Notes for PESC Admissions Application  
Workgroup Meeting  
7-6-2006  

Roll Call  
Bill Zimmer from SunGard Higher Education  
Adrianna Farella, chair, from Xap Corporation  
Paula Brower from SunGard Higher Education  
Monique Snowden from Texas A&M University  
Rick Burnette from Florida State University  
Cheryl Rich from Texas A&M University  
Larry Borgione (Note taker) from Oracle Corporation  
Jeff Korte from Jenzabar  
Mike Matthews from The College Board  
Mark Wysoski from SunGard Bi-Tech  
Phil Guth from Judson College (4 yr private) in Illinois  
Jim Sladen from The College Board  

Adrianna welcomed all in attendance. She asked for any updates to last week’s meeting and there were none. She welcomed Phil to the workgroup. She will make sure that he gets any materials that had been sent out to others.  

Call for Participants  
The workgroup reviewed the call for participation. Current members should use this to distribute to potential volunteers. Discussed the content. The concern was that we want to monitor the make up of the group. However, it might be best to get more members, as membership tends to decline over time. It was decided to leave off the following line  
Call in number will always be the same: Phone 800-508-7631; Pass code *9976409*  
IF the note is being forwarded to a list serve, group or website. It should be included if the message is sent to an individual.  
Adrianna stressed that we need to have good representation from various school types. We discussed the matrix of membership. The fireside chat at the AACRAO Technology Conference in July 2006 will be used to solicit additional members.  

Call Schedule  
Adrianna used the draft schema to organize the topics for meeting discussions. The way in which we plan to attack the project is to schedule the topics to be discussed for each meeting well in advance so that if additional participants can be invited or that regular members can prepare. We will continue to revise these plans. We will include the plans for the next 3-4 sessions in each set of minutes and on the agenda.
Discussion of Applicant: Person

**Background**
In January 2006, Adrianna met with the SPEEDE Committee and reviewed the TS 189 schema and the core academic record and applied them to a “straw man”. Rather than reinvent the wheel, the goal was create a draft schema aligned with what was originally defined for the core academic record and core main. One of the roles of this workgroup would be to ask for changes so that the admissions applications will be useful.

**Process**
The draft that has been distributed and the workgroup began the review the document for the schema starting with Page 9. Adrianna indicated how the diagram actually works and what the various items for the Applicant mean. Stressed that User defined extensions as an important feature of the XML format that allows for flexibility. Reviewed the details of the Applicant Person data on Pg. 11.

Question from Phil: How can one determine if fields used on the application schema have been taken from core main? Answer: If you have XML Spy, it is evident when looking at a schema. Not evident in these extract document. It is possible to go to the core main link on the PESC site; you will be able to access a text version of core main. XML Spy is very expensive and not always necessary.

The workgroup will review each data item with discussion to follow. Decided to look at each data item and examine its properties and if we have issues or problems are raised it can be placed in a “parking lot”. This will allow us to take a look at all items and then to return to items for further evaluation, discussion, and research.

**Data Item Discussion**
- **Institution assigned Identifier**: reviewed its properties; it is not clear that this data is numeric only or alphanumeric. The workgroup suggested that it should be alphanumeric. On core main, it is an alphanumeric field. No further questions or objections.
- **SIN (Canadian)**: reviewed its properties. SIN is from core main. This is an example of data that was pulled into the schema. No objections.
- **Agency Assigned ID**: reviewed properties. No objections.
- **Recipient Assigned ID**: How is this different from the Institution assigned ID? This is an example of a data item that was pulled with the thought that the workgroup would decide its relevancy to the admissions application. The straw man indicates that it is not recommended.
- **SSN**: reviewed properties. Recommended but NOT required. This property would be important for international students.

Next meeting will be devoted to the continuation of the Applicant Person discussion.

**Other Business**
Phil indicated that per the website, an XML Spy version ‘home addition” that is free. Phil will look into this.
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