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TRANSCRIPTS, TRANSCRIPTS EVERYWHERE...IS IT TIME TO STANDARDIZE THE PROCESS?

Michael Sessa, PESC President & CEO

In the last edition of THE STANDARD, I discussed the challenges Education faces in reaching interoperability. Whether funding, or resources, or technical limitations, there’s more than enough valid reasons to go around.

Lately though you may have heard a lot of discussion revolving around transcript exchange. The decision by the University of Texas at Austin to move its free, internet-based exchange service has sparked this discussion. Canadian and European stakeholders as well are advancing this discussion as the need for standardized exchange is not limited to the borders of the United States.

Leading the way in these discussions are the providers themselves along with community leaders AACRAO, ARUCC and PESC. It’s an exciting time as the major barrier to interoperability, as discussed last month, is the business side of interoperability, not the technical side.

Remember, the technology is available. Other industries and markets have used similar technologies and processes to bring about significant innovations and consumer-friendly products and services.

With the overall push by leaders and providers, including ApplyAlberta, BCCampus, ConnectEDU, Credential Solutions, the National Student Clearinghouse, OCAS, OUAC, Parchment, SCRIPSAFE and many others, the reality of electronic transcript exchange is closer than it’s ever been.

What will it take to get us there?

I have no fancy answer here. The truth of the matter is that it will take a lot of discussion, some compromise, strategic analysis, student-based decision-making, flexible business models, funding and oh yes, blood, sweat and tears.

I’ve heard it all before, you might say. Well what’s different this time is the commitment leaders are making to the community, to PESC Approved Standards along with a commitment to help fund such an initiative.

Yes there are many questions to be answered:

- What is the vision for standardized transcript data exchange and how long will it take to build?
- Who is building it and how much will it cost?
- Will there be costs to students and institutions?
- Can a decentralized peer-to-peer network exist alongside a public hub and spoke model?
- Will data exchange be in real-time?
- Can a receiving organization choose the technology through which it receives transcript data and will students have similar access?
- Will XML emerge as the preferred technology?
- Will transcript exchange be international?

The community, including the major providers, have committed to following the exchange guidelines being established by PESC’s Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force. According to Tim Calhoon, CDS Task Force Co-Chair and Director of the Technology Center for California Community Colleges under the office of the Chancellor:

"[It is expected that...] Any provider using these standards and registered in the service network could communicate directly with the appropriate exchange host for a targeted institution. The services would be 'payload agnostic' & while our immediate interest is for transcript exchange, the network could be used for the exchange of other existing or future PESC standard transactions."

Supplementing the CDS Task Force are PESC’s Education Record User Group, which governs the maintenance and development of all PESC Approved Transcript Standards, and PESC’s Seal of
Approval, which once applied for and awarded indicates a provider’s adherence to the standard in the method it was intended to be used.

Will these services bring about the interoperability that we envision? We hope so. These services are tools that the community must embrace and use in order to be truly valuable.

An historic meeting with SPEEDE discussing this topic occurred at AACRAO’s Annual Meeting this April 2013. With several hundred folks in attendance, including numerous institutions and providers, the commitment and passion to reach this level of interoperability was astounding.

Many more discussions and meetings and a lot of hard work will be needed to get us where we want to be. To continue this tremendous momentum, PESC is hosting the next discussion at its Spring 2013 Data Summit being held May 1-3, 2013 in San Diego at the OMNI.

Registration is still available at www.PESC.org for folks interested in attending the Summit in person. PESC will host this discussion via conference call as well with the following information:

**Transcript Exchange Discussion**
PESC Spring 2013 Data Summit
Thursday May 2, 2013
8:30am – 10:15am PDT (11:30am – 1:15pm EDT)
888-205-5513, #952016

Many organizations have published announcements and white papers stating their commitment to PESC and to a standardized process. PESC has created a TRANSCRIPT page on its website located at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=183 that will maintain every major announcement.

On this all-inclusive page too are all the PESC Approved Standards for high school and college transcripts including XML, EDI, PDF and the EDI/XML Crosswalks as well. We look forward to these discussions and thank the community leaders for advancing this very important topic.

**H.R. 521: TRANSFORMING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY ACT**
The promise of technology is great. It can increase equity and access to educational opportunities. It can enhance the impact and reach of great teaching. It can help re-envision how education is delivered, making learning more student-centered and recognizing teachers as education designers. It can lower costs & increase efficiency & productivity

Schools should be the place that prepare students for the world of tomorrow, with the best tools of today. Schools should use real-world technology that allows students to grapple with real-world problems—so they can compete in a globally competitive economy. But most schools are behind the curve, lacking the resources, infrastructure, hardware, software, and human capacity needed to prepare students for the 21st century. It is time federal policy stepped up as a partner to states and localities to achieve these goals.

The Transforming Education through Technology Act would help schools, districts, and states transform learning systems by utilizing innovative technology. Specifically the legislation would:

- **Support teachers and principals in using technology to increased college and career readiness, close achievement gaps, and engage all students**
  - supporting teachers and school leaders to use technology to redesign curriculum, individualize instruction, and increase student engagement
  - training teachers to incorporate technology and digital learning into classrooms
  - helping teachers and school leaders use real-time data and assessments to drive classroom and school practice
Help school districts build a technology infrastructure to make sure schools take full advantage of what technology has to offer
- enhancing broadband capabilities, wiring, or other forms of connectivity
- purchasing hardware, software, or computer devices that improve learning
- creating or upgrading to online assessments
- improving technology readiness for implementing college- and career-ready standards

Help states improve student learning, upgrade assessments, and improve educator preparation and support
- reviewing state technology standards for students and educators
- improving technology readiness and online assessments across the state
- aligning teacher and school leader preparation with technology and digital learning standards
- assist districts with professional development, curriculum, and instruction

Seed innovation to create the learning environment of tomorrow using the best technology of today
- personalizing instruction through gaming, blended learning, online credit accumulation, and other cutting-edge forms of self-directed learning
- preparing educators for tomorrow’s classroom, including on-demand professional development, pre-service training in digital learning, and online communities of practice
- ensuring equitable access to leading technology, such as intuitive games and interfaces, assistive technology, technology-based accommodations, and expanded learning opportunities
- improving efficiency and productivity through open educational resources (OER), 1:1 initiatives, or hybrid learning that extends the reach of effective teaching

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is pleased to announce that the next version of CEDS will be released in January, 2014. Version 4 of CEDS will build on the work of the previous versions and continue development in the P-20 domains and our expansion into adult education and workforce.

A special effort will be made in the upcoming development work to meet the needs of states developing integrated P-20W systems designed to get actionable information in the hands of stakeholders at all levels. As we develop the Version 4 content we will continue to work with other initiatives in our community so that CEDS continues to stay in front of users’ needs.

We are very encouraged by the current use of CEDS Align and Connect. There are currently over 850 users who have signed up for accounts to work in these tools.

The Version 4 release in January will include many user-suggested enhancements to these tools. Along with this we will be working to support CEDS use with tool tutorials and providing direct support for CEDS adoption and implementation across P-20W, including adoption by non-SEA organizations such as institutions of higher education and school districts.

Please visit the CEDS website to learn more about the recent Version 3 release, use the tools, and provide feedback for our upcoming Version 4 work. [https://ceds.ed.gov/](https://ceds.ed.gov/)

Thank you for continued interest in CEDS and your support!
What everyone’s talking about.

High School & College TRANSCRIPTS

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

Copyright © PESC. 2013. All rights reserved.
The National Student Clearinghouse’s Position on the Establishment of a National Electronic Education Data Exchange Network

April 9, 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Given the rapidly increasing mobility of students, there has never been a greater need to enable the efficient and secure exchange of student records, including transcripts and other documents, between institutions. As one of the leading providers of an electronic exchange network and the authorized agent for more than 3,400 colleges and universities, the National Student Clearinghouse is advocating the establishment of policies, guidelines, and procedures that will enable U.S. exchange networks to provide free and open exchange of education documents and data among institutions and the network service providers.

In our view, because the networks exist solely to serve institutions and their students and alumni, it is the nation’s institutions – working through their professional organization, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) – that should determine all functionality and drive innovation. Additionally, in order to ensure accessibility by all institutions and their service providers, the networks should be built using standards developed and approved by the P20W Education Standards Council (PESC) in collaboration with AACRAO. Moreover, all network service providers should commit to implementing PESC approved standards and obtaining an annual PESC Seal of Approval indicating a uniform level of implementation.

The Current Network Exchange Environment

Today the education community participates in an electronic transcript ecosystem that consists of numerous network service providers. These providers are not emergent, they are well-established organizations that have been in place for years.

The leading providers include:

- Avow by Parchment
- ConnectEd
- Credentials Solutions TranscriptsNetwork
- Docufide by Parchment
- eSCRIP-SAFE by SCRIP-SAFE International
- eTranscripts California
- Florida’s F.A.S.T.E.R.
- National Student Clearinghouse
- Ohio Board of Regents
- Pearson National Transcript Center
- Texas SPEEDE Server
- XAP etranscriptXchange

These services are provided by a mix of for-profit, not-for-profit, and publicly funded entities. In the commercial space, providers compete on cost, features, and participant coverage. This competition helps keep costs down and inspires continuing innovation.
The Need for National Standards

The good news is that all these network providers use standard EDI, XML, and PDF data file definitions defined by PESC and the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee. The bad news is there is no standard protocol for exchanging files between networks. However, the PESC Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force aims to address this gap by developing technical standards for an open data exchange network for the education community. Any individual institution or service provider using these standards and registered in the service network could communicate directly with the appropriate exchange host for a receiving institution. The CDS Task Force is also developing standards for a registry of participating institutions, which would be replicated across the data exchange network.

The notion of consolidating service providers into a single entity is not the right answer for the education community. Traditionally, the reduction or elimination of competition stifles innovation and ultimately raises costs. Not to mention that it would take years (if ever) for everyone to agree and convert to the single platform. The new CDS standards would allow providers to continue to differentiate on functionality, while providing a standard means for exchanging data between participating institutions. Examples of this model are the CommonLine/CommonRecord and Meteor initiatives in the student lending industry. Competing organizations came together to agree on common data exchange formats along with policies and procedures for the exchange, aggregation, and display of data. At the same time, these organizations competed on programs, features and prices, resulting in a rich set of customer offerings.

Reflecting the Values and Principles of the Education Community

As the Clearinghouse was asked to assume management of the Texas Server by the University of Texas at Austin, we concurred with UT Austin's view of the basic values and principles they had used to manage the server. Namely,

- Institutions want to serve their students and alumni.
- Institutions must specify parameters for assigning access rights to educational records.
- Institutions must articulate these requirements to service providers.
- Service providers must decide how to meet the requirements in a cost-effective way.
- Standards play a critical role in enabling cost-effective implementation.
- Access to the exchange networks should be available for free to institutions sending and receiving via multiple networks.
- Network service providers should provide free exchange of documents between service provider networks.
Additionally, the Clearinghouse’s view as a nonprofit service provider is:

- Our nonprofit mission is to serve the education community by facilitating the exchange and understanding of student data.
- All data exchange platforms should provide free exchange of data for the benefit of their customers.
- Schools must drive innovation and new functionality, either directly or through their advocacy associations, such as AACRAO and the SPEEDE Committee.
- Service providers must help set standards, along with institutions and stakeholders, within the PESC standards setting framework.
- PESC must provide the governance framework for standards, and must validate implementation of standards through activities, such as the PESC Seal of Approval.
- Service providers must commit to each other and the education community to implement new standards on an agreed-upon timetable.
- Service providers that do not implement new standards in the agreed-upon timetable risk inoperability with other service providers, reduced customer satisfaction, and ultimately, loss of customers.

**Governed by the Education Community**

The Clearinghouse currently leverages AACRAO and PESC to provide the governance and electronic standard setting bodies for the education community. The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee represents postsecondary institutions in U.S. and Canada. The Committee works closely with PESC and participates in the PESC workgroups that are responsible for setting standards and assessing implementation.

PESC is facilitating the following initiatives that directly impact the education record space:

- **Education Record User Group (ERUG):** Focuses on the utilization and development of standardized, electronic transcripts, and serves as the development vehicle for future releases of the standards.

- **Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force:** Focuses on developing standards for an open data exchange network for the education community.

- **PESC Seal of Approval:** A formal process governed by PESC members that is designed to communicate to the community-at-large that an organization has uniformly implemented an approved PESC standard. Implementers can use the Seal of Approval to market products and services to demonstrate alignment and interoperability.
A Commitment from the National Student Clearinghouse

In summary, the Clearinghouse recommends leveraging what is working today: the current electronic transcript ecosystem that consists of numerous network service providers.

In addition, we propose that AACRAO and PESC be the governance and electronic standard setting bodies for the education community and all network service providers, including the Clearinghouse. We encourage network service providers to utilize the PESC Seal of Approval process to validate conformance to standards.

On our part, the Clearinghouse commits to participating in the free and open exchange of education documents and data among network service providers and ensuring our data exchange platform conforms to PESC standards. Lastly, the Clearinghouse would be happy to join other network service providers in the timely, coordinated rollout of new PESC standards across network providers.
Open Standards, Open Networks

Five Principles and Actions to Achieve Open Exchange of Electronic Student Records

Matthew Pittinsky, Ph.D.
Chief Executive Officer, Parchment Inc.
Research Professor, Arizona State University

Mark N. Cohen
Senior Vice President & Co-Founder, Parchment Inc.
Co-Chair, PESC Education Record User Group

Parchment was founded in 2003, operating one of the earliest eTranscript exchanges in the academic community. In 2004, the nascent stage of eTranscripts meant Parchment had to print and mail more than 90% of the secondary school transcript orders we received online. Today, with 25% of U.S. secondary schools on the Parchment Exchange, that number is less than 3%, representing a stunning shift from paper to electronic by a large segment of America’s high schools.

We believe U.S. postsecondary institutions are on the verge of a similar tipping point. Key to unlocking this potential are open standards and open governance leading to broad-based interoperability among the eTranscript technologies in use by colleges and universities across the country. This has been the approach behind EDI standards developed through collaboration, lead by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) committee for the Standardization of Postsecondary Education Electronic Data Exchange (SPEEDE), and the newer XML standards developed by members of the P20W Education Standards Council (PESC). Parchment has been an active proponent of both efforts. Parchment is one of only two companies to be awarded the PESC seal of approval for the verified implementation of approved PESC data standards, and has supported the EDI standards developed by SPEEDE since 2008.

Since the announcement that the SPEEDE Server (“Texas Server”) operated by the University of Texas at Austin will be transitioning to the National Student Clearinghouse, a vendor of eTranscript services, the question of open standards and open networks has risen to the forefront once again. At issue is not how they operate their exchange, but a simple and important question about the future of the Texas Server: Will a community governance mechanism be put in place to provide stakeholders who rely on the Texas Server -- academic organizations and the technology platform operators who serve them -- with rights and responsibilities in setting the future of such a critical shared resource? Or will the server be operated unilaterally by a single provider with whom individuals and institutions that exchange through the server have no standing?

In preparation for conversations at the 2013 AACRAO Annual Meeting, we propose five fundamental principles we believe are central to realizing the vision of broad-based electronic
student record adoption so presciently detailed in the 1997 Business Case for the Electronic Exchange of Student Records published by SPEEDE. We also describe the concrete steps Parchment has taken to implement these principles.

1. Networks Should Not Limit Where Transcripts can be Sent

While there is value in universities choosing among alternative transcript exchange networks - working to drive innovation while driving down cost -- the exchange of transcripts and other student records should not be limited by the existence of proprietary exchanges.

What Parchment has done: Beginning in 2009, Parchment has worked to expand the reach of Senders on the Parchment Exchange beyond Parchment’s Receiver network. First, we implemented integration with The Common Application (comprised of 488 member colleges). Second, we recently implemented integration with the Texas Server and its (on-average) 280 recipients. Third, we implemented integration with California’s eTranscript CA network. Finally, although the pilot is still in its design stages, we announced a cross-vendor integration pilot with ConnectEDU as part of EExchange, a project of the PESC Common Data Services (CDS) Task Force. Together, these four examples represent concrete investments to ensure Parchment Send members can deliver not only to the 1,500+ Receive members on our platform, but to any destination represented among these networks.

2. Networks Should Not Limit From Where Transcripts are Received

Just as an institution’s delivery options should not be limited by their chosen eTranscript provider, their ability to receive transcripts should not necessitate integrations with numerous providers – adding complexity to what should be an opportunity to drive more efficient processes to receive inbound transcripts. To facilitate this principle, Parchment is committed to a free and open receiver network.

What Parchment has done: With the launch of the Universal Inbox within Parchment Receive, Parchment is one of only two providers to foster cross network interoperability, for a free and open exchange. Parchment now enables member institutions to aggregate the receipt of transcripts from our 7,400+ members along with the 187 institutions (March 2013) sending standards-based transcript data over the Texas Server, and those that originate with the eTranscript California network. Additionally Parchment is working with Credentials Solutions to enable members of the Parchment Exchange to “trade” with schools using Credentials Solutions TranscriptsPlus, and is actively working to add additional proprietary networks and state exchanges, including ASU Pathways.

3. Transcript Data Files and Exchange Protocols Should be Standards-Based

In order to maximize the reach for senders and receivers of transcripts, Parchment encourages the creation and adoption of standards for both the data files and the protocols used for the exchange of transcripts between networks.
What Parchment has done: Parchment continues to explore opportunities to expand the breadth of our delivery network and is an active supporter of, and participant in, the PESC CDS Task Force, whose members are working to develop the standards that will enable the exchange of transcripts and other data between participating exchange networks. A member of PESC since 2004 when Parchment contributed to the development of the XML schema for the High School transcript, Parchment is one of the few organizations active in both the secondary and higher education standards communities, including membership in the SIF Association since 2006.

4. Shared Resources Should Be Operated Under Shared Governance

As active members of the eTranscript community and on behalf of our 1,600+ postsecondary Exchange members, we believe that since the Texas Server is a hub that sits at the intersection of several eTranscript networks, it should be operated under an open and shared governance approach similar to services like InCommon.

What Parchment has done: In the spirit of our role in the eTranscript community, Parchment joined with Credentials to call for the National Student Clearinghouse to create a project with stakeholders including academic organizations, Parchment, Credentials, and other entities who exchange data through the server, or to participate in a new service-provider-agnostic consortia that contracts with the Clearinghouse to operate the Texas Server under its governance. Under this transparent community-based approach, the Texas Server would be funded by a cross-section of the service providers who benefit from it, with the standing required to honor commitments to their members. If the Clearinghouse decides not to allow other exchange providers to participate in the governance of the Texas Server, the inevitable outcome is that those organizations launch a new exchange server that does operate under consortia governance. Great effort should be made to avoid what would be unfortunate fragmentation.

5. Openness Needs to be Balanced With Security and Trust

While we call for networks to be open, this call is balanced with our responsibility to safeguard our institutional members’ data. Parchment and other operators of eTranscript exchanges make commitments to our members about the do’s and don’ts of how their transcripts are processed from student order through fulfillment. We believe that every network should operate under the terms and conditions associated with membership of institutions in their network; the issue arises when these networks exchange across each other. For example, Parchment explicitly commits in our data policy not to build an education record repository through our eTranscript exchange service. Inter-network exchange requires clear policies and practices that provide confidence in the integrity of those commitments.

What Parchment has done: As with Principle #4, Parchment has joined with other organizations to call for any “hub” technology that connects various networks to be operated under a shared governance model. Part and parcel of such a consortia approach would be the development of clear policies and commitments related to data security and privacy, to which participants in inter-network exchange would agree.
Credentials Solutions

Commitment to Open Exchange of Electronic Student Records

Thomas D. McKechney
Chief Executive Officer, Credentials Inc.

Credentials Solutions is a service company, owned and operated by its founding partners since 1997 for the purpose of re-engineering transactional processes that transform the student experience while delivering game changing operational efficiencies to student records operations at colleges and universities. Relying on the founders’ many years of experience in the financial services industry, Credentials has applied proven techniques and new technologies to introduce many innovations that have since been embraced as “best practices” in the student records industry. Credentials invented the practice of online degree verifications (1998), introduced a revenue sharing model for verifications (1998), developed “touchless” transcript order processing (2003), integrated FedEx delivery and tracking of transcripts (2006), and announced “touchless” electronic transcript extraction and delivery (2007). Since introducing TranscriptsPlus™ in 2001, Credentials Solutions has been joined by other service providers in the transcript marketplace – Docufide and Avow (Parchment), Scrip-Safe, National Student Clearinghouse, ConnectEdu, Pearson and XAP. Each of these firms has brought new ideas, technologies and services which have contributed to the dramatic growth in the sending and receiving of electronic transcripts. Credentials Solutions currently provides transcript services to more than 175 colleges and universities representing an aggregate enrollment of more than 3 million students.

As service providers, all of the aforementioned firms rely on the industry to provide standards for student privacy, data security, data formatting and data exchange protocols. Further, we have all relied upon the University of Texas at Austin for access to the national “hub” known as the SPEEDE Server. We appreciate the tremendous contribution made over the years by AACRAO, PESC and the University of Texas as they have provided an external environment that has been stable and predictable......a level playing field.

The recent announcement that the SPEEDE Server will be transferred from the University of Texas at Austin to the National Student Clearinghouse has introduced uncertainty into what had been a stable and predictable external environment. While we agree with the University’s decision to transfer the operations and development of the Server, we are deeply concerned with their choice of National Student Clearinghouse as the future operator. Our reason for concern is obvious. National Student Clearinghouse is an aggressive competitor in the transcript services marketplace. Their common practice of packaging access to services to one another, bundling, raises the specter of an unlevel playing field. The SPEEDE Server has been considered a “trusted network” in that all participants are known and vetted. Further, as a prominent Institution that invested its own resources for the
betterment of the entire community, the University of Texas could be “trusted” to operate and develop the Server without any conflict of interest. The door has always been open at the University of Texas for our input, questions and concerns. As previously stated, our primary concern with the transfer of the SPEEDE Server to NSC is the fundamental conflict of interest posed by the fact that the Clearinghouse competes in the transcript services market. Under the proposed arrangement, Credentials has no rights, no financial responsibilities and no oversight of policies, procedures or development of a Server operated by the National Student Clearinghouse. Consequently, the trusted network formerly known as the “Texas Server” is no longer trustworthy.

On behalf of our institutional client base and their 3 million students and in harmony with our colleagues at Parchment and Scrip-Safe, we urge the industry to consider the following principles which are intended to promote the accelerating growth and open exchange of electronic records while encouraging continued innovation and creativity amongst postsecondary institutions and their service providers:

1. All Networks should be made “OPEN” to the exchange of electronic student records thus expanding the reach of institutions everywhere.
2. If there is to be a central “hub”, as previously served by the “Texas Server”, its governance and financial support should be provided by the operator of the hub, the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee and the leading eTranscript service companies.
3. The industry must fully support standard file formatting and exchange protocols as defined under the PESC umbrella.
4. All networks and other participants in the exchange of electronic student records must subscribe to a common set of values and restrictions with respect to the security and use of the records being passed across networks. All networks should be open to industry oversight.

Credentials Solutions is fully prepared to share in the financial support of a national “hub” or any other shared resource developed in the future for the purpose of facilitating the exchange of student records. Further, we welcome the continuing development of standards for data exchange and commit to supporting all such protocols going forward including any industry oversight that may evolve.

Over the past 15 years, Credentials Solutions has become recognized as a valued member of the community and the source of numerous innovations that are now counted amongst the industry’s “best practices”. Moreover, our contributions to the industry have been delivered at virtually no cost to any college or university. From this position, we strongly urge the AACRAO membership, PESC, Clearinghouse, Parchment, Scrip-Safe and all other participants in the electronic exchange of student records to come down on the side of transparency in the form of open networks, open governance and open standards. This is the only path that will assure continued growth and innovation in the eTranscript industry.
Ellucian™ and National Student Clearinghouse® Alliance Enables Cost-Effective “Touch-Free” Electronic Transcript Processing and Delivery

Fairfax, Va., April 4, 2013

Web Services Strategy Delivers on Ellucian Extensible Ecosystem Vision and National Student Clearinghouse Mission to Help Cash-Strapped Colleges Move Into Electronic Age

Ellucian™ and the National Student Clearinghouse® today announced that they have formed a strategic alliance to enable real-time electronic authentication, production, and transfer of transcripts between the Clearinghouse and Ellucian’s administrative systems through the Ellucian eTranscripts interface. The alliance and solution are designed to reduce the workload of the registrar’s office and improve the service quality to students and alumni.

Ellucian eTranscripts will support Ellucian’s three administrative systems: Banner® by Ellucian, Colleague® by Ellucian, and PowerCampus™ by Ellucian. The solution creates a secure interface between institutions participating in Clearinghouse Transcript OrderingSM and the institution’s Ellucian administrative system. Ellucian and the Clearinghouse will make eTranscripts available at no additional cost to Ellucian support customers that choose to activate the API and that also participate in Clearinghouse Transcript Ordering.

Through this strategic alliance between Ellucian and National Student Clearinghouse, institutions are provided with a resource that allows them to automate costly, time-consuming, and manual transcript processes at the press of a button. Moreover, because transcript PDFs will be automatically generated and delivered, the solution represents a significant leap forward in the ability of institutions to universally adopt electronic transcript delivery. Ellucian selected the Clearinghouse because, as a nonprofit, the Clearinghouse actively seeks ways to provide the higher education community with cost-saving services, many of which are available to institutions for free.

“Our partnership with the National Student Clearinghouse is the first of its kind in the education industry,” said Mark Jones, chief product officer, Ellucian. “The ‘touch-free’ transfer is possible because Ellucian supports industry standards, like PESC, and is committed to providing our customers with new solutions that are fairly quick and easy to implement, yet deliver significant savings in time and improvement in the service that institutions provide to their constituents. It is also an outcome of our Ellucian Extensible Ecosystem vision to extend the value of our administrative systems by integrating them with other solutions and services that address the diverse needs of our customers.”
“This year, the National Student Clearinghouse celebrates its twentieth anniversary, making this announcement even more momentous for our organization,” said Rick Torres, president and CEO of the National Student Clearinghouse. “Our higher education clients continuously ask us to find more cost-effective ways to help them serve their students better. This initiative offers a significant starting point to address their requests in the transcript and electronic record space. The Clearinghouse currently provides nearly four hundred million dollars a year of economic savings and benefits to higher education. We intend to use this alliance as our model for enabling additional cost-saving automated solutions that will benefit the entire education community.”

The electronic interface and authentication is supported by PESC standards. The interface from the Clearinghouse to Ellucian’s student systems is achieved with a single web-based API, minimizing the institutions’ development time and maintenance investment. It is an outcome of the Ellucian Extensible Ecosystem, a flexible and open foundation that spans the three core administrative systems. One of the ways that Ellucian delivers on this architectural approach is through a robust API and web services strategy that wraps around the core ERP platforms, supporting deep, standards-based integration and extending interoperability with new and existing software solutions from Ellucian, partners, and other third parties.

About Ellucian

Ellucian helps education institutions thrive in an open and dynamic world. We deliver a broad portfolio of technology solutions, developed in collaboration with a global education community, and provide strategic guidance to help education institutions of all kinds navigate change, achieve greater transparency, and drive efficiencies. More than 2,400 institutions in 40 countries around the world look to Ellucian for the ideas and insights that will move education forward, helping people everywhere discover their futures through learning. Visit Ellucian at www.ellucian.com, follow Ellucian on Twitter (@EllucianInc), and like Ellucian on Facebook (/EllucianInc).

About The National Student Clearinghouse

The National Student Clearinghouse (a nonprofit formed in 1993) is the trusted source for and leading provider of higher education verifications and electronic education record exchanges, handling more than 700 million verification requests and 200 million education record exchanges annually. The Clearinghouse serves as a single point of contact for the collection and timely exchange of accurate and comprehensive enrollment, degree, and certificate records on behalf of its more than 3,300 participating higher education institutions, which represent 96 percent of all students in public and private U.S. institutions. The Clearinghouse also provides thousands of high schools and districts with continuing collegiate enrollment, progression, and completion statistics on their alumni.
Through its verification, electronic exchange, and reporting services, the Clearinghouse saves the education community cumulatively nearly four hundred million dollars annually. Most Clearinghouse services are provided to colleges and universities at little or no charge, including enhanced transcript and research services, enabling institutions to redistribute limited staff and budget resources to more important student service efforts. Clearinghouse services are designed to facilitate an institution's compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, The Higher Education Act, and other applicable laws.

In addition, the Clearinghouse provides accurate, timely enrollment and degree verifications to student loan providers, employers, student credit issuers, the U.S. Department of Education, and others who access its registry more than half a billion times annually. For more information, visit www.studentclearinghouse.org.

For More Information
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Laura Kvinge
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2. Project Overview

## Project Objectives Statement

The goal of this initiative is to create a national student-centric Canadian Transcript Exchange Network that is based on PESC XML standards with a priority on the electronic exchange of high school transcript within and between provinces & territories, and that is scalable to post-secondary transcripts and other stakeholders needing access to Canadian institutional official transcripts.

## Business Justification

- Service that is faster, more efficient for students across Canada
- Facilitates more timely transfer, articulation and admissions processes
- Facilitates student mobility
- Improvement in data quality, security, integrity, accuracy and comprehensiveness
- Transparency, traceability and accountability in the process
- Business process efficiencies for both senders and receivers of data
- Reusable, standard and consistent business processes used within Canada
- Standardization of data definitions for cross-country consistency
- Standardization facilitates adding new trading partners more easily
- Possibility of including identifiers on transcripts for better matching to other documents at destination
- Environmentally-friendly - reduction in the use of paper
- Standards-based integration modules within SIS systems can result in reduction of customization and maintenance costs
- Enable electronic consumption of data within other business processes for efficiency and quality control
- Opportunity to improve data analytics
- Opportunity for High School to High School record transfers
- Scalable to accommodate international needs in future

## Organization in support of this initiative

Example Ministries
Example regional and national associations, e.g. ARUCC
Example Ontario College Application Services

**This section will be completed once confirmed supporting organizations review the proposed charter**

## Stakeholders

**Direct Stakeholders for scope:**
- Students
- Canadian Council of Ministers of Education ([http://www.cmec.ca/](http://www.cmec.ca/))
- Association of Registrars of the Universities and Colleges of Canada (ARUCC)
- Provincial Education Ministries
- Regional Application Centres
- Canadian post-secondary institutions
- Canadian secondary schools & school boards
- Statistics Canada
- PESC organization
- Student Information System (SIS) providers for both post-secondary and secondary institutions
### Stakeholders

**Indirect Stakeholders for scope:**
- Professional certification bodies
- International providers
- Employers
- Credential validation service providers
- Credential assessment providers
- Articulation Services
- Testing centres

### Related Projects

Other PESC initiatives

### What is the impact of not meeting the project objectives?
### 3. Project Scope and Deliverables

#### In Scope

- Define governance model for transcript network and the project
- Change management process for specifications changes that aligns with the PESC Change Control Board processes (does this warrant a membership on the PESC Change Control Board)
- Develop template for inter-provincial SLA agreement used by participants
- Develop template for Data Sharing Agreement and Requirements (this could be incorporated in the SLA agreement master)
- Business requirements for participants
- Business rules for transcript payment settlement
- Transcript authorization and consent expectations from student, i.e., Does the applicant have to authorize each destination? Or does the applicant authorize institution(s) to request all necessary transcripts on their behalf?
- Develop a Canadian implementation guide & process that outlines expectations from participants and providers including the version(s) of PESC standards expected
- Define minimum and optional attributes within the specifications
- Communication plan (including solicitation of support from secondary schools, boards, and vendors)
- Contact with provincial and/or federal agencies for funding support
- Pilot implementation to demonstrate the business case value (e.g. BC, Alberta, Central & Atlantic
- Accepted transport mechanisms
- Accepted delivery model

#### Out of Scope

- Developing software
- Education policy
- Co-curricular transcripts
- PDF and EDI formats
- Standard high school course classification

#### Constraints

- Is there minimum participation level? How many provinces/institutions do we need for a viable service? We need a minimum of at least two provinces/territories representing 20% of total post-secondary applications
- Who owns transcript data? (may vary by province) would this need to be defined in inter-provincial SLA (Service Level Agreement)
- Data retention – who is allowed to retain and re-issue specific data (rather than just passing on if there are hubs)
- Data sharing agreements, copyrights and restrictions of use (e.g. Right to forward the data through hubs; disclosure to requester, value add services like application centre may distribute to their member institutions only, etc.
- Does the system need to accommodate student requests for transcripts?
- Canadian data is only resident in Canada i.e. data not stored in other countries unless authorized by student
- Software/SIS providers may not be able to support the project as is
- Time available by the Canadian PESC User Group to participate and move forward

#### Assumptions

- Inclusion of interim and enrolled data, not just historical - desirable
- Participants are responsible for their own systems and implementation efforts
• Leverage viable deliverables from Canadian PESC Users Group and other PESC initiatives
• There needs to be at least two provinces or territories involved to start the momentum
• Some areas may be limited by provincial, regional or institutional policies/practices, whereas this project cannot drive change, it may make recommendations for future change
• Current assumption is that secondary school transcripts are the first priority
• The network may expand to allow growth beyond Canada
• This is an institutionally driven initiative; government funding or priority is not prerequisite to participation
• Service architecture needs to accommodate a range of fees and policies (some charge, some do not)
• A business model may need to be developed for fee settlement
• The transcript exchange needs to accommodate transcript requests by institutions
• Minimum standards for the electronic transcript should follow the Canadian implementation guide
• Specific requirements for bilingualism will be defined within the project
• There needs to be a model for one-way transcript requests and governance or administrative management
• The governance model for the project allows for “opting out” of the project
• Assume that secondary schools, school boards and their vendors will support this initiative
• Institutions/Provinces will solicit government participation as needed
• PESC membership is not required for project participation

Dependencies

• Support for PESC standards (organizationally and to support any changes defined by the project)
• Timeline is dependent on institutional volunteer participation
• Limitations of vendor support

4. Critical Success Factors & Trade Off Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Success Factors (Deliverables)</th>
<th>Stakeholder Signing Off Status</th>
<th>Success Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARUCC (<a href="http://www.arucc.ca/">http://www.arucc.ca/</a>) support for the initiative</td>
<td>Formal written support by ARUCC for the initiative</td>
<td>66% of all Canadian PESC Users Group representatives by organization/stakeholder agencies support the charter by vote. One vote per represented organization actively participating on the Canadian PESC Users Group. Total eligible votes will be all organizations that have participated in at least one meeting since October 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Canadian PESC participants buy-in for deliverables - Quorum equals two-thirds of the members on the Canadian PESC User Group listserv</td>
<td>66% of all Canadian PESC Users Group representatives by organization/stakeholder agencies support the charter by vote. One vote per represented organization actively participating on the Canadian PESC Users Group. Total eligible votes will be all organizations that have participated in at least one meeting since October 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of 3 provinces from West, Central &amp; Atlantic representative of 20% of total application to post-secondary institutions in Canada by volume</td>
<td>Total applications in post-secondary in Canada participation rate is 20% of the total post-secondary enrolment in Canada. The following Statistics Canada baseline data will be used: <a href="http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100714/t100714a3-eng.htm">http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100714/t100714a3-eng.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following represent the approximate total of all Canadian Post-Secondary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradeoff Factors</th>
<th>Inflexible - Most Critical</th>
<th>Adaptable - Negotiable</th>
<th>Accepting - Will Concede</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>![Checkmark]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Major Project Milestones

List any known milestones driven by contractual dates, resource availability, scope, deliverables etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Kick-off</td>
<td>18-Oct-12</td>
<td>Initiative was kicked off at the PESC Data Summit in Vancouver October 18-19th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter accepted by Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>6-Dec-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop communication plan to engage key stakeholders within each province and nationally</td>
<td>11-Jan-13</td>
<td>• Lead by Maria Murray, Memorial University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Direct Stakeholders</td>
<td>28-Feb-13</td>
<td>• Input to proposed charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ontario University Registrar Group meeting - last week of Feb 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define a governance model for project</td>
<td>25-Jan-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm initial pilot participants</td>
<td>22-Feb-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>30-Jan-13</td>
<td>• Identify funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Application for fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel expense support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Charter</td>
<td>8-Mar-13</td>
<td>• Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Direct Stakeholder consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Project Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Pilot Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Organizations in support of the initiative have been listed on charter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Deliverables**

| Business Requirements & Rules                                           | 19-Apr-13   | • Business Requirements                                                  |
|                                                                          |             | • Payment Settlement                                                      |
|                                                                          |             | • Business Rules                                                          |
|                                                                          |             | • Consent and authorization rules                                          |
|                                                                          |             | • Input into the implementation guides                                    |
|                                                                          |             | • Defined delivery model                                                  |

| Change Management Process                                                | 19-Oct-12   | • Integrates with PESC Change Control Board                               |

| Canadian High School Implementation Guide                                | 26-Apr-13   | Online workshops focus on the Canadian High School PESC High School transcript 1.2.0; Core Main 1.3.0, Academic Record 1.6.0; Transcript Request 1.1.0; Transcript Acknowledgement 1.1.0; Accepted Transport Protocols |
6. Major Known Risks

A risk is any factor that may potentially interfere with successful completion of the project. A risk is not a problem: a problem is a situation that has already occurred; a risk is the recognition that a problem might occur. By recognizing potential problems, the Project Team can attempt to avoid or minimize a problem through proper actions. The project charter lists risks that are the high and medium within the risk plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Risk Description</th>
<th>Risk Priority</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Action Plan Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resource constraints</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Look at securing funding support, resourcing the initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of consensus on the model with stakeholders</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Have targeted a critical success number that would represent a significant critical mass in support of initiative. Use pilot processes to demonstrate the value add. Using PESC standards already in use in Canada.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Resource Estimates

“Function” means the various functional groups needed on the project (e.g. marketing, sales, development, process experts, networking engineers, architects, etc.).

“FTE” stands for “full time equivalent,” or the approximate number of man-hours divided by 8 hours per day. This gives managers an understanding of how many people from each function may be required.
8. Project Timeline Estimate

At a minimum, the Project Charter should include the list of business-critical milestones, as shown above. But when the charter is written, early investigation work may have already provided insight into how a project timeline could play out—how the project would likely be broken down into phases, and of what likely duration. That information can be provided in the Project Timeline Estimate shown below. The ‘range’ row shown is used to show uncertainty on the dates (+/- X months, for instance). Some teams do not include this section in a charter, but if you have the information available it can be a useful data point for assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>0 – Plan</th>
<th>1-Implementation</th>
<th>2- Evaluation &amp; Tuning</th>
<th>4 – Closeout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>14-Mar-13</td>
<td>13-Nov-30</td>
<td>30-May-14</td>
<td>6-Oct-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Project Communications

This section will be updated by Maria Murray Memorial University with proposed communication plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Project Authority

List the boundaries on financial and decision-making authority on the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Project Team Authority</th>
<th>Oversight and Escalation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope changes</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Milestone changes</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. List of Addenda

Additional documents used within the project or as a deliverable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Name</th>
<th>Filename (without version control)</th>
<th>Is this a Deliverable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Name</td>
<td>Filename (without version control)</td>
<td>Is this a Deliverable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Approvals

These signatures indicate our agreement to initiating the project defined by this charter and supporting it with resources for the initial project team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date (DD-MMM-YY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Select Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Charter Document Revision History

The team can choose to note critical decisions made regarding the Project Charter as the project progresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revision</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Decision and Change Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13-Oct-12</td>
<td>Bill McKee</td>
<td>Initial Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>18-Oct-12</td>
<td>Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>Updates completed from project name to scope section of charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19-Oct-12</td>
<td>Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>Updates made to the assumptions and constraints section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>25-Oct-12</td>
<td>Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>Completed Section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8-Nov-12</td>
<td>Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>Completed Section 4 and defined goal to have charter ready for group by December 6th meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>28-Nov-12</td>
<td>Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>Draft for review and approval by group for December 6th meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6-Dec-12</td>
<td>Canadian PESC Users Group</td>
<td>Recommend Draft for circulation by Canadian PESC Users Group after meeting December 6th 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growing Global Support of Groningen Declaration and Its Commitment to Student Data Portability at DSDDW 2013 in Beijing

Worldwide Digital Student Data Portability Conference Showcases National Student Clearinghouse® Initiatives: SPEEDE Server Expansion and U.S./Netherlands Data Exchange Pilot

April 11, 2013, Herndon, Virginia – An additional five countries, including Australia, France, Mexico, Romania, and Italy, signed the Groningen Declaration at the second Digital Student Data Depositories Worldwide (DSDDW). The meeting, which just ended in Beijing, expanded international support for student data portability. To demonstrate the viability of secure and compliant global digital student data exchange, the meeting showcased several initiatives, including two from the National Student Clearinghouse: the nationwide utilization of the University of Texas SPEEDE server and a pilot with DUO, an agency of the Dutch Ministry of Education, to create the first non-U.S. online academic credentials verification service.

The growing popularity of students studying abroad, along with the increase in academic fraud, is driving the need for the worldwide adoption of digital data exchange to support student mobility. The number of international students attending U.S. institutions is at a record high 764,495, while the number of U.S. students studying abroad has climbed to 273,996, according to the Institute of International Education. Meanwhile, academic fraud is now a $1.5-2.5 billion dollar global industry, according to the Illuminate Consulting Group, a strategic academic consulting firm.

During the first DSDDW seminar in April 2012, the Clearinghouse, along with seven countries and two European educational organizations, signed the Groningen Declaration, which called for “a more complete and far-reaching delivery of digital student data.” DSDDW 2013, hosted by DUO and the China Higher Education Student Information and Career Center (CHESICC), was co-sponsored by the Clearinghouse and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), which has a worldwide membership of 11,000 higher education professionals.

During the DSDDW 2013 keynote address, Shelby Stanfield, vice provost and registrar at the University of Texas at Austin, explained how the University of Texas Server (aka SPEEDE) has been developed in the U.S. as a shared exchange platform. UT-Austin started SPEEDE in 1995 and recently chose the Clearinghouse to assume its operation. The SPEEDE platform will be used to create a national electronic education data exchange network offering free, open, and secure standards-based access to U.S. institutions and their service providers.
Rick Torres, Clearinghouse president and CEO, and Jan Otten, policy advisor for International Affairs at DUO, reviewed the U.S./Netherlands data exchange pilot: the first online academic verification service created outside the United States. The pilot is based on a longtime service, DegreeVerifySM, provided by the Clearinghouse at no charge to more than 2,000 U.S. colleges and universities within the United States. Whether for Dutch students studying in the U.S. or American students studying in the Netherlands, degrees (along with enrollment for students attending U.S. institutions) will be able to be verified through this program. This service, expected to be implemented in the fall of 2013, will be free to all participating U.S. and Dutch institutions.

“Education has no boundaries and neither should the student records and documents that are needed to facilitate student mobility,” explained Mr. Torres. “On behalf of our thousands of participating institutions and their students, both international and domestic, the Clearinghouse will work with the world’s education community to streamline the international student admissions process and combat academic fraud using secure digital student data exchange while protecting rights to privacy.”

“Data portability has become an increasingly important issue for our worldwide membership as more and more students seek an education outside their own countries. The current paper-based application processes are costly, time consuming, and fraught with potential for fraud,” said Mike Reilly, executive director, AACRAO. “The Groningen Declaration and the opportunities it represents, like the initiatives spearheaded by the Clearinghouse and DUO, are exciting and welcome developments.”

Both SPEEDE and the DUO pilot, along with other DSDDW developments, will be discussed at the annual AACRAO meeting in San Francisco on April 15 by a panel of attendees of the Beijing seminar.

About The National Student Clearinghouse
The National Student Clearinghouse (a nonprofit formed in 1993) is the trusted source for and leading provider of higher education verifications and electronic education record exchanges, handling more than 700 million verification requests and 200 million education record exchanges annually. The Clearinghouse serves as a single point of contact for the collection and timely exchange of accurate and comprehensive enrollment, degree, and certificate records on behalf of its more than 3,300 participating higher education institutions, which represent 96 percent of all students in public and private U.S. institutions. The Clearinghouse also provides thousands of high schools and districts with continuing collegiate enrollment, progression, and completion statistics on their alumni.

Through its verification, electronic exchange, and reporting services, the Clearinghouse saves the education community cumulatively nearly four hundred million dollars annually. Most Clearinghouse services are provided to colleges and universities at little or no charge, including enhanced transcript and research services, enabling institutions to redistribute limited staff and budget resources to more important student service efforts. Clearinghouse services are designed to facilitate an institution’s compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, The Higher Education Act, and other applicable laws.

In addition, the Clearinghouse provides accurate, timely enrollment and degree verifications to student loan providers, employers, student credit issuers, the U.S. Department of Education, and others who access its registry more than half a billion times annually. For more information, visit www.studentclearinghouse.org.

###
PESC PRESENCE AT NCES - THANK YOU TO OUR PRESENTERS!

A big thank you to the many PESC Member representatives who helped provide timely and informative, and very well attended sessions at this past winter’s NCES Annual MIS Conference here in Washington DC at the Mayflower. PESC was involved in three major sessions and all are posted on the PESC website at: http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=160

Education Standards Working Together Toward Best Practice. February 13, 2013. Annual NCES MIS Conference. A presentation made by representatives of SIF, IMS, PESC, the Dell and Gates Foundations (Larry Fruth, Rob Abel, Michael Sessa, Lori Fey and Brandt Redd, respectively) on the importance of linking specification and standards development with implementation.

MyDataButton. February 14, 2013. Annual NCES MIS Conference. A presentation made by PESC Member representatives Jeffrey Alderson of ConnectEDU and Shawn Bay of eScholar on the current status of this initiative, an update on a number of state pilots and what to expect for next steps in the project.

Benefitting Students, States and Schools with Improved Transcript Services. February 15, 2013. Annual NCES MIS Conference. A presentation made by PESC Member representatives Doug Falk of the National Student Clearinghouse, Ron Hyman of Parchment and Jim Wager of SCRIP-SAFE on the value and importance of new and expanding etranscript services emerging in the industry as a result of improved technology and emergence of much needed standards.

DEADLINE FOR TRANSITION TO NEW NSLDS ENROLLMENT REPORTING FILE LAYOUTS AND RETIREMENT OF SSCR SOFTWARE

Pamela Eliadis, Service Director, System Operations & Aid Delivery Management, Federal Student Aid

We would like to remind the community that all schools are expected to transition to the new National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) Enrollment Reporting file layouts by March 31, 2013.

In addition, we would like to remind users of the SSCR for Windows software that after March 31, 2013, the software may no longer be used to submit enrollment data to the NSLDS. We will remove the SSCR for Windows software from the Federal Student Aid Download (FSAdownload) Web site on April 1, 2013.

See below for additional resources about the enhanced Enrollment Reporting process and information regarding the retirement of the SSCR for Windows software.

NSLDS Enrollment Reporting Process Resources

We first described the changes to the NSLDS Enrollment Reporting process and the new reporting formats in Dear Colleague Letter GEN-12-06, posted to the Information for Financial Aid Professionals (IFAP) Web site on March 30, 2012. On June 24, 2012 we implemented the enhancements in the NSLDS and NSLDS began accepting the new reporting formats.

Resources regarding this change include the following:

• The new NSLDS Enrollment Reporting file layouts, posted in the NSLDS Record Layouts section on the IFAP Web site on April 6, 2012;
• NSLDS Newsletter 39, providing instructions on selecting file preference;
• NSLDS Newsletter 40, including information on the new spreadsheet upload process;
• The NSLDS Enrollment Reporting Guide, a comprehensive document containing step-by-step instructions for reporting enrollment, using both the batch and online options.

We appreciate the assistance of all schools in making the transition to the new reporting file layouts by the end of March 2013.

Retirement of SSCR for Windows Software
As noted above, on April 1, 2013 we will remove the SSCR for Windows software from the FSAdownload Web site. The SSCR software will not be updated to support the new file layouts and will be retired.

As described in NSLDS Newsletter 40, one alternative to the SSCR for Windows software is to submit an NSLDS Enrollment Spreadsheet Submittal file through the NSLDS Professional Access Web site. The submittal format is designed to be used with a columnar spreadsheet application and allows schools to upload and submit up to 2500 records/rows of enrollment data at a time. With the use of the spreadsheet upload, schools do not have to return a roster file to NSLDS using the Student Aid Internet Gateway (SAIG). Submitting the spreadsheet is the same as providing a returned roster file.

Additional information about the submittal format may be found in the NSLDS Enrollment Spreadsheet Submittal documentation posted to the FSAdownload Web site, including the Cover Letter, Download Guide, and Submittal Instruction Guide.

For comprehensive information on the new NSLDS Enrollment Reporting process, refer to the resources described in the previous section.

Contact Information
We appreciate the assistance of all schools in ensuring that NSLDS includes the most useful and accurate information possible.

If you have questions about the new NSLDS Enrollment Reporting process and record layouts, contact the NSLDS Customer Support Center at 800/999-8219. You can also contact Customer Support by e-mail at nslds@ed.gov.

NSLDS Professional Access Web site users may also access information by clicking on the question mark icon on each Web page. Help text provides detailed assistance with many Enrollment Reporting features, including updating preferences on the NSLDS Enrollment Profile page, use of the NSLDS Enrollment Update and Enrollment Maintenance pages, as well as the Enrollment Submittal Web page.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION RECOMMENDS 5 MOOCS FOR CREDIT

By Steve Kolowich

In what could be a major step toward bridging the gap between massive open online courses and the credentialing system that they are supposed to "disrupt," the American Council on Education has endorsed five MOOCs for credit.

Two of the approved courses, "Introduction to Genetics and Evolution" and "Bioelectricity: A Quantitative Approach," come from Duke University. Two others, "Pre-Calculus" and "Algebra," come from the University of California at Irvine. The last, "Calculus: Single-Variable," comes from the University of Pennsylvania. All five are offered through Coursera.

The council, an association that advises college presidents, operates a credit-recommendation service that evaluates individual courses. If a course passes muster, ACE advises its 1,800 member colleges that they can be comfortable conferring credit on students who have passed that course.
Whether colleges take the council's advice, however, is an open question. "Ultimately, the degree-granting institution decides what credits to accept," said Cathy A. Sandeen, the council's vice president for education attainment and innovation. In other words, the council's endorsement alone does not mean students can expect to save money by redeeming their Coursera certificates—evidence that they have passed its courses—for credit toward a traditional degree.

But if some colleges follow through, the council's recommendations could go a long way toward straightening the crooked path from free college courses to valuable college credits. Simplifying that process could make the economic significance of MOOCs more tangible.

"This could make it much easier for students to get credit for MOOCs, and they don't necessarily have to figure out the complicated, back-roads way of doing so," said Amy Laitinen, deputy director for higher education at the New America Foundation, a research organization in Washington. "Making it easier is a big step toward making it happen at scale."

What MOOCs Will Mean

Any hypothesis about how MOOCs might "disrupt" the American higher-education system inevitably will turn on the willingness of colleges to grant credit for courses for which students do not pay tuition. And when it comes to inviting free online courses into the world of mainstream credentialing, institutions might prefer to act conservatively for fear of undermining their own bases of revenue.

Andrew Ng, a co-founder of Coursera, said some of the company's university partners have been wary even of submitting their own MOOCs for consideration by the council's credit-recommendation service. "For students to receive credit, even if that credit is sponsored by a different institution—that's a big step," said Mr. Ng. "I think it's still so new that a lot of us are getting used to the implications and what this means."

ACE has positioned itself to lead the inquiry into what MOOCs will mean to higher education. The council has gotten funds from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to study how the courses could be used to improve access and college completion, and it is currently reviewing courses from Udacity, another MOOC provider, for possible credit recommendations.

The approval of the first Coursera MOOCs is "an important first step in ACE's work to examine the long-term potential of MOOCs" to deal with issues such as "degree completion, increasing learning productivity, and deepening college curricula," said Molly Corbett Broad, the council's president, in a written statement.

But the second step, in which colleges begin accepting MOOC certificates for credit as if they were Advanced Placement scores, is equally important—and there is no guarantee that colleges will do so.

'A More Rigorous Process'

John Ebersole, president of Excelsior College, said his institution would not accept transfer credits from a Coursera MOOC, notwithstanding the council's recommendation. Excelsior, a pioneer of "competency-based" learning, is sympathetic to the notion of granting credit for learning that occurs outside the traditional classroom. But Mr. Ebersole said he was not impressed by Coursera's assessment methods.

"We would hope that ACE would support a more rigorous process, as is the case with other forms of noncredit instruction, whereby those seeking credit would complete a psychometrically valid
assessments in a secure testing facility," Mr. Ebersole said.

The council said it had confidence in its process for approving the courses for credit. Each course was reviewed by two independent faculty members, who looked at a number of aspects, including the tests and anticheat measures, which, in this case, involved a remote monitoring service called ProctorU.

"Our reviewers," said ACE’s Ms. Sandeen, "found their controls and techniques to be sufficient."

FSA TOOL PUBLISHES FAFSA COMPLETION NUMBERS FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATING CLASS OF 2013

Brenda Wensil, Chief Customer Experience Officer, Federal Student Aid

Tool provided completion numbers for over 24,000 high schools across the country in 2012

In March 2012, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) announced the release of an innovative FAFSA Completion Tool to help guidance professionals, school administrators and practitioners both track and subsequently increase FAFSA completions at high schools across the country.

Prior to publishing this data, the only source of data on FAFSA completions that high schools had were from self-reported student surveys, which were highly unreliable.

Through the FAFSA Completion Tool, educators have real-time access to reliable data to track FAFSA submission and completion and gauge their progress in increasing FAFSA completion.

Key studies have indicated that FAFSA completion correlates strongly with college enrollment, particularly among low-income populations.

Earlier this month, FSA updated and enhanced the FAFSA Completion Tool by revealing FAFSA submission and completion totals for the current year, as well as FAFSA submission and completion totals for the same time last year.

With this addition, the FAFSA Completion Tool—updated biweekly during the peak application period—now provides every high school in the United States whose students have completed five or more FAFSAs with information about how many applications were submitted and completed for the 2013–14 application year as well as comparison data from the 2012–13 FAFSA application year.

Last year’s data provides a baseline by which school districts can gauge their efforts, set goals to improve on last year’s performance, and subsequently increase FAFSA completion within their school district. School officials can determine their schoolwide FAFSA completion rates by comparing the number provided by the FAFSA Completion Tool with the number of seniors in their high school.

Last year, the Tool provided FAFSA submission and completion data for the senior classes at over 24,000 high schools in all 50 states, Washington, DC, and all U.S. territories. More than 30,000 visitors accessed the data throughout the spring of 2012 to inform their local FAFSA completion strategies and overall college access initiatives.

There are indications the Tool has contributed to raising FAFSA awareness across the country with more than 500,000 seniors having submitted a 2013–14 FAFSA through the end of January this year. This represents a 9 percent increase compared to early submissions during January 2012.

The promise of the FAFSA Completion Tool lies in its simplicity and its use of current data to effectively measure the success of FAFSA completion efforts. It provides college access professionals, counselors, and school administrators with a key verifiable outcome
metric proven essential for students’ access to federal financial resources for postsecondary education.

At the same time, while FAFSA data is important, we encourage high schools to use this data as one component of a comprehensive college access and completion program within their school.

For more information on the Tool and to search updated FAFSA Completion Data by High School for the senior class of 2013, visit StudentAid.gov/FAFSA-HS-data.

IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL STUDENT AID SYSTEM ACCESS CHANGES

Pam Eliadis, Service Director, System Operations & Aid Delivery Management, Federal Student Aid

During the weekend of March 9-10, 2013, we implemented two important changes related to Federal Student Aid system access. These system access changes, previously announced in multiple communications posted to the Information for Financial Aid Professionals (IFAP) Web site, are part of an ongoing effort to ensure the security of Federal Student Aid data systems.

AIMS Login Process Change

As of Monday, March 11, 2013, any user of a system behind Federal Student Aid's Access and Identity Management System (AIMS) is now required to read and accept the Federal Student Aid Privacy Act Acknowledgement and Rules of Behavior, as well as complete Federal Student Aid Security Training on an annual basis.

The systems/Web sites that are currently behind AIMS and which are affected by this change are eCampus-Based (eCB), eCDR Appeals, Experimental Sites, FAA Access to CPS Online, Financial Partners Datamart, National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) Professional Access, and Student Aid Internet Gateway (SAIG) Enrollment.

For a complete description of this change, refer to the February 6, 2013 electronic announcement, posted to the IFAP Web site.

COD Online Service Enrollment

In addition, over the past weekend we implemented the first phase of a change in how authorized users will access the Common Origination and Disbursement (COD) Web site.

As described in a March 8, 2013 electronic announcement, all COD Web site users must be enrolled for the COD Online Service and have an FSA User ID and password to access the COD Web site on or after May 4, 2013.

For a complete description of this change and the steps that must be completed, refer to the March 8, 2013 electronic announcement.

Contact Information

We appreciate the assistance of all Federal Student Aid system users as we implement these system access changes.

If you have questions regarding the login change for any system/Web site behind AIMS, contact the Customer Service Center for the specific system/Web site you need to access.

Service Center contact information is available on the IFAP Web site's Service Centers for Schools page or is provided on the specific Web site.

If you have questions about how to enroll a COD Web site user for COD Online Service or how to register for an FSA User ID, contact CPS/SAIG Technical Support at 800/330-5947 (TDD/TTY 800/511-5806) or by e-mail at CPSSAIG@ed.gov.
PESC is the voice for the efficient and secure real-time exchange of student data from initial access of the student from high school into the college environment, through successful completion of the education experience and into the workforce.

Transparent collaboration is our cornerstone principle. The sharing of ideas and best practices reminds us that while we work in a competitive environment, as stakeholders we must also cooperate and work together for the greater common good. That greater common good is ensuring student achievement and progression along the P20W education lifecycle and fostering a successful learning experience.

PESC is driving the collaborative development and alignment of data across disparate systems, across sectors & is eliminating barriers that inflate costs for institutions, students, states and taxpayers.

PESC envisions an interoperable environment that enables students to successfully progress & smoothly transition throughout the entire education lifecycle. The goal of seamless interoperability is achievable. We have the ability, we’ve identified what needs to be done, and we know how to do it.

JOIN THE COMMUNITY
JOIN THE EFFORT
JOIN PESC
The proprietary and disjointed approach education has historically and traditionally taken toward entry and retrieval of student data is costly, unwieldy and ineffective. Now more than ever and combined with unprecedented public and private funding and political will, technologies that provide significant improvement in process, customer service, research, data integrity, cost containment and accountability are available.

PESC recommends its Approved Standards, provided free of charge, as a solution as with standard methods of communicating and transporting data, disparate software and systems can be still be synchronized harmoniously.

PESC Approved Standards, created with open and transparent development and approval processes, include data element names, definitions, code sets, implementation guides and technical instructions. As a “best practices” model, they can be adopted by individual data systems and for exchange between data systems.

Student data will always originate from various sources and disparate systems. With PESC Approved Standards though, architects and IT directors can make sound decisions and rely on a proven return on investment. State administrators, admissions officers, registrars and business/financial aid officers can use and depend on the quality of student data.

Data and software providers can meet the needs of users faster without worrying about multiple methods and costly proprietary formats. Researchers can be more confident in the consistency of results and improve data-driven decision-making and accuracy.

By eliminating barriers, simplifying access, improving data quality, reducing cost, & bridging data gaps along the P20W education lifecycle, a new level of efficiency emerges. With its founding in 1997 by 29 leaders in education, PESC is powered by a strong membership that is dedicated to achieving its mission and together we are transforming the education landscape.

For current meetings, events, new development efforts & how to join, visit www.PESC.org or call +1.202.261.6516.
## Spring 2013 Data Summit

### Wednesday May 1, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30AM – 8:30AM</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30AM – 4:00PM</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30AM – 10:15AM</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15AM – 10:30AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30AM – Noon</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:30PM</td>
<td>Lunch: Keynote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30PM – 3:00PM</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00PM – 3:15PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15PM – 5:00PM</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30PM – 6:30PM</td>
<td>Annual Spring Reception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thursday May 2, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30AM – 10:15AM</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15AM – 10:30AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30AM – Noon</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:30PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30PM – 3:00PM</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00PM – 3:15PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15PM – 5:00PM</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30PM – 6:30PM</td>
<td>Annual Membership Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Friday May 3, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30AM – 10:15AM</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15AM – 10:30AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30AM – Noon</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon – 1:30PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30PM – 3:00PM</td>
<td>Concurrent Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00PM – 3:15PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15PM – 5:00PM</td>
<td>General Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30PM – 6:30PM</td>
<td>Annual Membership Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEDNESDAY MAY 1, 2013

GENERAL SESSION PROGRAM

8:30am – 10:15am

Introduction ACRP
SCOTT GILLIE, Executive Director, Encouragement Services, Inc. & President, Alliance of Career Resource Professionals (ACRP)

National Data Initiatives
MAUREEN MATTHEWS WENTWORTH, Program Director, Education Data and Information Systems, Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

Student eDentity: ePortfolios and Beyond!
JOHN C. ITTELSON, Ph.D., Director of Communication, Collaboration, and Outreach, California Virtual Campus; Professor Emeritus California State University Monterey Bay
HELEN L. CHEN, Ph.D., Center for Design Research, Office of the Registrar, Stanford University

10:15am – 10:30am
Break

10:30am – Noon

EdExchange: Enabling Common Data Exchange for California in the 21st Century
TIM CALHOON, Technology Center Director, Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges

Canadian Transcript Exchange Network
BILL MCKEE, Director of Operations, Ontario College Application Service (OCAS) & Chair, PESC Canadian PESC User Group

MyData
JEFFREY ALDERSON, Senior Director of Product Innovation, ConnecEDU
SHAWN BAY, Founder & CEO, eScholar
WEDNESDAY MAY 1, 2013

GENERAL SESSION PROGRAM

Noon – 1:30pm  Lunch – Keynote

American Higher Education: Second to None? How We Must Change to Meet 21st Century Imperatives

PAUL E. LINGENFELTER, Ph.D., President, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

1:30pm – 3:00pm  CEDS, IPEDS & SLDS

JACK BUCKLEY, Ph.D., Commissioner, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Institute of Education Sciences (IES), US Department of Education

HANS L’ORANGE, Vice President, State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)

TONY ROMANO, Director of IT, National Student Clearinghouse

Common Identity & Trust (CommIT) Collaborative

TIM CAMERON, Project Manager, Internet2

CHARLES LEONHARDT, Chief Technology Officer, Georgetown University

SHEL WAGGENER, Senior Vice President, Internet2

3:00pm – 3:15pm  Break

3:15pm – 5:00pm  PESC Update

MICHAEL SESSA, President & CEO, PESC

5:00pm  Adjourn
NEW RELEASE DATES FOR FY 2011 2-YEAR AND FY 2010 3-YEAR DRAFT COHORT DEFAULT RATES

Katrina Turner, Director, Operations Performance Division, Federal Student Aid

In February 2013, we postponed the release of the draft cohort default rates to all eligible schools, guaranty agencies, and lenders.

The release dates have been rescheduled and we plan to release 2-year and 3-year draft cohort default rates as follows:

* On March 18, 2013 we plan to release the FY 2011 2-year draft cohort default rates
* On March 25, 2013 we plan to release the FY 2010 3-year draft cohort default rates

All schools, both domestic and foreign, enrolled in the Electronic Cohort Default Rate (eCDR) process will receive their FY 2011 2-year and the FY 2010 3-year draft cohort default rate and accompanying documentation via their Student Aid Internet Gateway (SAIG) mailbox.

Any school not enrolled in the eCDR process may download their cohort default rates and accompanying documentation from the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) via the NSLDS Professional Access Web site.

Below we provide the instructions to download and view or print the Electronic Cohort Default Rate (eCDR) files that we will send to a school's SAIG mailbox on March 18 and 25, 2013.

If you have questions about the FY 2011 2-year and FY 2010 3-year draft cohort default rates, contact us by e-mailing fsa.schools.default.management@ed.gov or by calling the Operations Performance Division Hotline at 202/377-4259.

FY 2010 3-YEAR DRAFT COHORT DEFAULT RATES DISTRIBUTED ON MARCH 25, 2013

Katrina Turner, Director, Operations Performance Division, Federal Student Aid

We distributed the FY 2010 3-Year Draft Cohort Default Rate notification packages to all eligible domestic and foreign schools. This announcement provides information about our distribution of the draft rates and the begin dates for challenging the draft rates.

Distribution of FY 2010 3-Year Draft Cohort Default Rates

For both eligible domestic and foreign schools enrolled in the Electronic Cohort Default Rate (eCDR) notification process, we sent FY 2010 3-Year Draft Cohort Default Rate and accompanying documentation via the Student Aid Internet Gateway (SAIG). This information was sent to the SAIG mailbox for the destination point administrator designated by the school. Each eCDR package contained the following information:

* Cover Letter (message class SHDRLROP)
* Reader-Friendly Loan Record Detail Report (message class SHCDRROP)
* Extract-Type Loan Record Detail Report (message class SHCDREOP)

We did not send eCDR notification packages to any school not enrolled in eCDR. These schools may download their cohort default rates and accompanying Loan Record Detail Reports from the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS) via the NSLDS Professional Access Web site.

If a technical problem caused by the Department of Education (the Department) results in an inability to access the data, schools have five business days from the receipt of the eCDR notification package to notify Operations Performance Division at the e-mail address given below.

Any school that did not have a borrower in
Begin Dates for Challenging FY 2010 3-Year Draft Cohort Default Rates

Although not subject to loss of eligibility due to the FY 2010 3-Year cohort default rates, schools can challenge their rates via the eCDR Appeals Web site. The time period for challenging a school’s FY 2010 3-Year Draft Cohort Default Rate under 34 C.F.R Part 668, Subpart N begins on Tuesday, April 2, 2013 for all schools.

In order to complete an adjustment or appeal, you may need a data manager’s contact information. Click on a link entitled, "Numerical Data Managers" from the home page of the Cohort Default Rate Guide at http://www.ifap.ed.gov/DefaultManagement/finalcdrg.html where you will find a list of the data managers identified by a three-digit code found on a school’s loan record detail report.

When you click on the code or state (if no code exists), you will be directed to the data manager list that contains the name, address, telephone numbers, e-mail and Web site information for a particular data manager.

For additional information regarding the school cohort default rate calculation or the adjustment/appeal processes, please refer to the Cohort Default Rate Guide at http://www.ifap.ed.gov/DefaultManagement/CDRGuideMaster.html.

PESC LAUNCHES ‘I HEART’ DATA

PESC is pleased to announce the timely release of its i ♥ DATA campaign. i ♥ DATA is an education and outreach campaign that introduces a common blueprint or model for the education community to ensure data quality and integrity.

i ♥ DATA also advocates for the improvement of data quality and integrity through the adoption of its neutral model and five basic, common principles:

- DATA STANDARDS | Adopt & Implement Common Data Standards.
- DATA USAGE | Commit to Using High Quality Data at All Levels.
- DATA PERSPECTIVE | Set a P20W Perspective in Planning & Development.
- DATA AWARENESS | Advocate for Data Integrity in Both IT & Policymaker Sectors.
- DATA GOVERNANCE | Support an Open & Collaborative Committee of Stakeholders.

Through broad adoption, i ♥ DATA establishes a basic, common metric for assessment and comparison and is adoptable across P20W, across state lines and across the globe.

“Ensuring data quality and integrity is not a one-time event, but a practice,” states Michael D. Sessa, PESC President & CEO. “Adopting the five basic, common principles raises the bar, provides clarity and establishes a robust level of performance for organizations to follow to ensure data quality and integrity.”

i ♥ DATA is a voluntary, self-run program that enables SEA’s, LEA’s, schools/systems, colleges/universities, government agencies and marketplace providers to assess themselves against the five basic principles. All stakeholders can help.
spread the word about the importance of data quality and integrity by linking to the PESC website (banners are provided for organizations to post/link on their websites), by downloading and distributing materials from the PESC homepage and by visiting PESC throughout the campaign as we exhibit in 2013 at annual conferences for NCES, Ellucian Live, CANHEIT, SHEEO and EDUCAUSE.

**PESC PROVIDES ADDITIONAL BENEFIT FOR ASSOCIATION MEMBERS**

To all Associations within the PESC Membership:

One of the most valuable benefits provided to Associations within the PESC Membership is the ability to pass on PESC benefits to your members.

In particular, in attending PESC meetings and events, an association's members can register at the PESC Member rate. In addition to unlimited participation in PESC for the association's staff themselves, association members also have access to PESC workgroups and committees.

For example an institution or organization that is a member of NASFAA or AACRAO OR SHEEO, as all are PESC Members, can register at PESC meetings and events at the Member rate.

In addition, employees of both associations have unlimited participation in PESC. In passing benefits through your association to your members, we believe we are providing equitable access to the community at-large.

PESC’s cornerstone principle is transparent collaboration and we look forward to developing new and innovative ways to engage the community. For more information about PESC Member benefits, please visit [http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=118](http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=118). If you have questions or concerns about PESC Membership, please contact Membership Director Jennifer Kim at 202.261.6514 or jennifer.kim@pesc.org.

**PREMIER PESC PARTNERS**

* OUR HIGHEST MEMBERSHIP LEVEL *

- **National Student Clearinghouse**
  - [www.StudentClearinghouse.org](http://www.StudentClearinghouse.org)
- **Parchment**
  - [www.Parchment.com](http://www.Parchment.com)
- **SCRIP-SAFE International**
  - [www.Scrip-Safe.com](http://www.Scrip-Safe.com)
- **USA Funds**
  - [www.USAfunds.org](http://www.USAfunds.org)

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

P.L. 105-244

*Sec 101---Revision of Title I*

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

`Sec. 143. ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLIFICATION OF STUDENT AID DELIVERY.`

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

`(b) PARTICIPATION IN STANDARD SETTING ORGANIZATIONS-

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

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

`(3) The Chief Operating Officer may pay necessary dues and fees associated with participating in standard setting organizations pursuant to this subsection.
DATA STANDARDS
Adopt & Implement Common Data Standards.

DATA USAGE
Commit to Using High Quality Data at All Levels.

DATA PERSPECTIVE P20W
Set a P20w Perspective in Planning & Development.

DATA AWARENESS & EDUCATION
Advocate for Data Integrity in Both IT & Policymaker Sectors.

DATA GOVERNANCE
Support an Open & Collaborative Committee of Stakeholders.

A COLLABORATIVE CAMPAIGN UNIFYING EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS AROUND INTEROPERABILITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT
What is i♥data?
i♥data is an education and outreach campaign that:

- introduces a common blueprint or model for the education community to ensure data quality and integrity.
- advocates for the improvement of data quality and integrity through the adoption of its neutral model and five basic principles.

Why i♥data?
i♥data provides a common foundation for data quality and integrity:

- is adoptable across P20W, state lines and across the world.
- establishes a basic, common metric for assessment and comparison.

How does i♥data work?
i♥data is a voluntary, self-run program that:

- enables LEAs, SEAs, schools/systems, colleges/universities, government agencies & marketplace providers to assess themselves against the five basic principles.
- allows each of the five principles to be implemented independently from each other.

How do I get involved with i♥data?
All stakeholders can help spread the word about the importance of data quality and integrity:

- Link to the PESC website
- Visit PESC for i♥data materials as we exhibit throughout 2013 at NCES, Ellucian Live, SHEEO and EDUCAUSE annual conferences.

Who is involved with i♥data?
PESC worked directly with NCES, SHEEO, CCSSO, DQC, SIFA and with support from the Gates and Dell Foundations together launched CEDS. Now PESC, its Members and Sponsors lead this campaign to continue support for data standards and ask all stakeholders to participate.
The PESC Spring 2013 Data Summit takes place Wednesday May 1-3, 2-13 and includes PESC’s Annual Spring Membership Meeting and Annual Spring Reception.

Data Summits focus on open, collaborative, community development, implementation and integration, maintenance & exchange of data and data standards.

Access, overall connectivity, data quality and political factors that drive education systems and technology are also discussed.

All Concurrent and General Summit Sessions and events are open to all registered attendees and dress code is business casual.

Transparent collaboration, engaging discussions, awareness of technical resources & best practices, identification of emerging technologies, new business contacts and tips from experts of leading community organizations can be expected.

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

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

**GENERAL SESSIONS**

**Keynote Speaker**
Paul E. Lingenfelter, President, SHEEO

**American Higher Education: Second to None? How We Must Change to Meet 21st Century Imperatives**

**Introducing ACRP**
SCOTT GILLIE, Executive Director, Encouragement Services, Inc. & President, Alliance of Career Resource Professionals (ACRP)

**National Data Initiatives**
MAUREEN MATTHEWS WENTWORTH, Program Director, Education Data and Information Systems, Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

**Student eDentity: ePortfolios and Beyond!**
JOHN C. ITTELSON, PH.D., Director of Communication, Collaboration, and Outreach, California Virtual Campus; Professor Emeritus California State University Monterey Bay
HELEN L. CHEN, PH.D., Center for Design Research, Office of the Registrar, Stanford University

**Canadian Transcript Exchange Network**
BILL MCKEE, Director of Operations, Ontario College Application Service (OCAS) & Chair, PESC Canadian User Group

**EdExchange: Enabling Common Data Exchange for California in the 21st Century**
TIM CALHOON, Technology Center Director, Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges
Many organizations have published announcements and white papers stating their commitment to PESC and to a standardized process. PESC has created a TRANSCRIPT page on its website located at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=183 that will maintain every major announcement. On this all-inclusive page too are all the PESC Approved Standards for high school and college transcripts including XML, EDI, PDF and the EDI/XML Crosswalks as well. We look forward to these discussions and thank the community leaders for advancing this very important topic.
SEAL OF APPROVAL PROGRAM

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

- ConnectEDU
  www.ConnectEDU.com
- Parchment
  www.Parchment.com

The PESC Seal of Approval Program is a voluntary service offered by PESC for implementers of PESC Approved Standards to indicate a uniform level of implementation.

Implementers must formally apply to PESC for the Seal of Approval using the official application and must submit a small, non-refundable fee to PESC.

The service was designed to communicate to the community at-large that a certain implementation of PESC Approved Standards has been uniformly implemented according to the original intent and spirit of the PESC Approved Standard. A Seal of Approval can be used by implementers to market products and services to demonstrate alignment and interoperability.

For users, a product or service with a PESC Seal of Approval indicates that the product or service is in alignment and uniform with the original intent of the PESC Approved Standard. For providers of products and services, a PESC Seal of Approval indicates value in that the product or service was reviewed, analyzed and confirmed to be in alignment and uniform with the original intent of the PESC Approved Standard.

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

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

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

PESC LEADERSHIP TEAM

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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

BOARD OF DIRECTORS COMMITTEES

Executive Committee Chair
Francisco Valines, Florida International University

Finance Committee Chair
David Moldoff, AcademyOne
IN CASE YOU MISSED IT

STATE OF THE UNION

In his 2013 State of the Union address, President Obama outlined a series of proposals to increase access to a high-quality education. Among them were initiatives to make quality early education accessible to every child, to redesign the country’s high schools to meet the needs of the real world, and to tackle the spiraling cost of college.

The proposals complemented other efforts to strengthen the middle class, including calls to raise the minimum age and reform immigration.


Among the education excerpts from the speech:

- Expanding Early Learning. “Study after study shows that the sooner a child begins learning, the better he or she does down the road. But, today, fewer than 3 in 10 four-year-olds are enrolled in a high-quality preschool program. Most middle class parents can’t afford a few hundred bucks a week for private preschool, and, for poor kids who need help the most, this lack of access to preschool education can shadow them for the rest of their lives. Tonight, I propose working with states to make high-quality preschool available to every child in America…. Every dollar we invest in high-quality early education can save more than seven
dollars later on -- by boosting graduation rates, reducing teen pregnancy, even reducing violent crime. In states that make it a priority to educate our youngest children -- like Georgia or Oklahoma -- studies show students grow up more likely to read and do math at grade level, graduate high school, hold a job, and form more stable families of their own. So, let’s do what works, and make sure none of our children start the race of life already behind.”

- Redesigning High Schools. “Let’s also make sure that a high school diploma puts our kids on a path to a good job. Right now, countries like Germany focus on graduating their students with the equivalent of a technical degree from one of our community colleges, so that they’re ready for a job. At schools like P-Tech in Brooklyn -- a collaboration between New York City Public Schools, the City University of New York, and IBM -- students will graduate with a high school diploma and an associate’s degree in computers or engineering.... Four years ago, we started Race to the Top -- a competition that convinced almost every state to develop smarter curricula and higher standards, all for about 1% of what we spend on education each year. Tonight, I’m announcing a new challenge to redesign America’s high schools so they better equip graduates for the demands of a high-tech economy. And, we’ll reward schools that develop new partnerships with colleges and employers and create classes that focus on science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) -- the skills today’s employers are looking for to fill the jobs that are there now and will be there in the future.”

- Holding Colleges Accountable. “Now, even with better high schools, most young people will need some higher education. It’s a simple fact that the more education you have, the more likely you are to have a job and work your way into the middle class. But, today, skyrocketing costs price too many young people out of a higher education, or saddle them with unsustainable debt. Through tax credits, grants, and better loans, we’ve made college more affordable for millions of students and families over the last few years, but taxpayers can’t keep on subsidizing higher and higher costs for higher education. Colleges must do their part to keep costs down, and it’s our job to make sure that they do. So, tonight, I ask Congress to change the Higher Education Act so affordability and value are included in determining which colleges receive certain types of federal aid. And, tomorrow, my Administration will release a new College Scorecard (see below) that students and parents can use to compare schools based on a simple criteria: where you can get the most bang for your educational buck.”

**TESTIMONIALS ON PESC**

PESC Members: Jennifer Kim is in the process of reaching out to all members to either provide or update current testimonials and quotes. Any member, with dues paid current and in good standing, can submit a testimonial to PESC. Testimonials are used by PESC in THE STANDARD newsletter, on the PESC homepage and throughout the website, and in certain articles and press releases.

For members there is no charge or fee for submitting testimonials. While a solid testimonial reflects well on PESC, it also showcases your organization as a community member, a supporter of standards and interoperability and leader in education technology.

A form to submit a testimonial is located here: http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=169 and you are able to complete and submit them directly to PESC.
STUDENT LOAN PORTFOLIO DETAIL REPORT APPROVED THROUGH PESC AS EDUCATION COMMUNITY DATA STANDARD

Service Providers Collaborate to Improve Data Integrity and Exchange

The Board of Directors of PESC is pleased to announce the release of a Student Loan Portfolio Detail Report Standard approved through PESC’s development, approval & maintenance process. Now PESC approved, the Student Loan Detail Report Standard is expected to be used by lenders, servicers, guarantors, colleges and universities to exchange student loan repayment data and information. Leaders within the student aid sector had requested PESC’s expertise and service through a formal Letter of Intent.

“In order to assist schools with the management of cohort default rates (CDR), gainful employment, default prevention, default calculations, and overall repayment, lenders, guarantors and federal loan servicers provide schools with data files/reports reflecting their respective borrower loan data,” states Brian Allison, Vice President of Product Development at USA Funds and PESC Board member.

“Today, data files/reports are provided by these various organizations in their own proprietary formats leaving the schools to deal with multiple, disparate file formats/reports,” Mr. Allison, who also served as Co-Chair of the Development Workgroup, continued.

“With an increasing number of requests to modify these existing files/reports, this workgroup gathered national support for a single, standard report format,” adds Kristi Blabaum, Systems Integration Analyst at Great Lakes Higher Education and PESC Board member representing the National Association of Student Loan Administrators (NASLA). “A single standard will ease the burden on college and university staff and IT resources as well as those of the lenders, servicers and guarantors,” Ms. Blabaum, who also served as Development Workgroup Co-Chair, continued.

PESC members that approved the Student Loan Portfolio Detail Report Standard include:

- AACRAO
- AAMC
- AcademyOne
- American Student Assistance
- College Board
- ConnectEDU
- Ellucian
- Florida International University
- Georgetown University
- Hobsons
- Indiana State University
- Kuali Foundation
- NASLA
- National Student Clearinghouse
- NCHER
- Oracle
- Parchment
- San Francisco State University
- SCRIP-SAFE
- University of Illinois System
- University of Louisiana
- USA Funds
- US Department of Education
- Washington State University
- XAP


Organizations looking to communicate their use of this or any other PESC Approved Standard should contact the PESC offices at 202.261.6514.
PESC MEMBERS VOTE IN BOARD ELECTIONS
PROXY BALLOT DEADLINE APRIL 24, 2013

Please be advised that elections for PESC’s Board of Directors will be held during the 15th Annual PESC Membership Meeting scheduled for Thursday May 2, 2013 from 5:30pm - 6:30pm PDT at the Omni Hotel in San Diego.

PESC Membership meetings are open to all PESC Members & Affiliates & with prior notification, other interested parties.

The attached Proxy Ballot allows Members, who may not be able to attend the election in-person, the ability to cast a vote now. NOTE: If attending the 15th Annual Membership Meeting in person, Proxy Ballots can still be submitted now and can then either be replaced with an in-person vote on Thursday May 2, 2013 or remain as the official vote.

We recommend that every member organization submit a Proxy Ballot so that if any last minute emergencies occur (bad weather, flight or meeting delays, etc.), an official ballot is still on file for that member organization.

Those nominees appearing on the ballot will have five minutes each to address the Members immediately prior to voting at the Membership Meeting. Nominees, who may want to introduce themselves sooner as they may not be as familiar with the PESC Membership or who wish to communicate with Members over the coming weeks, can submit no more than two communications (emails, letters, etc.) to the PESC office.

In turn the PESC office will issue that nominee’s communication(s) to the PESC Members over the PESC Member listserv. Nominees are still able to communicate directly and independently with voting members outside of this process.

Note that PESC does not accept 'write-in' candidates. Instead and due to specific bylaw requirements, a slate of nominees is presented from which Members vote. Bylaws require that two members of the Board of Directors be from commercial organizations, two members be from higher education associations representing institutions, and two members be from other non-profit associations.

While the commercial representation requirement is satisfied with our current Board (those not being elected at this time), to comply with bylaws, one representative from a non-profit association and two representatives from higher education institutional associations must be elected.

Once these three are elected, the three nominees receiving the highest votes overall will be elected.

Proxy Ballots must be received in PESC’s offices by 5:00pm PDT Wednesday April 24, 2013.

We know there may be questions about elections. Please feel free to contact me directly via email or in the office at 202.261.6516 with any question or concern.

EDUCATION DEPT. TO RENEW EFFORTS AT GAINFUL-EMPLOYMENT AND STATE-AUTHORIZATION RULES

By Kelly Field

The Obama administration is not giving up on efforts to hold colleges accountable for their students' employability and to force states to step up their oversight of distance education.

In a notice to appear in Tuesday's Federal Register, the Education Department says it will revisit its controversial "gainful employment" and "state authorization" regulations as part of expanded rule-making sessions on fraud in the student-aid
system. Both rules have been struck down in court, following challenges by for-profit colleges.

The original "gainful employment" rule, which the department published in 2011, would have cut off federal student aid to career-oriented programs whose graduates had high debt-to-income ratios and low loan-repayment rates. A federal judge blocked the core piece of the rule before it took effect, finding that the department had the authority to define "gainful employment" but had offered no reasoned basis for its debt-repayment threshold.

The department did not appeal the full decision but asked the court to reinstate a requirement that institutions report information about their students' loan-repayment rates and debt-to-income ratios. The judge denied that request last month.

Though the administration has not said whether it will appeal the latest ruling, Tuesday's notice suggests that it is open to other ways of defining gainful employment. In the notice, the department says it is seeking feedback on the "best measures" and "their thresholds" for distinguishing "successful and unsuccessful programs."

Expansion to Foreign Locations
The department will also revisit the requirement that colleges seek approval from each state in which they enroll students in online programs. That portion of the "state authorization" rule was blocked in 2011, on the grounds that institutions did not have time to review it, and remanded to the department for further review. In the coming rule-making sessions, the department will seek to expand the rules to foreign locations of domestic institutions.

The new topics will be added to a rule-making process that was supposed to focus on the use of debit cards for disbursing federal student aid and ways to streamline the campus-based student-aid programs. The department held a pair of hearings on those issues last May but had yet to schedule any negotiating sessions.

Tuesday's notice will add several new topics to the agenda. In addition to gainful employment and state authorization, the department will seek to revise rules on student-aid refunds and revamp underwriting criteria for PLUS loans. It will also put in place new reporting requirements stemming from the 2013 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, focused on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Hearings on the new topics will be held in May, in San Francisco, Minneapolis, and Washington. Negotiations are expected to begin this fall.

In its notice, the department says it plans to hold additional rule-making sessions on college affordability and quality, as part of a "long-term agenda" that "will take several years to complete."

A group of higher-education leaders, accreditors, and regulators led by a former U.S. education secretary is seeking to streamline distance-education and state-authorization regulations to make it easier and more affordable for colleges to enroll students across the country.

The group, the Commission on the Regulation of Postsecondary Distance Education, released a report on Thursday that proposes a plan for interstate reciprocity, based on the voluntary participation of states and colleges.

The commission said such a framework would help reduce the high costs and inefficiencies often associated with applying for authorization, and would do so by establishing nationwide
performance guidelines agreed to by participating states.

Colleges have been required for many years to receive authorization from the states in which they enroll students before they can receive federal student-aid funds.

Though many colleges assumed the requirement did not apply to online programs, a federal rule, adopted in July 2011, sought to explicitly extend the rule to online and distance-education programs. The rule was overturned shortly thereafter, but many states still adopted new regulations for institutions operating distance-education programs within their borders.

A problem for many colleges is the high fees to apply for authorization in each state, which could cost an institution tens of thousands of dollars, depending on the number of states in which it seeks to operate. In some cases, colleges have simply turned away students in certain states in order to avoid the authorization costs.

'A Real Difference'

But Richard W. Riley, who served as secretary of education under President Bill Clinton, said his commission’s plan would significantly reduce the costs associated with applying for state authorization. Under the proposed framework, all participating colleges would face one fee structure, including one annual fee that would be "much less" than the current fees, according to the report.

Under the plan, the four regional higher-education compacts that already exist—the Midwestern Higher Education Company, the New England Board of Higher Education, the Southern Regional Education Board, and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education—would oversee the reciprocity agreements.

To participate in the reciprocity system, the home state of a college would oversee and regulate the institution’s work in other states to ensure that it met a set of national baseline standards. Other states in which the college operates could not regulate that institution unless it had a "physical presence" in the state, which the report defines as a continuing occupation of a physical location for instruction or the maintenance of an administrative office to facilitate instruction.

Additionally, the report says, responsibility for dealing with student complaints would shift to the home state of a college, rather than the state in which the student receives instruction, a step that would bolster consumer protection for students.

"This proposal will make a real difference in the ability of higher-education institutions to effectively deliver distance-education courses across the country," Mr. Riley said in a written statement.

Representatives from 47 states will meet with members of the commission in Indianapolis next week to discuss the recommendations. The commission plans to start accepting states into the reciprocity system as early as this fall. Once a state has been approved by its regional compact, colleges in that state may begin applying to participate.

**FY 2014 BUDGET**

On April 10, President Obama sent Congress his annual budget request, presenting his plan to invest in the true engine of America’s economic growth: a rising and thriving middle class. He also addressed the press in the Rose Garden, noting that, while our economy is poised for progress, we need to be smarter about our priorities as a nation.

“Tо help workers earn the skills they need to fill [good] jobs, we’ll work with states to make high-quality preschool available to every child across America,” he said. “And, we’re going to pay for it by raising taxes on tobacco products that harm our
young people…. We’ll reform our high schools and job training programs to equip more Americans with the skills they need to compete in the 21st century economy. We’ll help more middle class families afford the rising cost of college. And, to make sure hard work is rewarded, we’ll build new ladders of opportunity into the middle class for anybody willing to work hard to climb them. We’ll partner with 20 of our communities hit hardest by the recession, to help them improve housing, and education, and business investment.”

FOR MORE INFORMATION, PLEASE GO TO http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/04/10/president-obama-sends-congress-his-fiscal-year-2014-budget.

The President is requesting $71.2 billion in discretionary funding for the U.S. Department of Education, an increase of $3.1 billion -- or 4.5% -- over the Fiscal Year 2013 pre-sequester level. “We must continue to build on the reforms already transforming classrooms across the country,” Secretary Duncan stated. “Strategic investments in our educational system will not only provide more opportunities for millions of Americans, but they will also strengthen our nation’s workforce.”


The cornerstone of the President’s education investments is expanding high-quality early learning opportunities to all four-year-olds from low- and moderate-income families. Studies show these children have less access to high-quality early education and are less likely to enter school prepared for success -- creating an educational opportunity gap that can shadow them for the rest of their lives. The Preschool for All proposal would invest $75 billion over 10 years in separate, fully offset mandatory funding to create new partnerships with states and provide high-quality preschool to more communities. The proposal also provides $750 million in discretionary funding to help states strengthen their early learning systems and prepare to expand access to high-quality preschool.


Including Preschool for All, the President’s budget is targeted to strengthen the education pipeline from cradle to career, including:

· furthering the K-12 reform agenda by investing in school turnaround efforts, STEM programs (http://www.ed.gov/stem), and teachers and leaders (http://www.ed.gov/teachers-leaders), as well as increasing investments in what works (http://www.ed.gov/k-12reforms);

· redesigning the high school experience and increasing the career readiness of high school students and adult learners (http://www.ed.gov/highschool);

· making college more affordable and improving quality by incentivizing states and institutions to do their part in controlling costs and providing value (http://www.ed.gov/college);

· keeping schools and communities safe through an Administration-wide plan to protect children and neighborhoods from gun violence (http://www.ed.gov/school-safety); and

· providing ladders of opportunity to the middle class, through a robust Promise Neighborhoods program and investments in low-income communities (http://www.ed.gov/ladders).

administration-budget-makes-major-investment-in-early-learning/), the budget summary (http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget14/summary/14summary.pdf), and fact sheets on cross-cutting issues (www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget14/).

Furthermore, one can view video from the Department’s budget briefing for associations (http://edstream.ed.gov/webcast/Viewer/?peid=bc34e2a90df4d978e44a729b10ef0541d) and listen to the Department’s press call (http://www2.ed.gov/news/av/audio/2013/04102013.mp3).

**STANFORD U. AND EDX WILL JOINTLY BUILD OPEN-SOURCE SOFTWARE TO DELIVER MOOCS**

By Jeffrey R. Young

Starting in June, colleges that want to deliver their own massive open online courses will be able to use a free software platform developed jointly by Stanford University and edX, the nonprofit MOOC provider founded by Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The move is a merger of sorts between two previously competing software-development projects with the same goal. EdX has long said it would make the software it built to power its MOOCs freely available to anyone as an open-source package. And Stanford was working on Class2Go, its own free software for online courses. Now the two software teams will work together and focus on developing a single platform.

Here’s where it gets confusing. Despite the joint work on software development, Stanford has no plans to join edX as a partner, and it will not offer courses via edX. Instead, Stanford will create its own branded presence, with the jointly built software platform powering it in the background.

Stanford will also continue to deliver some courses through Coursera, a company started by two Stanford professors that is now working with highly selective colleges around the world.

John Mitchell, vice provost for online learning at Stanford, said in a telephone press conference on Tuesday that the goal was to create the “Linux of online learning.” (For those not in the know, Linux is perhaps the world’s most successful open-source effort, producing a free alternative to Microsoft’s Windows or Apple’s Macintosh operating system.)

Students taking courses via edX will see no immediate effect from the decision announced on Tuesday, although leaders said that new features could be added faster now that more programmers were involved in building its back-end software.

The move might cause some headaches for universities that had already started using Class2Go to deliver their own MOOCs. Mr. Mitchell said that the software would continue to be offered for those that wanted to use it, but it won’t be upgraded. The vice provost said that his team would try to make it easy for colleges that are now using Class2Go to move content from that system to the new platform.

One for-profit education company is already using the edX software to run its Web site. The company, 10gen, was given early access to the software as part of a pilot project to test whether it could be easily used, said Anant Agarwal, president of edX.

Colleges have an increasing number of choices for delivering online courses. Last year Google announced a free open-source software platform for MOOCs, called Course Builder. And many colleges have already purchased software to deliver online courses that could also be used for MOOCs.
A CONSUMER INTERNET PRIVACY BILL OF RIGHTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEARN MORE AT WHITEHOUSE.GOV
DATA SYSTEMS ONLY DO WHAT YOU ASK THEM TO DO.

WHAT ARE YOU ASKING YOURS TO DO?

SOLUTIONS ARE AVAILABLE. NOW IS THE TIME. PESC IS THE PLACE.

FOR THE COMMUNITY. BY THE COMMUNITY.

PESC
EXPERIENCE. THE DIFFERENCE.
Burden statement: The Commission estimates the burden of this collection of information as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED ANNUAL REPORTING BURDEN HOURS AND BURDEN HOUR COSTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 CFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 32, Appendix A, Form TO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 The Commission estimates that entities will spend $100 per hour. The $100 per hour estimate was used as the average hourly wage rate in the PRA section of the Internal Business Conduct Standards for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants final rule (see Duties Rules; Futures Commission Merchant and Introducing Broker Conflicts of Interest Rules; and Chief Compliance Officer Rules for Swap Dealers, Major Swap Participants, and Futures Commission Merchants, 77 FR 10218, 20194 (Apr. 3, 2012)) and the wage rate for CCOs under the DCO final rules (see Proposed Collection, Comment Request: Further Definition of “Swap,” “Security-Based Swap,” and “Security-Based Swap Agreement”; Mixed Swaps; Security-Based Swap Agreement Recordkeeping; Book-out Agreement Confirmation, 76 FR 69344, 69428 (Aug. 16, 2012)). As the Commission explained in the Internal Business Conduct Standards final rule, the estimate of $100 per hour was based on recent Bureau of Labor Statistics findings, including the mean hourly wage of an employee under occupation code 23–1011, “Lawyers,” that is employed by the “Securities and Commodity Contracts Intermediation and Brokerage Industry,” which is $85.20. The mean hourly wage of an employee under occupation code 11–3011, “Financial Manager,” in the same industry is $89.90. Additionally, SIFMA’s “Report on Management & Professional Earnings in the Securities Industry—2011” estimates the average wage of a compliance attorney at $96.42 and a compliance specialist in the U.S. at $74.85 per hour. As in those rules, the Commission is using a $100 per hour wage rate in calculating the cost burdens imposed by this collection of information and requests comment on the accuracy of its estimate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
Office of the Secretary
[Docket ID DoD–2013–OS–0028]
Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request
ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by March 22, 2013.

Title, Associated Form and OMB Number: Federal Agency Retail Pharmacy Program; OMB Control Number 0720–0032.

Type of Request: Extension.

Number of Respondents: 250.

Responses per Respondent: 8.

Annual Responses: 2,000.

Average Burden per Response: 8 hours.

Annual Burden Hours: 16,000.

Needs and Uses: The Department of Defense (DoD) is extending the information collection requirements under current OMB control number 0720–0032. Specifically, under the collection of information, respondents (drug manufacturers) will base refund calculation reporting requirements on both the Federal Ceiling Price and the Federal Supply Schedule Price, whichever is lower. Previously, drug manufacturers’ reporting requirements addressed only the Federal Ceiling Price. DoD will use the reporting and audit capabilities of the Pharmacy Data Transaction Service (PDTS) to validate refunds owed to the Government. The government received approximately $1.5 billion from pharmaceutical companies as a result of this program/refund calculation reporting requirements.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent’s Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Mr. John Kraemer. Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Kraemer at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

You may also submit comments, identified by docket number and title, by the following method:

• Federal eRulemaking Portal: http://www.regulations.gov. Follow the instructions for submitting comments.

Instructions: All submissions received must include the agency name, docket number and title for this Federal Register document. The general policy for comments and other submissions from members of the public is to make these submissions available for public viewing on the Internet at http://www.regulations.gov as they are received without change, including any personal identifiers or contact information.

DOD Clearance Officer: Ms. Patricia Toppings. Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Ms. Toppings at WHS/ESD Information Management Division, 4800 Mark Center Drive, East Tower, Suite 02G09, Alexandria, VA 22350–3100.

Aaron Siegel,
Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
[Docket No. ED–2013–ICCD–0015]
Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program (DL) Regulations

AGENCY: Department of Education (ED), Federal Student Aid (FSA). ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 et seq.), ED is proposing an extension of an existing information collection of a previously approved information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before April 22, 2013.
Address: Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at http://www.regulations.gov by selecting Docket ID number ED-2013-ICCD-0015 or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Room 2E117, Washington, DC 20202–4537.

For further information contact: Electronically mail ICDocketMgr@ed.gov. Please do not send comments here.

Supplementary information: The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize the public’s reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department’s information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program (DL) Regulations.

OMB Control Number: 1845–0021.

Type of Review: an extension of an existing information collection of a previously approved information collection.

Respondents/Affected Public: Individuals or households; State, Local, or Tribal Governments; Private Sector.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Responses: 6,603,667.

Total Estimated Number of Annual Burden Hours: 535,998.

Abstract: The William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program regulations cover areas of program administration. These regulations are in place to minimize administrative burden for program participants, to determine eligibility for and provide program benefits to borrowers, and to prevent fraud and abuse of program funds to protect the taxpayers’ interests. This request is for continued approval of reporting and recordkeeping related to the administrative requirements of the Direct Loan program.


Kate Mullan, Acting Director, Information Collection Clearance Division, Privacy, Information and Records Management Services, Office of Management.

[FR Doc. 2013–03789 Filed 2–19–13; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Applications for New Awards; Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Program

Agency: Office of Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education.

Action: Notice.

Overview Information

Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Program

Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2013.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.351D.


Deadline for Notice of Intent to Apply: March 22, 2013.


Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: June 20, 2013.

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination (AEMDD) program supports the enhancement, expansion, documentation, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative, cohesive models that are based on research and have demonstrated that they effectively—(1) integrate standards-based arts education into the core elementary and middle school curriculum; (2) strengthen standards-based arts instruction in these grades; and (3) improve students’ academic performance, including their skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts. Projects funded through the AEMDD program are intended to increase the amount of nationally available information on effective models for arts education that integrate the arts with standards-based education programs.

Priorities: This competition includes one absolute priority and four competitive preference priorities that are explained in the following paragraphs. Absolute priority 1 is from the notice of final priority, requirements, and definitions for this program, published in the Federal Register on March 30, 2005 (70 FR 16234). The competitive preference priorities are from the notice of supplemental priorities and definitions for discretionary grant programs, published in the Federal Register on December 15, 2010 (75 FR 78486), and corrected on May 12, 2011 (76 FR 27637) (Supplemental Priorities).

Absolute Priority: For FY 2013 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, this priority is an absolute priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3) we consider only applications that meet this priority.

This priority is:

This priority supports projects that enhance, expand, document, evaluate, and disseminate innovative, cohesive models that are based on research and have demonstrated their effectiveness in (1) integrating standards-based arts education into the core elementary or middle school curriculum, (2) strengthening standards-based arts instruction in the elementary or middle school grades, and (3) improving the academic performance of students in elementary or middle school grades, including their skills in creating, performing, and responding to the arts. In order to meet this priority, an applicant must demonstrate that the model project for which it seeks funding (1) serves only elementary school or middle school grades, or both, and (2) is linked to State and national standards intended to enable all students to meet challenging expectations and to improve student and school performance.

Note: National standards are the arts standards developed by the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations or another comparable set of national arts standards. The standards developed by the
As our nation strives to have all students graduate from high school ready for college and other postsecondary learning opportunities, we have to confront the reality that we are far from achieving this goal. The problem is most severe with economically disadvantaged students. For example, in states where all eleventh graders take the ACT® Test, only 45% of low-income students in 2012 met the ACT College Readiness Benchmarks in English, 30% in reading, 21% in mathematics, and 13% in science.¹

For many students, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds, learning gaps appear in early childhood.² Large numbers of disadvantaged students enter kindergarten behind in early reading and mathematics skills, oral language development, vocabulary, and general knowledge. This situation poses a challenge for intervention models that presume that 15% or so of students need short-term additional help, 5% or so need long-term intervention, and the regular academic program will take care of the rest.³ In cases where the great majority of students are academically behind and need major assistance, the regular academic program must be upgraded to deliver a richer curriculum to all students. Such a curriculum is highly beneficial for all students, but is especially critical for disadvantaged students, who often arrive from home with limited knowledge and vocabulary. School districts must develop a system of practices that enable such a curriculum to be taught effectively.⁴

**Why Early Learning is Important**

That learning gaps emerge early, particularly among disadvantaged students, is one of the better-documented facts in education.⁵ Students who do not have a good start usually do not thrive later on. That is due not only to the fact that students in stressful environments with limited learning opportunities often remain in those environments, but also because early learning itself facilitates later learning—students who already know more about a topic often have an easier time learning additional information on the same topic, and early exposure to knowledge can stimulate students to want to learn more.⁶
Getting students off to a good start in preschool and the elementary grades is vitally important for several reasons:

**Learning takes time.** Research studies have addressed the value of allowing sufficient time per topic for students to adequately master the topic.\(^7\) This implies that subject-matter learning should be spread out over many years to permit a range of topics to be addressed in adequate depth. For example, one well-known curriculum for the elementary and middle grades spreads the study of US History out over all of those grades, covering fewer topics in greater depth in each grade.\(^8\)

**Learning is cumulative.** In a well-designed curriculum, learning in the upper grades builds on prior learning in the lower grades.\(^9\) This is most obvious in the case of mathematics, but is also true for other content areas such as science, history, geography, literature, and the arts. For example, students learning about glucose metabolism in high school biology classes benefit from having learned the necessary prior knowledge about chemistry in elementary and middle school.

**Student interests often develop at an early age.** Students with the good fortune to be exposed to rich content in science, history, and other subjects at a young age may develop an interest in those subjects. Interest, in turn, leads to greater learning.\(^10\) Disadvantaged students often depend on their schools for this exposure, since their access to content outside of school may be limited. Simply having the content available in libraries and on the Internet is not enough, because children need adults to guide them to the content and help them understand it.\(^11\)

**Empirical evidence shows the difficulty of catching students up in middle and high school.** Several studies have explored the importance of preparation prior to eighth grade for students to have a reasonable chance of meeting college readiness benchmarks by the end of high school.\(^12\) For example, students who were far off track in eighth grade had only a 10% chance in reading, 6% chance in science, and 3% chance in mathematics of reaching ACT's College Readiness Benchmarks by twelfth grade. In higher poverty schools those numbers were 6%, 3%, and 3%.\(^13\) Results were similar for students catching up between fourth and eighth grade.\(^14\) The harder it is to get off-track students on track in the upper grades, the more important it is to get them on track in the early grades.
Strengthening Early Learning

What kinds of learning are important to emphasize in the early years? The following are components of a strong preschool and elementary school education.

**A strong start in reading (decoding) and mathematics.** Educators have long emphasized the importance of learning to read well in the early grades, a belief supported by longitudinal research. Reading consists of two abilities: the ability to identify the words on the page (decoding), and the ability to understand the words once they are identified (comprehension). Decoding is the main constraint on reading ability for beginning readers. Fluent decoding depends on mastering letter-sound relationships and becoming familiar with spelling patterns in the English language. Ensuring that students learn to decode well depends, among other things, on using activities and methods in preschool, kindergarten, and first grade that develop children's phonological (sound) awareness and their knowledge of the relationship between letters and sounds. Meanwhile, children's comprehension can be developed in the early grades by reading aloud to them from books that develop their knowledge and vocabulary.

In mathematics, the ability to do simple arithmetic and place numbers on the number line by first grade predicts mathematics performance in fifth grade. Involving preschool and kindergarten students in games that involve number comparisons, counting, and adding can help prevent mathematics difficulties from emerging in the early elementary grades.

**A content-rich curriculum.** A large part of the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students may be due to greater vocabulary and content learning by students in advantaged home environments. One study found that kindergarteners’ general knowledge of the world was a better predictor of those students’ eighth-grade reading ability than were early reading skills. This is consistent with research showing that reading comprehension, particularly in the upper grades, depends heavily on students’ vocabulary and background knowledge. To develop this knowledge, students need a curriculum rich in content not only in English language arts and mathematics, but also in science, history, geography, civics, and the arts.

Development of wide vocabulary and background knowledge takes time. This helps to explain why reading gaps don’t close quickly, and why programs that have been successful in closing math skills
gaps have had greater difficulty closing reading gaps. The time required to develop students’ knowledge and vocabulary is one reason why content-rich curriculum should begin in early childhood. Early content learning can also stimulate curiosity and interest in subjects such as science, history, and art. Content knowledge is also important for abstract reasoning—an abundance of concrete examples make reasoning easier.

By contrast, explicit instruction in comprehension strategies such as “finding the main idea” and “questioning the author” makes only a limited contribution to students’ reading comprehension. Therefore, instruction in these strategies should not be allowed to take large amounts of time away from content area learning. A content-rich curriculum can also enhance the effectiveness of a major comprehension strategy—“activating the student’s prior knowledge”—by increasing the amount of prior knowledge possessed by students.

Activities that develop students’ academic and social behaviors. Behaviors such as paying attention, completing assignments, persisting in difficult tasks, and regulating one’s own actions (thinking before acting) play a large role in students’ success in school and later on in life. Educators can lay the foundation for these behaviors in preschool, kindergarten, and first grade by classroom activities that develop children’s “executive function”—their ability to direct their own attention and activity. Programs that target specific desired student behaviors and explicitly teach those behaviors through active learning (students act out or practice the behavior, rather than just being told about it) are effective at improving both behavior and academic achievement.

Barriers to Strengthening Early Learning

Three important barriers to strengthening the early curriculum may be summarized under the heading of A-B-C: accountability system design, beliefs about early learning, and capacity limitations.

Accountability system design. Accountability systems have been designed to create a sense of urgency about improving test scores. However, this has often had the undesirable effect of shortening educators’ time horizons so that they emphasize changes aimed at improving accountability ratings over the short run. These changes can include narrowing the curriculum to de-emphasize subjects not tested in the current grade, and spending inordinate amounts of time coaching students on how to answer sample test questions.
By contrast, many steps to improve academic learning and behaviors take time to bear fruit and may not immediately result in higher test scores. For example, implementing an excellent kindergarten and first-grade reading, mathematics, science, social studies, or fine arts program will not immediately affect test results in the older grades. Neither will field trips to science and art museums, nature areas, and historical sites—all of which develop knowledge of the world. Accountability incentives should be modified to recognize efforts that increase student learning over the longer run and promote learning in grades and subject areas not covered on state tests.

**Beliefs about early learning.** Some educators and policymakers have resisted the introduction of a content-rich curriculum in the early grades because they do not think that it is the right thing to do. Examples of these beliefs include:

- **The belief that content learning will be boring to young children.** Whether content is meaningful and interesting to students depends largely on how it is taught and on whether students have the prior knowledge needed to appreciate the new information. Good teachers present information in a way that appeals to students’ experience and imagination, and good curriculum developers pay attention to building necessary prior knowledge before introducing new information. Thus, the concern that content learning will be boring is largely a concern about the capacity of the school system to provide sound curriculum and effective teaching.

- **The belief that young students should mainly learn content close to their everyday experience.** This belief has held sway mainly in social studies, where a common curricular approach, “Expanding Environments,” focuses on students’ families in kindergarten and first grade, neighborhoods in second grade, and community in third grade, before expanding to state history in fourth grade and US history in fifth grade. This approach can sacrifice four years of student learning about the larger world outside their own communities.

- **The belief that students can learn everything they need later by looking up information online.** Understanding and evaluating the cacophony of information and opinion on the Internet—or even knowing what to look up—requires prior knowledge of the subject area being addressed. Further, the ability to look things up does not substitute for prior knowledge when people think or make judgments—learning enough to make informed decisions usually requires sustained study, not just the acquisition of a few isolated pieces of information. Thus, the ready availability of so much information has probably increased the value of early exposure to knowledge.
• The belief that teaching academic content in science, social studies, and fine arts in the early grades will crowd out essential learning in reading, mathematics, and academic and social behaviors. One promising approach to avoid this problem is to integrate learning in the other subject areas into the reading and writing program, using read-alouds to expose beginning readers to content knowledge and vocabulary. The approach treats content learning as an essential part of the comprehension strand of reading instruction.37 A pilot program using this approach was found to outperform conventional approaches to teaching reading.38

Capacity limitations. Teachers in the early grades may not be well equipped with training, instructional materials, and ongoing professional support to teach all of the necessary content in their classrooms. Addressing this problem requires school districts to upgrade their systems that support teaching and learning, as discussed in the next section.

Importance of a System to Support Early Learning

Improving teaching and learning in the early grades involves not a flurry of disconnected initiatives, but a sustained, coherent, coordinated effort by district and school leaders to provide the necessary support for improving practices at the classroom level. Educator practices learned from research on effective schools can be grouped under five major themes, described in more detail in the Core Practice™ Framework.39

Curriculum and academic goals. School districts can support their teachers by developing a clear and specific written curriculum that describes what must be taught in each grade and subject and provides examples of what mastery of each learning objective looks like. Such a curriculum can address the likely amount of time required to teach each topic and the integration of content across subject areas, issues that are especially important in the early grades.

Staff selection, leadership, and capacity building. Teaching a content-rich curriculum across the subject areas places a large premium on teachers’ knowledge and skills, especially for those who teach multiple subjects. This requires the careful selection of school and district leaders who can help teachers improve these skills, as well as the provision of frequent common planning times built into the school’s master schedule where teachers can discuss their students’ learning in an environment of collaboration and trust. Professional development should be carefully chosen to develop the most critical knowledge and skills needed to teach the district’s curriculum in each subject.
Instructional tools: programs and strategies. School and district leaders should carefully pilot and evaluate instructional materials they are considering for purchase to make sure those materials address the learning goals in the district’s written curriculum. A similar process based on evaluation, data, and prior research should be used to make decisions about instructional strategies and arrangements—for example, the extent to which teachers in the early grades should specialize in different subjects.

Monitoring performance and progress. Monitoring student learning is vital for helping educators make instructional decisions: to identify which students need extra help; to place students in learning groups or intervention programs; to know which concepts need to be retaught; and to identify which lessons, teaching strategies, or instructional materials are working. This requires schools and districts to use assessments in the early grades that are based on the district’s written curriculum. Frequent formative assessment is needed throughout the year in order for teachers to respond quickly to student needs and keep parents informed about how their children are doing.

Intervention and adjustment. School leaders need to work with teacher teams to identify and assist students who need extra help. Timely assessments make it easier to identify those students early when assistance can have the greatest impact. The same logic applies to identifying and assisting teachers and entire schools in need of support.

A school district can be said to have a system to improve early learning when changes in any one of these five areas are accompanied by related changes in the other four areas. For example, changes in the district’s written curriculum should be accompanied by matching changes in staff development, instructional resources, assessment, and interventions.40
Conclusion
Implementing all of the components of a strong early learning program is difficult and requires a sustained district-wide effort to improve teaching and learning in the early grades. Maintaining such an effort requires school leaders and policymakers to promote public awareness of:

1. The importance of early learning. Educators and policymakers must help the public understand the reasons why early learning is so important: that later learning builds on early learning; that learning about a sufficiently broad range of topics takes time, and cannot be accomplished exclusively in the later grades; that catching students up from far behind is difficult in the upper grades; and that early learning develops students’ interests and intellectual curiosity, influencing whether they become lifelong learners.

2. The components of a strong early learning program. These components include a strong early reading and mathematics program; a content-rich curriculum not only in English language arts and mathematics, but also in science, history, geography, civics, and the arts; and activities designed to develop students’ academic and social behaviors.

3. The obstacles to strengthening early learning programs. These obstacles include accountability incentives that encourage educators to focus on short-term results on a few measures; beliefs that an increased emphasis on early content learning is not desirable or necessary; and limitations in the training and support for educators in the early grades.

4. The importance of a system to improve early learning. School districts should focus on steadily improving practices at the district, school, and classroom levels in five areas: a) curriculum and academic goals; b) staff selection, leadership, and capacity building; c) instructional programs and strategies; d) monitoring performance and progress; and e) intervention and adjustment. They can use information derived from the study of effective schools, such as that contained in the Core Practice Framework, as a guide to their improvement effort.
Endnotes

1  Those states were Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, North Dakota, Tennessee and Wyoming. The dataset consisted of each student’s most recent ACT score for students set to graduate in 2012. For students who retook the ACT their senior year, the scores are from the 2011–2012 school year; otherwise they are from the spring of 2011 when the students were in 11th grade.


In the study, “far off track” in eighth grade was defined as scoring more than one standard deviation below the ACT College Readiness Benchmark on EXPLORE in the subject in question. ACT, Catching Up, 2012.


The Common Core State Standards recognize the reciprocal relationship between reading and content knowledge: “By reading texts in history/social studies, science, and other disciplines, students build a foundation of knowledge in these fields that will also give them the background to be better readers in all content areas. Students can only gain this foundation when the curriculum is intentionally and coherently structured to develop rich content knowledge within and across grades.” Common Core State Standards Initiative, Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (Washington, DC: Author, 2010), 6,10, http://www.corestandards.org/.

Vocabulary and knowledge acquisition are also closely related to each other. Most vocabulary is learned in context, not memorized from word lists. Knowledge acquisition is essential for helping students understand the context. In addition, many words and phrases (e.g., “democracy”) are tied to whole bodies of knowledge, only a small fraction of which is conveyed by their dictionary definitions.


34 If science content were similarly restricted, then the study of dinosaurs, ocean life, volcanoes, and other things not in the students’ immediate environment would be removed from the curriculum in kindergarten through third grade.


36 For example, most readers are unqualified to practice medicine despite the vast array of medical knowledge available on the Internet and in readily accessible reference books.


To award grants to encourage State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to utilize technology to improve student achievement and college-and-career readiness, the skills of teachers and school leaders, and the efficiency and productivity of education systems at all levels.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on ________________

A BILL

To award grants to encourage State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to utilize technology to improve student achievement and college-and-career readiness, the skills of teachers and school leaders, and the efficiency and productivity of education systems at all levels.

1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Transforming Education through Technology Act”.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.
Sec. 3. Findings.
Sec. 4. Purposes.
Sec. 5. E-rate restriction.
Sec. 6. Rule of construction regarding purchasing.
Sec. 7. Definitions.

TITLE I—TECHNOLOGY READINESS AND ACCESS

Sec. 101. Technology grants program authorized.
Sec. 102. State applications.
Sec. 103. State use of grant funds.
Sec. 104. Local subgrants.
Sec. 105. Reporting.
Sec. 106. Authorization.

TITLE II—TECHNOLOGY FOR TOMORROW FUND

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 203. Application.
Sec. 204. Use of funds.
Sec. 205. Data collection and reporting.
Sec. 206. Performance measurement and evaluation and dissemination.
Sec. 207. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) There is growing opportunity provided by technology in classrooms, for every grade, in every subject, and for all types of learners, to—

(A) ensure that students are college-and-career ready; and

(B) access the accelerating roll-out of online assessments.
(2) Comprehensive education technology programs have shown great success in improving student achievement, reducing secondary school dropout rates, and improving graduation and college enrollment rates.

(3) Mooresville Graded School District in the State of North Carolina has implemented an integrated education technology initiative, which has led to its ranking as the third highest achieving district in the State, with 21 percent composite achievement rate increases and 25 percent graduation rate increases over 5 years.

(4) At Manor New Tech High School in the State of Texas, where 65 percent of students receive free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and 75 percent are students of color, a project-based learning focus on science, technology, engineering and mathematics, has led to 62 percent of students being the first generation in their families to enroll in an institution of higher education and a near zero secondary school dropout rate.

(5) At the City Arts and Technology High School Envisions in San Francisco, California, which emphasizes personalized learning environments, inte-
gration of arts and technology in project-based learning, and development of deeper learning skills, 98 percent of the graduates enrolled at an institution of higher education, 91 percent remained enrolled at such an institution, and 100 percent met the course requirements for entrance to the University of California.

(6) The Federal Government placed a strong emphasis on technology professional development in the past decade, but no longer provides any funding support for such activities. Annual appropriations for grants awarded under the Enhancing Education through Technology Act of 2001 under subpart D of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) ended in 2010 and all funds appropriated by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5) for such grants were to have been spent by September 2011.

(7) Online professional development courses offer excellent opportunities for educators to receive the training that they need 24 hours each day, 7 days each week. However, a recent survey indicates that only 25 percent of teachers make use of online professional development courses.
(8) For technology to be fully integrated into
classrooms and to ensure that students are college-
and-career ready, it is critical that school adminis-
trators are confident in their abilities to use tech-
ology and thereby lead change in their schools and
local educational agencies. The Federal Government
must invest in building leadership skills and capacity
for technology to truly take hold in our Nation’s
schools.

SEC. 4. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) improve the achievement, academic growth,
and college-and-career readiness of students who
have developed the ability to think critically, apply
knowledge to solve complex problems, work collabor-
atively, communicate effectively, be self-directed,
and be responsible digital citizens;

(2) ensure all students have access to individ-
ualized, rigorous, and engaging digital learning expe-
riences;

(3) ensure that educators have the knowledge
and skills to develop and implement digital learning
curriculum, use technology effectively in order to
personalize and strengthen instruction, and effec-
tively deliver and utilize assessments to measure student outcomes and support student success;

(4) ensure that administrators have the leadership, management, knowledge, and skills to design, develop, and implement a school or local educational agency-wide digital age learning environment;

(5) improve the efficiency and productivity of education through technology;

(6) address the connectivity needs of local educational agencies and educational service agencies that are eligible for support under the E-rate program without duplicating the support available under such program; and

(7) ensure that State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and elementary schools and secondary schools have the technological capacity and infrastructure to meet purposes described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

SEC. 5. E-RATE RESTRICTION.

Funds awarded under this Act may be used to address the networking needs of a recipient of such funds for which the recipient is eligible to receive support under the E-rate program, except that such funds may not be duplicative of support received by the recipient under the E-rate program.
SEC. 6. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING PURCHASING.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit a recipient of funds under this Act to purchase goods or services using such funds without ensuring that the purchase is free of any conflict of interest between such recipient, or any partner of such recipient, and the person or entity receiving such funds.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this Act, any term that is defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801) has the meaning given the term in such section.

(2) DIGITAL LEARNING.—The term “digital learning” means any instructional practice that effectively uses technology to strengthen a student’s learning experience and encompasses a wide spectrum of tools and practices, including—

(A) interactive learning resources that engage students in academic content;

(B) access to online databases and other primary source documents;

(C) the use of data to personalize learning and provide targeted supplementary instruction;
(D) student collaboration with content experts and peers;

(E) online and computer-based assessments;

(F) digital content, adaptive, and simulation software or courseware,

(G) online courses, online instruction, or digital learning platforms;

(H) mobile and wireless technologies for learning in school and at home;

(I) learning environments that allow for rich collaboration and communication;

(J) authentic audiences for learning in a relevant, real world experience;

(K) teacher participation in virtual professional communities of practice; and

(L) hybrid or blended learning, which occurs under direct instructor supervision at a school or other location away from home and, at least in part, through online delivery of instruction with some element of student control over time, place, path, or pace.

(3) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP.—The term “eligible partnership” means a partnership that includes—
(A) not less than 1—

(i) State educational agency; or

(ii) local educational agency or consortium of local educational agencies; and

(B) not less than 1—

(i) local educational agency, educational service agency, consortium of local educational agencies, or consortium of educational service agencies;

(ii) institution of higher education;

(iii) nonprofit or community-based organization; or

(iv) business or for-profit organization.

(4) ELIGIBLE TECHNOLOGY.—The term “eligible technology” means modern information, computer, and communication technology hardware, software, services, or tools, including computer or mobile hardware devices and other computer and communications hardware, software applications, systems and platforms, and digital and online content, courseware, and online instruction and other online services and supports.
(5) **E-rate Program.**—The term “E-rate program” means the Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism.

(6) **Professional Development.**—The term “professional development” is a process of continuous improvement for teachers and school leaders that improves educator knowledge, skills, and practice toward the goal of increased student achievement and—

(A) is intensive, ongoing, connected to practice, and on-site where allowable;

(B) is focused on student learning and addresses the teaching of specific curriculum content;

(C) is aligned with school improvement priorities and goals of the school and local educational agency; and

(D) builds strong working relationships among teachers and school leaders that—

(i) may be built around active professional learning communities; and

(ii) may contain on-demand components, such as instructional videos, training documents, or learning modules.
(7) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education.

(8) **STUDENT TECHNOLOGY LITERACY.**—The term “student technology literacy” means student knowledge and skills in using contemporary information, communication, and learning technologies in a manner necessary for successful employment, lifelong learning, and citizenship in the knowledge-based, digital, and global 21st century, including, at a minimum, the ability to—

(A) effectively communicate and collaborate;

(B) analyze and solve problems;

(C) access, evaluate, manage, and create information and otherwise gain information literacy;

(D) demonstrate creative thinking, construct knowledge, and develop innovative products and processes; and

(E) carry out the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) in a safe and ethical manner.

(9) **TECHNOLOGY READINESS SURVEY.**—The term “technology readiness survey” means a survey completed by a local educational agency that pro-
vides standardized information comparable to the information collected through the technology readiness survey administered under the Race to the Top Assessment program under section 14006 of division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5) on the quantity and types of technology infrastructure and access available to the students served by the local educational agency, including computer devices, Internet connectivity, operating systems, related network infrastructure, data systems, and—

(A) requiring—

(i) an internal review of the degree to which instruction, additional student support, and professional development is delivered in digital formats, media, and platforms and is available to students and educators at any time;

(ii) an internal review of the ability of educators to use assessments and other student data to personalize and strengthen instruction and identify professional development needs and priorities; and
(iii) any other information required by
the State educational agency serving the
local educational agency; and

(B) may include an assessment of local
community needs to ensure students have ade-
quate on-line access and access to devices for
school-related work during out-of-school time.

(10) UNIVERSAL DESIGN FOR LEARNING.—The
term “universal design for learning” has the mean-
ing given the term in section 103 of the Higher

TITLE I—TECHNOLOGY
READINESS AND ACCESS

SEC. 101. TECHNOLOGY GRANTS PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts appropriated
under section 106, the Secretary shall award State Grants
for Technology Readiness and Access (in this title referred
to as “grants”) to State educational agencies to strength-
en State and local technological infrastructure and profes-
sional development that supports digital learning through
State activities under section 103(c) and local activities
under section 104(c).

(b) GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—
(1) RESERVATIONS.—From the amounts appropriated under section 106 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

(A) three-fourths of 1 percent for the Secretary of Interior to provide assistance under this title for schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Education; and

(B) 1 percent to provide assistance under this title to the outlying areas; and

(2) GRANTS.—From the amounts appropriated under section 106 for any fiscal year and remaining after the Secretary makes reservations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall make a grant for the fiscal year to each State educational agency with an approved application under section 102 in an amount that bears the same relationship to such remainder as the amount the State educational agency received under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) for such year bears to the amount all State educational agencies with an approved application under section 102 received under such part (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) for such year.

(c) MINIMUM.—The amount of a grant to a State educational agency under subsection (b)(2) for a fiscal
year may not be less than one-half of 1 percent of the
total amount made available for grants to all State edu-
cational agencies under such subsection for such year.

(d) REALLOTMENT OF UNUSED FUNDS.—If any
State educational agency does not apply for a grant under
subsection (b)(2) for a fiscal year, or does not use its en-
tire grant under subsection (b)(2) for such year, the Sec-
retary shall reallocate the amount of the State educational
agency’s grant, or the unused portion of the grant, to the
remaining State educational agencies that use their entire
grant amounts under subsection (b)(2) for such year.

(e) MATCHING FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency
that receives a grant under subsection (b)(2) shall
provide matching funds, from non-Federal sources,
in an amount equal to 20 percent of the amount of
grant funds provided to the State educational agency
to carry out the activities supported by the grant.
Such matching funds may be provided in cash or in-
kind, except that any such in-kind contributions
shall be provided for the purpose of supporting the
State educational agency’s activities under section
104(e).

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive the
matching requirement under paragraph (1) for a
State educational agency that demonstrates that such requirement imposes an undue financial hardship on the State educational agency.

SEC. 102. STATE APPLICATIONS.

(a) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under section 101(b)(2), a State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require and containing the information described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of how the State educational agency will meet the following goals:

(A) Use technology to ensure all students achieve college-and-career readiness and technology literacy, including by providing high-quality education opportunities to economically or geographically isolated student populations.

(B) Provide educators with the tools, devices, content, and resources to—

(i) significantly improve teaching and learning, including support to increase personalization for and engagement of students in pursuit of college-and-career readiness and technology literacy; and
(ii) develop and use assessments to improve instruction consistent with the principles of universal design for learning, including for students with disabilities and English-language learners.

(C) Ensure administrators and school leaders have the flexibility and capacity to develop and manage systems to carry out activities described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and support administrators and school leaders in utilizing technology to promote equity and increase efficiency and productivity.

(D) Enable local educational agencies to build the technological capacity and infrastructure (including through local purchasing of eligible technology), necessary for the full implementation of on-line assessments for all students, (including students with disabilities and English-language learners) and to—

(i) ensure the interoperability of data systems and eligible technology; and

(ii) carry out subparagraphs (A) through (C).

(2) A description of the results of the technology readiness in the State as determined by local
educational agency responses to the technology readiness survey, including—

(A) the status of the ability of each local educational agency served by the State educational agency to meet the goals described in section 104(b)(1);

(B) an assurance that not less 90 percent of the local educational agencies served by the State educational agency have completed and submitted the technology readiness survey to the State educational agency; and

(C) an assurance that the results of the technology readiness survey for each such local educational agency are made available to the Secretary and the public through the Website of the local educational agency.

(3) A description of the plan for the State educational agency to support each local educational agency served by the State educational agency in meeting the goals described in section 104(b)(1) not later than 3 years after the local educational agency completes the technology readiness survey by addressing the readiness gaps identified in such survey.
(4) A description of the State’s process for the adoption, acquisition, distribution, and use of content, how the State will ensure integrity of such processes, and how such processes support the goals under paragraph (1) or how a State will change such processes to support such goals, and how the State will ensure content quality.

(5) A description of how the State educational agency will ensure its data systems and eligible technology are interoperable.

(6) An assurance that the State educational will consider making content widely available through open educational resources when making purchasing decisions with funds received under this title.

(7) A description of the State’s student technology literacy standards and the technology standards for teachers and administrators, and an assurance that the State’s student technology literacy standards meet the requirements of section 7(8).

(8) An assurance that subgrant awards under section 104 will be carried out by the State educational agency staff with responsibility for leadership, coordination, and implementation of instructional and other classroom technologies.
(9) A description of how the State educational agency will award subgrants to local educational agencies under section 104.

(10) A description of the process, activities, and performance measures, that the State educational agency will use to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the grant and subgrants funds awarded under this title across the State and in each local educational agency.

(11) A description of how the State educational agency will, in providing technical and other assistance to local educational agencies, give priority to the local educational agencies proposing to target services to—

(A) students in schools in need of improvement and persistently low-achieving schools; and

(B) schools with a high percentage of students that are eligible for free or reduced price lunch under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

(12) A description of how the State educational agency consulted with local educational agencies in the development of the State educational agency’s application under this subsection.
(13) An assurance that the State educational agency will provide matching funds as required under section 101(e).

(14) A description of how the State educational agency will ensure that funds received under this title is not duplicative of support received under the E-rate program.

(15) An assurance that the State educational agency will protect the privacy and safety of students and teachers, consistent with requirements of section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974” and section 2441(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6777(a)).

SEC. 103. STATE USE OF GRANT FUNDS.

(a) Reservation for Subgrants to Support Technology Infrastructure.—Each State educational agency that receives a grant under section 101(b)(2) shall expend not less 90 percent of the grant amount for each fiscal year to award subgrants to local educational agencies in accordance with section 104.

(b) Reservation for State Activities.—

(1) In general.—A State educational agency shall reserve not more than 10 percent of the grant
received under section 101(b)(2) for the State activities described in subsection (e).

(2) GRANT ADMINISTRATION.—Of the amount reserved by a State educational agency under paragraph (1), the State educational agency may reserve not more than 1 percent or 3 percent, in the case of a State educational agency awarding subgrants under section 104(a)(2), for the administration of the grant under this title, except that a State educational agency that forms a State purchasing consortium under subsection (d)—

(A) may reserve an additional 1 percent to carry out the activities described in subsection (d)(1); and

(B) shall receive direct approval from the local educational agencies receiving subgrants under section 104(a) from the State educational agency prior to reserving more than the additional percentage authorized under subparagraph (A) to carry out the activities described in subsection (d)(1).

(c) STATE ACTIVITIES.—A State educational agency shall use funds described in subsection (b) to carry out each of the following:
(1) Except for the awarding of subgrants in accordance with section 104, activities described in the State educational agency’s application under section 102(b).

(2) Providing technical assistance to local educational agencies to—

(A) identify and address technology readiness needs;

(B) redesign curriculum and instruction, improve educational productivity, and deliver computer-based and online assessment;

(C) use technology, consistent with the principles of universal design for learning, to support the learning needs of all students including students with disabilities and English-language learners;

(D) support principals to have the expertise to evaluate teachers’ proficiency in implementing digital tools for teaching and learning; and

(E) build capacity for individual school and local educational agency leaders.

(3) Developing or utilizing research-based or innovative strategies for the delivery of specialized or rigorous academic courses and curricula through the
use of technology, including digital learning technologies and assistive technology.

(4) Integrating and coordinating activities under this title with other educational resources and programs across the State.

(5) Disseminating information, including making publicly available on the Websites of the State educational agency promising practices to improve technology instruction, and acquiring and implementing technology tools and applications.

(6) Ensuring that teachers, paraprofessionals, library and media personnel, specialized instructional support personnel, and administrators possess the knowledge and skills to use technology—

(A) for curriculum redesign to change teaching and learning and improve student achievement;

(B) for formative and summative assessment administration, data analysis, and to personalize learning;

(C) to improve student technology literacy;

(D) to expand the range of supports and accommodations available to English-language learners and students with disabilities; and
(E) for their own ongoing professional development and for access to teaching resources and tools.

(7) Coordinating with teacher and school leader preparation programs to—

(A) align digital learning teaching standards; and

(B) provide ongoing professional development for teachers and school leaders that is aligned to State student technology standards and activities promoting college-and-career readiness.

(d) PURCHASING CONSORTIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency receiving a grant under section 101(b)(2) may—

(A) form a State purchasing consortium with 1 or more State educational agencies receiving such a grant to carry out the State activities described in subsection (c), including purchasing eligible technology;

(B) encourage local educational agencies to form local purchasing consortia under section 104(c)(4); and
(C) promote pricing opportunities to local educational agencies for the purchase of eligible technology that are—

(i) negotiated by the State educational agency or the State purchasing consortium of the State educational agency; and

(ii) available to such local educational agencies.

(2) RESTRICTIONS.—A State educational agency receiving a grant under section 101(b)(2) may not—

(A) except for promoting the pricing opportunities described in paragraph (1)(C), make recommendations to local educational agencies for or require use of any specific commercial products and services by local educational agencies;

(B) require local educational agencies to participate in a State purchasing consortia or local purchasing consortia; or

(C) use more than the reservation amount authorized for the administration of the grant under subsection (b) to carry out the activities described in paragraph (1), unless the State
educational agency receives approval in accordance with subsection (b)(2)(B).

SEC. 104. LOCAL SUBGRANTS.

(a) Subgrants.—

(1) Grants to local educational agencies.—From the grant funds provided under section 101(b)(2) to a State educational agency that are remaining after the State educational agency makes reservations under section 104(b) for any fiscal year and subject to paragraph (2), the State educational agency shall award subgrants for the fiscal year to local educational agencies served by the State educational agency and with an approved application under subsection (b) by allotting to each such local educational agency an amount that bears the same relationship to the remainder as the amount received by the local educational agency under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) for such year bears to the amount received by all such local educational agencies under such part for such year, except that no local educational agency may receive less than $5,000.

(2) Competitive grants to local educational agencies.—If the amount of funds ap-
appropriated under section 106 is less than $500,000,000 for any fiscal year, a State educational agency—

(A) shall not award subgrants under paragraph (1); and

(B) shall—

(i) award subgrants, on a competitive basis, to local educational agencies based on the quality of applications submitted under (b), including—

(I) the level of technology readiness as determined by the technology readiness surveys completed by local educational agencies submitting such applications; and

(II) the technology plans described in subsection (b)(3) and how the local educational agencies with such plans will carry out the alignment and coordination described in such subsection; and

(ii) ensure that such subgrants are of sufficient size and scope to carry out the local activities described in subsection (c).
(3) Definition of Local Educational Agency for Certain Fiscal Years.—For purposes of awarding subgrants under paragraph (2), the term “local educational agency” means—

(A) a local educational agency;

(B) an educational service agency; or

(C) a local educational agency and an educational service agency.

(b) Application.—A local educational agency that desires to receive a subgrant under subsection (a) shall submit an application to the State at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the State educational agency may require, including—

(1) a description of how the local educational agency will—

(A) carry out the goals described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 101(b)(1); and

(B) enable schools served by the agency to build the technological capacity and infrastructure (including through local purchasing of eligible technology), necessary for the full implementation of on-line assessments for all students (including students with disabilities and English-language learners) and to—
(i) ensure the interoperability of data systems and eligible technology; and

(ii) carry out the goals described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 101(b)(1);

(2) a description of the results of the technology readiness survey completed by the local educational agency and a description of the plan for the local educational agency to meet the goals described in paragraph (1) within 3 years of completing the survey;

(3) a description of the local educational agency’s student technology literacy standards, and its goals for the technology skills for teachers and administrators, and an assurance that the student technology literacy standards meet the requirements of section 7(8).;

(4) a description of the local educational agency’s technology plan to carry out paragraphs (1) and (3) and how the agency will align and coordinate the activities under this section with other activities across the local educational agency;

(5) a description of the team of educators that will coordinate and carry out the activities under this section, including individuals with responsibility
and expertise in instructional technology, teachers that specialize in supporting students with disabilities and English-language learners, school leaders, technology officers, and staff responsible for assessments and data analysis;

(6) a description of how the local educational agency will evaluate teachers’ proficiency and progress in implementing technology for teaching and learning;

(7) a description of how the local educational agency will ensure that principals have the expertise to evaluate teachers’ proficiency and progress in implementing technology for teaching and learning and the interoperability of data systems and eligible technology;

(8) a description of the local educational agency’s procurement process and process for the creation, acquisition, distribution, and use of content, how the local educational agency will ensure integrity of such processes, and how such processes support the goals described in paragraph (1) or how a local educational agency will change such processes to support such goals, and how the local educational agency will ensure content quality;
(9) a description of how the local educational agency will carry out activities under subsection (e);

(10) a description of how the subgrant funds received under subsection (a) will be coordinated with and supported by other Federal, State, and local funds to support activities under this title;

(11) a description of how the local educational agency will ensure that the subgrant received under subsection (a) is not duplicative of support received under the E-rate program; and

(12) an assurance that the local educational agency will protect the privacy and safety of students and teachers, consistent with requirements section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly known as the “Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974” and section 2441(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6777(a)).

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE.—Subject to paragraph (3), a local educational agency receiving a subgrant under subsection (a) shall use not less than 40 percent of such funds to support activities for the acquisition of eligible technology needed to—
(A) except for the activities described in paragraph (2), carry out activities described in the application submitted under subsection (b), including purchasing devices, equipment, and software applications, and improving connectivity to and within schools; and

(B) address readiness shortfalls identified under the technology readiness survey completed by the local educational agency.

(2) Professional Development for Digital Learning.—Subject to paragraph (3), a local educational agency receiving a subgrant under subsection (a)—

(A) shall use not less than 35 percent of such funds to carry out—

(i) digital age professional development opportunities for teachers, para-professionals, library and media personnel, specialized instructional support personnel, technology coordinators, and administrators in the effective use of modern information and communication technology tools and digital resources to deliver instruction, curriculum and school classroom management, including for classroom
teachers to assess, support, and provide engaging student learning opportunities, including professional development that—

(I) is ongoing, sustainable, and scalable;

(II) is participatory;

(III) includes communication and regular interactions with instructors, facilitators, and peers and is directly related to up-to-date teaching methods in content areas;

(IV) includes strategies and tools for improving communication with parents and family engagement;

(V) may be built around active professional learning communities or online communities of practice or other tools that increase collaboration among teachers across schools, local educational agencies, or States; and

(VI) may contain on-demand components, such as instructional videos, training documents, or learning modules;
(ii) ongoing professional development in strategies and pedagogy in the core academic subjects that involve the use of technology and curriculum redesign as key components of supporting effective, innovative teaching and learning, and improving student achievement;

(iii) ongoing professional development in the use of educational technologies to ensure every educator achieves and maintains technology literacy, including possessing and maintaining the knowledge and skills to use technology—

(I) across the curriculum for student learning;

(II) for real-time data analysis and online or digital assessment to enable individualized instruction; and

(III) to develop and maintain student technology literacy;

(iv) ongoing professional development for school leaders to provide and promote leadership in the use of—

(I) educational technology to ensure a digital-age learning environ-
ment, including the capacity to lead the reform or redesign of curriculum, instruction, assessment; and

(II) data through the use of technology in order to increase student learning opportunity, student technology literacy, student access to technology, and student engagement in learning; and

(v) a review of the effectiveness of the professional development and regular intervals of learner feedback and data; and

(B) may use such funds for—

(i) the use of technology coaches to work directly with teachers, including through the preparation of teachers as technology leaders or master teachers—

(I) who are provided with the means to serve as experts and to create professional development opportunities for other teachers in the effective use of technology; and

(II) who may leverage technologies, such as distance learning and online virtual educator-to-educator-
tor peer communities, as a means to support ongoing, participatory professional growth around the integration of effective educational technologies;

(ii) innovative approaches to ongoing professional development such as non-standard achievement recognition strategies, including digital badging, gamification elements, use of learner-created learning objects, integration of social and professional networking tools, rating and commenting on learning artifacts, and personalization of professional development; and

(iii) any other activities required to carry out the local educational agency’s technology plan described in subsection (b)(4).

(3) MODIFICATION OF FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.—A State educational agency may authorize a local educational agency to modify the percentage of the local educational agency’s subgrant funds required to carry out the activities described in paragraphs (1) or (2) if the local educational agency demonstrates that such modification will assist the
local educational agency in more effectively carrying
out such activities.

(4) PURCHASING CONSORTIA.—Local edu-
cational agencies receiving subgrants under sub-
section (a) may—

(A) form a local purchasing consortia with
other such local educational agencies to carry
out the activities described in this subsection,
including purchasing eligible technology; and

(B) use such funds for purchasing eligible
technology through a State purchasing con-
sortia under section 103(d).

SEC. 105. REPORTING.

(a) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—Each local
educational agency receiving a subgrant under section 104
shall submit to the State educational agency that awarded
such subgrant an annual report the meets the require-
ments of subsection (e).

(b) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—Each State
educational agency receiving a grant under section
101(b)(2) shall submit to the Secretary an annual report
that meets the requirements of subsection (e).

(e) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—A report submitted
under subsection (a) or (b) shall include, at a minimum,
a description of—
(1) the status of the State education agency’s
plan described in section 102(b)(3) or local edu-
cation agency’s technology plan under section
104(b)(4), as applicable;

(2) the categories eligible technology acquired
with funds under this title and how such technology
is being used;

(3) the professional development activities fund-
ed under this title, including types of activities and
entities involved in providing such professional devel-
opment to classroom teachers and other staff, such
as school librarians;

(4) the instruction, strategies, activities, and
curricula used in the programs funded under this
title; and

(5) the types of programs funded under this
title.

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out
this Act $500,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and such sums
as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal
years.
TITLE II—TECHNOLOGY FOR TOMORROW FUND

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Technology for Tomorrow Fund”.

SEC. 202. TECHNOLOGY FOR TOMORROW FUND.

(a) Grants to Eligible Partnerships.—From the amounts appropriated under section 207 and not reserved under subsection (b), the Secretary shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible partnerships to enable the eligible partnerships to carry out activities described in section 204 to improve student achievement, academic growth, and college-and-career readiness through the use of technology and digital learning.

(b) Reservation of Funds.—The Secretary may reserve up to 5 percent of the amounts appropriated under section 207 for a fiscal year for—

(1) the administration of this title; and

(2) the evaluation and dissemination activities described in section 204(b).

(c) Duration of Grant Period.—A grant under subsection (a) shall be awarded to an eligible partnership for at least a 2-year period and not longer than a 3-year period, except that the Secretary may award the eligible partnership an additional 2-year grant if the eligible part-
nership demonstrates satisfactory progress on the performance measures described in section 206(a).

SEC. 203. APPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To receive a grant under section 202, an eligible partnership shall submit an application at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, and containing the information described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—An application submitted under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a description of the eligible partnership, the partners forming the eligible partnership, and the roles and responsibilities of each partner;

(2) a demonstration of each partner’s capacity and commitment to fulfill its role and responsibilities to ensure the successful completion of activities described in section 204;

(3) a description of how the grant funds will be used to improve the achievement, academic growth, and college-and-career readiness of students, particularly at-risk, low-come, and low-performing students;

(4) a description of how the activities funded by the grant will be innovative, systemic, or evidence-based by ensuring such activities—
(A) are based on strong or promising evidence or a review of the best available research evidence; and

(B) may contribute to the development and use of new models;

(5) a description of how such activities will utilize technology and digital learning to—

(A) promote personalized, individualized instruction that improves student achievement, academic growth, and college-and-career readiness;

(B) improve teacher and school leader preparation, training, knowledge, skills, practice, and professional capacity;

(C) ensure all students, particularly at-risk and historically disadvantaged students, including students with disabilities and English-language learners, have equitable access to high-quality curriculum, instruction, assessments, technology, and digital learning; or

(D) improve the efficiency and productivity of education;

(6) a description of how the eligible partnership will measure and report data on the effectiveness of such activities under section 205(a) ;
(7) an assurance that the grant funds will not solely be used—

(A) to purchase materials, hardware, or technology-based tools; or

(B) to implement online learning to the exclusion of other activities;

(8) a description of how the eligible partnership will ensure that a grant received under this title is not duplicative of support received under the E-rate program; and

(9) such other information as the Secretary may require.

(c) APPLICATION REVIEW AND AWARD.—

(1) APPLICATION REVIEW AND APPROVAL.—

The Secretary shall—

(A) establish a peer review process to assist in the review of the grant applications and approval of the grants under this section;

(B) appoint to the peer review process individuals who are educators and experts in—

(i) technology and digital learning;

(ii) classroom instruction and teaching practice;

(iii) school improvement, redesign, or turnaround;
(iv) teacher and school leader training

or professional development; and

(v) education efficiency and productivity; and

(C) ensure that each grant is of sufficient

size and scope to carry out the activities de-
scribed in the grant application under sub-
section (b), including the activities described in
section 204 and measuring and reporting data
under section 205(a).

(2) Grant Award.—In awarding grants under
this title, the Secretary shall, to the extent prac-
ticable, ensure—

(A) diversity in the type of activities fund-
ed under the grants, including statewide and
local initiatives;

(B) equitable geographic distribution of the

grants, including urban and rural areas and
small and large local educational agencies; and

(C) that eligible partnerships receiving

such grants—

(i) demonstrate that activities funded

by the grant will be carried out based on

strong or promising evidence; and
(ii) are committed to and capable of successfully carrying out the activities described in the grant application submitted under subsection (b), including the activities described in section 204 and measuring and reporting data under section 205(a).

SEC. 204. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—An eligible partnership receiving a grant under this title shall use grant funds to carry out 1 or more of the following activities that utilize technology and digital learning to promote:

(1) Personalized, individualized instruction that improves student achievement, academic growth, and college-and-career readiness, such as—

    (A) hybrid, blended, or other digital-learning opportunities that combine online and teacher-based instruction to improve student outcomes;

    (B) gaming or other personalized digital or technology-based tools that individualize instruction and promote self-directed learning and higher order thinking skills, including giving students control over the place, pace, or time of learning;
(C) online platforms or opportunities that provide students opportunities for credit recovery or advanced credit accumulation; and

(D) expanding the accommodations available to students with disabilities and English-language learners.

(2) Improving teacher and school leader preparation, professional development, knowledge, skills, practice, and professional capacity, such as—

(A) tools or programs that equip teachers to differentiate instruction, conduct ongoing formative assessments, and use real-time data or data systems to identify individual student learning needs and guide personalized instruction, learning, and appropriate interventions that address those individualized student learning needs;

(B) on-demand professional development, online communities of practice, or other technology-based tools that improve teaching and leadership;

(C) pre-service training in the use of technology and digital learning to improve student outcomes; and
(D) technology-based tools to improve the administration and implementation of teacher evaluation systems or other human capital systems.

(3) Ensuring all students, particularly at-risk and low-performing students, have equitable access to high-quality curriculum, instruction, assessments, technology, and digital learning by effectively implementing technology tools consistent with principals of universal design for learning, such as—

(A) using tools or programs to teach students higher order thinking skills;

(B) improving the education of students with disabilities through assessment accommodations, including assistive technology;

(C) improving the education of English-language learners, including language proficiency and academic content, through intuitive games and interfaces, web-based interventions, or technology-based assessments and assessment accommodations;

(D) technology-based tools or digital learning opportunities that enhance high-quality early learning or early childhood education programs;
(E) expanding learning opportunities, particularly for students who are low-performing or live in rural areas, that increase access to high-quality curriculum and instruction, advanced placement or international baccalaureate courses, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education, or enrichment activities; and

(F) enhancing the quality, depth, or administration of student assessments, including summative, formative, and classroom-based assessments.

(4) Improving the efficiency and productivity of education, such as—

(A) extending the reach of high-quality materials, tools, curriculum, instruction, or teachers through such means as open educational resources or blended learning;

(B) making student learning or school improvement more effective and cost-efficient through online or digital platforms; and

(C) use of laptops, personal devices, or technology-infused instruction to reduce cost and improve delivery of instruction.
(b) LIMITATIONS ON USES OF FUNDS.—An eligible partnership may not use the total amount of a grant received under this title for a fiscal year—

(1) on materials, hardware, or technology-based tools; or

(2) to implement online learning to the exclusion of other activities.

SEC. 205. DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING.

(a) REPORTING.—Each eligible partnership receiving a grant under this title shall collect and report to the Secretary, on at least an annual basis, such information on the progress, outcomes, and best practices learned from activities under the grant as the Secretary may require, which—

(1) shall include information on the impact of the grant on student outcomes, such as—

(A) the number of and demographic information about students who are served by the eligible partnership under this title;

(B) student achievement, student growth, and graduation rates of such students;

(C) college-and-career readiness data about students of such students, such as rates of credit accumulation, course taking and completion, and college enrollment and persistence;
(D) student attendance and participation rates; and

(E) such other information the Secretary may require or other information the eligible partnership proposes to include and approved by the Secretary; and

(2) may include data on—

(A) student engagement and discipline;

(B) school climate and teacher working conditions; and

(C) increases in inclusion of students with disabilities and English-language learners.

(b) DISAGGREGATION.—Each eligible partnership receiving a grant under this title shall disaggregate the information required under subsection (a) in the same manner as information is disaggregated under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(h)(1)(C)(i)).

SEC. 206. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Prior to the reviewing and awarding of grants under this title, the Secretary shall establish performance measures used to evaluate the progress and performance of each eligible partnership that—
(1) shall include, at a minimum, information on
the impact of the grants on student outcomes as re-
ported under section 205(a); and

(2) may include such other information as the
Secretary may reasonably require.

(b) Evaluation and Dissemination.—From
amounts reserved under section 202(b), the Secretary
shall—

(1) conduct or enter into a contract with an
outside evaluator to conduct—

(A) a comprehensive evaluation after the
third year that the grant program is carried
under this title on the effectiveness of all grants
awarded under this title; and

(B) a final evaluation following the final
year of the grant program under this title—

(i) that focuses on the improvement in
student outcomes reported under para-
graphs (1) through (3) of section 205(a);

(ii) that compares the relative effec-
tiveness of different types of programs car-
rried under this title and compares the rel-
ative effectiveness of variations in imple-
mentation within such programs; and
(iii) identifies the conditions and practices needed for the effective use of technology and digital learning, including issues related to teacher professional development, educational leadership, classroom and school practices and implementation and support;

(2) disseminate and provide technical assistance to local educational agencies and State educational agencies on best practices in utilizing technology and digital learning to improve student achievement, academic growth, and college-and-career readiness; and

(3) ensure that the Department of Education applies the best practices described in paragraph (2) in carrying out other innovation funds.

SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years.
Innocentive and Lumina Foundation Recently Launched Open Innovation Partnership to Increase Postsecondary Degree Attainment in America

Lumina Foundation has been working with InnoCentive to unveil its Open Innovation Pavilion, which seeks to uncover new ways to catalyze systemic changes in higher education. Working together, we hope to create new pathways for millions of Americans to access and earn high quality college degrees, certificates, and credentials. Please note, although the Foundation's focus is on postsecondary education in America, all of our creative Solvers from around the world are encouraged to participate and apply their unique global perspective.

Additional information about Lumina Foundation, the Pavilion and Challenges, as well as advice to Solvers, can be found on InnoCentive's Seeker Spotlight blog which features a new post by Lumina's Vice President of Communications and Innovation Kiko Suarez.

Correlations to Determine the Complete Economic Impact of Post-Secondary Education

Lumina Foundation, the Seeker for this Challenge, has issued Goal 2025 - to increase the number of adults in the United States obtaining high-quality, documented, post-secondary education from roughly 44% to more than 60%. One motivation for this goal, and a key factor for encouraging action toward it, is its economic impact. In order to fully predict this, Solvers are requested to propose novel and unexpected correlations between post-secondary education attainment and outcomes with a clear economic impact (an expected example, for instance, is increased income). In addition to providing convincing rationale for their proposed correlation, Solvers are requested to identify one or more existing data sets that could be used to determine the correlation's validity and the magnitude of its economic impact. In formulating submissions to this Challenge, Solvers may consider utilizing recent progress in the field of big data analytics that have not yet been applied to this problem.

This is an Ideation Challenge with a guaranteed award for at least one submitted solution.
Challenge 9933169  
Deadline: April 25, 2013  
**Reward: $10,000**

**Visualizing the Impact of Significant Increases in Post-Secondary Education**

Lumina Foundation, the Seeker for this Challenge, has issued Goal 2025 - to increase the number of adults in the United States obtaining high-quality, documented, post-secondary education from roughly 44% to more than 60%. A key aspect to increasing awareness of, stressing the importance of, and motivating action toward Goal 2025 is finding a compelling way to present existing information on the effects of meeting (or not meeting) this goal. Accordingly, Lumina Foundation desires Solvers create compelling visual presentations of the impact of significantly increasing post-secondary education by taking advantage of the wealth of information and studies published in this area.

This is an Ideation Challenge with a guaranteed award for at least one submitted solution.

Challenge 9933171  
Deadline: April 25, 2013  
**Reward: $10,000**

**Design of Student-Centric Websites for Open-Enrollment Colleges and Universities**

Lumina Foundation, the Seeker for this Challenge, desires fully coded examples of a front-end user interface for deployment by community colleges. The key requirement is that the interface should be organized and presented in a way that focuses on meeting the information needs of students, particularly those who are exploring a range of avenues of study.

This is a Reduction-to-Practice Challenge that requires a written proposal as well as delivery of a functional code for a website. In addition to the Challenge award, the Seeker is very interested in further collaboration with the awarded Solver(s).

Challenge 9933168  
Deadline: April 30, 2013  
**Reward: $100,000**
Learning Powered by Technology

Newsletter of the Office of Educational Technology (OET) at the U.S. Department of Education

Sign up to receive this newsletter.

Expanding Evidence Report Released

The final version of OET’s Expanding Evidence report is now available, suggesting new ways to collect evidence about what works in a fast-changing digital world. Read the report, or skip right to the Evidence Framework.

Input Needed on Learning Registry Viewer

OET is piloting a new Learning Registry “viewer” to make it easier to find digital resources. The viewer makes it easier to navigate the ocean of educational resources, but we need your feedback! (What’s the Learning Registry?)

Boost for Competency-Based Learning

In March, ED issued guidance on providing Title IV (federal student aid) eligibility to competency-based

April 2013

Connect with OET on Twitter, YouTube, and at ed.gov/technology

Marina Martin, Entrepreneur in Residence

Joining the team in Summer 2012, Presidential Innovation Fellow Marina Martin has been serving as OET’s entrepreneur in residence leading the Education Data Initiative and helping rethink how open data can be used to improve learning.
learning programs opening the doors for innovation in higher education.

Where OET Will Be

- April 2-3: Early Education and Technology for Children (EETC) Conference - Salt Lake City
- April 5: 2013 NCES State Data Conference and IPEDS Workshop - Washington, DC
- April 9: Data Quality Campaign's "Changing the Ground Game" meeting - Washington, DC
- April 15-17: ASU Education Innovation Summit - Scottsdale, AZ
- April 22: Regional Datapalooza (first ever!) - Raleigh, NC
- April 25: Intel Education Visionary Conference - Washington, DC

On Our Radar

Watch the video of OET Acting Director Richard Culatta's Tedx BeaconStreet talk: "The Answer to 3 Educational Challenges"

Education Week examines the varied approaches to personalized learning by the 16 Race to the Top - District grantees

Read a summary of the SXSW EDU conference, which featured OET participation

Learning Powered By Technology contains links to other websites and news articles. These links represent just a few examples of the numerous education reference materials currently available to teachers and the public. The opinions expressed in any articles or web pages do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. The inclusion of resources should not be construed or interpreted as an endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any private organization or business listed herein.
Elections for PESC’s Board of Directors will be held during the 15th Annual PESC Membership Meeting scheduled for Thursday May 2, 2013 from 5:30pm - 6:30pm PDT at the Omni Hotel in San Diego. PESC Membership meetings are open to all PESC Members & Affiliates & with prior notification, other interested parties.

This Proxy Ballot allows Members, who may not be able to attend the election in-person, the ability to cast a vote now. NOTE: If attending the 15th Annual Membership Meeting in person, Proxy Ballots can still be submitted now and can then either be replaced with an in-person vote on Thursday May 2, 2013 or remain as the official vote. We recommend that every member organization submit a Proxy Ballot so that if any last minute emergencies occur (bad weather, flight or meeting delays, etc.), an official ballot is still on file for that member organization.

Those nominees appearing on the ballot will have five minutes each to address the Members immediately prior to voting at the Membership Meeting. Nominees, who may want to introduce themselves sooner as they may not be as familiar with the PESC Membership or who wish to communicate with Members over the coming weeks, can submit no more than two communications (emails, letters, etc.) to the PESC office. In turn the PESC office will issue that nominee’s communication(s) to the PESC Members over the PESC Member listserv. Nominees are still able to communicate directly and independently with voting members outside of this process.

Note that PESC does not accept 'write-in' candidates. Instead and due to specific bylaw requirements, a slate of nominees is presented from which Members vote. Bylaws require that two members of the Board of Directors be from commercial organizations, two members be from higher education associations representing institutions, and two members be from other non-profit associations. While the commercial representation requirement is satisfied with our current Board (those not being elected at this time), to comply with bylaws, one representative from a non-profit association and two representatives from higher education institutional associations must be elected. Once these three are elected, the three nominees receiving the highest votes overall will be elected.

Please vote for six (6) persons:

- [ ] Jeffrey Alderson  ConnectEDU  Commercial
- [ ] Kristi Blabaum  Great Lakes Educational Loan Services, Representing NASLA  Non-profit Association
- [ ] Todd Bloom  Hobsons  Commercial
- [ ] Mark Cohen  Parchment  Commercial
- [ ] Tuan Anh Do  San Francisco State University, Representing AACRAO  Higher Education Association Representing Institutions
- [ ] Mark Jones  Ellucian  Commercial
- [ ] William McKee  Ontario College Application Service (OCAS)  Higher Education Association Representing Institutions
- [ ] David Moldoff  AcademyOne  Commercial
- [ ] Rick Skeel  Kuali Foundation  Higher Education Association Representing Institutions

Member Organization:

Voting Representative (please print):

Signature: ____________________________________________________________________ Date: ____________________________________________________________________

Proxy Ballots must be received in PESC’s offices by 5:00pm PDT Wednesday April 24, 2013.
NOMINEE BACKGROUND
2013 ELECTIONS FOR PESC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JEFFREY ALDERSO
INCUMBENT

SENIOR DIRECTOR OF PRODUCT INNOVATION, CONNECTEDU
Jeff serves as ConnectEDU’s primary liaison to data standards bodies such as SIFA and PESC, and is an active member of PESC’s CDS Task Force, CommIT project and serves as Vice Chairman. While actively guiding the development of new products and services for the p20 landscape at ConnectEDU, Jeff collaborates with other vendors of student information systems, electronic transcript exchange systems and key stakeholders in secondary and postsecondary institutions. Through his leadership, ConnectEDU became the first vendor of an electronic transcript exchange network to use the PESC High School XML Transcript standard in an operational capacity in August of 2006. Prior to joining ConnectEDU in 2004, Jeff was a security engineer in Oracle Corporation’s advanced programs group. Jeff carries professional certifications that are directly applicable to his work with PESC, including PMI Program Management, Oracle Database Administration, Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer, Microsoft Certified Database Administrator, and Cisco Certified Network Administrator. Jeff has over 15 years experience in deploying secure, standards-based, data solutions for education and government, as well as five years service as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Air Force. Mr. Alderson received his B.S. in Electrical and Computer Engineering from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in Massachusetts.

KRISTI BLABAUM
INCUMBENT

SYSTEMS INTEGRATION ANALYST, GREAT LAKES EDUCATIONAL LOAN SERVICES, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT LOAN ADMINISTRATORS (NASLA)
Kristi brings over 20 years of financial aid experience to her current position as a Systems Integration Analyst at Great Lakes. For the last 16 years she has been involved in many industry initiatives such as CommonLine processing and the Common Record: CommonLine standards. Kristi has been a representative on the PESC Board for the last 2 years, and she has been a member of the PESC Steering Committee for the last 4 years. She has also participated in the Change Control Board (CCB) for 8 years and has been the Chair for the last 5 years. Kristi’s also recently co-chaired the Student Loan Data Reporting Workgroup. She has also held the position of Co-Chair of the Origination Standards Advisory Team (OSAT) within NCHelp’s Electronic Standards Committee (ESC) for 8 years.

TODD BLOOM, PH.D.

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER, HOBSONS
Todd Bloom, Ph.D. is Chief Academic Officer at Hobsons. Todd is responsible for leading the policy, research, and government relations efforts for Hobson’s’ higher education and K12 divisions. Todd has extensive experience in the education market having provided leadership and organizational development service to institutions, state departments and research organizations, as well as private education companies. Prior to joining Hobsons, Todd was both Chief Academic Officer at Student Paths, a college and life readiness company, and Managing Partner at Blueprint Education Group, an education management consulting firm. To these organizations and their clients, Todd brought a deep understanding of P20 needs and effective strategies for improving organizational performance. Todd earned his Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

MARK COHEN

SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF MARKET STRATEGY AND CO-FOUNDER, PARCHMENT
As Senior Vice President of Market Strategy and co-founder of Parchment (originally known as Docufide), Mark has served in a variety of roles over the company’s history, most recently as VP of Product Development. Founded in 2004, Parchment’s member network now includes 25% of the nation’s high schools, 1,800 colleges and universities, international members in 93 countries and has delivered as more than 8,000,000 transcripts. In his role, Mark serves as the executive owner for a series of corporate initiatives which includes helping to shape Parchment’s corporate strategy, developing Parchment’s security and data privacy policies as Security Officer, and leading Parchment’s commitment to data standards and open data. Mark represents Parchment at PESC, SIFA and a number of associations and policy conferences, helping to align product strategy to these industry initiatives. A PESC member since 2004, Mark is Co-Chair of the Education Record User Group (ERUG) and has been an
Tuan Anh Do

**ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY, SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS (AACRAO)**

Tuan Anh Do serves as Assistant Director for Enrollment Management Technology within the Division of Student Affairs at San Francisco State University going on 16 years. He oversees all the Information Technology needs for Enrollment Management and key on-campus auxiliary units. Tuan is Enrollment Management’s main technical contact on a variety of systems, inclusive of being Coordinator for the Student Information System, Coordinator and Oracle DBA for Singularity Document Archive system, Oracle Application Developer, EDI Developer, ASP Web Developer and a shared resource on-campus for issues concerning Data Flow, Transformation and Integration between systems. Tuan has been the California Representative of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee since 2005 and has served as Chair of the SPEEDE committee. Tuan has also served as Vice-President and President of the Singularity User’s Management Team (SUMiT) as well as being active member of the PESC Change Control Board, PESC Technical Advisory Board and is the former Co-Chair of the PESC Education Record User Group.

Mark Jones

**SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT & CHIEF PRODUCT OFFICER, ELLUCIAN**

As senior vice president and chief product officer for Ellucian, Mark Jones is responsible for ensuring that the company’s current product offerings meet and exceed our customers’ expectations, and that future products create even greater value on the basis of evolving requirements within the higher education market. Previously Mr. Jones served as chief client officer having joined the company in September 2010, bringing over 20 years of higher education software experience spanning both administrative and academic technology. Mr. Jones has a strong history of product innovations in higher education, most recently serving as president of Echo360, Inc. In this position he was responsible for the development of the patented rich media hardware/software platform and led the company to market leadership in the lecture capture category. Before his tenure at Echo360, Mr. Jones helped fuel the rapid growth of the National Student Clearinghouse where, as vice president of marketing & product management, he introduced a number of innovative products and services for the registrar, financial aid, and institutional research communities. His more than 25 years of experience in technology also includes positions at Mercator Software, one of the leading ERP integration providers, as vice president of product management; National Computer Systems where he served as product manager on the U.S. Department of Education’s Title IV delivery systems and launched the first online transcript/application solution in 1993; and IBM Corporation, where he began his career. Mr. Jones has been a long-time supporter of the higher education standards community, with early involvement in the SPEEDE/Express community and eventually serving on the PESC board of directors. Mr. Jones was the primary author of multiple PESC schemas while employed by the National Student Clearinghouse. Mr. Jones holds a B.S. in Business Administration from the University of Minnesota and has completed coursework for the Master of International Management program at the University of Denver.

William McKee

**DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, ONTARIO COLLEGE APPLICATION SERVICE (OCAS)**

William McKee is a recognized strategic technology leader and team-building coach, who is creative and who drives for measurable results. As the Director of Operations at Ontario College Application Service (OCAS), William is a member of the OCAS executive team and is accountable for client and IT services at OCAS. William has been chairing the Canadian PESC User Group for the last two (2) years and is a strong advocate of data standards in Canada. William has a proven senior strategic leadership track record with twenty-nine (29) years of experience driving results in the IT, Education, Healthcare, Energy and Financial Services industries. Prior to joining OCAS, William was a consultant and CIO of McKesson Inc. responsible for providing outsourcing services to multiple Canadian and US Hospitals, in the capacity as Outsource CIO, Systems Solutions Provider and implementer of HBOC Hospital Information Systems. William served as the Director of Information Systems for Grand River Hospital Corporation & Kitchener-Waterloo Hospital where he was an instrumental leader of the IT strategy for merging of multiple hospitals and the establishment of the 1st Regional Community Health Network. William has held a number of IT lead roles with The Prudential Assurance Company Limited, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited Research Company.
and The Canadian Hemophilia Society. He earned a B.Sc. Degree in Computer Science and Mathematics from McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario Canada.

**DAVID MOLDOFF**

**INCUMBENT**

**FOUNDER & CEO, ACADEMYONE**

David K. Moldoff, Founder and CEO of AcademyOne, Inc., is a visionary in higher education responsible for AcademyOne’s overall strategy with specific emphasis on the technology infrastructure, integration of applications and services as well as exploiting his vast industry network with regards to sales, strategic partnerships, associations, etc. Mr. Moldoff is a successful entrepreneur with over 30 years of experience in launching and managing new companies and new products in technology for higher education. Before forming AcademyOne in 2005, he was SVP of Solutions Architecture and Infrastructure for SCT, which he was instrumental in selling to SunGard in 2004. Mr. Moldoff has been an active board member with several organizations including PESC, Bommi, Inc, and the Open Enterprise Application Integration Foundation for Higher Education; and has been an active member of Educause, NACUBO, NASFAA, NACUBO and AACRAO through his company affiliations, sponsoring keynote speakers, and national awards for innovation. Mr. Moldoff is a Gundaker Fellow and multiple Paul Harris Fellow, lives in West Chester, Pennsylvania with his wife and two children, and is a graduate of Drexel University.

**RICK SKEEL**

**FUNCTIONAL DIRECTOR, KUALI STUDENT, KUALI FOUNDATION**

Rick has been a long time member of PESC as a member of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, and was on the Committee that formed the foundation for what became PESC. He has worked with national and community standards groups for more than 20 years through his work on SPEEDE. He was a member of the PESC board for more than 7 years and had to step down from his position on the Board because of a change in employment. He worked at the University of Oklahoma for more than 35 years and retired from that institution at the end of October 2012. That retirement also took him off of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, at least temporarily. He is now working with the Kuali Foundation as the Functional Director of Kuali Student, which has been a member of PESC for several years and very supportive of national standards. Rick is very interested in returning to the PESC Board to continue the work he has been involved in for so many years, and believes his past experience as well as his new position gives him a breadth of experience that is very valuable to the organization.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
April 2, 2013
Contact:
Michael Sessa
PESC President & CEO
+1.202.261.6516

STUDENT LOAN PORTFOLIO DETAIL REPORT APPROVED THROUGH
PESC AS EDUCATION COMMUNITY DATA STANDARD
Service Providers Collaborate to Improve Data Integrity and Exchange

(Washington, D.C.) – The Board of Directors of PESC is pleased to announce the release of a Student Loan Portfolio Detail Report Standard approved through PESC’s development, approval & maintenance process. Now PESC approved, the Student Loan Detail Report Standard is expected to be used by lenders, servicers, guarantors, colleges and universities to exchange student loan repayment data and information. Leaders within the student aid sector had requested PESC’s expertise and service through a formal Letter of Intent.

“In order to assist schools with the management of cohort default rates (CDR), gainful employment, default prevention, default calculations, and overall repayment, lenders, guarantors and federal loan servicers provide schools with data files/reports reflecting their respective borrower loan data,” states Brian Allison, Vice President of Product Development at USA Funds and PESC Board member. “Today, data files/reports are provided by these various organizations in their own proprietary formats leaving the schools to deal with multiple, disparate file formats/reports,” Mr. Allison, who also served as Co-Chair of the Development Workgroup, continued.

“With an increasing number of requests to modify these existing files/reports, this workgroup gathered national support for a single, standard report format,” adds Kristi Blabaum, Systems Integration Analyst at Great Lakes Higher Education and PESC Board member representing the National Association of Student Loan Administrators (NASLA). “A single standard will ease the burden on college and university staff and IT resources as well as those of the lenders, servicers and guarantors,” Ms. Blabaum, who also served as Development Workgroup Co-Chair, continued.

PESC members that approved the Student Loan Portfolio Detail Report Standard include:

- AACRAO
- AAMC
- Academy One
- American Student Assistance
- College Board
- ConnectEDU
- Ellucian
- Florida International University
- National Student Clearinghouse
- NCHER
- Oracle
- Parchment
- San Francisco State University
- SCRIP-SAFE
- University of Illinois System
- University of Louisiana
Documentation for this newly approved standard is posted on the PESC website at www.PESC.org. Organizations looking to communicate their use of this or any other PESC Approved Standard should contact the PESC offices at 202.261.6514.

ABOUT PESC
Established in 1997 at the National Center for Higher Education and located in Washington, D.C., PESC is a non-profit, community-based, 501 (c)(3) umbrella association of colleges and universities; college and university systems; professional and commercial organizations; data, software and service providers; non-profit organizations and associations; and state and federal government agencies. Through open and transparent community participation, PESC enables cost-effective connectivity between data systems to accelerate performance and service, to simplify data access and research, and to improve data quality along the education lifecycle.

PESC envisions national and international interoperability, that is a trustworthy, inter-connected environment built by and between communities of interest in which data flows seamlessly from one system to another and throughout the entire eco-system when and where needed without compatibility barriers but in a safe, secure, reliable, and efficient manner. To achieve the mission and the vision, PESC organizes activities to: accelerate performance and service, reduce cost, lead collaborative development, set and maintain common data standards, promote best practices, link public and private sectors, and serve as data experts.

While PESC promotes the implementation and usage of data exchange standards, PESC does not set (create or establish) policies related to privacy and security. Organizations and entities using PESC standards and services should ensure they comply with FERPA and all local, state, federal and international rules on privacy and security as applicable. For more information, see www.PESC.org.

# # # #
TICAS Recommends Big Changes to Pell Grants, Student Loans, Tax Benefits
New report outlines evidence-based reforms to increase college affordability and completion, align incentives for colleges with better outcomes for students

The Institute for College Access & Success (TICAS) today issued a white paper calling for major changes to the way federal student aid is applied for, allocated, delivered, and communicated, as well as to how colleges are held accountable for the taxpayer funding they receive.

Federal grants, loans, and tax benefits help millions of students and families pay for college every year. TICAS’ in-depth analysis of available data and recent research found strong evidence that financial aid can and does increase college enrollment and completion. It also identified many aspects of current federal policy that must change to narrow persistent and growing income gaps in enrollment and outcomes. *Aligning the Means and the Ends: How to Improve Federal Student Aid and Increase College Access & Success* was developed with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation’s Reimagining Aid Design and Delivery project.

“For when it works as it should, financial aid enables all students willing to study hard to go to college and get a quality credential without burdensome debt,” said TICAS president Lauren Asher. “Federal aid can and must do more to keep college within reach for all students and families.”

The paper includes more than two dozen specific recommendations for ensuring college access and supporting student success. TICAS calls for bold yet practical changes to reduce complexity, improve timing, target resources to those with greater financial need, reduce fraud, and strengthen incentives for colleges to serve low- and moderate-income students well. These reforms address problems throughout the aid process, from pre-application through repayment. Major recommendations include:

- Dramatically simplify the federal aid application process by using data available from the IRS when students typically apply to college.
- Align incentives by rewarding colleges that serve low-income students well with additional funding and flexibility to innovate, while scaling sanctions to reflect the degree of risk schools pose to students and taxpayers.
- Double the maximum Pell Grant to close the growing income gaps in enrollment and completion, which persist even for students with similar levels of academic preparation.
• Offer one undergraduate student loan with no fees, a low in-school interest rate, and a fixed rate in repayment that is never too much higher than the interest rate on loans being offered to current students.

• Streamline overlapping income-based loan repayment programs into one improved plan that assures borrowers of manageable payments and forgiveness after 20 years.

• Eliminate higher education tax benefits, which are badly timed and poorly targeted, and use the savings for Pell Grants and incentives for states and colleges. If tax benefits are retained, streamline them into an improved American Opportunity Tax Credit that provides more help for low- and moderate-income students.

• Create and promote tools – from early aid estimates based on tax returns to standardized award letters – that give students and families clear, concise, and timely information about aid, costs, and outcomes to inform their decisions about where to apply and how to pay for college.

“The question is not whether we have the resources to get far more students to and through college, or whether we know what will make a difference,” said TICAS vice president Pauline Abernathy. “It is whether we have the will to make the changes and investments needed to keep college within reach.”

Some of the recommendations in Aligning the Means and the Ends will cost little or nothing. Others will require additional investments, and the paper includes options that would more than cover those costs. Many of those options enjoy bipartisan support and have been endorsed by a broad range of organizations and experts. The paper also includes a set of guiding principles for ensuring that policy reforms advance rather than undermine college access and success.

#  #  #
Summary of Activities, Meetings and Conference Calls
of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee
Months of January and February 2013

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). The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee actively meets and works year round with a focus on the creation, maintenance, and promotion of standards for the electronic exchange of student transcripts and other student education records. The AACRAO SPEEDE committee reports to the AACRAO Vice President for Information Technology (Group VI), Jim Bouse.

The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee currently meets at the AACRAO Annual Meeting, at the AACRAO Technology Conference and at the two PESC Data Summits each year.

This year, one meeting will be held in conjunction with the Pacific ACRAO meeting in the fall, so that the Committee may promote the electronic exchange of student records at PACRAO. This would be in lieu of one of the PESC annual data summits.

Face to Face Meetings of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee Held: None

AACRAO SPEEDE Committee conference calls held (with number of participants):
1/10/13 (8), 2/14/13 (5), and 2/21/13 (6).

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 officially stepped down from his position as AACRAO’s representative on the PESC Board of Directors in mid-November. Tuan Anh Do has been appointed by AACRAO as his replacement.
- Susan Reyes and Tom Stewart serve on the Change Control Board (CCB).
- Jerry Bracken now serves on the Technical Advisory Board (TAB).
- Robin Greene and Monterey Sims serve with the Seal of Approval Program.

Name Change for PESC: Although the acronym PESC is not changing, the “P” is changing from “Postsecondary” to “P20W” for PreSchool, through Grade 20, through Workforce, to acknowledge the changing area of development and interest of PESC activities.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Transcript</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>May 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Transcript</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transcript Acknowledgment</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Batch Submission</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>July 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>February 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request for Student Transcript</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to a Request for Student Transcript</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application for Admission</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Test Score Reporting</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPEDS Graduation Rates</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPEDS Fall Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPEDS 12 Month Enrollment and Completions</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PDF Attachments</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Acknowledgment</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It is recommended that all users update to the latest version of each schema. All users who have updated to the latest version can accept all documents created with all earlier versions as long as the first digit of the Version Number is the same. All users of an earlier version can also receive documents created in later versions as long as the first digit of the Version is the same, **provided that no data were included that use the new data elements, or new values of old data elements.**

**PESC Workgroups and User Groups of Interest to AACRAO Members include:**

**EdUnify**: This web services group was launched to automate electronic lookup, reporting and exchange, PK12 and workforce linkages, and transfer of credit.

**Academic e-Portfolio**: This workgroup holds regular conference calls and welcomes participation from anyone whose school or company is a member of PESC or AACRAO.

**Education Record User Group (ERUG) for Approved PESC XML and EDI Standards**: PESC formed this user group that deals with maintenance of all of the approved XML schemas in the admissions and student records area, as well as all of the ANSI ASC X12 EDI Standards for the admissions and student records area. Matt Bemis of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee currently co-chairs the User Group with Mark Cohen from Parchment (formerly Docufide).

ERUG currently holds hourly conference calls on Wednesdays at 2 pm Eastern Time, whenever there are agenda items to discuss. Anyone whose school or company is a member of PESC is welcome and encouraged to join ERUG and participate in discussion of proposed changes to existing schemas.

**Commit**: This newly renamed workgroup will build upon earlier work done by other PESC groups to allow a person to create a secure valid log-on ID that can be used for future log-ons to multiple web sites (such as admission test sites or college admissions web sites).

**Canadian User Group**: There is extensive volume production use of PESC XML schemas in the province of Alberta and a great deal of interest in the same in Ontario and British Columbia. There is also extensive use of the EDI Transcript Suite of Standards in Ontario and BC. This new group will explore issues of special interest to Canadian users (and potential users) of PESC XML schemas and EDI transaction sets.

Ontario Universities’ Application Centre (OUAC) will begin receiving PESC XML High School Transcripts from Ontario Colleges Application Services (OCAS) and generate PDF (short-term solution) to route to Ontario universities.

The group is now exploring the possibility of a nationwide electronic exchange of high school transcripts throughout Canada using the PESC XML High School Transcript as the standard.

**PESC XML Course Inventory Schema**: This PESC Workgroup has submitted its first draft of this new schema that will allow the electronic exchange of detailed information about an education course. It would also facilitate the exchange of these data between a school and its course catalog vendor.
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Other Activities of the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee:

Crosswalks for EDI Transaction Sets to PESC XML Schemas, and vice-versa: Most schools that are just beginning to implement the electronic data exchange of postsecondary student transcripts are expected to implement the PESC XML format. However, almost all of the current production exchanges via the University of Texas at Austin Internet Server are using the ANSI ASC X12 EDI format. To allow new users access to the established EDI exchanges, and to allow established EDI users to exchange with the new XML users, crosswalk rules are being developed from one format to the other.

These rules were developed by the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee and approved by the PESC ERUG and are now posted on the PESC.org web site at http://www.pesc.org/interior.php?page_id=219. Those approved to date are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosswalk Rules Between Electronic Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript Acknowledgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to Request for Transcript</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Work is in progress for the crosswalk rules from the High School Transcript - EDI TS 130 Version 4010 to PESC XML Version 1.0 and also for the PESC XML Response to a Request for a Student Transcript Version 1.0 to the EDI TS 147.

In addition, the Ontario Universities’ Application Centre (OUAC) announced that it is working on a process that will convert PESC XML Transcript Schemas to EDI Transcripts, and vice versa, for the electronic exchange of student transcripts within the province of Ontario.

State and Province Electronic Transmission Initiatives and Mandates: The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee now updates, every few months, a spreadsheet of 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. If not, please let us know.

We know there is a great deal of activity among AACRAO member schools in the secure electronic exchange of PDF Student Transcripts. Since a large portion of these PDF documents do not go to postsecondary schools, we need you to report this PDF activity so it can be included in this document on the AACRAO web site. Please send any 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/About-AACRAO/committees/speede/statestat.aspx.

State EDI, XML, and PDF Contacts: The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee also recently updated the contacts list. It is now posted on the AACRAO web site at http://www.aacrao.org/About-AACRAO/committees/speede/statecont.aspx. Please send updates and corrections to wbemis@usc.edu.

Common Education Data Standards (CEDS): The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee, primarily through PESC, is involved in defining the data elements now being included in this national project. Version 3.0 of this standard is now available at http://ceds.ed.gov. The review of Version 3.0 has begun and we hope that it will include even more data elements that are used in high school and college student transcripts.

University of Texas at Austin Free Internet Server Operation: In October 2012, AACRAO made an announcement about a one year trial project for the National Student Clearinghouse to assume operation of the Texas Internet Server. During this trial period, the use of the Texas Internet Server would continue to be free for the electronic exchange of EDI and XML student records that utilize the PESC EDI and XML standards. The AACRAO SPEEDE Committee has been asked to participate as an unbiased reviewer of this discovery process.

NASDTEC Presentation about UT Austin SPEEDE Server at the NASDTEC conference in June 2013: Shelby Stanfield will present a program session at the June 2013 annual conference in Austin, Texas of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

Survey of the Electronic Exchange of PDF Transcripts: The SPEEDE Committee is currently working on a brief survey to be distributed to the AACRAO community via SPEEDE-L and the REGIST-L listserve to gather information about the techniques and processes used in the electronic exchange of PDF student transcripts.

Nursing Centralized Application Service (CAS): This service appears to be similar to the AMCAS process, where an applicant submits one application to apply for multiple nursing schools. The service then distributes copies of the application and supporting documents, including PDF transcripts, to all the schools to which the applicant is interested in applying.
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**University of Texas at Austin SPEEDE Internet Server:** Shelby Stanfield, the Vice Provost and University Registrar at UT Austin has provided us with the following information about the use of the Free SPEEDE Server. Cumulative 12 month stats are as of the end of February 2013:

<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 January</td>
<td>132,481</td>
<td>137,108</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Transcripts for past 12 months</td>
<td>1,151,397</td>
<td>1,312,948</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS131 Transcript Acknowledgments for January</td>
<td>159,594</td>
<td>148,171</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS131 Transcript Acknowledgments for past 12 months</td>
<td>1,128,142</td>
<td>1,521,451</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS189 Applications for Admission for January</td>
<td>169,683</td>
<td>175,622</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS189 Applications for Admission for past 12 months</td>
<td>1,458,537</td>
<td>1,558,493</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Total Transactions for January **</td>
<td>528,563</td>
<td>541,293</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Total Transactions for past 12 months **</td>
<td>4,429,926</td>
<td>5,191,556</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Sending Schools in January***</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of TS130 Sending Schools per month for past 12 months ***</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of TS130 Receiving Schools in January***</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of TS130 Receiving Schools per month for past 12 months ***</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4%</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, such as Parchment, Florida K-12, Florida Postsecondary, Pearson, Texas Education Agency, Triand, and Xap Corporation, that distribute transcripts through the Server on behalf of multiple schools.

**XML Transcripts:** In January 2013, 17 schools in 5 states (Arizona, Iowa, Missouri, New Mexico, and Tennessee) exchanged 2,416 PESC XML Transcripts via the UT Austin Internet Server.

**Server Milestones:** In January 2013, the University of Texas at Austin Internet Server exchanged its 35 millionth document.
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Other Electronic Transmission Activity Not Using the Texas Server: North Carolina sends electronic high school transcripts within the statewide college access web portal, CFNC.org. Within this NC network, there are 524 high schools (representing all NC Local Education Agencies) sending electronic transcripts to 110 NC participating colleges and universities. For the months of January and February 2013, a total of 34,006 electronic high school transcripts were securely delivered in the PESC XML format. On February 12, 2013, the 1 millionth electronic high school transcript was delivered within this system that went live in the Fall of 2003.

Other provinces and states that exchange PESC XML or EDI transcripts without the use of the Texas Server include Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Florida, Maryland, Ohio, and New Jersey. For example, in Canada, as of August 2012, a total of 320,152 PESC XML Admission Applications have been submitted by applicants since ApplyAlberta came online in October 2009. In addition, 78,488 PESC XML Postsecondary (College) Transcripts have been processed through the Alberta system.

And several vendors exchange many electronic high school and/or college transcripts using their own networks. These include Pearson (formerly National Transcript Center), Parchment (formerly Docufide), ConnectEDU and the several other vendors who distribute PDF transcripts.

Future Meetings: The following are future events at which the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee is planning to participate:

AACRAO Annual Meeting April 14 - 17, 2013 (Sunday through Wednesday) at the Moscone Conference Center West in San Francisco, CA

PESC Spring Data Summit May 1 - 3, 2013 (Wednesday through Friday) at the Omni Hotel in San Diego, CA

AACRAO Technology Conference July 14 -16, 2013 (Sunday through Tuesday) at the JW Marriott Starr Pass in Tucson, AZ

PACRAO Meeting October 27 - 30, 2013 (Sunday through Wednesday) at the Paris Hotel in Las Vegas, NV
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AACRAO SPEEDE Committee Members for 2012-2013:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. Matt Bemis</td>
<td>Associate Registrar, University of Southern California</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wbemis@usc.edu">wbemis@usc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Bracken</td>
<td>Software Engineer, Core Services, Brigham Young University (UT)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeraldbracken@gmail.com">jeraldbracken@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuan Anh Do</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, Chair</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>Doug Holmes, Scribe</td>
<td>Programmer Analyst III, Ontario Universities’ Application Centre, 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:doug@ouac.on.ca">doug@ouac.on.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Reyes</td>
<td>Analyst Programmer, San Diego State University (CA)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:susan.reyes@sdsu.edu">susan.reyes@sdsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey E. Sims, Conference Program Coordinator and Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Director of Operations/University Services Document Processing University of Phoenix (AZ)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:monterey.sims@phoenix.edu">monterey.sims@phoenix.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>
</tbody>
</table>

And that’s the update for the past two months from the AACRAO SPEEDE Committee.
NCES Announces the Summer Forum and the STATS-DC 2013 Data Conference

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is sponsoring a two and a half-day meeting of the membership of the National Forum on Education Statistics at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, DC, July 15–17, 2013.

Immediately following the Forum is the STATS-DC 2013 Data Conference, "Discovering Through Data" (July 17–19, 2013). Highlights of the conference include:

• Discussions on technical and policy issues related to the collection, maintenance, and use of education data for education researchers, policymakers, and data system managers from all levels of government who want to share innovations in the design and implementation of education data collections and information systems;

• Information sessions on the Common Core of Data (CCD), data collection, data linking beyond K-12, data management, data privacy, data quality, data standards, data use (analytical), data use (instructional), fiscal data, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS), and changes in how the U.S. Department of Education collects and uses data; and

• Updates on federal and state activities affecting data collection and reporting, with a focus on information about the best new approaches in collecting, reporting, and using education statistics.

You are invited to attend the Summer Data Conference in Washington, DC and to submit a proposal to present a session. For more information, please visit: http://ies.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences/?id=1064&cid=2.

Visit http://nces.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences/PDF/STATSDC2013Brochure.pdf to access the conference brochure. Please note that the brochure will not be mailed.

To register and optionally submit a concurrent session or demonstration proposal, please visit http://ies.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences/Register.aspx?id=1064

*** The deadline to submit a proposal is Friday, April 26, 2013. ***
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NCES Releases "Issues and Recommendations for Best Practice" Report on Testing Integrity

Issues and Recommendations for Best Practice, a report on practices that support the integrity of test results, is now available. The report is part of a broader effort by the Department of Education to identify and disseminate practices and policies to assist efforts to improve the validity and reliability of assessment results. The report draws upon the opinions of experts and practitioners who responded to the Department’s Request for Information (RFI), the comments and discussions from NCES’ Testing Integrity Symposium, and, where available, policy manuals or professional standards published by State Education Agencies (SEAs) and professional associations.

The report focuses on four areas related to testing integrity: (1) the prevention of irregularities in academic testing; (2) the detection and analysis of testing irregularities; (3) the response to an investigation of alleged and/or actual misconduct; and (4) testing integrity practices for technology-based assessments.


The National Center for Education Statistics is part of the Institute of Education Sciences, within the U.S. Department of Education.
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NCES Releases Report on Dual Credit and Exam-Based Courses in U.S. Public High Schools: 2010-11

During the 2010–11 school year, 82 percent of high schools reported that students were enrolled in dual credit courses. "Dual Credit and Exam-Based Courses in U.S. Public High Schools: 2010-11," a First Look report from the Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) provides national data about enrollment in dual credit courses, eligibility requirements for enrolling in dual credit courses, the types of instructors in dual credit courses, and expenses paid by students and their parents. This survey is an update to a 2002-03 dual credit survey.

Findings include:

• During the 2010–11 school year, 82 percent of high schools reported that students were enrolled in dual credit courses and 69 percent reported enrollments in Advanced Placement (AP) or International Baccalaureate (IB) courses. High schools reported approximately 2 million enrollments in dual credit courses and about 3.5 million enrollments in AP or IB courses.

• Of the high schools with students enrolled in dual credit courses with an academic focus taught at locations for secondary school students, 61 percent reported these courses were taught solely by high school instructors. For schools with students in dual credit courses with a career and technical/vocational focus taught at locations for secondary school students, 67 percent reported these courses were taught by high school instructors only.

• High schools with students enrolled in dual credit courses with an academic focus reported that most students (and their parents) generally paid out of pocket for the following expenses for these courses: full or partial tuition (45 percent), fees (46 percent), and books (47 percent). High schools with students taking dual credit courses with a career and technical/vocational focus reported that most students (and their parents) generally paid the following expenses for these courses: full or partial tuition (28 percent), fees (34 percent), and books (31 percent).

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

To view the full report please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013001
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The Nation's Report Card: Mega-States Is Now Available!

The Nation's Report Card: Mega-States presents achievement results for students in California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas. It covers student performance in grades 4 and 8 reading, mathematics, and science. The report highlights changes in academic performance over time and in the most recent assessments, comparisons to the nation and among the five states, score gains for various student groups, and student performance at or above the NAEP Proficient level.

Click here to find results for the Mega-States. Download the print report and find additional resources and information from the Mega-States website.

NAEP is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education. The National Assessment Governing Board sets policy for NAEP.

To view the full 2011 Mega-States report please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013450
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NCES Releases New State-Level Data on the State Education Reforms Website

New state-level data on arts education, early childhood education, as well as school, college, and career readiness are now available on the State Education Reforms website. The State Education Reforms website, which draws primarily on data collected by organizations other than NCES, compiles and disseminates data on state-level education reform efforts in five areas:

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

The "Assessment and Standards" section of the site had two tables updated and one table added. In the "Staff Qualifications and Development" section, a new table was added. Three tables were updated and one table was added in the "Student Readiness and Progress Through School" section. These tables can be easily located by the "Updated!" and "New!" tags next to the table titles.

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

The State Education Reforms website is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education.
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NCES Releases Report on Dual Enrollment Programs and Courses for High School Students at Postsecondary Institutions: 2010-11

During the 2010-11 academic year, 53 percent of all institutions reported high school students took courses for college credit within or outside of dual enrollment programs. “Dual Enrollment Programs and Courses for High School Students at Postsecondary Institutions: 2010-11,” a First Look report from the Postsecondary Education Quick Information System (PEQIS) provides national data about enrollment in dual enrollment programs, eligibility requirements for participating in dual enrollment programs, the types of instructors in dual enrollment programs, and expenses paid by students and their parents. This survey is an update to a 2002-03 dual enrollment survey.

Findings include:

• During the 12-month 2010–11 academic year, 53 percent of all institutions reported high school students took courses for college credit within or outside of dual enrollment programs. Forty-six percent of all institutions reported that high school students took courses for college credit within a dual enrollment program, and 28 percent of institutions reported that high school students took courses for college credit outside a dual enrollment program. Institutions reported that approximately 1,277,100 high school students took courses for college credit within a dual enrollment program and approximately 136,400 high school students took courses for college credit outside a dual enrollment program.

• Among institutions with dual enrollment programs that had at least some instruction offered on high school campuses, 45 percent reported courses taught by both high school and college instructors, 34 percent reported high school instructors only, and 21 percent reported college instructors only.

• Forty-five percent of institutions with a dual enrollment program indicated that students (and their parents) generally paid out of pocket for tuition, 50 percent indicated that students generally paid for fees, and 60 percent indicated that students generally paid for books.

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

To view the full report please visit
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RFP: Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

On March 1, 2013, the U.S. Department of Education re-released the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers with modifications. Recognizing that a potential conflict of interest (COI) exists for prospective offerors, the Department is implementing a two-phase process for this procurement in which prospective offerors are requested to submit a COI strategy by March 15 for Department review. Other modifications include a reduction in scope and reduced period of performance. Proposals are due May 3. More details can be found at the following link: 
https://www.fbo.gov/index?s=opportunity&mode=form&id=00f5df516be7df994ba960d8cb4a9ada&tab=core&_cview=1.

You may also visit: 
http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ccp.asp
The Mathematics Curriculum Study Is Now Available!

The report, *Algebra I and Geometry Curricula: Results From the 2005 High School Transcript Mathematics Curriculum Study*, builds upon the results from NAEP’s previously released *High School Transcript Study* and looked at the math coursetaking patterns of America’s high school graduates to examine the content and challenge of Algebra I and Geometry courses in our nation’s public high schools.

The report addresses three broad research questions:

1. What differences exist in Algebra I and Geometry course curricula?

2. How accurately do school course titles and descriptions reflect the rigor of what is taught in Algebra I and Geometry?

3. How do Algebra I and Geometry curricula relate to math coursetaking patterns and NAEP performance?

Download the [print report](http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard) and find additional resources and information at [http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard](http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard).

*NAEP is a product of the National Center for Education Statistics at the Institute of Education Sciences, part of the U.S. Department of Education. The National Assessment Governing Board sets policy for NAEP.*
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New Statistics in Brief focuses on the federal student loan debt burden of students who do not complete a postsecondary credential

The cumulative federal student debt burden among students who did not complete a degree or certificate within 6 years of enrolling amounted to 35 percent of their annual income for students who first enrolled in 2003-04.

*Federal Student Loan Debt Burden of Noncompleters*, a Statistics in Brief, focuses on the federal student debt burden accrued by students who do not complete a postsecondary credential within 6 years of enrolling. It is based on data from the two most recent longitudinal studies of beginning postsecondary students conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics: students who first enrolled in 1995-96 (as of 2001) and those who first enrolled in 2003-04 (as of 2009).

- In 2009, the percentage of noncompleters after 6 years ranged from 19 percent of students in private nonprofit 4-year institutions to 46 percent in public 2-year colleges or for-profit institutions. An increase in noncompletion between 2001 and 2009 was observed only for students in for-profit institutions (35 percent to 46 percent).

- In 2009, borrowing rates from federal student loan programs ranged from 25 percent of students in public 2-year colleges to 86 percent in for-profit institutions; comparable rates for students in 4-year public and nonprofit institutions were 58 percent and 64 percent, respectively.

- In 2009, the cumulative amount borrowed per credit earned was highest for noncompleters in for-profit institutions ($350 per credit, compared with $80 to $120 per credit in the other three sectors).

- In 2009, the median cumulative federal student debt for all noncompleters amounted to 35 percent of their annual income; debt burden was highest for students in 4-year nonprofit institutions (median debt equaled 51 percent of borrowers' annual income). Debt burden among noncompleters who started in for-profit institutions increased from 20 percent to 43 percent of annual income between 2001 and 2009.

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

To view the full report when it is released please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013155
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NCES Releases Pilot Test Results for New Measures of Certification, Licensure, and Educational Certificates

As part of a larger inter-agency effort to develop new federal data on adults’ education, training, and credentials for work, NCES developed and pilot-tested a set of survey items on industry-recognized certification, state licensure, and educational certificates. The pilot test concluded that the main item on certification and licensure provides a valid measure of these credentials, and that three additional items, on the credential provider, occupational field of the credential, and whether the credential is required for work, can be used to provide other key information about these credentials. The study also found that proxy respondents were able to answer basic questions about key credentials. The pilot test produced equivocal results about the measurement of subbaccalaureate educational certificates, leading to a recommendation for further work specifically on this type of credential.

This pilot study was undertaken for questionnaire and procedural development purposes only. The estimates from this report should not be cited as population estimates because the sample design and data collection procedures were not intended for that purpose, but rather to support the evaluation of questionnaire items.

To view the full report when it is released please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013190

For more information about NCES’ interagency work on adult education and training, please visit the website for the Interagency Working Group on Expanded Measures of Enrollment and Attainment (GEMEnA).
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New Statistics in Brief focuses on the federal student loan debt burden of students who do not complete a postsecondary credential (Revised)

(This NewsFlash has been revised to correct an error in summarizing data from the report it announces.)

The median cumulative federal student debt burden among students who did not complete a degree or certificate within 6 years of enrolling amounted to 35 percent of their annual income for students who first enrolled in 2003-04.

Federal Student Loan Debt Burden of Noncompleters, a Statistics in Brief, focuses on the federal student debt burden accrued by students who do not complete a postsecondary credential within 6 years of enrolling. It is based on data from the two most recent longitudinal studies of beginning postsecondary students conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics: students who first enrolled in 1995-96 (as of 2001) and those who first enrolled in 2003-04 (as of 2009).

- In 2009, the percentage of noncompleters after 6 years ranged from 19 percent of students in private nonprofit 4-year institutions to 46 percent in public 2-year colleges or for-profit institutions. An increase in noncompletion between 2001 and 2009 was observed only for students in for-profit institutions (35 percent to 46 percent).

- In 2009, borrowing rates among noncompleters from federal student loan programs ranged from 25 percent of students in public 2-year colleges to 86 percent of students in for-profit institutions; comparable rates for noncompleters in 4-year public and 4-year private nonprofit institutions were 54 percent and 66 percent, respectively.

- In 2009, the cumulative amount borrowed per credit earned was highest for noncompleters in for-profit institutions ($350 per credit, compared with $80 to $190 per credit in the other three sectors).

- In 2009, the median cumulative federal student debt for all noncompleters amounted to 35 percent of their annual income; debt burden was highest for students in 4-year private nonprofit institutions (median debt equaled 51 percent of borrowers’ annual income). Debt burden among noncompleters who started in for-profit institutions increased from 20 percent to 43 percent of annual income between 2001 and 2009.

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

To view the full report when it is released please visit http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013155
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