

CENIC's One Gigabit or Bust Initiative
University Applications Task Force Meeting Minutes
November 15, 2004

The UniApps Panel had a free spirited discussion about the SFSU Ubiquitous Media Project and Survey. They have conducted extensive interviews on all CSU campuses.

1. The Ubiquitous Media Project will share their survey data with the UniApps Task force.
2. The data from the ongoing Ubiquitous Media Project will address many of the Task Force's inquiries about the terms of reference for assessing the role of the university in an information intensive environment.
3. What the appropriate ways of measuring or assessing the improvement to the learning experience through the use of high bandwidth technologies? How should the university adapt its own internal mechanisms to capture those potentialities?

University Applications Task Force

- A. SFSU: Joaquin
 - a. How to leverage the CENIC infrastructure for the mission
 - b. Applications requiring high bandwidth
 - c. Community stakeholders who interface with the university
- B. Ubiquitous Media:
 - a. Broadcast model is already being used
 - i. Final Cut enable that to some degree
 - ii. Costs have come down for digital video production
 - b. Collaborative Media that is network based
 - i. Suite of applications that could enable to put gigabit to the test
 - ii. Xerox laboratories
 1. actually deployed in Japan
 - c. Community Based Mode
 - i. Community service - broadcast, cinema, etc
 - ii. What are the most appropriate services that the university, economic development initiatives
 - iii. An incubator to test deployment of the services, embedded in existing practices, orgs can work with the university
 - iv. Working with faculty and students, what are the requirements? Not just a vision but a practical approach.
 - d. Look at the academic side –
 - i. How to enhance the teaching and learning process
 - ii. Went to all 23 CSU centers - about applications - technology is being used in non-appropriate. Funding is put in the wrong places. Academic Technology Report. Chancellor's Office Website.
- C. University of Phoenix: online instruction
 - a. Could be addressed online through the CSU system
 - b. What is the cost of generating an online course?
 - i. Syllabus can be repeated

- ii. Greater delivery efficiencies
 - iii. How we can drive technology to generate customer relationships
 - iv. Specific needs of faculty –
 - c. Making the transition - can you achieve the same goals in the online environment?
 - i. What student groups are this appropriate for?
 - ii. Information competence training or technology training?
- D. Role of the University
 - a. It is not the content, it is the learning experience
 - b. Facilitators of the learning.
 - c. Waste - training. Faculty doesn't know how to teach online.
- E. Educational Games
 - a. Info Smog –

Task Force - Entertainment Technology

- A. Commercial entertainment products
- B. The test bed is being built in SFSU
 - a. Not building the delivery of content
 - b. The Entertainment Task Force is not going to build the delivery system
 - c. How can we create more of a community - whereas content is one-way;
- C. Open educational resources, MIT, Third World Countries
 - a. How to assess the actual learning outcomes
 - b. An E-portfolio of film students
 - c. Collaborative Annotations
 - d. Ubiquitous Media - collaborations - you can simultaneously annotate
 - e. The technology will help a greater number of learners succeed, one of the metrics will be dollars per student or megabits per student
 - f. Assessment or learning objectives