Consultation Meeting Minutes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date/Time | 16th Jan 2017, 4:00pm to 5:00pm |
| Venue | SMU SISS Meeting Room 4.6 |
| Attendees | Prof Kam, Albert, Jun Liang, Russell |
| Agenda | 1. Share findings so far for review 2. Determine areas to work on |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Task/Description | Person in Charge | Due Date |
| 1 | Comments on the final proposal  Prof Kam commented that:   * For our project, there was no need for the homepage * Ideally, the landing page should be the project description, and the roadmap should not be put there; instead, put the executive summary * Executive summary can be more dynamic as the project progresses * It would be good to describe the company, the approach that the group is taking and the operations service flow * A summary of system that the group is looking at should be provided, as well as one thing that the group should be working on * The final proposal should describe the business in greater detail – for example, going into what kind of content they provide; it should also be content rich with text, photos and videos included. | All | 23 Jan |
| 2 | Comments on further development – main website  Professor Kam commented that:   * The group would need to explore the sponsor more because their business is slightly different and brainstorm * The sponsor’s main website was neat and organised, with clear categories for articles * With the current data we have and what may be obtained from their main website, we might not need to ask for more data, especially since the website is relatively content-rich compared to the Facebook site. He suggested looking deeper into the posts in the sponsor’s website. * With 6 months’ worth of data, the group should spend time to look through each of the topics, try to extract data to find out the number of screen shots and quality of the pictures, and finally map this with the measures that the group already has. * The reviews section of the website is quite rich, and suggested looking more into these reviews to obtain more insights, and also to check if the sponsor specially engages people to do these reviews. * The group could conduct a study on how consistent these reviewers are * A reviewer to note would be a ‘Rachel Yohannan’ who has done numerous reviews * The objective would be to determine if the reviews are consistent, and to determine if they can retain viewers that are regular and consistent * The group could explore how the sponsor rates its ‘top 500’ contributors, and also whether it is useful to analyse these contributors and review whether their current internal rankings are in line with the analysis that the group is doing. | All | 23 Jan |
| 3 | Comments on further development – general  Professor Kam commented that:   * The group should carefully evaluate what is the value of various Facebook Insights information – like what they tell us, number of views and content and such. * An example for this to gain good insight is the question of whether there is a difference in terms of views i.e. difference between this post and a post of another same nature. For instance, taking 30 or 50 and doing a comparison, find out whether there is a difference in the ratings, and hence evaluate what the key factors that make up this difference are. * Within these 6 months of data, determine how many of the posts or videos are under the food/travel category, for example. With that, the group should be able to direct and search the content on the website itself. These can be crawled out of the sponsor’s CMS. * The group could find out the number of photos, the quality of the descriptions (whether they are in paragraphs or just small sentences). * The group could map the content from the pages into Facebook * There could be more focused analysis by comparing differences if split into more categories * The distribution could be compared by looking at the categories. Extract the actual content and compare – in terms of the images, image grading, video grading, JMP Pro text explorations amongst others | All | 23 Jan |
|  | Comments on further development – general  Professor Kam commented that:   * The objectives for the proposal need to be revised. * For this case, first want to study the content of the webpage, to identify the similarities and differences. To compare and contrast, study the uniqueness of their content. * The group might want to explore Facebook insight data to compare the total lifetime views for different categories and then translate this to the scope of the work. Can break it down to the broad base. Go further down to the scope of work to discuss what we have. Be more focused on what the group want to do in its investigations. * Analysis should not just look at the data only, need to look into the context and see the post message from the link itself. Find out what causes these differences. * The group might want to ask for or extract the actual posts that correspond to the 4/6 months of data given already. * These changes do not have to be written into the proposal, but should be considered when revising the wiki page later. * The group should organise the home page better – ideally having the project summary as the homepage, and the ‘About Us’ tab last. * The group should revisit the content of the posts, and try to determine what are the characteristics that tend to make a post viral, doing this by extracting a few characteristics and comparing whether they are statistically different or significant, and comparing these for those posts that went viral and those that did not. * The sponsor could be benchmarked against other companies. However, it was noted that unless data was publicly available, this was likely to be quite difficult. * The group’s documentation is missing. * The group should take some time to revise the motivation etc. because the interim report is not on the quality alone but also whether there has been improvement made to comments. * For the Gantt chart, there should be clear indication on who is being assigned to do what job. | All | 23 Jan |