requested that an optional occurrence of “EducationLevel” be added as a child data element to “Applicant.Person” to be located immediately above “NoteMessage”.

Public Comment 9: In the documentation of your earlier version, you had the academic record under the application, but later, you placed it outside the application and placed it on the same level.
Reason: This loses the relationship between the academic record reported in the application and the application itself.

Proposed Solution: As multiple applications may have different academic records reported, it would be better to keep the reported academic record with the application it was reported under. Using much the same logic, many of the elements that are currently at the same level of the application, including family, residency, self reported tests, and extra curricular activity may be better placed under Application.

Response: After further discussion with the commenter, it was agreed that since the schema is to be used only for a single submission for one applicant at one point in time, that the current placement of the complex data element “SelfReportedAcademicRecord” as child to “Applicant” will be satisfactory.

Public Comment 10: The duplicate naming of entities between core main and the admissions application standard, while technically appropriate under different namespaces, can create confusion and resulting QA issues for a development team, and does cause issues for some toolkits.

Reason:

Proposed Solution: Recommend changing the duplicate naming to unique names, regardless of the namespace breakout.

Response: The Change Control Board agrees that there is an outstanding concern with this issue and the Technical Advisory Board is reviewing options to address the situation. There was a decision made at the time of implementation of the first standards that this was the best practice so updating all of the standards will take time since this will require a major release of Core Main.

Education Test Score Reporting

Public Comment 1: It would be beneficial if PESC were to consider PK12 assessments in this effort and aim for making them consistent with SIF standards.

Reason:

Proposed Solution:
Response: There was no intent to exclude PK12 from this development effort and the workgroup solicited broad participation. PESC’s development work reflects the needs of higher education and of PESC’s membership, and the same holds true for SIFA in PK12. Because PESC is funded by membership dues and has no major outside funding, participation in PESC workgroups is open to any and all representatives of PESC member organizations. While we look to be responsive to the needs of the broad education community, we ask organizations looking to align PESC’s standards to join PESC and help fund the development effort.

Additional tests can be added to the list of tests and subtests when needed. Some K12 assessments for California as well as national tests (e.g., GED, PSAT, PLAN and EXPLORE) that are targeted to PK12 have been added already.

For those that are not in the listed enumerations of TestCode, ‘OtherTests’ can be selected and then under TestName the name of the test can be completed. Also the same process can be used for SubTestCode & SubTestName.

Public Comment 2: I was wondering if the workgroup considered the possibility of a lender/servicer being able to receive this information electronically.

Reason: Part of our Human Capital Score requires students to enter their test date/scores, college they will be attending, etc. and I was thinking that this electronic reporting option may allow us to "verify" the score electronically, rather than receiving a hard copy document from the student.

Proposed Solution:

Response: There is no intent to restrict the users and/or implementers of this standard. For testing agencies, only the permission of the student is required to release information to a company or other institution which is more of a policy and process issue than a standards or data transport issue.

Public Comment 3: I see it includes clearinghouses, employers, research, local and federal agencies. Is there any target implementation date???

Reason:

Proposed Solution:
Response: The testing organizations and student information system providers that participated in the development of the standard have not yet committed to any specific date for implementation.

**IPEDS — Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System**

**Public Comment 1:** As a software provider of reporting for NCES IPEDS reporting, can you give us a progress/status statement regarding the xml standards and format for these reports. We would like to consider a timeline to support our clients with an xml report for all the ipeds surveys.

*Reason:* We would like to consider a timeline to support our clients with an xml report for all the ipeds surveys.

*Proposed Solution:*

*Response:* The IPEDS team is working on the remaining four reports. The Implementation Guide for two reports has been sent to NCES (GRS & SFA) and there are two Implementation Guides that will be worked on soon by the IPEDS committee (Completions & 12 month enrollment). After these 4 are complete they will be sent to CCB for review and then sent out for Public Comment.
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Leading the Establishment and Implementation of Common Data Standards in Higher Education

Simplifying Access  ♦  Improving Data Quality  ♦  Reducing Cost
The XML candidates for the Admissions Application, Education Test Score Reporting and IPEDS – Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System are presented by the Standards Forum for Education to the Members of the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC) for vote as official PESC Approved Education Community Standards. Please indicate your votes by checking one of the boxes under each candidate below and submitting your ballot to PESC:

If not approved, please indicate reason(s) below. Attach more sheets if necessary:
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Date: 

All ballots must be received by PESC by 5pm PDST Tuesday August 11, 2009.
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1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
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Washington DC 20036
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I hereby grant the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC) non-exclusive, royalty-free, irrevocable, world-wide authorization to reproduce and distribute to the general public, without charge, the above-listed testimonial in hard copy, digital or any other format, including but not limited to distribution on the internet, via CD-ROM and inclusion in electronic databases. I also authorize PESC and its membership organizations to reproduce and distribute copies of this testimonial, without charge, to other persons in their offices, firms or at the institutions of higher education that they represent, provided that they include in the copies any credits, acknowledgements, copyright notice, and other such information contained in the materials. I retain all other rights in and to the materials, including copyright therein.
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Email: Michael.Sessa@PESC.org
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**Smart Options: Investing the Recovery Funds for Student Success**

A collective group of organizations, including the Data Quality Campaign, collaborated to publish *Smart Options: Investing the Recovery Funds for Student Success*. The article identifies five priorities for states when investing the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funds and highlights providing data and information that educators, policymakers, and parents can use as priority number two. Although states have made impressive progress on implementing their longitudinal data systems, too few have taken the necessary steps to ensure that the information produced by these data systems is harnessed to inform and improve the processes and outcomes of states’ education efforts. This shift requires building the political will and taking the practical steps to remove current barriers to accessing, sharing and using these data.

Based on the DQC’s 10 essential elements of a longitudinal data system and 10 actions for states, the article recommends governors and chiefs:

**Link teacher data to student performance data**

As with students, teachers should be given a unique statewide identifier that follows them over time. That makes it possible to determine which students and which courses are being taught by teachers with different levels and types of preparation or certification and which forms of teacher training and certification have the greatest effect on students’ academic growth in the classroom. Such a match makes it possible to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, including traditional and alternative certification programs, based on student academic progress. Combining this information with student demographic information also allows states to determine the experience level of the teachers teaching low-income or special needs students.

**Link K-12 data systems with early learning and postsecondary education**

Multiple agencies, including child welfare, health, and early learning, seek to improve child outcomes, but they often pursue these goals in (continued on page 2)

---
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**Leveraging Federal Funding for Longitudinal Data Systems: A Roadmap for States**

The DQC has released a roadmap of federal funding opportunities that can be used for data-related activities. States can use this as a planning tool as they prepare applications for stimulus funds. The document is available at: [http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/5204](http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/5204).

---

**Join the DQC on Facebook**

Join the DQC on Facebook. DQC now has a Facebook Page and a Cause – Improve Student Achievement. On our page you can access live news updates about DQC and data, stay informed about public events hosted by DQC, see pictures of our staff members, connect with other users that support DQC and improved student achievement, and more. We encourage fans and supporters to post the latest news and information on the DQC Page Wall and to invite other interested Facebook users. Click here to become a fan and from this site you can access and support our Cause.
SMART OPTIONS (CONTINUED)

isolation, with little information and few data systems bridging these supportive service systems. For a variety of reasons, including actual or perceived barriers under state and federal privacy laws, agencies often are reluctant to share information needed to improve educational outcomes. But improving educational outcomes for each student requires an increasingly comprehensive picture of student services and outcomes across systems. Creating linkages between education and social services will give decision makers appropriate access to the comprehensive information needed to improve the educational outcomes and welfare of every student.

Align data definitions and design specifications with those set nationally

States and districts are still struggling with a lack of standard technical definitions for the exchange of data in education which allows data to flow more easily from P-12 to higher education and across traditional boundaries such as state borders. Creating a unified interoperable system to move data offers tremendous cost and time savings. By taking a systematic approach to data management and implementing software that adheres to agreed-upon interoperability standards and data definitions, education agencies can redirect resources and staff from redundant and often ineffectual, data-centric tasks to valuable student-centered education.

Make sure educators, policymakers, and parents know how to use the data and that the data are used to drive key decisions

Creating state longitudinal data systems and having the information to answer key questions about performance is a vital first step, but collecting data alone will not lead to continuous improvement and, ultimately, student success. States also must have policies and practices in place so that stakeholders throughout the education system can have access to, understand and be able to use the information effectively. State policymakers need to demand that there are web-based portals for parents, educators, advocates, and policymakers that provide information in ready-to-use, easy to understand presentations. Educators especially need greater training on how to use this new information to continuously improve their teaching and results.

To read the report in its entirety, please visit http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/448/. There is also a supplemental reading guide at http://www.coalitionforstudentachievement.org/economic_rec.asp.

DQC HOSTS WORKING MEETING ON COMMON DATA STANDARDS, INTEROPERABILITY, AND PORTABILITY

Building and deploying longitudinal data systems that can share data among P-12, postsecondary education, and workforce as well as across traditional boundaries such as state borders, can be greatly facilitated through the development and use of common data standards. Recognizing the importance of common standards, the Data Quality Campaign hosted a working meeting entitled “Common Data Standards, Interoperability, and Portability,” in Arlington, Virginia on May 5, 2009, to begin the conversation about common data standards — the potential, the challenges, and the opportunities. The working meeting was funded by the Lumina Foundation and was attended by representatives from the K-12 education, postsecondary education, and workforce sectors, as well as representatives from non-profit organizations and the federal government.

Participants were provided with an opportunity to hear presentations from a variety of organizations -- the US Department of Education, the US Department of Labor, the National Commission on Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council (PESC), and the State Interoperability Framework Association (SIFA) – on issues related to standards, data frameworks, and data models.

Throughout the day, participants engaged in conversations about data standards and interoperability, and identified challenges related to undertaking the task of developing voluntary common data standards. Progress was made at the working meeting as participants agreed that having a set of standardized and coherent unit-level definitions is important, and a critical step towards interoperability.

For those interested in learning more about this work, the DQC web site has a dedicated section on the subject of “Common Data Standards.” Meeting resources and presentations have been placed on the DQC web site at the following link: http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/topics/35.
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**DQC Prepares to Launch its 2009 Annual Survey**

It’s that time of year again! The DQC will be sending its annual survey in mid-August to states and soliciting their responses for 2009. The DQC will continue to send our survey to each state’s education agency and will continue to ask questions about states progress on the 10 Essential Elements; however, there will be two significant changes to the survey this year:

1. This year’s survey will include questions pertaining to the 10 State Actions.
2. Also given that stimulus funding has increased states’ focus on linking different state data systems, the DQC will be soliciting responses from other state stakeholders, including the Office of the Governor, State Higher Education Department, State Department of Labor / Workforce, State Board of Education, and State Legislatures. **The DQC strongly encourages each state to coordinate its answers and submit only one response to the DQC.**

Recognizing there may be questions regarding these changes, the DQC will be hosting two webinars to further explain the process and address any concerns. The two webinars are tentatively scheduled for:
- Early-August 2009 – Webinar to discuss survey release and process.
- Mid-August 2009- Webinar to answer questions about survey questions.

If you are interested in participating in either or both of the webinars or learning more about the DQC survey, please do not hesitate to contact Bi Vuong at Bi@DataQualityCampaign.org with your questions. For more information on the 10 Essential Elements or 10 State Actions, please visit the DQC website, www.dataqualitycampaign.org.

***Attention all State, Regional, and Local Educational Agencies:*** The SIF Association wants to learn what you are doing about interoperability and educational applications. Please take this 5 minute survey by July 26 at http://edusystemics.net/survey and enter the code DQCS. Survey respondents will receive a copy of the Executive Summary report of the survey and will be entered into a raffle to win an iPod Shuffle.

**Data-Driven Districts: Building the Culture and Capacity to Improve Student Achievement**

**Excerpt**

Since its inception in 2005, the DQC has focused on improving state longitudinal data systems. However, the DQC partners recognize that districts are responsible for delivering educational services and that many already have student-level data systems — in some cases more advanced than the emerging state longitudinal data systems. A district’s capacity to provide the structures and processes for the collection, analysis, and utilization of student data is pivotal to the success of students in the classroom. Understanding how the state can support these efforts will help realize the potential of investments in longitudinal data systems at all levels.

DQC partnered with APQC in 2008 to conduct a benchmarking study of district best practices and investigate how states can support districts and data-driven decision-making at all levels. The 69 participating districts, including eight best-practice districts from across the nation, collaborated for six months to identify and understand what distinguishes characteristics of districts that are excelling at using data for making key operational and instructional decisions. Based on input from special advisers, subject matter experts, study participants and secondary research, APQC chose to focus on four key district-level areas affecting data-driven decision-making:

1. **Data collection.** This area focuses on how districts collect and aggregate data from often disparate data sources.
2. **Data management and analysis.** This area focuses on how districts maintain and analyze their existing data.
3. **Culture.** This area focuses on cultural aspects that promote data use and affect how data shape conversations, meetings and strategic plans within a district.
4. **Implementation.** This final area focuses on how data-driven decision-making is actually being implemented. (continued on page 4)
**DATA-DRIVEN DISTRICTS (CONTINUED)**

**Key Findings**
Based on the survey results, several key distinctions emerged between best-practice districts and other participant districts. Districts that have successfully integrated data into their instructional and management processes consistently:

*Use standards-based measures to inform instructional decisions.* Standards-based grading systems reduce the subjectivity of classroom grades. Once this has been accomplished, the classroom grade can become a powerful indicator and predictor of growth and achievement.

*Offer professional development opportunities to support a culture of data use.* Best-practice districts use professional development as an opportunity to establish and promote a culture in which data are used to inform instruction and guide collaboration versus a culture in which data are used to evaluate performance.

*Establish and leverage leadership support for a data driven culture.* A common characteristic of all best-practice districts is leadership that sets the tone for and demands that all interactions and decisions be based on data. Throughout the study, districts consistently remarked that time was a key factor in the cultural acceptance of data use. Teachers and central office staff must have time to review and analyze data if they are to accept and appreciate its importance, which requires leadership support.

*Adopt a continuous improvement model that tracks key indicators.* A common characteristic across all best-practice districts was strict adherence to a continuous improvement model to manage and improve all instructional and operational aspects of the district. The use of continuous improvement tools, such as balanced scorecards and the Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) cycle, requires districts to have systems in place to track and report numerous performance metrics.

*Design and implement a data governance strategy to ensure data quality.* Best-practice districts have well-established, documented and consistent procedures and business rules for data validation. Lacking clearly defined business rules for data entry can lead to duplication of information in data systems or sometimes omission of data.

**Challenges of District/State Connection**
The study also uncovered a number of challenges to state/district relationships. Districts have vastly different levels of sophistication for building and using data systems to inform decisions; therefore, the state has the opportunity to provide economies of scale and help all districts use data to inform decisions. Before realizing the potential of these state investments, the cultural and technical differences that exist between state and district data systems must be addressed including:
- Misalignment between data requested by the state and data used by the district to improve student achievement; and
- State-to-district transfer barriers that include lack of communication and collaboration, frequently changing requirements, and speed of data delivery.

DQC will use the findings from this study to direct its work on improving relationships between states and districts that result in data systems and use that improve student achievement. This issue brief was written in conjunction with the DQC Quarterly Issue Meeting held in October 2008 on the same topic. To read the issue brief in its entirety and view the video of the meeting and related materials, please visit: [http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/events/241](http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/events/241).
**NEW DQC TEAM MEMBERS**

Please join us in welcoming two new DQC staff members: Bi Vuong and Rebecca Carson.

**Bi (pronounced “Bee”) Vuong** has joined the staff as a Senior Associate. Prior to joining the DQC, Bi worked with EducationCounsel LLC, on a number of projects covering a variety of policy areas including: assessments and accountability, high school reform, and statewide systems of supports and interventions. Among her projects, Bi supported three states in their efforts to establish coherent accountability and support systems as part of the College- and Career-Ready Policy Institute. She also helped design, develop, and manage the daily operations of a knowledge management tool that houses information on 50 states’ college-ready policies.

Bi, a native of Hawaii, holds a Master’s in Public Administration and a Certificate in Demography from Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. She completed her undergraduate study at Kenyon College, graduating with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science.

**Rebecca Carson** joins the DQC as a Program Coordinator. In this capacity she will write issue and policy briefs surrounding data quality issues, manage the Web site, and assist in the planning of DQC events. During her graduate studies, Rebecca was a grant writer for academically-focused after school programs provided by Foundation Communities, a local affordable housing provider in Austin, Texas. She also served on the Texas State Senate Higher Education Committee, focusing on special education issues.

Rebecca received her BS in Elementary Education and in Human and Organizational Development with a specialization in Community Leadership and Development from Vanderbilt University and her Master of Public Affairs from the University of Texas at Austin’s Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs.

**Do You Know a Data Champion? The Data Quality Campaign 2009 Recognition Program**

Each year, the DQC recognizes exemplary leaders in the building and use of longitudinal data systems. It is time to submit your nominations for the 2009 DQC awards.

*CATEGORIES:*
- LEA Data Director and/or Staff,
- SEA Data Director and/or Staff,
- State Policymaker (e.g., Chief, Legislator, Governor)

*Criteria for consideration (nominee must exhibit leadership or innovation in one or more of these areas):*
1. Coordinate stakeholder involvement in design and use of the system
2. Build coalitions to garner support of data systems and use
3. Lead the design and implementation of the data system
4. Provide professional development for use of data
5. Create a data system targeted toward the end user
6. Secure financial and/or political support for creation and maintenance of data systems
7. Demonstrate data systems and data use is a high priority
8. Embed data use into accountability AND instructional decisions

Complete the form by visiting [http://dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/535](http://dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/535); then send via e-mail to Rebecca Carson (Rebecca@DataQualityCampaign.org) or fax to 512-320-1877. **Deadline is October 16, 2009.** Award recipients will be announced in November, 2009.
Visit the New 2009 Economic Stimulus & Data Section of the DQC Website

On February 17, 2009, President Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) providing billions of dollars in new education funding to states and localities, including funds to implement statewide longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement. The DQC has developed a new section of the web site with information and guidance on how this process will work, the timeline for distribution, and guidance on how states and localities should apply for funds. Particular focus is on how these funds can be used to support the development and use of longitudinal data systems to improve student achievement and system performance. The new site includes articles under the headings of “What’s New,” “What the Economic Stimulus Package Provides for Education and Data,” “Federal Guidance on Applying for Economic Stimulus Funding,” and “Additional Information and Explanations of Funding Opportunities.”

(http://www.dataqualitycampaign.org/resources/421)

New Endorsing Partners

The Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA)
www.nwea.org
The Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) is a national not-for-profit organization dedicated to helping all kids learn. Founded in 1977 in Oregon, NWEA provides research-driven—and scientifically based—assessment tools and services that help students identify and reach their aspirational learning goals. NWEA provides partners (public and private schools, districts, state departments of education, educational programs, charter schools and a variety of other educational agencies) with comprehensive and accurate data to inform important decisions about the academic growth of every child. NWEA’s flagship assessment is its family of Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments, which are state-aligned, computerized-adaptive tools that accurately reflect the instructional level of each student.

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)
www.aacc.nche.edu
Founded in 1920, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) has, over four decades, become the leading proponent, and the national “voice for community colleges.” AACC is the primary advocacy organization for community colleges at the national level, and works closely with directors of state offices to inform and affect state policy. AACC supports and promotes its member colleges through policy initiatives, innovative programs, research and information and strategic business and industry and the national news media.
Summary of Meetings and Conference Calls of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee
Months of May and June 2009

This is an update for interested members of the AACRAO membership about the ongoing activities of the Standardization of Postsecondary Education Electronic Data Exchange (SPEEDE) Committee of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). SPEEDE is a committee that is more active year round than many of the other AACRAO standing committees. The SPEEDE committee reports to the AACRAO Vice President for Information Technology (Group VI), Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith.

Face to Face Meetings Held: None.

AACRAO SPEEDE Committee conference calls held (with number of participants):
5/7/09 (7), 5/14/09 (6), 5/21/09 (7), 5/28/09 (7), 6/4/09 (6), 6/11/09 (6), 6/18/09 (7), and 6/25/09 (5). The average number of participants per call was 7.

Activities related to PESC: AACRAO is a founding member of, and an active supporter and participant in the Postsecondary Electronic Standards Council. PESC is the standards setting organization for the electronic exchange of student records in higher education in North America.

- Rick Skeel represents AACRAO on the PESC Board of Directors.
- Clare Smith-Larson is Chair of the PESC Steering Committee.
- Tuan Anh Do and Tom Stewart serve on the Change Control Board.
- Tuan Anh Do also serves on the Technical Advisory Board.

And, much of the real work of PESC is accomplished in workgroups.

PESC Standards and Workgroups of Interest to AACRAO Members Include:

XML College Transcript - PESC approved this schema as a standard in May 2004. PESC approved a new version (1.1.0) of the schema in October 2007. The three .xsd files to view the schema with a reader such as Altova Corporation’s XMLSpy, and Version 1.1.1 of the Implementation Guide are posted on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=164 . It is recommended that all users update to Version 1.1.0 of the schema. All users who have updated to the latest version can still accept all documents created with Version 1.0.0. All users of Version 1.0.0 can also receive documents created in Version 1.1.0 provided that no data were included that use the new data elements, or new values of old data elements.
May and June 2009 Report from AACRAO SPEEDE Committee

XML High School Transcript - The XML High School Transcript was approved as a PESC standard in June 2006. The Implementation Guide Version 1.0.2 in PDF format and the three files to needed to view the schema (Version 1.0.0) are available on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=163.

XML Application for Admission - This workgroup held weekly conference calls for about two years. The workgroup was chaired by Adriana Farella, from The Catholic University of America, and Tom Stewart of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee assisted her. Notes from the workgroup conference calls and the latest draft of the Implementation Guide are available on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=136. Clare Smith-Larson and Robin Greene are other AACRAO SPEEDE members who actively participated in this workgroup.

The PESC Change Control Board approved the proposed schema and responded to the comments received after its posting on the PESC web site for a 30 day review and comment period of the higher education community. Approval now awaits a vote by the PESC Membership and the PESC Board.

XML Education Test Score Reporting - Information on this PESC proposed standard is located on the web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=132. It serves essentially the same purpose as the EDI Transaction Set 138 so that education test scores can be exchanged electronically. Tuan Anh Do, Clare Smith-Larson and Tom Stewart of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee were active participants on this workgroup. Michael Morris from ACT, Inc., chair of the workgroup, presented the schema for approval of the PESC Change Control Board and it was approved. It now awaits approval by the PESC Membership and the PESC Board.


Academic Record Batch Submittal: Since each XML instance document is a stand-alone document for transmission, several schools and agencies had asked for some way to bundle multiple XML documents in the same manner that multiple EDI documents were bundled inside the ISA/IEA envelope.

This schema became a PESC XML Standard in July 2007 and information about this Standard may be viewed on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=185.
XML Transcript Request and Response: The XML schemas for the Request for a Student Transcript and also for the Response to that Request for a Student Transcript were approved in October 2007 as PESC standards.

An updated version of the Implementation Guide (Version 1.0.1) was prepared for the XML Request for a Student Transcript. No changes were made to the schema, but several recommendations were modified to allow for the requestor to specify that the transcript be released after a specified future date, or after a specified future event has occurred. The .xsd files and the two Implementation Guides are available on the PESC web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=174. The latest Guide (4/20/08) is more appropriate for a school requesting a transcript from a current or prior school attended by a student.

Standardization of PDF Education Documents: A workgroup was formed to deal with the issue of standardization of PDF documents and their electronic transmission. Armando Rodriguez from Xap Corporation and Jim Bouse of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee co-chair this new group. It now holds regular conference calls and welcomes the participation of anyone whose school or company is a member of PESC.

XML Functional Acknowledgment of XML Instance Documents: Another workgroup was formed to create the XML equivalent of the EDI TS997. Rob Moore from the National Transcript Center and Monterey Sims from the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee are the co-chairs of this workgroup. It held regular conference calls and presented the schema to the PESC Change Control Board for approval. It now awaits posting on the PESC web site for a 30 day comment period.

Academic Progress (formerly Degree Audit): Clare Smith-Larson from the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee co-chairs this newly activated group with Dave Moldoff from AcademyOne. New participants whose school or company are members of PESC are welcome.

Education Record User Group for Approved XML and EDI Standards: PESC formed a user group (ERUG) that will deal with maintenance of all of the approved XML schemas in the student records area, as well as all of the ANSI ASC X12 EDI Standards for the admissions and student records area. In the future, as they are approved, the User Group will also consider modifications to the Application for Admission, Course Catalog and Education Test Score Reporting schemas, as well.

Tuan Anh Do of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee and Dr. Barbara Clements from the National Transcript Center co-chair the User Group. All members of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee plan to be active with this new workgroup, and other participants whose schools or companies are members of PESC are welcome.
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Among the items approved and/or being discussed by the User Group are

a. Provisions to allow either the old or the new versions of race and ethnicity information;

b. Provisions to allow either the old code set of education tests and sub-tests or the newer, updated code set being included in the XML Admissions Application schema;

c. Modification for a student's agency assigned ID to specify the agency that assigned the student’s ID as well as the student number;

d. Timing of new releases of the XML College Transcript (Version 1.2.0) and of the XML High School Transcript (Version 1.1.0) to include a few approved enhancements, as well as other enhancements included in the XML Application for Admission.

ERUG holds conference calls on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month at 2 pm Eastern.

Crosswalks for High School and College Transcripts (EDI to XML and vice versa):
Jim Bouse from the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee reported that the state of Oregon has prepared XSLT's for these four crosswalks for use within the state of Oregon. They have shared them with the University of Texas at Austin SPEEDE Internet Server staff which is working on a project to provide them as an optional feature of the Server.

Current Activities of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee:

Electronic Requests for Student Transcripts: The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee explored the idea of the addition of information about the policy of schools for honoring electronic requests from other schools for a student’s transcript. Amy Berg and Monterey Sims from the University of Phoenix are beginning to gather the national data. They plan to present the results of the survey at the AACRAO Technology Conference in Tucson in July. The Texas SPEEDE Internet Server is exploring a modification of its participant table to store participating schools’ policies.

Crosswalk Rules for EDI Transactions Sets to XML Schemas and vice versa: The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee has completed drafts for the crosswalks for the Request for a Student Transcript.

Drafts are also completed for the Student Transcript Acknowledgment.
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A draft of the crosswalk for the EDI to XML for the Negative Response to a Request for a Student Transcript has also been completed.

The committee hopes to approve the above drafts at the July AACRAO Technology Conference.

State and Province Electronic Transmission Initiatives and Mandates: The SPEEDE Committee recently updated a spreadsheet of all the activities, mandates and initiatives of which we are aware in each US State and Canadian Province. We encourage you to review the spreadsheet to insure it is up to date for your state or province. Please send updates and corrections to stewartj@aol.com. It is now posted on the SPEEDE page on the AACRAO web site at http://www.aacrao.org/speede/statestat.cfm.

State EDI and XML Contacts: The SPEEDE Committee also recently updated the contacts list. It is now posted on the AACRAO web site at http://www.aacrao.org/speede/statecont.cfm. Please send updates and corrections to cssmith@iastate.edu.

UT Austin SPEEDE Server Participant Table: There was a request from the California Community Colleges to modify the participant table so that individual colleges can be listed, but still route the transcripts through the CCCTran server. After a review, the staff at UT Austin indicated that such a process already exists and they volunteered to assist the CCCTran staff in implementing the process.

PESC XML Schemas using the simple data element “MonthDay”: It was brought to our attention that existing Implementation Guides indicating the proper way to include month and day in an instance document were incorrect. For example, to include a student’s birth month and day of November 2, the proper way is to include “–1102” with two dashes preceding the number 1102. The affected guides will be reissued to correct this error.
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University of Texas at Austin SPEEDE Internet Server: Shelby Stanfield, University Registrar at UT Austin has provided us with the following information about the use of the Server as of the end of June 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Transcripts for June</td>
<td>102,280</td>
<td>158,576</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Transcripts for past 12 months</td>
<td>793,662</td>
<td>961,795</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS131 Transcript Acknowledgments for June</td>
<td>102,280</td>
<td>134,114</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS131 Transcript Acknowledgments for past 12 months</td>
<td>640,593</td>
<td>779,336</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS189 Applications for Admission for June</td>
<td>42,624</td>
<td>58,856</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS189 Applications for Admission for past 12 months</td>
<td>819,693</td>
<td>994,957</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Total Transactions for June **</td>
<td>302,390</td>
<td>416,412</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Total Transactions for past 12 months **</td>
<td>3,035,561</td>
<td>3,662,221</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Sending Schools in June ***</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of TS130 Sending Schools per month for past 12 months ***</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Receiving Schools in June ***</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of TS130 Receiving Schools per month for past 12 months ***</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Total Transactions include TS130 Transcripts, TS131 Acknowledgments, TS997 Functional Acknowledgments, TS 189 Applications for Admission, and TS138 Test Scores.

*** In addition to this number of schools, there are other entities that distribute transcripts through the Server, such as Docufide, Florida K-12, Florida Postsecondary, National Transcript Center, Texas Education Agency, Triand, and Xap Corporation.
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The schools or other entities that sent the most TS130 transcripts through the UT Austin SPEEDE Server in June were

- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (42,161) facilitated via the College Foundation of North Carolina’s statewide college access web portal;
- Florida Public K-12 Schools (23,522);
- Texas Education Agency via National Transcript Center (15,064);
- Florida Public Postsecondary Schools (13,123);
- Xap Corporation (3,522);
- Maricopa Colleges in Arizona (3,461);
- Triand on behalf of Public High Schools in Arkansas (2,547).

Schools in 17 US states and one Canadian province (BC) sent TS130 transcripts through the Server in June.

In addition, 40 PESC XML College Transcripts were exchanged among postsecondary schools in Tennessee through the Texas SPEEDE Server in June; 34 PESC XML Transcripts were sent via the Server to schools in California and to the National Transcript Center; 23 XML Transcripts were exchanged among 4 schools in Georgia; 22 XML Transcripts were sent to Xap Corporation by the National Transcript Center; and the U of Minnesota-Twin Cities sent 19 XML Transcript to AMCAS.

And, the College Foundation of North Carolina processed 643 PESC XML High School Transcripts for 8 pilot high schools in the Wake County Public School district in May and June 2009.
May and June 2009 Report from AACRAO SPEEDE Committee

Future Meetings: The following are future events at which the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee normally participates:

AACRAO Technology Conference in Tucson, AZ July 19-21, 2009: This Sunday through Tuesday conference will be held at the JW Marriott Starr Pass Tucson Resort & Spa, 3800 w Starr Pass Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85745; Phone 520.792.3500; Reservations phone 888.527.8989. Web reservations link is http://marriott.com/tussp?groupCode=aacaaca&app=resvlink.

Registration and pre-conference workshops will be on Sunday morning. Opening session and breakout program sessions will continue Sunday afternoon. The last sessions will end at noon on Tuesday.

The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee plans to hold a pre-conference workshop on Sunday morning. We encourage schools to send both a registrar and/or admissions type to this workshop along with a technical person from your school. Our goal is to provide you with information and techniques and answer any questions you might have that can assist you in implementing or enhancing electronic student records exchanges on your campus.

The SPEEDE Committee will meet Tuesday afternoon at the end of the ATC.

PESC Fall Workgroup Summit in Washington, DC October 2009: This two day meeting is usually held on a Monday and Tuesday and SPEEDE members most active in PESC usually attend. It is a meeting where most active workgroups and user group meet face to face.

AACRAO Annual Meeting April 21-24, 2010 (Wednesday through Saturday) in New Orleans at the Ernest N. Morial Convention Center.
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AACRAO SPEEDE Committee Members for 2009-2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and University/College</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry Billing, Chair</td>
<td>Associate Registrar, Conestoga College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning (Ontario), and representative to the AACRAO SPEEDE committee from the Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbilling@conestogac.on.ca">bbilling@conestogac.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. “Jim” Bouse</td>
<td>Associate Registrar for Technology, University of Oregon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbouse@uoregon.edu">jbouse@uoregon.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuan Anh Do, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Systems Support Group, Undergraduate Admissions, San Francisco State University (CA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doey@sfsu.edu">doey@sfsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin S. Greene</td>
<td>Senior Associate Director of Technology and Internet Services, College Foundation of North Carolina, University of North Carolina General Administration</td>
<td><a href="mailto:greeners@northcarolina.edu">greeners@northcarolina.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey E. Sims</td>
<td>Director of Operations/Intake, University of Phoenix (AZ)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:monterey.sims@phoenix.edu">monterey.sims@phoenix.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Skeel</td>
<td>Director of Academic Records, University of Oklahoma</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rskeel@ou.edu">rskeel@ou.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare Smith-Larson</td>
<td>SPEEDE/Project EASIER Coordinator, Iowa State University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cssmith@iastate.edu">cssmith@iastate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. “Tom” Stewart</td>
<td>Retired College Registrar, Miami Dade College (FL)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stewartj@aol.com">stewartj@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Tashjian</td>
<td>Associate Director, Student Information Systems, Office of the Registrar, University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tim.tashjian@austin.utexas.edu">tim.tashjian@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And that’s the update for the past two months from the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee.
The fourth Rome Student Group Workshop meeting was held in Santiago de Compostela Spain, June 22-23 2009, in Association with EUNIS 2009 Conference, held at The Faculty of Medicine, University of Santiago.
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Introduction
The RS3G June 2009 workshop included representatives from 17 counties, 42 organizations and 62 participants gathered at the annual EUNIS 2009 Conference. As in the past, I have ventured to participate in these workshops to keep apprised of the progress and events unfolding in Europe following the Bologna and Copenhagen processes. I am also afforded the opportunity to share my ideas and observations, which have been many.

This workshop was held in Santiago de Compostela in northwest Spain midst the surroundings of ancient convents, monasteries, churches and buildings in the old city that dates back 2,000 years. Interestingly, there is a striking juxtaposition in Santiago of centuries-old buildings and cutting-edge modern architecture and outdoor sculpture. The influence of the Arabs, Romans, Moors, English and French can be seen in the architecture, infrastructure, names of roads, places, and even the art. The long history is worn into the stone walks and alleys layered over time and aged by the humid air and rain because Santiago sees 300 days of rain on average per year. Santiago is about 30 miles from the coast and is on the downhill slope from the mountains. The old city has narrow alleys filled with small stores, banks, cafes and restaurants trying to squeeze business from the random street traffic passing by foot. For 1000 years, the faithful follow a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. James in the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela. It is known in English as the Way of St. James and in Galician as the Camiño de Santiago. Over 100,000 pilgrims travel to the city each year from points all over Europe, and other parts of the world. The pilgrimage has been the subject of many books, blogs and television programs notably Brian Sewell’s The Naked Pilgrim.

The University Of Santiago de Compostela (USC) is over 400 years old. It has an expansive campus blending the ancient baroque and antique world with the modern study offered by a major Spanish university. I found the Faculty of Medicine an interesting building. It is located only a few blocks from the main square of the old city including the Plaza do Obradoiro where the Royal Hospital was founded in 1499 and is now operated as the oldest Hotel in the world. The buildings reflect an architecture born from marble and granite stone. The foundations are built on stone paths layered by huge blocks. Each building was built to last forever even though the interior spaces have undergone renovation and renewal. In the Faculty of Medicine building, traces of chalk boards have been replaced by white erase boards and projectors. Expansive lecture halls have been wired with electricity. The halls are wide and open. And the sterile feeling still permeated the formal building as it boasted anatomy, radiology, physiology and neurology departments.

The marble staircase inside The Faculty of Medicine, worn by students and faculty stepping to class over centuries, reminds me of the objective of education as we ascend new knowledge with optimism listening to lectures and studying. There had to be at least fifty large steps turning up the staircase worn by millions feet who strived up and down before me. The challenge to exercise our brain, heart and bodies must have been taken into consideration by those who designed the Faculty of Medicine including the staircase as a central access way. The rush of blood from my pumping heart stimulated by walking up or down the marble steps between sessions, stimulated my brain to absorb more content
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and observation. I was very alert during my stay. And, I attribute that to the constant walking and climbing around Santiago. I can just imagine what students and faculty felt as they raced to make class times and lectures. I also can’t stop thinking about the unintended benefit the architect layered into the building with treads spread apart, forcing everyone to take the stairs, since elevators would steal the value of the exercise and stimulation.

Another interesting observation compared to visiting other schools of medicine, were several plaques and statues commemorating past faculty. What I did not see were large portraits of past faculty or art work reflecting the progress of medical research. I did not see all the rooms so I may be amiss on this. There was a small easel holding a formal and uniform collage of faculty pictures from the nineteen century near the lectern.

The lecture hall housing the RS3G workshop meeting was a large expansive, modern appointed classroom, outfitted with folding tray tables and comfortable theater chairs. It offered an elevated stage and power for the presenter using the overhead high resolution projector. It had a large electric screen. I was not using my PC at the workshop so I was not concerned with power. Others were, as they stretched extension cords and power to their chair. Wireless was provided which of course allowed participants to stay connected to their office and their world. But, I was not concerned about staying connected while giving my attention to the workshop and participants.

**EUNIS, the European Union Information System Association** invited RS3G to host this fourth workshop as part of their annual conference after the last workshop in Stuttgart, Germany. It was confirmed by the Steering Committee in Amsterdam April 16th 2009 after we drafted the manifesto for RS3G. We also discussed the ideas for the workshop agenda focusing on the mutual desire to support growing conversations about collaborations and networking that has proven popular in past workshops. Attending this workshop afforded two meetings. First, I wanted to participate and continue my support of RS3G. Second, I wanted to get introduced to EUNIS and reflect on how it has evolved serving its membership.

On the evening of June 22nd, The **RS3G steering committee** met with members of the EUNIS board led by Jean-Francois Desnos and Jan Madey to discuss the various options of collaboration and association. The meeting was held at the **HOTEL VIRXE DA CERCA** at 18:30 in the well shaded court yard. The décor was appointed with artifacts from water wells and mills. My research about the history of the meeting site revealed it was formerly a bank and prior to that, a residence for the Jesuits in the 18th century. There was a deep
well about three meters wide covered with a thick glass sheet right in the bar and lounge floor on the first floor leading into the special room arranged for our gathering. You could peer down the ancient well into the black hole. After the steering committee meeting with EUNIS, the RS3G social network meeting and dinner commenced at 9:30PM. About thirty attended the dinner and social event continuing to reinforce the importance of relationships.

The menu consisted of four courses, red and white whites and wonderful service as the day melded into night. Food was served family style allowing everyone to share. I sat next to Victor Raviaoli, the Managing Director of Kion from Italy and Jan-Martin Lowendahl from Gartner and we took the chance to catch up on global education issues. I was a bit travel weary by the time we had dinner the evening of the 22nd. My journey began 24 hours early getting on the USAIR flight from Philadelphia to Lisbon at 8:30PM on the 21st with my 87 year old Dad. He has accompanied me on other trips including Rome, Italy when the first RS3G Workshop was held.

Traveling to Santiago de Compostela
After landing at 8:30am on the 22nd, my Dad and I left the plane with our luggage. First, we had to pass through customs. That was an interesting experience as we entered the massive hall, lined up and began waiting slowly for the customs agents to review our passport. There must have been a thousand people in line for visitors coming to Lisbon from all parts of the world. Separate on the left side of the hall, I could see the automatic entry portal for those citizens and residents who have the electronic Europass ID. There was no line and people could go right thru as efficient as walking thru a doorway.

We were not so lucky. Waiting over two hours and still very little progress getting thru the line, started to make me wonder if this delay would impact our next segment of travel. And, I was getting worried my 87 year old dad could not stand much longer or that he would have to have access to a bathroom soon, given his previous medical conditions. So, I did what any arrogant American would do, I flagged down a customs agent allowing young families and travelers who need special assistance
because they had connecting flights and pleaded with her to let us get through the special line, given the circumstances. She agreed, and we skipped out of line ahead of at least two hundred people. I felt bad about that, but I hope my economic contribution to the Lisbon economy would suffice to compensate for my decision.

After getting thru customs, we quickly found a bathroom and then exited the terminal in search of the Lisbon train station. There were very little signs directing travelers to ground transportation options. There were no information booths either that I could find. That was surprising, since travelers need signs and assistance given their unfamiliarity with any new facility. But, who thinks of them? Like students without an advocate or mentor, we searched and searched, finally realizing there was no train connection in the airport directly. After trying to ask a few airport workers, we realized we needed transportation to the train station.

*We took the airport bus shuttle* after asking an airport worker on a smoking break how to get a train north to Porto. She pointed us to a bus that was loading passengers and had graphics on it that offered a path to a dozen city stops downtown. We approached the waiting bus and asked the bus driver about getting a train north to Porto. He acknowledged the first stop was what we wanted. I should have better prepared for this part of the journey.

So, we paid the bus fare and boarded the standing room only bus crowded with commuters. About ten minutes away from the airport, we were dropped a few blocks away from a train station. We walked our luggage over cobbled tile sidewalks to the train station and had to climb down about twenty stone steps. The building was not senior friendly or offered handicap people any special entrances to navigate. So, it took me a while to help my Dad get down the steps. After entering the train station, I ventured to one of the ticket windows to learn we were in the wrong train station. The metro train station the airport bus driver thought we wanted was obviously a mistake. It was hard to communicate the specifics using hand signals and gestures. We needed to go to Lisbon’s main departure point for international destinations and central/northern Portugal called Santa Apolónia Station located on Avenida Infante Dom Henrique, eastern district of Alfama, on the Tagus River banks. On reflection, I should have asked how do we get to Santa Apolónia?

*Oh, I need a Taxi.* Of course I was not surprised we selected the wrong train station by my question and guidance we were provided in a rush standing in the bus door, my deficient translation skills and my lack of preparation. So, we walked back to the street level, up the stairs and hailed a taxi cab for the Santa Apolónia train station that could take us to Porto, Lisbon. The taxi ride was about ten minutes. Our taxi cab driver knew where to go, and he actually took us back toward the airport, dropping us off in front of the main train station.

*The main Lisbon train station* looked modern from a distance, but seemed built for a different era. Small room size cement boxes looked like bunkers from WWII were scattered on the first floor, each with its own purpose. Some were lounges by train type and others were ticket booths where agents behind thick glass windows would peer out and serve customers seeking assistance. We bought two first class tickets on the CP train after finally finding a cement box that was selling the north/south train
tickets. After waiting about an hour, we boarded the train north to Porto Lisbon from the second floor platform. I was most relieved.

At first, we did not know we had assigned seats, and sat on the last car we boarded. The ticket was coded and I could not figure out how the class or seating was represented. When the ticket conductor collected out tickets, he moved us to our assigned seats in the next car, even though the train was half filed and there were plenty of seats in the cabin. So, I had to pull two sets of luggage and followed my dad to the correct seats. First class did not appear to offer any other convenience over a regular fair – other than assigned seats closer to the café car. Unlike trains in Germany, I felt we overpaid for first class seating and derived no real benefit from it.

On the way to Santiago from Lisbon, just about everyone we met spoke very little English, so I resorted to hand signals and simple words to frame my questions or answers. I tried to use words from an internet dictionary, but found my accent embarrassing and awkward. Plus, the delay and my latency were just too slow to respond to conversation.

*The train ride north to Porto, Lisbon* was much smoother than the Amtrak Excellar on the East Coast of the US. There must have been twenty stops along the way, slowing down the effectiveness of the train’s power and speed. We finally got to Porto and after three hours. Entering the Porto train station, I began searching to find where to buy train tickets that would take us on to Santiago, our final destination. I waited in line and asked the customer service agent where to acquire tickets for Santiago and they pointed to the end of their counter line. So, after waiting a few more minutes and trying to convey our destination, the customer service representative told us there was no direct train to Santiago today and that we would have to take two trains getting us in well past my target time of 18:00. This would have meant I would miss the RS3G steering committee meeting altogether.

**Oh, I need another Taxi.** After a rush of anxiety, we pulled the Portugal/Spain maps out and started considering options. Within a few minutes of looking like puzzled travelers, a middle aged man asked if we could use a Taxi. His name was Alfredo Vincenti. I replied by asking if he could take us to Santiago directly. Alfredo replied yes as he used his hands to convey two and ½ hours - pay by meter. It was over 500 kilometers. I figured it would be about 300 EU. So, in my anxiety and frustration, we agreed to take a Taxi instead of venturing to find a train to Santiago or rent a car. We pulled our luggage over to his taxi cab and took off for the highway. It cost $320 EU for the taxi ride, an entertaining way to see the roadside along highways A-8, A-3 and AP-9. We passed thru Via Nova de Famalico, Braga, Ponte de Lima, Valenca, Porrino, Vigo and Pontevedra like the Star Ship Enterprise passes planets on its way to its destination in another star system. The vineyards and mountainside were plush green as we ventured north. The coastal cities smelled of sardines and the sun drenched road was spotted with toll booths metering traffic along the high speed parkway.

*We arrived in Santiago de Compostela* while it was still light around 18:00 (6 PM).
Alfredo dropped us off quickly in front of the Hotel Compostela and helped us with our bags. The Hotel was book shelved between two banks on a major corner of Rua de Horreo and Rua da Fonte de San Antonia. It was a quick check-in and we rode a small Ottis elevator to the first floor where we found our rooms.

The Hotel housed within the Plaza de Galicia, an UNESCO heritage site dating back to 1499. The interiors are beautifully renovated with a very contemporary feel. The sleek lines, attractive wooden furniture and modern lighting highlighted with chrome and marble features were far superior to large box hotels made of concrete slabs and cookie cutter rooms. The rooms display wooden floors and soothing, organic colors.

After washing up and changing clothes, I walked up the street to HOTEL VIRXE DA CERCA for the RS3G steering committee meeting afraid I was going to be late. It was easy to find. I walked down from the street entrance to the first floor, through the lounge and saw familiar faces sitting around the patio table enjoying the sunshine. I joined the table, pulled up a chair and began listening to the remarks.

After the RS3G steering committee meeting, I returned to the Hotel Compostela for my Dad. He was fast asleep, exhausted from the travels and asked to skip the evening dinner. So, I returned to the HOTEL VIRXE DA CERCA on my own for dinner that lasted until after midnight Spain time. The meal was Galizian cuisine enjoyed in a relaxing atmosphere with a variety of the “tapas” and local wine. By end of dinner and after several glasses of wonderful Spanish wine, I was ready to hit the sack and was thankful my hotel was only a few blocks away on the same road. It would have been so easy for me to get lost.

Registering and attending EUNIS and RS3G Workshop
The next day began at 8:00am after a quick and satisfying buffet breakfast in the basement of the Hotel Compostella. The traditional continental breakfast included local orange juice, fruits, meats, breads and scrambled eggs. I left the hotel for the Faculties of Medicine to find the EUNIS Conference with my local map. It was a hardy walk past the Cathedreal and Parador de Santiago - Hostal Reis Catolicos. I was a bit winded as I rushed to continue on to my destination. Along my path, I met Pierre Ageron from the University of Lyon, France as he was navigating his way to the conference. We shared the path to the conference together.

Combining history, art and tradition, the goal of pilgrims and the emblem of St. James, the Hostal dos Reis Católicos, in the Plaza do Obradoiro, forms together with the cathedral one of the world’s most remarkable, and most visited, urban settings. The Hostal, which first saw life as a Royal Hospital in 1499 to house the many pilgrims arriving in Santiago, today still invites the traveler to enjoy this universal and fascinating city. Considered the oldest operating hotel in the world, it is also one of the most luxurious and beautiful. Later, I ventured into the foyer just to check it out. The tall ceilings, carpets and furniture, emblems of the day, reflected the rich history and thousands of patrons who walked in my steps with intrigue. I peered into the restaurant and gift store, and then returned to my path.
Up the street from the **Plaza do Obradoiro**, the Faculty of Medicine stood parallel to a row of proprietary stores and cafes serving tourists. The EUNIS Banner hung over the main entrance of the Faculty of Medicine. I ventured in and found the marble staircase and small posters pointing to the second floor. My first pass up the marble staircase was quick and it led me right to the registration area for the conference. After waiting a few minutes, the EUNIS staff gave me the checkin bag, tickets, name tag and material for the conference. From there, I ventured down the hall to the **Aula Castelao** room where the RS3G workshop was scheduled.

After taking my seat, I ventured through the conference bag and materials. Scanning the registration material, I found the Workshop introduction and agenda:

**The Fourth RS3G Workshop**


This workshop builds on the previous activities of the Rome Student Systems and Standard Group (RS3G) around standards and procedures supporting digital student data exchange in Higher Education Institutions. RS3G has been focused on putting into perspective how standardization efforts can help solve the challenging interoperability problems paving the road toward the harmonization of Higher Education at international level. One of its distinctive traits is to provide a context for understanding international standardization activities, contributing to them in a practical way, and engaging in international collaboration projects. RS3G is dedicated to addressing issues such as the critical “adoption dilemma” as well as key success factors like “bridging the gap” between standardization authorities and the implementation community. The workshop will also showcase real ongoing projects and their expected impact on Bologna Process while providing references for further investigation and opportunities for direct involvement.
The RS3G Workshop Agenda and Program
Santiago de Compostela, Spain, June 23rd 2009

Welcome by EUNIS Vice-President - Jan Madey (10:00 - 10:15)

RS3G update (10:15 - 11:30)

- Intro (numbers and previous events) - Simone
- Steering Committee presentation - Jonathan
- RS3G Manifesto - Manuel
- Liaisons: EAIE SIG - Herman, EUNIS Task Force - Jean Francois
- Focus on Identity Management - JM

coffee break (11:30 - 12:00)

The Big Picture: Identity Management and Student System Standards - a tag team that must work (12:00 - 13:00) JM

lunch break (13:00 - 14:00)

Update on European Learner Mobility project (14:00 - 15:00) Cleo S.

- Status Update
- Data Model review
- Looking forward & forward looking
- call for services!

International Collaboration Projects (15:00 - 16:00) Janina D.

- Mobility data exchange between university consortia and HE system providers: a MUCI - CINECA call for participation
- Other proposals - initiatives, EU funded projects,

coffee break (16:00 - 16:30)

Discussion and Closing (16:30 - 17:30)

- Final Remarks, comments, proposals
- EAIE workshop (September 16th 2009)
- Next RS3G workshop in Sweden (Nov. 2009)
Review of the Workshop and My Observations

Welcome by EUNIS Vice-President - Jan Madey (10:00 to 10:15)

Jan Madey (Poland), Vice President of EUNIS provided a short introduction for the RS3G Workshop. He mentioned the importance of adoption and the development of standards (specifications) to support student mobility.

Jean Francios Desnos (France), President of EUNIS echoed Jan Madey’s comments and welcomed all to the workshop.

RS3G update (10:15 - 11:30)

- Intro (numbers and previous events) - Simone
- Steering Committee presentation - Jonathan
- RS3G Manifesto - Jonathan
- Liaisons: EAIE SIG - Herman, EUNIS Task Force - Jean Francois

Simone Ravaioli, KION (Italy) along with Jonathan Dempsey, Digitary (Ireland) provided the RS3G update. Jean Francios was introduced and added a few comments about his efforts with the RS3G. He attended our first Steering Committee Meeting in Amsterdam when I first met him.

Simone proceeded to review the history of the RS3G with a powerpoint. It was effective to reflect back on the start of RS3G, especially for new participants who made up over 50% of the audience from my casual observation.

Simone summarized the past travels in building RS3G awareness across the European continent spanning 6,000 kilometers between Rome, Stuttgart, Dublin and Santiago.

Simone also tested the audience with a slide showing a huge number on the background of the Santiago Shell lodged in a stone block. The number was 601742. Many guesses were made from the number of mobile students to the number of days since the turn of the millennium. The number represented 60 participants from 17 countries and 42 organizations were pre-registered for the workshop. This was a significant increase over the prior three Workshops – revealing what Simone believes is a growing interest in the group and its mission.

Jonathan focused on the **RS3G Manifesto, Governance and Mission of RS3G**:

RS3G is an international group of stakeholders of HE contributing to:

Facilitate student mobility and lifelong learning

by:

- Building community to share news and experience in student systems
- Identifying and sharing opportunities to establish interoperability
- Providing expertise to the development of business cases driving specifications
- Contributing to, endorsing and facilitating uniform adoption towards standards
- Fostering contacts with formal entities such as EC, EUA, ENQA, CEN *
- Liaise with communities of interest like EAIE, EUNIS **
- Showcasing outcomes of RS3G activities

**RS3G Steering Committee**

- Steering committee members
  - Gunnar Backelin, LADOK (SE)
  - Jonathan Dempsey, Digitary (IE)
  - Jean Francois Desnos, EUNIS (FR)
  - Manuel Dietz, QS unisolution (DE)
  - Herman de Leeuw, EAIE (NL)
  - Simone Ravaioli, KION (IT)
- Advisors to steering committee
  - Jan Martin Lowendahl, Gartner Research (SE)
  - David Moldoff, PESC and Academy One (USA)
  - Mark Stubbs, Manchester Metropolitan University (GB)

**RS3G Mission:** RS3G (Rome Student Systems and Standards Group) is an established group of software implementers and stakeholders in the European Higher Education domain which is focused on contributing to the definition and adoption of standards and procedures for the exchange of data to facilitate student mobility and lifelong learning.
The Big Picture: Identity Management and Student System Standards - a tag team that must work (12:00 - 13:00)

Jan-Martin Lowendahl (Jan-Martin.Lowendahl@gartner.com)

The presentation made by Jan-Martin was a very good overview of why Identify Management Systems (IAM) should matter to Higher Education. With mobility, come the business drivers to address how we collect identity attributes, how we secure them and how we validate them. Trust and the movement across physical and virtual borders is a tag team that must work together. Higher Education has a constant feed of new learners, faculty and generate alumni annually.

Gartner has invested in a great deal of research on IAM. And, Jan-Martin shared some of the insights gained from the research including business drivers for local solutions. The highest ranked reason organizations implement IAM is for user convenience. Much of IAM focuses on security and provisioning user access to computing resources. What was nice about the charts Jan-Martin presented was the regional comparison across AMEA, North America and Asia/Pacific.

IAM is a complex subject. So, surveys often reveal variations of response, based upon perceptions, differing glossaries and understandings of what IAM covers. Simple questions are still helpful. In 2008, nearly 50% of organizations are in process of implementing IAM. 37% say they are implemented IAM.

Jan-Martin then presented a complex diagram representing all the components and functions of IAM. It covered Identity Auditing, Identity Administration, Directory Technologies, Identity Verification, and Access Management. This solution oriented view was from the perspective of an organization managing IAM, serving requests from others or integrating with other environments.

The identity process begins with proven identity, creating identity, changing identity, using identity, monitoring identify and retiring identity spanning multiple tools and functions. Jan-Martin then reviewed the vendor world and how tools overlap the IAM space.

Evolution of IAM was reviewed from the legacy single sign-on to, directory services, web sign-on, real-time federation, real-time authorization, identity administration, to audit. A typical university environment was reviewed.

Jan-Martin discussed three paradigms of IAM using pictures. One was an isolated Rock reflecting an organizational perspective of managing identity, one was Stonehenge (federated IAM) where a community shares a common infrastructure to manage identity, and one was pebbles (user centric) where consumers, creators and certifiers work across the connected cloud of systems and tools through services.

The role of governments in IAM is evolving. It is the oil or sand in the gears, depending on your perspective. Europass, passport control, protecting and promoting the freedom of mobility, commerce and regulation (oversight) are part of the process and examples of how the ecosystem is evolving. Higher education is one aspect of the IAM ecosystem creating identity, using identity, certifying claims...
and providing a learning environment helping people expand their abilities, knowledge, competencies, etc.

The axioms of identity were reviewed. Identity is subjective. Identity changes over time (claims change because people evolve), Identify allocates risk.

**On the absurdity of owning one’s own identity...**

Bob Blakley

Levels of assurance is the basis of trust, proofing, legal impact, secure transmission, variety of form and confidence. What is the cost of assurance? What is the latency? What is the value/benefit?

Jan-Martin transitioned the conversation to thinking about identity and IAM is really about managing claims. He introduced the claims ecosystem – forget identity and focus on claims management across consumer, creator and certifier. The future roles will be fulfilled by services exposed through standard data exchange or access. This is why it is part of the conversation and foundation of our work to develop specifications and drive for data standards. The protocols of exchange and process are overlaid with IAM.

The right person, in the right place, to enable every student to reach their full potential – whether in the real or virtual world – this should be our community focus. As we move more and more commerce to virtual, interconnected systems and services will rely on IAM in the cloud. Trust will be federated to mitigate cost and risk – through assurance and connectivity – compared to disconnected and isolated systems - which obscures trust and difficulty in assessing risk because claims can’t be certified easily.

Personal, business and societal goals will be achieved if we address IAM from a political, governance, institutional and consumer perspective.

How do we progress? Key recommendations: work on government’s role, understand the development of standards (specifications to adoption to standards) real and defacto, develop interoperability – which means we need to recognize there will be multiple protocols, methods, technology, etc. Recognize identity and identity assets as real assets. We all need to find our place in the claims ecosystem.
Update on European Learner Mobility Project (14:00 - 15:00)
Cleo Sgouropoulou<csgouro@cs.ntua.gr>

- Status Update
- Data Model review
- Looking forward & forward looking
- Call for comments!
- Call for services!

ELM (European Learners Mobility) - is the standardization project (Europass) ongoing within CEN (Central European Normalization)

Overview: Cleo did a fantastic job summarizing a very complex ELM project and process which is creating a Diploma Supplement XML domain model. Cleo had a 35 slide Powerpoint deck and references to an ELM wiki to convey the material and progress to date. Check out: http://wiki.teria.no/confluence/display/EuropeanLearnerMobility/European+Learner+Mobility

The ELM project is expected to last 14 – 16 months in the development stage including collecting public comment and adjusting the specification to satisfy community concerns. Cleo did not outline the expected window of time it will take to achieve adoption of the Diploma Supplement (DS) specifications and the challenges to persuade service providers and developers to adjust their product roadmaps to incorporate the specifications across the ecosystem – for producing and consuming the DS in electronic form versus the paper form. This includes the protocols for request/reply, semantics, security, access methods, whether the infrastructure will be decentralized or federated across countries, systems and institutions. The ELM-DS is being developed independent of all the technical implementation issues at the moment, which has positive and negative implications. The more important and positive view of ELM-DS is that it is the first step augmenting Europass with the added data definitions and schemas that long term will evolve to address learner claims and identity management (creation, collection, certification and recognition of claims) and offering the services to stakeholders seeking access to them.

A question continues to come up in my mind, and one I have been shared with my European colleagues since getting involved in RS3G - is the focus on producing the ELM-DS without a real set of user stories explored on the consumption side and transforming the paper form to an XML form. So, it is leaving the actors wondering or imagining how will the ELM-DS impact future tools and system functionally? Obviously, the ELM-DS will be used for assessment of prior learning from an overall level – similar to the transcript – from an institution’s perspective or from an employer’s perspective. But, having it in paper form, electronic document form like a PDF or complex XML form, does not address how the information rendered in the ELM-DS will improve functionality, including fact checking and certification, handing the evolution of data as an individual claims for “credit” evolve and managing the instances of data as a result of attendance and learning engagements lifelong across many theaters. Transforming the DS into
XML as outlined in the project is a valuable step, but I infer it will have to go thru the context of use in more granular steps, where further requirements will unfold and impact the speed or slowness of adoption. The tendencies of many will be to delay and postpone, reflected in a normal adoption curve of new technology. The hype cycle and timing of adoption will depend on many unknown variables.

About 7 months have expired since the start of ELM-DS and the project has developed the first draft of the abstract and conceptual models leading to name spaces and domains for basic data schemas making up the Diploma Supplement. This is fantastic progress to date. A reference set of other specifications are noted. I did not review the details of the specification yet, but plan too. Missing on the surface is the review of HR_XML and other person data specifications that would overlap and compete with software tools and services already in place using them. The domains of ELM-DS are:

- a Person instance, representing the learner/holder of the qualification,
- a Provider instance, representing the awarding institution, and, optionally,
- a Diploma instance, comprising information about the learning opportunity, at programme level, leading to the described qualification, as well as the actual result for the specific person
- a Transcript instance, containing LearningOpportunity instances representing the component units, each of which contains provider, credit, and result information.
- Additional Information property containing a description of additional achievement information.

The enhancement of learner mobility and employability is a high priority within the European Education Area. That is why CEN is funding the ELM-DS project. The establishment of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and Europass as a framework for the transparent description of qualifications and competences provides the common basis for well-structured recording of life-long learning events including European higher education structures and learners' private / institution-owned information.

This leads me to another observation: the PESC work on the Academic Progress Event Model spans institutions, program and offerings and overlaps the ELM-DS in a more granular form. The ELM-DS offers a means of sharing aggregated information (claims, collection, assessment, validation and certification) throughout life-long learning, not just between entry and exit points and not following a functional use model. For instance, the applicability of part or all of the DS to support dual enrollment, study abroad and transfer will be seen in the next presentation by Janina Mincer Daszkiewicz – who takes a more practical and functional approach toward using data exchange between two institutions across countries – reinforcing, the entry and exit points of life-long learning are not the only uses of the DS and its granular parts. Events inside the academy can be supported as new tools evolve to support dual enrollment, study abroad, placement and academic progress. This is more a suggestion I guess.
The goal of developing the ELM-DS specification is to support the development (or really the desire for new tools) of a new generation of technology-enhanced services for learners (learning and employment opportunities exploration), higher educational institutions administrations (certification or augmentation of learner information), employers (work-place descriptions, recruiting and development of learners' competencies) and other stakeholders of learning, education and training throughout Europe, as the European Union and Commission, the Member States and their governments and ministries, etc.

The Diploma Supplement (DS) is considered one of the most important Europass documents, having an essential role in the transparent interpretation and recognition of academic and professional qualifications (diplomas, degrees, certificates) across the diverse European educational systems map. In particular, the E-DS aims at:

- Promoting transparency within and between higher education systems;
- Providing accurate and up-to-date information on an individual's qualifications;
- Aiding mobility and access to further study and employment abroad;
- Providing fair and informed information relating to qualifications; and
- Facilitating academic and professional recognition and thus increasing the transparency of qualifications.

The entity domain model is an overview of the major areas of the ELM-DS.
The DS constitutes an instrument upon which a high level of agreement on the content and structure has been achieved among the EU member states. Indeed, most of the European countries have taken up the DS initiative and have specified their national variants of DS, in most cases being minor variations of the Europass DS. However, currently the DS is mostly issued in paper-based format. In cases where it is issued electronically, the DS is represented in a proprietary manner. A major problem is now the lack of interoperable tools, impeding the recording and/or reuse of data in existing learning management systems for the production of an electronic DS and the exchange of information among interested parties. I don’t think having the XML version will address the proprietary delivery and use of the DS until a delivery mechanism or transport infrastructure evolves as part of the specification or in tandem. That of course is my opinion.

The ELM-DS is a proposed (specification) supporting the recording and exchange of DS information among learner information systems, as well as the aggregation of information by third party suppliers. New tools will evolve to present, prepare, access and assess the content of the DS once the specification is finalized. That is the expectation.

The ELM-DS has been developed as:

- a lightweight standard taking into consideration existing and emerging business processes
- an easy-to-implement standard in order to ensure a rapid uptake by stakeholders of learning, education and training throughout Europe (Higher Education Institutions, learners, employers, service providers, etc.)

The ELM-DS is based on a data model expressing information of a learner’s qualification, in full compliance with the Europass requirements, needed for the general purposes of:

- the exploitation of academic achievements abroad: in continuing education or in seeking job opportunities
- the admission of students or graduates in home and European universities: acknowledgment of credits or transfer of credits accumulated in home institutions moving from one university to another.
- the expression of the level, content and nature of qualifications to potential employers both nationally and at a European level.
- the enhancement of internal and European student mobility, from a university to another, or from one branch of studies to another.
- the proper integration of foreign workers into a country's employment setting.
- the normalization of higher education qualifications, either in academic or non academic paths.
- the establishment of good practices in the recognition procedures of qualifications among Higher Education Institutions.

Check out the ELM-DS wiki for more information or review the PPT on the RS3G.org website.
International Collaboration Project (15:00 - 16:00)
Janina Mincer Daszkiewicz<jmd@mimuw.edu.pl>

Mobility data exchange between university consortia and HE system providers: a MUCI - CINECA call for participation

The third RS3G workshop presentation covered a pilot designed to serve user functionality and data exchange between institutions driven by very specific requirements. It was not a standard or community developed specification such as ELM-DS that is abstract and conceptual. The presentation was a static demonstration of the potential power of rendering common data exchange protocols, semantics and methods to support functional uses with negotiated data packages between institutions sending and receiving learners.

Janina Mincer Daszkiewicz presented WEB-SERVICES FOR EXCHANGE OF DATA ON COOPERATION AND MOBILITY BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS. Janina presented a grounded approach using a SOA (service oriented architecture) with web services framed to support a set of application methods with well defined data payloads rendered across the institutional boundaries and systems to serve functions required by end-user needs. The pilot demonstrated how collaboration and application of technology are not the barriers to a wider scale implementation of data exchange and interoperability, but the will and governance to foster the motivation to overcome the challenges of sharing common infrastructure, definitions, methods and specifications – and, in a broader context, re-tool systems to support new enrollment patterns of mobility.

Motivations and incentives must be aligned to avoid the “not-invented here”, which often creates differentiation and lack of portability of systems and data – due to the nature of innovation and the human desire to create the state of the art. Second, the application functionality must compete for resources and localized support, to enable success across institutions. There are thousands of applications and functions spanning academic and administrative departments within an institution. They all compete for IT resources and support. Creating a functional approach is often the fastest and easiest path demonstrating the value of IT’s investment, but it lacks reuse across other functional areas, resulting in a more costly model to support.

In other words, requesting the course and program history from a student system (for example) can be used across multiple applications and multiple uses. ERP and student systems evolved with managing basic person data, course data and organization data as a hierarchy across functional areas to optimize storage and retrieval. Instead of creating an abstract and conceptual approach across user roles, access and functions, Janina and her team took a very pragmatic method of building exactly what her team felt they needed to address student mobility across institutions and academic programs as a demonstration project. This is not intended to be a negative. But, one has to make a choice to create community specifications that can have broader use or focus on specific uses and examples. The latter, will require greater cost of
integration long term and attract many to duplicate with varying levels of reflection, given the
direct impact on self interests and motivations to solve problems that are here today. It also
reveals how architecture and methods are the focus, not the actual data payloads and the effort to
transform point to point implementations – which will be taxing to accommodate, but possibly
more realistic than expecting everyone to re-tool systems following new specifications.

So, the pilot revealed great potential regarding the use of web services and functional design,
supported by the sharing of a common infrastructure. This could be a future model for other
functional uses and developers - one that can satisfy short term demands. Finally, it is a more
granular approach toward data exchange, designed to support user stories and expectations to
lower cost, improve productivity and service to mobile learners.

**RS3G Discussion and Closing (16:30 - 17:30)**

- Final Remarks, comments, proposals
- EAIE workshop (September 16th 2009)
- Next RS3G workshop in Sweden (Nov. 2009)

Overall, I think this workshop was the best out of four so far. I think the presentations and discussions
that were stimulated were well received by the participants. Even the standing breaks and lunch,
offered everyone adequate time to follow-up on thoughts, network and find time to catch up on email.

The next workshop is scheduled for Sweden November 2009. The actual dates will be published and
emailed to participants with an invitation. Please share the invitation with others when you receive it.

*My final remarks about the workshop and RS3G progress:* our incremental approach is respective
and thoughtful of past work while focusing on influencing the next generation systems that could
support interoperability, collaboration and the evolution of data standards. We are working from the
shoulders of others, leveraging and recognizing their efforts with mutual respect. Our hope is, we can
serve the market better sharing and working toward what we have in common, even in the face of
competition. Our goal is to foster the real and virtual ecosystem around education through a common
purpose which will help institutions serve people better, putting the right person, in the right place, to
enable learners no matter where they are or where they want to go, reach their full potential.

Simone: thank you for a great job organizing the RS3G workshop. And Jonathan: thank you for being
the foundation to support open and frank conversation needed by RS3G to be successful.

*My other activities outside of the RS3G Workshop,* Simone scheduled a wonderful
dinner at a semi-private restaurant called Casa Marsla, a block off the Plaza do Obradoiro on the evening
of June 23rd 2009. The dinner started at 21:45 (9:45) and covered nine courses with a variety of wines I
could not keep track of. We had fennel soup, popcorn covered whipped goose livers, asparagus salad,
hake fish, lemon sauté’ sardines, filet of beef, two different sorbets with cherries and strawberries, and

Prepared by D.Moldoff, AcademyOne, Inc.
a frozen sugar convection along with homemade breads. We rambled back to our hotel at 1:00 in the morning.

EUNIS 2009 activities and sessions spanned two more days. There were keynotes and parallel sessions throughout Wednesday and Thursday. I attended a few sessions and networked during lunches. I slept late on June 24th, given the late night before.

Harmonizing Higher Education – A Special Concert
On the evening of June 24th, EUNIS hosted a special Concert and Dinner. The concert musicians from the Real Filharmonia de Galicia (RFG). were:

- Violin: Anca Smeu
- Viola: Ionela Ciobotaru
- Violoncello: Thomas Piel
- Double Bass: Carlos Mendez
- French Horn: Xavier Ramon
- Basoon: Manuel Veiga
- Clarinet: Saul Canosa

The concert included Beethoven Septette in E flat Major and as encore, the tango "Por una cabeza" by Carlos Gardel, arranged for septette by the basoon player. How appropriate and well done!

The Beethoven Concert at EUNIS was wonderful stimulant. It got me thinking. Yes Simone -the parallels to our need to develop and adopt data exchange standards to support the academy is related to listening to Beethoven in a country far away from my home.

Even though the RS3G is a small community of implementers and system developers, we can make a big impact like Beethoven did who lived and worked three centuries before us. The services we should render as ‘implementers’ is like musicians playing a Beethoven score. Do we all have to write our own specifications? Or, can we share a common score, transforming how we differentiate to how we collaborate and interconnect? In other words, successful software implementers should be seen as those that have the interconnections and pipes synchronized.
with the community specifications developed and approved by groups like RS3G, CEN and others.

The specifications we jointly develop and validate are much like the music composed by Beethoven. They are complex and cover orchestration, timing, protocols, semantics and fit within the lines. If we apply our efforts to create a common score, and focus on building adoption, we would then be supporting the processes of curriculum alignment or tuning, assessing comparability and rigor, supporting mobility and commerce far better, than if we continue down our isolated path developing one-off systems that only a few hear or see. When we think of the billion of people in the world who aspire to higher education and have no access (at the least), we can see there is an ample market to develop ways to serve the common good of the student. Beethoven’s music has been heard by billions, even in the variation of performance. Yet, all musicians strive to play it the way it is.

The music art form has evolved from a single man who developed his ability to compose music that has evolved into a standard – through adoption we all can we can all relate too – no matter where we came from or what language we speak or what school we attended, we all can listen to and consume the music (if we can hear that is).

The beauty of having well developed music score that all musicians aspire to play through training, practice and performance – no matter what country or language on this earth, transcends our drive for differentiation – with no parallel and how I would wish the practice of software development would evolve beyond local perspectives into such a model.

Developing Student Systems and Functional applications have not taken this path because of isolation. We have gone down a proprietary path for sake of differentiation and competitive motives. What is cool about thinking about Beethoven or for that matter, any formal music, is I could hear the same music anywhere in the world, and most aspire to retain the score and intent by staying within the lines and notes – at least the classics. They (musicians) don’t vary speed or decibel. They don’t re-write it. They strive to make it as comparable as possible – by excelling at repeating it. We dwell on how remarkable the sounds are, when the music is followed to the specification (music score). Why do we not do that with software and specifications?

Musicians attempt to make their performance live up to the standard and differentiate on how well they do that. We assess them that way. If they squeaked off key, we would immediately hear it and squint. We should strive to develop our “score” to support data portability, exchange and interoperability in the same light. No matter where one plays the Violin and Beethoven, Base or French horn, the goal of the musician is to repeat it the best way they can
to stay compatible with the intent of the composer – not to be different in other words. We need to develop a model for adoption that follows that pattern.

Like a specification, Beethoven wrote the music to orchestrate many instruments through sponsorship, like our present day specifications should augment and drive how the moving parts of higher education should tie together and “Harmonize” to support our audience’s desire for clarity and practice. In other words, how do we do this? It is a complex puzzle – not as challenging as developed a music score like Beethoven who was deaf. We find sponsors (CEN) like Beethoven and Mozart did in their era, to develop specifications that we can aspire to follow, improving our ability to assess learning and outcomes in the process, rather than get bogged down by the differences in how we administer data, methods and functions that no one hears or sees.

**No one wants US Money**

In preparation for coming to the RS3G Workshop, I withdrew $500 in cash from my bank and took the remaining Eruos I had in my desk drawer as spending money. In the Philadelphia Airport, before departing, my Dad and I exchanged $500 US dollars for Euros saving the rest of our cash to exchange if we needed it. Well, we spent the Euros we converted by the end of the RS3G workshop. So, since our Hotel was bookshelved by two banks, I went into each bank requesting to convert $500 in US currency to Euros. Both refused and said they would only do that for customers. I proceeded to two other banks down the street, and got the same response.

So, my only avenue was to withdraw more cash from my bank account, which of course got me to thinking about the economic consequences of how currency exchange is similar to prior credit recognition. When we hear the response our currency is not valued, it creates unintended consequences, like reducing my likelihood of spending more money on things I may want, but not need.

Which, in turn, from a macro economic perspective, the actions of banks not accepting my currency, will ripple through the economy, one traveler at a time coming from the US? This is similar to institutions, employers and even governments not accepting the credentials of others coming from places outside their domain. It impacts the global market and implications of protectionism reinforced by risk aversion, which in the end, will diminish mobility and commerce, not support it. Just an observation I thought about considering the topic of the EUNIS conference and the focus of the RS3G workshop.

**Renting a Car**

Another interesting topic of cross country commerce and the implications on policies and practices often employed to avoid risk, is the renting of a car. Before my trip, I had arranged for
a car rental from EuropCar, to pick up a small compact in Lisbon and drive to Santiago and then on to Madrid. Obviously, my intent was to site see and spend my couple of travel days eating in local establishments and seeing the sights much closer to earth than an air transfer would afford. Sure, I could have easily arranged for an airport to airport shuttle. It would have been much less expensive. But, I was not just trying to get between point A - and point B without any opportunity to experience the local color and places that would be abstracted from 35,000 feet in the sky. So, I wanted to experience driving up the Portugal coast and down thru the country reaching Madrid. How often would life afford me this opportunity I thought?

Because I wanted to take the rental car across two counties, like I do in the United States all the time, I was going to be charged $900 Euros for a one-way drop off charge! So, EuropCar offered an option to pick up a car in Santiago’ train station instead of Lisbon to save the drop off charge if I keep the car in the same country. This is due to multiple companies or franchises not cooperating on managing the fleet across their proprietary borders. In the end, the penalty of trying to meet my desire was too expensive, so I reduced my expectation and took the option EuropCar offered. Much like student mobility, dual enrollment requires coordination and compromise across two institutions. It is similar to the extra effort of wanting to get local exposure of culture, geography and people when renting a car across countries. It is not just educational institutions impacted or inhibiting mobility. Commerce and the resistance inherited by borders and proprietary interests often can be seen across other industries that dampens the real value.

So, I rented the car in Santiago and picked up the car the morning of the 23rd, and ventured to the local parking garage as close as I could to the Hotel Compostela. The hotel did not have parking. So, I found a garage that would cost $8 Euro a day. Funny, I had to rent the car for three days and park it two of them to get the one way drop off charge reduced to $20 Euro. I still felt that was worth it.

I had to wait about 30 minutes for the EuropCar attendant to retrieve my car and clean it. That was ok, since I had to get my mind around driving a manual transmission again, something I have not done in over twenty years. Like riding a bike, it came back quickly as I ventured up the hilly streets to find the garage. I only stalled out once and quickly recovered.

Our Journey to Madrid by Car
It was about 500 kilometers from Santiago de Compostela to Madrid. I think we made it in 600 kilometers by the time we arrived at Madrid Airport. That sounds pretty absurd when you think of an airport hotel 12 kilometers from the airport, hidden in an industrial park, behind tall buildings obscuring signage and roads. Most of the 100 extra kilometers were the result of trying to get to the hotel once we arrived at the airport at dusk the evening of the 25th.
Leaving Santiago de Compostela was pretty easy by car. After picking up the rental car at the garage and paying the attendant, I drove out the garage on to a street under construction, ripped apart for what seemed water drainage and had to navigate barriers I could not read nor understand. Still, it took me about fifteen minutes to circle around the block, about 300 meters away during what seemed like rush hour traffic at 11:00am in the morning. I got to the front of the hotel, grabbed our bags and got my Dad into the front seat. We departed by 11:30am for Madrid finally without harm or issue that could not be dealt with.

I gave the maps to my Dad, hopefully expecting he could help me navigate the highway and on to the cities down south. He had trouble reading the small print in the moving car. So, I relied more on signs and my sense of direction finding the first highway to Lugo. It was pretty easy, considering all the energy exasperated thinking about getting lost or not knowing how to ask for directions in Spanish.

We stopped along the highway several times to take pictures, get gas and eat. We saw hundreds of pilgrims walking, riding and experiencing the Way to St. James. The pilgrimage to Santiago has never ceased from the time of the discovery of St. James' remains. We did not exactly follow the path in reverse, since we were headed south to Madrid on highway A-6, but it was worth noting we were following a path that has been around for centuries and probably millions have traversed the ground under our feet – or for that matter, tires.

Lugo was our first stop. It is a city built on Roman ruins and the perimeter of the old city has a standing, well maintained Roman wall. We drove around the city and took pictures of the wall that has remained for centuries, even through wars and storms, showing the engineering and architectural feat mastered by the Romans. Our journey continued on highway A-6.

We passed thru Baralla, Villa Franca del Briezo, Ponferrada, Astorga, La Beneza, San Cristobol de Entrevinas, Benevente, Cercicnos before heading for Madrid. The further south we came, the flatter and more arid landscape began to take over the horizon. Driving around the small towns was fun, comparing architecture, geography, climate changes and of course the mountain views. I was fascinated by the windmills in the distant mountain hills as my father was more intrigued by the power distribution lines connecting towers across the landscape.

One of the most interesting experiences driving down to Madrid was when we stopped for a late lunch at a truck stop that served family style. We first hit the men’s room. Then, we ventured to determine how the protocol worked to be seated. There were no menus. There were no prices. There were no signs. I could see ten or so long tables filled with patrons being served, enjoying wine, beer, soda and water. The tables were spread across a large central room with an attached bar. Just about all the tables were filled. So, we spotted one half empty and proceeded to sit down.
Within a few minutes, one of the waitresses came over to our table and pulled the paper table cloth off and cleared the plates from the former patrons. As I watched others, they just seemed to order from memory and I took my clues quickly. When the waitress came over to us again with her menu pad, I pointed to the guy next to be and said I wanted what he had – which was a sirloin steak with potatoes fries. Within five minutes she brought what seemed like a bucket of chicken noodle soup with fresh baked bread. Then she brought us to servings of steak. Instead of wine at 2pm in the afternoon, I choose a bottle of water. It was hard to comprehend so many drivers consuming entire bottles of wine and beer and re-entering the highway. At the end of the meal, I did not know how much it cost or if the waitress would bring a bill. Watching others, I soon saw they just stood up, left no tip and walked to the bar to pay. I did that as well, and as I was trying to request the price for the meal, a nice women waiting to be seated spoke in English and told me the meal cost $22 Euros. That was fortunate, because I opened my wallet and starting pulling out 20’s thinking I needed several more to pay off the rather modest meal.

We re-entered the highway after our rest. And, made our way to the Madrid Airport by 18:00. Then, I proceeded to follow the directions printed from Google maps, only to get totally lost seeking signs and placards with any clue of the Hilton Hotel. We were so close, but so far away. After asking three different people for assistance, I finally saw something familiar. It was not the Hilton Hotel as I expected, but the EuropCar drop-off station, which was in front of the Hilton Hotel, masked by a large office building. I was so relieved. We parked the car and registered in the hotel for our final night. The next day, we returned to the airport by hotel shuttle, boarded the plane after a small wait and had no trouble getting thru customs after landing.

The journey was over and I took my Dad home.