# TEAM HEI

# SUPERVISOR MEETING MINUTES 08, 8 APRIL 2015

| | |
|---|---|
| **Subject:** | Minutes 08 |
| **Date:** | 8 April 2015 |
| **Time:** | 11.00 am |
| **Venue:** | SMU SIS, Level 5 Supervisor's Office |
| **Secretary:** | Keith Tan |

**Attendees:**

1. Professor Benjamin Gan
2. Ngoh Jun Dat
3. Chester Chiew Wei Hong
4. Keith Tan Xiang Wei
5. Kong Yu Ning

**Meeting Agenda:**

1. Update on User Tests
2. Review of Final Presentation
3. Questions
4. Any Other Busines

## Planned Agenda

- General feedback: Prof is worried our slides are too long and do not have enough time
- Need to put the insights of the MOM in the UT slides
  - What we learnt (Very important)
- 1st problem statement is a bit general
  - Prof questioned "Govt agencies NOT ABLE TO TRACK THE EFFECTIVENESS" as he doubts that is really the case. He claims that they DO track but we need to be specific about what they do not track but is important to say what can our system do for them
  - Be specific about keywords like "tracking"
- Prof don't understand what is "No leads" for 2nd problem statement
  - Feels that our problem statements is like "saving the world"
  - "Problem statement has to be clear"
  - Be very specific how our application can solve.
  - E.g. "I want to reduce the sun ray exposure, because I invented a sun-block lotion"
- Prof view:
  - Spam test is not accurate since only testing 100 emails. He feels 2000 emails were a much bigger difference and the spam test we did was not "quantifiable"
- Survey results:
  - Need to be clear that this survey is done by IDA
  - Data to support your needs, but not your work
- Challenges faced:
  - Too many words
  - Too general. How many people you interview, what are the questions asked etc

- o Be specific about what you did, who you did with
- o State clearly the quantitative/qualitative stuff
- Our Research Slide #20
  - o Need to explain clearer what is in the Obama campaign and how did it help them
- Project Motivation Slide #21
  - o Did not get crux of the interview, hence, linking back to "challenges faced"
- Progress Summary
  - o It will always be 100% when you make scope changes
  - o Should compare planned vs actual to make a comparison of status completion
- Prof's feedback for last skit:
  - o It was fun, making a dry topic interesting.
  - o If the objective is the same, do the same with a different scenario
  - o Be more specific who is the actual client instead of "popular philanthropist
  - o Idea: Can have an idea of MOM scenario where it is interesting and people are talking about
    - ▪ Why are people doing AB test?
    - ▪ Why are people sending emails?
    - ▪ Have some concepts to portray how system can help
- Architecture diagram:
  - o This diagram only shows the third party tools we are using, would be nice to have a different diagram about the modules that we have and the class component and modules. Database layer
  - o Something that shows how we design our architecture, flexibility, stuck with certain things, how we deal with interface issues
- Technical Complexities slides:
  - o Talk about it on Friday
- Quality attributes:
  - o Maintainability is unable to achieve.
    - ▪ Skip the part that it is maintainable
    - ▪ If we use the system for 10 years, and there are many changes and many things are able to change easily, then it is maintainable
  - o Usability:
    - ▪ We can't really say it is usable when we don't really have any real users using it yet.
    - ▪ It is all relative until it is used by real users.
    - ▪ Can say we did some tests, compare relativity, we asked some questions and users said this that.
  - o Advice is don't go into "Quality attributes"
  - o Performance:
    - ▪ Example is doing caching and they look at all the possible caching like slow load, lazy load etc and finally chose the best code
  - o Flexible vs hardcoded:
    - ▪ Whether it is easy to change.
    - ▪ Easy to achieve. Can try
  - o Main thing is like for usability is to compare many scenarios, like whereby we can look at how it looks in this browser and how it looks in another browser and come up with a plan for it
- X-Factor:
  - o Prof thinks it has not gone live yet as even many agencies treat us as testing
  - o Live is rarely hard but it is those apple applications that is live. For those case, it is the number of downloads they have to show then. They also have to compare sales vs downloads
  - o "We have convinced companies to use our system in a real email campaign to send out email campaigns"
- **User Test: IMPORTANT section**
  - o Explain what each user test is about and the number of users, with how many responses, plus how we randomly selected A and B variant, and then from there, what did we learn, such as "sending out emails on Monday" is really bad. This is the kind of insights they are looking for, which is all we are talking about earlier in problem statements

- E.g. " We sent out emails to IDA employees to invite them to a dinner-and-dance"
- E.g. " We found out that sending out emails on Monday is bad… because… "
  - Did you help IDA find out about the recipients email patterns
- Need to consider confounding variables as taught in IDP?
- **INSIGHTS!** is extremely important, which can be our X-factor:
  - As a result of this past campaign, they have decided to change the email campaign template such that next year, there will be how many emails with what template sending out. Main thing is to show that there is an action based on our insights
- Challenges faced:
  - It is important. Like how we face many difficulties such as email spam, email sending problem, A/B from 2 to 6 etc.
  - List down all the challenges faced
    - E.g. Spam issues
    - Emails not sending out
    - Convincing Government agencies to use our system
    - Adopting a new language (C#)
- Take some time to do about reflections. Was there something we learn from this course that we did not get from other modules. What makes courses like this interesting or bad. Like if we meet with real problem and is stressed to improve it with the limited constraints we have. Main thing is for prof to understand what to improve from this course. We can use this part to suck his lup cheong.
- Do not focus so much on Emerson awards. Focus on IS480 awards better
  - **IS480 award**
    - *Technical complexity*
      - Abit hard probably the weakest point that we have
      - Our technical complexity is not our fighting point
    - *Value for sponsor*
      - Explain IDA is going to do this and that
      - How much value can we provide for our users
      - Couple the insights for the user and the recipients
      - Solving a specific need and not the whole picture
    - *Project Management*
      - Always addressing the current issues that we face
        - Spam issues, load issues
      - New features and
      - Getting different agencies to accept our solutions
        - Going above and beyond to look for test opportunities
        - Coordinating the UTs for different departments
- Can loan projector under Prof name

## Others

1. **Next Supervisor Meeting**

   **1.1.** The team confirmed with Prof ben that the next supervisor meeting would be on the 10th April.

**Action Items:**

| Task | Due Date | Member in-charge |
|------|----------|------------------|
| Amend Slides | 10th April | Jun Dat |

The meeting was adjourned at 11.15 am. These minutes will be circulated and adopted if there are no amendments reported in the next three days.

**Prepared by,**

Ngoh Jun Dat

**Vetted and edited by,**

Kong Yu Ning