**Internal Meeting 8**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | 3 March 2018 |
| Time: | 7.30pm – 10pm |
| Venue: | SMU SOB GSR |
| Attendees: | Joanne Ong Shi Ying  John Koh Wei De  Rachel Tay |
| Absentees: |  |
| Agenda: | Interim Submission Preparation |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Details | Action By | Due Date |
| 1 | Data cleaning and preparation   * Re-cleaned the 3-hour and 3-day datasets   + Include only ‘Undergraduates’ in our analysis   + Renamed ‘sufficiency measure’ to ‘overdue period’   + Add binary column (Y/N) ‘Overdue?’ | John and Rachel | - |
| 2 | Analysis   * + For  those borrowing for only half an hour before returning, look at the user borrowings and see if they are only borrowing the books once. This would possibly point towards instances of photocopying.   + Summary table     - Which students are borrowing once?     - Successions     - Time elapsed between loans per user for the same title       * If user hasn’t borrowed before, NIL.       * If he has, # of hours in between the borrowings * If data is highly skewed, then mean test is not good, use nonparametric test. * Add the hours up together when you find that the users are borrowing per succession.   + Count every successions then do a distributions of the successions.   + Re-shelving takes at least 15 minutes. To be safe, can be between 3-4 hours. * How long the course reserves remain idle. * We want to increase the loan periods, but is there evidence to show it? Why is it not enough? Find ways to prove the reasoning. “I have to borrow many books in a row?”.   + High repeated borrowings of the same book   + Borrow once then photocopy   + Just overdue the book | All | - |

Meeting was adjourned at 10pm. These minutes will be circulated and adopted if there are no amendments reported in the next three days.

**Agenda for next meeting**

1. Finish up data cleaning
2. Start on some analysis
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Vetted and edited by,
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