**Meeting Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | 09-10-2014 |
| Time: | 6:00 PM – 6:40 PM |
| Location: | SIS level 5 faculty lounge |
| Purpose: | Mid-terms feedback review and user test design consultation |

**Attendees:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | ✓ | Role | Reasons for Absent |
| Young Soo | ✓ | Reviewer for Mid-terms |  |
| Clarice Ang | ✓ | Deputy PM / UX Designer |  |
| Goh Chun Yang | ✓ | Lead Developer |  |
| Syafi Salim | ✓ | QA / Business Analyst |  |

**Agenda:**

Discuss mid-terms feedback with the reviewer (on the comments he made).

**Discussion:**

1. User testing - representation for mid-terms was acceptable, but we should try to improve on our explanation.
   1. Prof. did not understand our explanation during mid-terms probably because we did not put our point across properly.
2. Profiling/ categorizing our users for user testing is good, but we should understand if the users will be useful for us to find out how to improve our application.
   1. Explained why we want to engage Prof. Venky for our user testing, he finds the reason acceptable. So we can try to use this kind of reasoning when we choose them for our user testing.
   2. However, we might want to be more careful with why we want to engage the students for user testing. (how they would value add to our application feedback)
3. Regarding on his comment to come up with more complex scenarios for our demo, he was referring to how the parameters are fixed during the demonstration, which he did not understand the value in our application then.
   1. Maybe we can show more detailed use of our parameters and different data for running the simulation in our application.
4. Prof. Young Soo, suggest that at least one of us should try to understand the queuing theory/model in case if questions are raised during our final presentation. (i.e. mm1/mmc/mms)