GENERAL INFORMATION

PROGRAM NAME: (Double-click in the green box to enter information)
Articulation and Transfer Services

NAME: Name of person or persons that completed this APRU form.
Renee Augenstein

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. What are the primary support purposes of this program? (Choose (x) all that apply)

- Basic Skills
- Access
- Learning Resources
- Degree
- Success
- Academic Services
- Transfer
- Retention
- Personal Enrichment
- Career/Technical
- Persistence
- Student Cohort
- Other (Explain)

B. What is the Mission Statement for this program?

To promote the attainment of educational goals and facilitate student transfer, the Articulation and Transfer Services Office provides services and resources to De Anza students, faculty, and support services through the development of formal articulation agreements with regionally accredited 4-year institutions, transfer agreements with select colleges/universities, and general transfer advising guidelines and reference materials. The Articulation Officer (AO) serves as an articulation and transfer policy consultant to all faculty, and academic/student services units, and serves as a liaison to UC, CSU, independent institutions and system offices.

C. How many students does this program serve? (Approx. annually unduplicated)
14,301

D. Identify and describe (briefly) this program’s relationships and collaborations with other college programs:
Articulation and Transfer Services (ATS) works with most Instructional Departments/Divisions and Academic Services on articulation and curriculum matters. The work is a collaborative effort but the services provided by ATS are unique. ATS works extensively with the Counseling Division and the Transfer Center providing transfer/articulation materials and resources, transfer/articulation updates, and advising support services for staff and students. ATS works collaboratively with the Transfer Center to provide an on-campus presence of colleges and universities and transfer opportunities for students. ATS also provides transfer/articulation support to EOPS, ISP, and SSRS. Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAG/TAA) are developed by ATS but the student advising component is a coordinated effort between ATS, Transfer Center, Counseling, EOPS, ISP and SSRS. ATS also works extensively with Admission and Records (Evaluations) on articulation and transfer related issues that impact internal policies/processes/procedures, degree audit, credit evaluation, GE certification, and transfer degrees. On occasion, ATS works with Assessment on prerequisites and special exams.

IIA. PROGRAM SERVICES

Click on the "List of Services" tab at the bottom of this sheet.

IIB. SERVICE DESIGNATIONS

Click on the "Service Designations" tab at the bottom of this sheet.

III. OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT - INSTRUCTION

(Skip Section III and go to Section IV if there is no curriculum offered in this program)

A. Which SLO statements did you assess in 2011-12?

B. What did you learn? Briefly summarize the results of the reflection and enhancement discussions.

C. What additional resources are needed to implement the enhancement/improvements plans? (Please give a very brief overview - details will be asked for in Section VI)

D. What are your SLOAC plans for 2012-13?
IV. OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT - SERVICES

A. Which SSLO statements did you assess in 2011-12?

#1, 3, 4, 5

B. What did you learn? Briefly summarize the results of the reflection and enhancement discussions.

SSLO #1: As in previous years, all courses submitted for UC transfer, CSUGE and IGETC were approved. An articulation survey sent to faculty in-services and, if the Articulation Web Site is reestablished, integrate a survey mechanism.

SSLO #2: The Transfer Planning Website usage data continues to show an increase in pageview rate. Unfortunately, time needed to complete the study was not available, as it was part of future cycles.

SSLO #3: The Transfer Planning Website usage data continues to show an increase in pageview rate. Unfortunately, time needed to complete the study was not available, as it was part of future cycles.

SSLO #4: For Fall 2012 transfer, 754 UC TAGs were submitted of which 271 required De Anza review. ATS communicated with all 754 TAGs. The AO evaluated 75 (26%) of those TAGs. 68% were evaluated by 6 counselors and 6% by an academic advisor. As the TAG submission process and on-line TAG system are completely controlled by UC, the TAG timeline is not operationally conducive to the quarter system.

SSLO #5: The Transfer Planning Listserv has 602 members, an increase of 332 from our last Program Review, but the number of messages sent each month has declined. We also plan to increase listserv awareness by coordinating publicity efforts with ISP, Puente, and SSRS.

C. What additional resources are needed to implement the enhancement/improvements plans? (Please give a very brief overview - details will be asked for in Section VI)

Time.

D. What are your SSLOAC plans for 2012-13?

SSLO #1: Continue to track articulation results. Survey faculty in-services and, if the Articulation Web Site is reestablished, integrate a survey mechanism. SSLO #3: Continue to track usage levels. Initiate the user survey on the Transfer Planning Web Site. SSLO #4: Continue to track TAG numbers. Assess TAG materials produced by ATS. SSLO #5: Continue to track listserv activity, increase usage and messages, and, time permitting, develop the survey to help refine content and appearance.
V. CURRENT TRENDS/CHALLENGES

A. What does the near future portend for this program?

The impact the budget crisis will have on ATS is not known at this time.

B. What are the challenges for this program?

Time. Because of the urgent need to provide interim support to the Transfer Center, due to the loss of the Transfer Center Coordinator position a few years ago and the loss of full-time staff support since 3/8/11 (1/3 of which was regained in January 2012), since winter 2011 ATS staff has experienced a substantial decrease in time available to work on long established program duties and responsibilities. This has resulted in project/service delays, suspensions, and discontinuance. Since winter 2011, the AO has spent approximately 65% of her time working on Transfer Center activities and issues. ATS staff each reported approximately 50% of their time was dedicated to the Transfer Center from spring 2011 through the beginning of winter 2012. Without full-time staff support for the Transfer Center, the AO’s Transfer Center time remains the same to this day. ATS staff reported a decrease in time needed to support the Center. This loss of ATS time has greatly impacted our operations and level of productivity, which includes SSLO assessments and program revision plans for 2011-12. It is unclear at this juncture what the plans are for the Transfer Center. With the additional workload placed on ATS because of a) the STAR Act (SB 1440), b) the increase in faculty’s interest in articulation due to enrollment concerns, c) the increase in articulation issues due to statewide initiatives and changing policies, d) the increase in transfer admission policy changes across the State due to the budget crisis, e) the increase in demand to pursue out-of-state transfer opportunities for students, and f) the anticipated need to address components of the Student Success Task Force (SSTF) recommendations, combined with the Transfer Center situation and the unknown budget impact to ATS, we anticipate even greater challenges in the future.

C. What are the opportunities for this program?

A critical component of ATS’s responsibility is working with faculty to develop curriculum and being a liaison between De Anza faculty and 4-year institutions. The STAR Act (SB 1440), along with the restrictive timelines and guidelines embedded within it, adds a dimension to this responsibility because we essentially MUST all work together immediately to achieve this legal mandate. I believe the challenges this external pressure is creating also provide us with the opportunity to build stronger relationships within the De Anza community and with our 4-year partners. In order to succeed, ATS must help to bridge the needs and perspectives of instruction and student services, the community college and CSU, and the legislature and students.

D. Does this program anticipate rapid change, slow change, no change, or other?
## 2011-12

**SSPBT Annual Program Review Update**

Depending on the decisions regarding the Transfer Center, ATS may experience rapid change or slow change. The situation with the Transfer Center aside, the need for an increase in dedicated articulation time is critical to meet the needs of articulation/transfer initiatives and legal mandates (e.g. STAR Act (SB 1440), C-ID, Student Success Task Force (SSTF) Recommendations). A recent report (5/11/12) from the Legislative Analyst's Office regarding implementation of SB 1440 indicate that CCC need to increase the number of AA-T/AS-T degrees for transfer and it's recommended that the Legislature "provide additional guidance and clarification to CCC and CSU on their responsibilities, as well as continued oversight to track their progress." In support of SB 1440, ATS created and maintains an interim De Anza STAR Act Website, developed the degree-application process, created advising tools, provided in-services to counseling and instructional faculty, and is working with faculty through the Curriculum Committee to develop additional degrees. As the statewide implementation of the STAR Act is further developed and refined, ATS will continue to track CSU's progress and incorporate CSU's decisions into our campus process and advising tools. Extensive articulation work is also being done to receive C-ID identifiers for De Anza courses. Transfer has always been a priority for De Anza, but as the numbers and percentages of De Anza students transferring are further scrutinized based on the SSTF's outcome metrics, it is imperative that support for ATS continues so the foundation work (articulation, guidelines, policies, resources, agreements) required for student transfer remains intact.

### E. Are there any amendments to this program's 2008-09 Comprehensive Program Review? (CPR)

TAG #, STAR Act (SB 1440) Update (to be added when data is received)

### F. Explain what changes or revisions you have made, if any, to your services based on results of last year's program review update (2010-11).

ATS last reported a record number of TAGs processed for Fall 2011. Since the last program review UC has refined their TAG policy limiting students to a single TAG for Fall 2012. Though the number of TAGs submitted was lower in this past cycle (754 TAGs submitted; 271 required De Anza review) the low level of advising staff available during TAG-critical summer months required ATS to provide students with an alternate advising service. TAG workshops were developed and 36 were offered during June - September 2011. The Articulation Officer conducted 78% of these workshops, servicing 284 students.

### G. Explain anything that should be known about this program that hasn't been asked.

**a)** ATS plays a unique role at De Anza as we provide service and support to De Anza students, faculty, staff, programs, and administration. **b)** Key Transfer Center activities temporarily "picked up" by ATS include: coordination of Fall 2011 Transfer Day, coordination of all university representative visits from spring - fall 2011 (with 50% involvement continuing winter/spring 2012), and the coordination of Center coverage and daily operations spring 2011 - fall 2011 (with 50% involvement continuing winter/spring 2012).
### VI. RESOURCE REQUESTS

#### A. Personnel Requests:
Please submit the top three personnel requests in ranked order: (If there are more than three personnel requests, maintain a separate prioritized list using the same justification categories as in the APRU. If resources are available the SSPBT may ask for more items to be submitted.)

**Program Position Priority #1:**
- Faculty
- Staff
- Administration
- Full-Time
- Part-Time
- Est. Cost:

Brief description: (new or replacement from retirement or resignation)

**Rationale:** How will this person enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support this program's need for this position?

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)

- Critical
- Important
- Nice to have

**Program Position Priority #2:**

Brief description: (new or replacement from retirement or resignation)
Rationale: How will this person enhance or maintain your program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support this program's need for this position?)

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)

Critical       Important       Nice to have

Program Position Priority #3: (Check (x) appropriate boxes)

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)

Critical       Important       Nice to have

B. Equipment Requests: Please submit the top three program equipment requests in ranked order: (If there are more than three equipment requests, maintain a separate prioritized list using the same justification categories as in the APRU. If resources are available the SSPBT may ask for more items to be submitted.)

Program Equipment Priority #1:

Est. Cost: $1,500
2011-12
SSPBT Annual Program Review Update

Priority #1 item name:
HP DesignJet 130 Color Ink-Jet Printer

Brief description:(new, upgrade, or replacement)
New - poster printer

Rationale: How will this resource enhance this program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?

To produce professional looking posters and signs to promote transfer events.

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have".
(Choose only one)

[ ] Critical  [x] Important  [ ] Nice to have

Program Equipment Priority #2:

Est. Cost: $982

Priority #2 item name:
Epson Powerlite 1770W

Brief description:(new, upgrade, or replacement)
New - portable projector (district standard)

Rationale: How will this resource enhance this program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?

To support group presentations and workshops when smart-rooms are not available.

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have".
(Choose only one)

[ ] Critical  [ ] Important  [x] Nice to have

Program Equipment Priority #3:

Est. Cost:
2011-12
SSPBT Annual Program Review Update

Priority #3 item name:

Brief description: (new, upgrade, or replacement)

**Rationale:** How will this resource enhance this program’s plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program’s need for this item?

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)

| Critical | Important | Nice to have |

**C. Facility Requests:** Please submit the top three facilities resource requests in ranked order: (If there are more than three facilities requests, maintain a separate prioritized list using the same justification categories as in the APRU. If resources are available the SSPBT may ask for more items to be submitted.)

**Program Facilities Priority #1:**

Est. Cost:

Priority #1 project name:

Brief description: (new, remodel, relocation)

**Rationale:** How will this resource enhance this program’s plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program’s need for this item?

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)
2011-12
SSPBT Annual Program Review Update

Critical      Important      Nice to have

Program Facilities Priority #2:

Priority #2 project name:

Brief description: (new, remodel, relocation)

Rationale: How will this resource enhance this program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)

Critical      Important      Nice to have

Program Facilities Priority #3:

Priority #3 project name:

Brief description: (new, remodel, relocation)

Rationale: How will this resource enhance this program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for this item?

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether this request is considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one)

Critical      Important      Nice to have
### D. Professional Growth Resource Requests

In the space below, identify any professional growth initiatives that need additional funding. Include whether the needs are related to technology (hardware/software), the discipline, legal matters, District/College operations, Research/Innovations in the classroom, office, operations, etc. (List in ranked order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Growth Initiative request #1</th>
<th>Est cost of #1</th>
<th>Est cost of #2</th>
<th>Est cost of #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale: How will each professional growth initiative resource enhance this program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for each item?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether each of the top three requests are considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one per request)

**Professional Growth Initiative request #1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Nice to have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Professional Growth Initiative request #2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Nice to have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Professional Growth Initiative request #3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Nice to have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### E. Operating Resource Requests ('B' augmentations)

In the space below identify any additional operational funding needs. (List in ranked order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Resource request #1</th>
<th>Est cost of #1</th>
<th>Est cost of #2</th>
<th>Est cost of #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rationale: How will each additional operational resource enhance this program's plans to improve outcomes? What specific SLOAC/SSLOAC results support the program's need for each item?
2011-12
SSPBT Annual Program Review Update

Based on the needs of this program, check (x) whether each of the top three requests are considered to be "Critical", "Important", or "Nice to have". (Check only one per request)

**Operational budget request #1:**

- [ ] Critical
- [ ] Important
- [ ] Nice to have

**Operational budget request #2:**

- [ ] Critical
- [ ] Important
- [ ] Nice to have

**Operational Budget request #3:**

- [ ] Critical
- [ ] Important
- [ ] Nice to have