

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE**  
SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING, TECHNOLOGY, AND COMPUTER SCIENCE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Dianne Bezdon, Chair  
University Resources Policy Committee

SUBJECT: Use of Technology Fee

DATE: September 11, 1998

Disposition: For Information Only

Attached is a recommendation clarification from BAS to Walt Branson, VCFA and ITPC. A response from Branson is also included. BAS will be forwarding the recommendation again to Branson and through him to ITPC, and *is for information only* to the Senate.

copy G. Bullion

---

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY**  
**Fort Wayne**  
**2101 Coliseum Boulevard East**  
**Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805**

**BUDGETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE**

TO: IPFW Faculty Senate

FROM: Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Use of Technology Fee

DATE: August 24, 1998

Re: For Information only

On May 8, 1998, the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee sent to Walt Branson, Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs, and through him to the Information Technology Policy Committee, a clarification of our prior recommendation. Our recommendation is intended to have the Technology Fee be as widely used for all IPFW students as is possible.

On June 19, 1998, Walt Branson sent the enclosed reply to the BAS Chair, George Bullion.

The Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee will once again send this recommendation to Walt Branson, and through him to the Information Technology Policy Committee, for their consideration, operational change, and policy change.

Thank you.

---

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY - PURDUE UNIVERSITY**  
**Fort Wayne**  
**2101 Coliseum Boulevard East**  
**Fort Wayne, Indiana 46805**

**BUDGETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE**

**TO:** Walter J. Branson, VCFA  
Information Technology Policy Committee members:  
Branson, Borelli, English, Christy, Hollander, Cigna, Dahl, Schoeler, Jones J., Lane  
P., Manalis, Violette,  
Franke, Newell  
**FROM:** George W. Bullion, Chair  
Members:  
Barrett, Cochren, Guthrie, Oberstar, Pacer, Pippert, Thuente D.

**SUBJECT:** Clarification of a recent BAS recommendation  
Concerning the Student Technology Fee usage

**DATE:** May 8, 1998

Approximately 1 1/2 years ago the Budgetary Affairs Subcommittee made a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Financial Affairs regarding the use of the Student Technology Fee. Mr. Branson took our recommendation to the ITPC and it was subsequently acted upon favorably.

It has come to our attention that the main intent has not been fully implemented and we now take this opportunity to clarify our intent and ask for immediate corrections and implementation for the 1998-1999 academic year budget and that of subsequent years.

As background we point out the following items that were part of our original, and now clarified, recommendation:

1. The Student Technology Fee increases in total value each year at the same rate as the increase for student regular course fees. This of course means that the total pool of money enlarges each year.
2. The original policy for the use of this funding source targeted hardware.

3. The BAS recommendation clearly noted that this was a somewhat shortsighted policy. As the number of labs increased the need for supplies to meet the increasing use and needs of students was apparent. Supplies should also include software needs where appropriate.

4. BAS further noted that support for either Teaching Assistants or Consultants in the labs would also be an appropriate use of the technology fee funds. In this we did not expect that current planned budgets would be supplemented with the technology fee funds. We clearly saw the funds to expand the assistance for students.

5. The term laboratory was to be interpreted in the broadest connotation to include all labs that the technology fee would be allowed to support. This should include those laboratories that are used as computer classrooms.

It has recently come to our attention that in the area of computer labs, *ONLY* laboratories under the direct aegis and control of Computing and Data Processing are being supported. This is clearly not the intent of our original recommendation.

We now clarify our recommendation and ask that all laboratories (computer and otherwise) share in the Student Technology Fee pool of funds in the area of supplies (recurring expenses). This may need to be done on a proportionality approach for the next year or so.

It is clear to BAS that after the next couple of open computing laboratories are established for Computing and Data Processing their original planning and needs (that were finite) will have been met. At the same time it is also clear that many departmental labs will be aging to the point of needed replacement on a planned and prioritized schedule. It is expected that the Information Technology Policy Committee will take up this issue in the next year or so.

BAS will also look in on this issue, but in the meantime would like to note the following:

1. The Student Technology Fee **SHOULD** support all student technology use at IPFW, not just the primary use of Computing and Data Processing.

2. The Student Technology Fee pool of available annual funds will continue to rise.

3 . All indications are that hardware costs will continue to decrease.

4. The technology fee should support both recurring and non-recurring costs if this funding source is to be used to ultimate effectiveness in support of students at IPFW.

Your immediate consideration of our clarification of our original recommendation, and your recognition of our ongoing concern for student support, will be appreciated. We look forward to your earliest response and actions in regards to the budget planning for the use of the Student Technology Fee.

cc: Mike Wartell, Chancellor

Faculty Senate for Information Only (Fall, 1998)

---

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE  
VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FINANCIAL AFFAIRS  
**MEMORANDUM**

TO: George Bullion  
FROM: Walt Branson  
DATE: June 19, 1998  
SUBJECT: BAS Technology Fee Recommendation

I took the BAS Technology Fee memo of 5/8/98 to the ITPC for their consideration. In general, there was no opposition to the recommendations. In fact, there was very strong support from some individuals. The majority of the committee members felt that at this time the priority for the student technology fee should continue to be recurring and nonrecurring purchases that directly impact the most students. To support this position, the committee voted to recommend that the Chancellor approve the attached policy for use of the funds for 1998-99. Please note that this policy is to be reviewed yearly.

With this policy in mind, the committee then voted to recommend that the Chancellor approve the attached schedule of expenditures for 1998-99. The year 1999-2000 is presented for planning purposes only and will be acted on by the committee next year. As you can see, the list reflects the continued creation and upgrade of the open student labs as well as other items that impact all students. I still remain optimistic that at some point there should be funding available for the upgrading and addition of department labs but at this time that is not the committee's highest priority.

I am sure the committee would be happy to have you attend a future meeting if you would like.

att.

---

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE

**POLICY ON USE OF TECHNOLOGY FEE FUNDS**

APPROVED BY THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE, JUNE 24, 1997

AMENDED BY THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE, JUNE  
11, 1998

**Eligible** Technology Fee funds can be used to support the acquisition of both goods and

**Expenditures**

**Services** Eligible goods include computers and associated peripherals, infrastructure, software, and supplies for

use by students in the production or acquisition of knowledge. Eligible services include costs associated

with maintaining the above goods, and are limited by Purdue University policy to a fixed percentage of

Technology Fee income; these services include costs for consulting, maintenance and repair, and telephone lines dedicated to student-operated computers.

Specifically excluded are goods and services targeted at supporting university administration or instructional initiatives—for example, equipment and materials designed for use by instructional personnel in or outside of classrooms, laboratories, and similar instructional settings.

**Priorities** In allocating Technology Fee monies among eligible expenditures, the following 3 principles should obtain:

- Preference should be given to expenditures that promise benefits to the largest number of students. Proposals for Technology Fee funding should provide detailed information about the likely number of students benefiting from the proposed expenditure.
- Preference should be given to technologies of proven effectiveness and utility rather than to novel and emerging technologies.
- Attention should be given to ensuring that new information-technology expenditures are compatible with and complementary to existing and planned parts of the overall system.

**Annual Review** The Information Technology Policy Committee should review and, as necessary, revise this policy on an annual basis.

Senate Reference No. 98-11

IPFW STUDENT TECHNOLOGY FEE USE

*Updated, June 12, 1998*

<b>Total</b>	<b>Recurring</b>	<b>Non-Recurring</b>
1998-99 student tech fee revenue \$803,560	\$200,890	\$602,670
	<b>Approved</b>	
<b>Proposed Recurring Funds <u>2000</u></b>	<b><u>1998-99</u></b>	<b><u>1999-</u></b>
Novell/Corel License* \$25,000-\$35,000	\$20,000-\$30,000	

Dial-In Telephone Lines	\$15,000-\$20,000
\$20,000-\$25,000	
Microsoft License	\$45,000-\$50,000
\$45,000-\$50,000	
Laser Printer Paper	\$20,000-\$25,000
\$25,000-\$30,000	
Toner Cartridges	\$20,000-\$25,000
\$22,000-\$25,000	
Open Lab Student Consultants	\$45,000-\$55,000
\$55,000-\$60,000	
Application Software Maintenance	\$30,000-\$40,000
\$45,000-\$50,000	
 Total Recurring;	 \$195,000-\$240,000
<u>\$237,000-\$275,000</u>	

**Nonrecurring Funds**  
**2000**

	<b><u>1998-99</u></b>	<b><u>1999-</u></b>
Campus Network Infrastructure	\$ 50,000-\$ 60,000	\$
60,000-\$70,000		
Replacement Labs		
Upgrade KT 204-A&B (56)	\$115,000-\$125,000	--
-		
Upgrade Library Lab (19)	---	\$
45,000-\$ 65,000		
Kettler 217D - Mac (18)		\$
45,000-\$ 55,000		
Add Kiosks (10+)	\$ 6,000-\$ 12,000	
???		
Security Infrastructure Development	\$160,000-\$190,000	
???		
User Authorization & Management		
System for Lab Login, Mail,		
Web space & Internet Security		
Infrastructure Replacement/Upgrade	\$ 60,000-\$ 90,000	\$
60,000-\$ 90,000		
Email - Network Components		
New Labs		
Walb Union (proposed 65)	---	
\$240,000-\$260,000		
Kettler 232 (40)	\$190,000-\$220,000	-
--		
 Incremental Application Software Licenses	 \$ 65,000-\$ 90,000	
<u>65,000-\$ 90,000</u>		

Total Non-Recurring  
\$515,000-\$620,000

\$646,000-\$797,000

Novell/Corel license is under negotiation. Cost could increase.