

BUDGET NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPLICATION #1

Name of Person Submitting Request:	David Bastedo
Program or Service Area:	Biology Department
Division:	Science
When was the last Program Efficacy document completed?	2009
What rating was given?	Expansion
Amount Requested	\$2800

1. Provide a rationale for your request.

One of the most valuable resources of the Biology Department are its cadre of microscopes. There are approximately 180 microscopes spread throughout 6 Biology labs. These were purchased in 1998 for approximately \$300,000. They are now 12 years old. The department has only enough funds to clean and maintain each of them every other year. As growth has occurred over the last 5 years, more and more sections of students utilize the microscopes and they are beginning to wear. They can be maintained for years to come, but at this age, they require more service than the department's budget can afford. We must double the maintenance schedule so that all microscopes are now serviced yearly.

2. Indicate how the content of the EMP One-Sheet and latest Program Efficacy Report support this request. How is the request tied to program planning? (*reference the page number(s) where the information can be found on the EMP and Program Efficacy*).

The EMP, pg 28, clearly shows the growth in FTES over the last 5 years in the Biology department. EIS data from Spring 2010 shows enrollment census figures of 1988 students. Most of these students will handle a microscope many times during a typical semester. When these microscopes were purchased, EIS data showed only about 1200 students in various Biology sections. When the wear-and-tear of use by more and more students is coupled with the aging nature of these microscopes, it should be obvious to all that an enormous investment in equipment must be protected. An intelligent strategy is to forgo expensive replacements and provide the necessary maintenance of these important department resources.

3. Indicate if there is additional information you wish the committee to consider (*for example: regulatory information, compliance, updated efficiency and/or student success data or planning etc*).

Already some of the microscopes are failing. A few microscopes have become unusable and it would not be cost effective to repair them. These are being held for spare parts in the repairing of other microscopes. Wear and tear is beginning to show and the department believes that now is the time to increase maintenance to protect the college's investment in these expensive tools. The maintenance can only be done by a factory trained technician.

4. Evaluation of related costs (including any ongoing maintenance or updates) and identification of any alternative or ongoing funding sources. (for example Department Budget, VTEA or Perkins)

There are no alternative funding sources for the Biology department. These budgeted funds will be added to the existing funds in the 5640 accounts for maintenance of microscopes only.

5. What are the consequences of not funding this budget request?

The consequences are dire financially. Without adequate maintenance the microscopes will fail one by one decreasing the effectiveness of the biology labs. This will be a slow drawn out process in which instruction will have to breach a critical level to warrant a new purchase of many microscopes at hundreds of thousands of dollars. In the meantime, student learning will become less and less effective. The comparison of investing funds to maintain microscopes for another 12-15 years versus having to replace them in 5 years due to neglect is staggering. The investment of less than \$3,000 each year will easily compensate for a potential expense of \$400,000 in a few short years.