

2 Mar 2017 Supervisor Meeting 8

Created by: Gareth Ng (02/03/17) Edited and Vetted by: Jeremy Ong(02/03/17)

DATE		TIME	VENUE				
02-Mar-17		2:00 PM - 3:00 PM	SMU SIS M	R 4.6			
Meeting Type	Supervisor Meeting						
Facilitator	Jeremy Ong						
Note taker	Gareth Ng						
Timekeeper	Chermain Ang						
Attendees	Chermain Ang (CA), Gareth Ng (GN), Jeremy Ong (JO), Prof Kam Tin Seong (TS)						
Absentees	NA						
Agenda	Updates and clarification for changes performed after Interim presentation						
MEETING ITEM 1: Updates and clarification for changes performed Time Allocated 60 mins							
Name	Discussion			Follow Up By			
JO	values ir presenta (impute consider b. Showed towards	towards Latent Class Analysis (LCA) – binning of response rates in 10% blocks, as well as how we identified the clusters into Easy, Medium, and					
TS	fine.	•					
10	Medium (majority Hard clu credit ca since the with 0.5	hlighted to Prof Kam that only the Hard and dium clusters have questions with 0.5 credit ajority of questions with 0.5 credit are in the cd cluster), and asked if questions with 0.5 dit can be considered as a Hard question, ce there are only a small number of questions h 0.5 credit. Incurred with the suggestion, and shared that idea is to be able to assign a weight to the					
TS	Easy, Me suggeste Easy, Me	edium, and Hard questiced to assign a weight on edium, and Hard questic	ons, and 1,2, and 4 to the ons respectively.				
JO		sked if the scoring should be performed eparately for each subject component as well, or					



2 Mar 2017 Supervisor Meeting 8

Created by: Gareth Ng (02/03/17) Edited and Vetted by: Jeremy Ong(02/03/17)

	to do up a standardized scoring for the booklets only.	
	g. Mentioned that it would be good to have scores for each subject in the booklet, as well as the total scores for each booklet.	
TS	h. Suggested to tabulate the maximum scores for each booklet and derive the percentage score of each student based on the booklet they took, to have a standardized form of comparison.	10
10	i. Mentioned to Prof Kam that we intent to do an ANOVA test on the results after performing the standardized scoring, to identify if there are differences between Public and Private schools, and if there are no significant differences, to consider them all together in our following steps.	
TS	j. Recommended to consider looking into doing two models, one which combined both types of schools, and one which considers them separately, as they might have different form of teaching/syllabus.	
10	 Asked Prof Kam for suggestions on what other statistical test methods to read up on/consider for the PISA dataset 	
TS	I. Mentioned that for between group tests, ANOVA will be good enough. Subsequent steps to consider is on descriptive analysis, to see if there are any clear differences between different schools. Next, for explanatory analysis, to consider the relationships between school's services and performance for example, and for students, to identify student's performance with the factors available (e.g. family background). m. Suggested to read up on the Fit Linear Model chapter in the JMP help book, as well as to consider Stepwise analysis as well, to reduce the number of variables.	GN
10	n. Checked with Prof Kam on the considerations for using Mean or Median to look at the data distribution.	
TS	 o. Advised to look at the spread of the data. p. Mentioned that the team has only around 3 weeks to focus on data analysis, following which, to work on writing a practice paper. 	



2 Mar 2017 Supervisor Meeting 8

Created by: Gareth Ng (02/03/17) Edited and Vetted by: Jeremy Ong(02/03/17)

JO	q. Thanked Prof Kam for his advice and called an end to the Supervisor Meeting.
Remarks	

To-do

No.	Action Items	Person I/C	Deadline	Remarks
1h	Assign weight to questions based on assign cluster and perform scoring analysis	10	5 Mar 17	
1l, m	 Perform ANOVA test on the standardized scores for schools. Read up on the statistical methods mentioned and how to perform the analysis using JMP. 	GN	6 Mar 17	