

Solutions

2.1

Thirty voluntary current users; twenty expressed interest.

2.2

Forty requests; six double bookings.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: interest is not daily-use demand from all thirty; no proven conflict removal; six unique people not established; maintenance cost unknown rather than free; no universal approval or rollout decision.

2.4

Non-user needs/frequency/access barriers; waits/abandoned attempts/conflict causes/trial effect; task time/cost/staffing/funding.

3.1

Three themes linked to U/B/M; relevant missing evidence; conditional focused thesis; explains why demand depends on reliable accessible provision; addresses maintenance/resource feasibility; fairly treats scarce-resource objection without inventing success or funding.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: focused conditional thesis and clear introduction; accurate evaluated U/B/M evidence with local source credit; demand/access limits rather than universal interest; booking counts and missing experiences rather than proven solution; resource requirements without invented cost or provision; connected synthesis and fair scarce-resource counterargument; feasible proposed evaluation and proportionate conclusion with honest source entries; coherent truthful 650–800 word response. Example: “A shared equipment service should be considered through a limited trial only if the fictional campus can protect access, examine booking reliability and provide a feasible maintenance plan. The supplied cards identify reasons to investigate, but none establishes that the proposed service works. A conditional trial is therefore more defensible than immediate wider adoption. Its purpose should be to answer specific questions about demand, usability and resources, rather than to turn interest into a promise of universal benefit.

The user-interest survey provides one reason to explore demand. Twenty of thirty voluntary current users expressed interest in a shared service (U, §1). Their responses matter, but they do not describe the whole campus. Non-users were not surveyed, and the record does not show frequency of likely use or access barriers. Some interested respondents might use equipment occasionally, while people outside the sample could have needs the survey missed. These are possibilities to investigate, not findings. A trial plan should therefore gather information through accessible routes and retain the distinction between interest and actual use.

Booking reliability creates a second condition. The two-week record contains six double bookings among forty requests (B, §1). This identifies a problem worth examining, but

requests are not necessarily different people. The record also omits waiting time, abandoned attempts and causes of conflicts. A new service could make some bookings clearer without addressing every cause, or it could appear successful if frustrated users stopped requesting equipment. Neither outcome has occurred in the supplied evidence. Evaluating reliability must therefore include access experiences as well as the visible conflict count.

Resources connect these concerns to practical provision. The maintenance note identifies cleaning, repair and replacement as recurring tasks, but provides no cost, task-time estimate or staffing allocation (M, §1). It is a planning requirement, not evidence that maintenance is already available or free. Equipment that attracts interest but cannot be maintained may provide unreliable access. Before starting a trial, the campus would need a responsible maintenance arrangement, a realistic account of required work and the relevant approval. The cards do not establish what those arrangements would cost or whether resources exist.

Together, the sources support a connected argument rather than three independent summaries. U supplies bounded evidence of interest; B identifies reliability questions; M identifies resource conditions. Interest alone cannot outweigh missing access information, and a reduction in recorded conflicts would not justify expansion if maintenance proved unmanageable. Conversely, missing estimates do not show that the service must fail. The appropriate conclusion is that these conditions should be investigated together before a wider decision, with the priorities and remaining uncertainty stated openly.

A serious counterargument is that even a limited trial consumes scarce time and resources without a proven benefit. That concern should not be dismissed as opposition to sharing equipment. A trial is justified only if its questions are important, its work is feasible and its information can guide a real decision. If no responsible maintenance arrangement or workable evaluation is available, further planning may be preferable to starting immediately. Limiting the scope can reduce commitments, but it does not make staff time or repairs automatically free.

A proposed evaluation could record actual use, conflicts, waiting time and abandoned attempts through a clearly defined procedure. It could also record maintenance tasks and the effort required to complete them. Demand information should include relevant non-user perspectives rather than repeat only the original current-user survey. Before observing results, the campus should state how the measures will inform continuation, revision or stopping. A simple before-and-after difference may have alternative explanations, so the chosen comparison and its limitations must be reported honestly. These are proposed measures, not completed findings.

The decision should therefore remain conditional. A feasible limited trial may help address the linked demand, access, reliability and resource questions, but the supplied records do not approve or validate it. Wider adoption should depend on reviewed evidence against explicit criteria and the necessary practical arrangements. This conclusion acknowledges the potential opportunity without claiming a known future outcome.

Local source entries: Fictional card U, User-interest survey, §1; fictional card B, Booking record, §1; fictional card M, Maintenance planning note, §1. All are original classroom cards supplied in this sheet, not real publications.”