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ABSTRACT

Intellectual property (IP) topics such as copyright, licensure, and fair use have become critical to today's information professional. This study proposes to explore and analyze the current state of IP education within Library and Information Science graduate programs accredited by the American Library Association (ALA). Despite the importance of IP issues to information professionals, we propose that ALA-accredited MLS/MLIS programs do not require courses focusing on IP issues. IP issues include, but are not limited to, questions of copyright, interlibrary loan procedures, and electronic database licenses. This study will help identify the extent to which IP training in U.S. ALA-accredited programs is available. Through a brief, preliminary questionnaire, e-mailed to all U.S. ALA-accredited LIS graduate programs, we will identify which schools offer courses focusing on IP issues. Follow up interviews will determine the nature of IP courses in accredited programs. The findings will be published on a website accessible by the public. Future researchers will be able to use this information to design studies that can assess the quality of the content of such courses.

INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH PROBLEM

Intellectual property (IP) issues present many challenges to the modern information professional. As Shalini R. Urs (2004) noted, “The challenges of intellectual property issues stem from their very nature – their value increases with use, and the value of intellectual property lies in public use!” (p. 202). This observation illustrates why libraries must be able to balance the interests of creators, publishers, and users of copyrighted works. Creating this balance is not simple. Considering the often complex nature of copyright law and the admonition that only
legal professionals provide legal advice, the issue becomes exceptionally difficult to comprehend and manage.

*Research Problem*

Through graduate library science courses, future information professionals could be prepared to navigate successfully through the IP challenges they will undoubtedly face during their careers. However, a potential problem exists – perhaps LIS students do not have access to such courses. We were first introduced to this possibility through an article in *Information Today* by K. Matthew Dames. Dames (2006), who holds a J.D. and M.L.S., has been advocating for IP education in LIS programs. Dames did not conduct a formal study, but he made this observation about IP education in LIS programs:

Out of the 49 ALA-accredited graduate library science programs in the continental U.S., I found only two schools—Syracuse University and Emporia State University in Kansas—that offer a copyright course. In fact, less than half (only 24 of the 49 schools) offer a course that addresses information policy or legal issues on any level. (Dames, 2006, para. 11).

We decided that a formal study is needed to confirm or deny these observations and to obtain additional information. We believe IP issues are critical to today’s information field. And, as technology increases the possibilities for library and information services, information professionals will face even more IP decisions. Many library projects and services – including digitization projects, interlibrary loan, and electronic materials – “involve a complex understanding of copyright law,” (Dames, 2006, para. 3). For librarians to make sound decisions on these issues, they must have access to education focusing on IP concepts.
Goals and Objectives of Study

This study proposes to discover whether library and information science programs are offering educational training on IP issues. Through interviews, we will examine how many schools offer IP courses, whether the courses are required or elective, and whether students are electing to take non-required courses. The frequency in which programs offer IP courses and the factors determining frequency will also be examined.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

We hypothesize that most ALA-accredited MLIS programs do not require courses focusing on IP issues. It is also possible that some schools do not offer IP courses at all. Furthermore, even at schools that have courses studying IP issues, such courses are likely to be offered infrequently, not have IP issues as the primary focus, and/or have only a small number of seats available. The answers to our research questions – which focus, in part, on type and frequency of courses – will confirm or deny these hypotheses.

Benefits and Importance of Proposed Research

The proposed research will highlight an issue that has been overlooked within the field of information studies. Our study will set the stage for future researchers. Through identifying the extent to which LIS students have access to IP courses, we will enable future researchers to design studies that can assess the quality of the content of such courses.

Our study could lead to further studies on how copyright and IP education could help librarians solve the problems they face in the library and information science field. This research could also increase awareness of the necessity of and demand for copyright and IP courses. The result could be that programs would collaborate on, develop, and offer copyright courses to library students in the future.
While many people are aware that a concept known as copyright exists, very few understand its nature. An understanding of copyright issues, policies, and reasoning could trickle down from colleges to information professionals and to the general public. A course specifically addressing copyright as a whole and solutions to practical challenges could benefit the profession and society as a whole.

Lastly, all types of libraries are facing funding issues. A recent San Francisco Chronicle article about “the largest library shutdown in the United States” illustrates this (May, 2007). The March 4, 2007, article discusses the closing of the entire Jackson County Library System, which, according to May, had an average of 1,472,000 visitors per day in 2006. With the funding problems facing libraries, the last problem any library needs is lawsuit costs associated with IP infringement. While IP lawsuits against libraries aren’t probable, the possibility always exists – especially in special libraries at corporations or law firms. James S. Heller (2002) provides several examples of this:

… Newsletter publisher Washington Business Information sued the Collier, Shannon & Scott law firm for making cover-to-cover copies of newsletters and sending them to attorneys throughout the firm. The firm reportedly paid a huge amount of money to the publisher to settle the lawsuit. And in 1999, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae, a large New York-based law firm, purchased a multiyear photocopying license with the CCC and paid an undisclosed settlement to avoid a copyright infringement suit brought by four publishers. (Heller, 2002, 34).

Information professionals in all environments need to know what is acceptable under IP rules. While they cannot advise their organizations in legal matters, they can help to establish
policies and ensure the policies are compiled with by members of their organizations. A proper grounding in IP concepts through graduate courses could give them the background to do this.

Assumptions and Limitations

This research proposal is presented with the underlying assumption that, in order to make better decisions and recommendations concerning IP issues, librarians should have a proficient educational background in the copyright field. We also assume that graduate courses may be the best opportunity for information professionals to learn about IP issues. There are many ways information professionals may be educated on these issues – graduate courses, on-the-job training and seminars are just some of the examples. IP courses could have many benefits that on-the-job and seminar training may not provide – these courses could allow information professionals to study IP issues in depth early in their careers. On-the-job training and seminars may provide some guidance but certainly wouldn’t allow as much time for scholarly debate and study as courses would.

This study assumes IP concepts in relation to libraries involve the major issues and general principles of copyright owner's rights, liability for infringement, fair use and library exemption, audiovisual works, and non-print media. Library services directly related to IP topics include digital information, licensing of electronic information, electronic reserves, and distance education, in addition to the standard issues of photocopying and interlibrary loan.

The limitation of the study is that it may be difficult to get the faculty and staff participants to invest the necessary time in order to contribute to the research study. We are using in-person interviews, but we realize that not all schools may be able or willing to participate in such interviews. To help with this problem, we are making interviews as easy as possible for the interviewees. We will also offer an alternative method of providing data so that
we can obtain as much information as possible about graduate LIS programs in U.S. ALA-approved institutions.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

IP issues are matters of concern for information professionals. According to Carlos Fernandez-Molina (2004), information professionals face many legal concerns about electronic information in particular. Fernandez-Molina categorized these concerns into five areas: “1) selection of materials and censorship, 2) access to information, 3) reference services and information brokerage, 4) privacy, confidentiality, and data protection, and 5) copyright” (Fernandez-Molina, p. 11). The legal issues facing libraries are changing rapidly due to advances in technology. “For this reason,” Fernandez-Molina states, “not only is it necessary that library and information science students (future professionals) receive instruction about legal problems, but also that practicing professionals periodically receive updated instruction” (p. 121).

Many professional associations suggest copyright and IP education for information professionals. The Special Libraries Association (SLA) lists IP and copyright knowledge as a professional competency, stating that an information professional “advises the organization on copyright and IP issues and compliance” (Special Libraries Association, 2003, p. 5).

In its “Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Law Librarianship,” the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) states:

The use and dissemination of legal information is affected by legal and ethical considerations. Law librarians must understand the legal complexities that affect access to and use of information, including copyright, freedom of information, privacy, and issues related to unauthorized practice of law and/or malpractice.
Law librarians must be familiar with and understand any legal requirements and ethical considerations of both the legal profession and librarianship. (American Association of Law Libraries, 1988, para. 15).

Surprisingly, the American Library Association (ALA) does not include copyright in its draft of core competencies. Renee McKinney (2006) compares the proposed competencies to curricula at LIS schools. However, since copyright, IP and legal issues are not specifically part of the ALA’s proposed competencies, they are not even discussed in the comparison. Given the size and scope of the ALA, this finding helps confirm the need for more research. One might wonder why such an important issue is not part of the core competencies of the very organization that accredits our library and information science schools.

There is also evidence that legal issues, including copyright, can be confusing to information professionals. Elizabeth Gadd and Richard Gaston (2001) conducted a small-scale study focusing on copyright and IP issues from the perspectives of information professionals. The authors analyzed messages posted to a copyright listserv in 2000 by information professionals in the United Kingdom. Though copyright and IP laws differ from country to country, the study is relevant because information professionals are likely to face some of the same challenges anywhere in the world. Gadd and Gaston found that their sample population had the most questions about copyright of traditional printed materials. There were 223 messages about this topic, and 196 were specifically about photocopying rights. The number of messages focusing specifically on photocopying shows how copyright is complex and can be very confusing to decipher. There were also approximately 100 messages about areas aside from traditional print sources. From the study, Gadd and Gaston concluded that, “the increasing volume of traffic, and large number of members, on Lis Copyseek indicates that copyright is an
area of increasing concern to HE (higher education) in general and libraries in particular” (p. 393).

Other studies identify copyright and IP issues as key areas in librarianship; however, copyright and IP education is not the focus of the studies. Sajjad ur Rehman (2003) published a study on curriculum and perceived competencies in the LIS field. His study included practitioners and LIS faculty members in North America, East Asia, and the Arabian Gulf. The respondents were asked to rate different categories on the level of importance to LIS competencies. Rehman found that education about legislation, copyright and IP issues was identified as a needed supplementary core by 31.4 percent of respondents. This same area was identified as a needed primary elective by 51.4 percent. While Rehman’s survey did not discuss copyright and IP issues in depth, his results provide what is probably the strongest support for our research proposal by showing that these issues are important and that further exploration is needed.

In a small study, Terry L. Weech (2005), a library and information science professor at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, analyzed four schools that offered specialties in digital librarianship. Weech discusses two authors who suggested core areas in education for future digital librarians. One of these areas was “social, economic and policy areas” (para. 9). Copyright and IP issues are listed under this area. However, while copyright and IP issues are identified as key areas, courses on these issues were only listed for two of the four schools offering digital library specializations. This research shows that LIS students may not have access to the information needed to develop these key competencies.

The review of the previous literature and research studies shows there is not a clear picture of the current and future state of copyright and IP education for the LIS community. The
connection between advocacy for copyright and intellectual education and implementation of the same appears to be missing. A clear picture can only be obtained through a narrow study that looks at this one area of LIS education, instead of the entire curriculum. Through interviews with representatives of schools, we hope to provide this much-needed data.

**METHODOLOGY**

*Research Design*

The study contains aspects of exploration, description, and explanation. The study is exploratory since “…the subject of study itself is relatively new” (Babbie, 2006, p. 88). As demonstrated in the literature review, formal studies that specifically examine IP course offerings within LIS programs do not exist. We will describe the types of courses offered and briefly examine why courses are offered. Data will be collected through two traditional survey methods – self-administered questionnaires and interviews. The unit of analysis is a social artifact – the courses offered. We will examine the following variables:

1. Dedicated intellectual property courses; attributes: offered/not offered, elective/required/neither, frequency of course offering, number of seats available, number of seats generally vacant after registration.

2. Non-dedicated intellectual property courses; attributes: offered/not offered, elective/required/neither, frequency of course offering, number of seats available, number of seats generally vacant after registration.

*Definitions of Key Concepts/Terms*

**ALA-accredited program**: any graduate library and information science programs accredited by the American Library Association at the commencement of the study. This includes schools that are conditionally approved by the ALA.
**Intellectual Property**: “a category of intangible rights protecting commercially valuable products of the human intellect. The category comprises primarily trademark, copyright, and patent rights, but also includes trade-secret rights, publicity rights, moral rights, and rights against unfair competition” (Garner, 2004, p. 824).

**Intellectual Property Course**: Any course addressing intellectual property issues such as copyright, licensure, and fair use within a library context; course is offered by an ALA-accredited graduate LIS program.

**Required Intellectual Property Course**: Any course addressing intellectual property issues that is required for graduation by an ALA-accredited library program.

**Elective Intellectual Property Course**: Any course addressing intellectual property issues that is offered on an elective basis by an ALA-accredited library program.

**Dedicated Intellectual Property Course**: Any course with a primary purpose of addressing intellectual property issues.

**Non-Dedicated Intellectual Property Course**: Any course with a secondary purpose of addressing intellectual property issues; this means IP issues may be discussed in the course but that they are not the focus of the course.

**Population and Sample**

The population for this study is every director – or an alternative representative of the school identified by the director – of ALA-accredited graduate LIS programs in the United States. The directors will be identified by reviewing the websites and contacting the departments of all schools approved by the ALA at the commencement of the study. Directors will be contacted via e-mail for demographic information and to assess whether they would be willing to participate in the interview. The sample will be comprised of all directors who agree to
participate in the interview. A second e-mail will be sent out to all non-responding directors to ask if they would be willing to answer the questions in an on-line survey. The goal is to obtain as much data from as many schools as possible.

Data Collection

The initial e-mail will be sent to all identified directors or representatives. A sample of the proposed e-mail is attached in Appendix A. The directors will be asked if their school offers IP courses and if they would be willing to participate in an interview. To ensure the e-mails are actually received and not sent to junk mail folders, we will request read receipts for every e-mail sent. If we do not receive a read receipt, we will know the e-mail may have been lost. After initial contacts have been made, we will provide willing respondents with further details of the interview process, including date range, length, and format. A website will be available for interested parties wishing to obtain more detailed information about the study.

The interviews will take place at each school. Since the schools are spread out across the nation, we will utilize volunteers from other LIS schools to assist with interviews. This will alleviate the problems of the high costs associated with travel. We have identified volunteers through the LIS Student Research Coalition, a non-profit organization established to encourage research by LIS students and to provide guidance and tips for research projects. The LIS Student Research Coalition is also providing a portion of the funding for this project.

Since our volunteers cannot be trained in person, we will develop an online WebEx training program. This online presentation will ensure the proper training of all volunteers. In addition to the WebEx training, volunteers will have password-protected access the research Web site, where they can interact with other volunteers, access interview materials, contact study directors, and review frequently asked questions. Once training is complete, each volunteer will
be assigned to the participant at their current school and/or nearby schools, so the volunteers will not have to travel great distances. Babbie (2006) points out the advantage of this is “to save time and money, a given interviewer is typically assigned to complete all the interviews in a particular geographic area … If the interviewer does anything to affect the responses obtained, the bias thus interjected might be interpreted as a characteristic of that area” (p. 265).

Interviews will consist of open and closed questions. Since “certain questions will be relevant to some of the respondents and irrelevant to others,” contingency questions are included in the interview (Babbie, 2004, p.251). A sample of the interview structure is attached as Appendix B. Interviewees will be provided with copies of the definitions to ensure they understand the terms used in questions.

Having an interviewer conduct this stage of the study rather than mailing a questionnaire to a respondent has many advantages. These advantages include a higher response rate, decrease in the number of “don’t knows” and “no answers,” prevention of respondent confusion, and the opportunity to observe the respondent (Babbie, 2004, p. 263). The first two advantages noted will contribute to higher quality quantitative data. A higher response rate will provide more data in which to analyze. Decreasing the number of unusable answers will increase the quality of data available. We believe interviews are especially appropriate for this study because IP concepts are frequently matters of gray area. Interviews would help clarify any confusing issues and allow interviewers to probe more deeply into the reasoning behind the answers given. Additionally, observations of respondents’ reactions may lend additional insight into what a particular respondent is thinking. For example, if a respondent laughs at a particular question, an interviewer could follow up and ask what caused this particular response.

The interviews will also allow respondents to explain their answers to the “why”
questions. By asking why courses are offered more/less, the interviewer may be able to gather information leading to a holistic explanation of the IP situation beyond the simple quantification of respondent’s answers.

Data Analysis

The purpose and design of this study calls for the qualitative analysis of quantitative data. The data analysis will proceed in three stages. Stage 1 will include the direct comparison of schools requiring dedicated IP courses, schools requiring non-dedicated IP courses, and schools which offer elective courses covering IP issues, both dedicated and non-dedicated. This comparison will be represented in a bar chart. Stage 2 will provide further analysis of ALA-accredited LIS programs offering elective courses in IP. This analysis will be portrayed in two three-dimensional graphs. The two graphs will be broken up by schools offering dedicated elective IP courses and schools offering non-dedicated elective IP courses, as related to the frequency these courses are offered and the number of students electing to enroll in them. Stage 3 will consist of qualitative analysis of the contingency questions. The contingency questions will be coded to create uniformity in the free-form answers. This process will be open coded, and the researchers will apply codes according to the data collected. Once the answers from the contingency question are coded, the data will be entered into the NUD*IST system for further analysis. The researchers will look for outlying patterns in the free-form answers.

Criteria of Measurement Quality

To ensure precision, we will not provide pre-selected answer choices. For example, we could ask if a course is never offered, sometimes offered, or frequently offered. However, this will not provide the most precise information. Instead, we are seeking information such as “offered once every two semesters.” If respondents provide vague answers, interviewers will be
instructed to probe for specific answers. The detailed training provided to the volunteers will ensure consistency and reliability. As Babbie (2006) says, “… clarity, specificity, training, and practice can prevent a great deal of unreliability and grief” (p. 146).

**Ethics**

There are no major ethical concerns for this study. All participation will be voluntary. The quantitative and qualitative data for each school will be reported. We may publish direct quotes from respondents but may withhold their name and institution if the respondent requests it and the action seems appropriate. As such, these responses may be kept confidential but will not be anonymous. This will be made clear to the respondents. There will be no deception involved in the study. Respondents will be informed of the researchers’ affiliations and purposes for conducting the study.

**MANAGEMENT PLAN**

This study is slated for completion six months from initial survey to final data analysis and findings. See Appendix C for timeline. Sample population will be divided by region. Management structure and personnel requirements are as follows:

**Team Managers (2):** Team Managers are responsible for supervision of Team Coordinators, management of budget resources, coding and analysis of data, and compilation of study results and findings. Team Managers are responsible for development and training of volunteers via online application.

**Team Coordinators (2):** Team Coordinators are responsible for identifying and contacting study participants, coordinating volunteers for in-person interview, and perform data entry and coding. Team Coordinators serve as liaison between Team Managers, volunteers, and study participants.
Volunteers: Volunteers, comprised of current MLIS students, are responsible for conducting the in person interviews with study participants. Volunteers are required to tend training and demonstrate competence in filed research methodology and goals of particular study. Volunteers report to assigned regional Team Coordinator.

BUDGET

Personnel

The following is a description of budgetary considerations (See Appendix D for detailed budget). Team Managers will receive a $30,000 (thirty thousand US dollars) stipend each. Team Managers will be PhD level researchers in the Library and Information Science field. Team Coordinators will receive a $15,500 (fifteen thousand US dollars) stipend each. Team Coordinators will be PhD seeking students enrolled in a doctoral Information Science program. Volunteers will receive $100 (one hundred US dollars) compensation upon conclusion of six month term. A total of $4200 (forty-two hundred US dollars) has been allocated in the event every qualifying program participates in the study. As interviews will be conducted on campus and volunteers are all current, on campus students, mileage and other expenses will not be reimbursed.

Equipment

Each team, comprised of one Team Manager and one Team Coordinator, will receive one laptop complete with licensed NUD*IST and WebEx software and tech support. Each Team Manager, Team Coordinator, and volunteer will receive a calling card to be used for study logistical purposes. Miscellaneous office supply monies have been set at $2,000 (two thousand US dollars) to cover incidental expenses associated with the study and as a reserve in the event calling cards limits are met.
Total budget amount is $105, 450 (one hundred and five thousand four hundred and fifty US dollars). Budget total is calculated to cover all personnel and equipment expenses for the duration of the study to submission for publication.
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Appendix A: Initial E-Mail

Dear Mr./Mrs. ____________,

We are writing to encourage your school’s participation in a study that could help improve certain aspects of LIS education. Our study is based at the Florida State University College of Information and receives some grant funding and guidance from the LIS Student Research Coalition. The goal of our study is to determine the current state of intellectual property (IP) education in LIS graduate programs. We believe IP issues already play an important role in the LIS field and that they will play an even more visible role as technology evolves. We hope you will consider participating in this very important study.

We are obtaining our data through the use of in-person interviews. We realize LIS schools are spread across the nation, and, as such, we have recruited and trained a group of highly qualified LIS students to assist with the interview process. This will ensure that someone is close enough to travel to your school for an interview.

Additional information about the logistics of our study can be found at www.lisstudentresearchcoalition.com/ip_study. We would like to obtain some initial data from your school prior to sending additional information about interviews. Please respond to this e-mail with the following information:

1. Does your MLS/MLIS program offer courses focusing, in part or entirely, on intellectual property (IP) issues? (IP issues include, but are not limited to, copyright, licenses and fair use.)

2. Are you willing to participate in an interview about IP education within your program?
Thank you for your time. We look forward to hearing from you. If you believe this message should be directed to another person within your program, please forward this information to them and kindly provide us with their name and title so that we may correct our records.

Jenniferanne Broido, Julie Camp, Lisa Duque, Tina Smith, and Ryan Valentin

Florida State University College of Information
Appendix B: Interview Guide

1. Does your program require dedicated IP courses? [If yes, go to 1a.-1c. If no, go to 1d.]

   1a: How often are required, dedicated courses offered? [If vague answers, such as “sometimes” are provided, probe for more specific answers. Go to 1b.]

   1b: Why are they offered more/less than other classes? [Go to 1c.]

   1c: How many seats are typically available in dedicated IP courses? Are all seats generally full at the end of registration? [If no, ask about how many seats are usually open.]

   1d: Why does your school require/not require dedicated IP courses?

2. Does your program require non-dedicated IP courses? [If yes, go to 2a.-2c. If no, go to 2d.]

   2a: How often are required, non-dedicated courses offered? [If vague answers, such as “sometimes” are provided, probe for more specific answers. Go to 2b.]

   2b: Why are courses offered more/less than other classes? [Go to 2c.]

   2c: How many seats are typically available in required non-dedicated IP courses? Are all seats generally full at the end of registration? [If no, ask about how many seats are usually open.]

   2d: Why does your school require/not require non-dedicated IP courses?

3. Does your program offer elective, dedicated IP courses? [If yes, go to 3a-3c. If no, go to 3d.]
3a: How often are elective, dedicated IP courses offered? [If vague answers, such as “sometimes” are provided, probe for more specific answers. Go to 3b.]

3b: Why are courses offered more/less than other courses? [Go to 3c.]

3c: How many seats are typically available in elective, dedicated IP courses? Are all seats generally full at the end of registration? [If no, ask about how many seats are usually open.]

3d: Why does your school offer/not offer elective, dedicated IP courses?

4. Does your program offer elective, non-dedicated IP courses? [If yes, go to 4a-4c. If no, go to 4d.]

4a: How often are elective, non-dedicated IP courses offered? [If vague answers, such as “sometimes” are provided, probe for more specific answers. Go to 4b.]

4b: Why are courses offered more/less than other courses? [Go to 4c.]

4c: How many seats are typically available in elective, non-dedicated IP courses? Are all seats generally full at the end of registration? [If no, ask about how many seats are usually open.]

4d: Why does your school offer/not offer elective, dedicated IP courses?

5. Does your school have plans to implement any version of IP courses in near future? [If yes, go to 5a.]

5a: What type [of those listed above] of course is it? [Go to 5b.]

5b: Why did you decide to implement this course?
Appendix C: Management Plan Timeline

Month 1

- Identify all qualifying ALA graduate LIS programs by director and contact information.
- Send out initial email identifying research proposal and follow up after two weeks allowing for additional two week response time for a four-week total timeframe from initial email to receipt of answers.

Month 2

- Identify sample participants and assign to appropriate East/West region.
- Contact LIS student research coalition to secure two volunteers at sample participant location.
- Coordinate and schedule volunteer training through online WebEx application.

Month 3

- Conduct interviews through site volunteers under the supervision of team coordinators.

Month 4

- Interview follow up and clarification.
- Interview responses coded.

Month 5

- Data analysis through NUD*IST application.

Month 6

- Compilation of study results and findings.
Appendix D: Budget

Personnel

Team Manager 1 (stipend)........................................................................30,000
Team Manager 2 (stipend)........................................................................30,000
Team Coordinator 1 (stipend).................................................................15,500
Team Coordinator 2 (stipend).................................................................15,500
Field Volunteer(s) (compensation).........................................................4,200

Total Personnel......................................................................................90,000

Equipment

NUD*IST (2 users, tech support).............................................................2,000
WebEx (2 users, tech support).................................................................2,000
Laptop Computer 1..............................................................................1,500
Laptop Computer 2..............................................................................1,500
Calling Cards.......................................................................................1,250
Miscellaneous Office Supply...............................................................2,000

Total Equipment..................................................................................10,250

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET..................................................................105,450