**EQUIPMENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT APPLICATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of Person Submitting Request: | **John Stanskas** |
| Program or Service Area: | **Architecture and Environmental Design** |
| Division: | **Science** |
| When was the last Program Efficacy document completed? | **Spring 2008** |
| What rating was given? | **Continuation** |
| Equipment Requested | **Printer** |

1. Provide a rationale for your request.

|  |
| --- |
| The LARGE SCALE PRINTER in the Architectural Drafting Laboratory is outdated and difficult to maintain. It is used to produce architectural drawings created by students to simulate real, work environments. The printer supports instruction by providing students the opportunity to create and read scale drawings used in the construction of projects. |

1. 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 program has plans to expand the scope of offerings into land management and landscape design as shown in the last program efficacy document on page 18. To do this, the program needs to maintain current equipment needed for instruction. |

1. 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).*

|  |
| --- |
| The program’s FTES growth has been tremendous over the period documented in the EMP (page 24), from 17.4 FTES in 2004-05 to 67.83 FTES in 2008-09. Faculty load quadrupled during this period, also. In the 2009-2010 year, the program’s FTES generation reached 78. The efficiency data documented in the EMP shows weakness as expansion and initial course offerings of new curriculum were established. For 2009-10, the efficiency was higher, over 400 WSCH/FTEF (393 for fall 2009, 424 for spring 2010). While less than the campus average, this is an improvement and passable average for a laboratory based program with limited workspaces. |

1. 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)

|  |
| --- |
| The printer will cost approximately $4500. Some cost is associated with the purchase of ink and paper printer. However, with a new printer the cost for maintenance should decrease. |

1. What are the consequences of not funding this equipment?

|  |
| --- |
| The program will continue to offer inferior services to students in the laboratory. The department will continue to patch together the printer to squeeze another year of life from it. |