

Team One Piece

Date: 27/09/2014

Location: SIS GSR 3-1

Subject: Supervisor Meeting (Demo & Midterm Preparation)

Attendee(s): Prof Kim, Aniket, Ila, Chenguang, Mi Mi, Siddhant

Absentee(s): Phyu Phyu

AGENDA

1. User Testing SMU scheduling and execution
2. User Acceptance Testing (BP) scheduling and execution
3. Preparation for Test Plans (BP & SMU)
 - Consent Form
 - Test Instructions
 - Survey
 - Observation form
4. Midterm presentation draft discussion
5. Changes requested
 - Schedule Publish/Recall
 - Optional Hint for Take Quiz
6. Which team presentation should we see during Mid Term
7. Wiki enhancement
8. Next Supervisor meeting agenda and timing
9. Market Research - Technical comparison in market

Discussion and feedback:

- **Highlight unique features of the system- spend 5 minutes discussing Impressify and Hibernate.**
- Presentation rehearsal to be done next week with prof.
- Requested 1 hr 30 minutes for next week's meeting.
- Some teams are integrating more complicated solutions- we have to show our unique things in order to sell the idea. Show reviewers that this is not a simple thing.
- Need to internally discuss how to decorate technical complexity.
- Structure of data is not complicated but implementation is pretty complicated.
- One slide on the same.
- Complexity in handling multiple files- word documents, csv, pptx, audio and video
- Must highlight the problems we were facing during integration- this is pretty complicated.
- Next week we need to decorate content instead of coding new functionalities
- **Our UI has already been accepted by the client, hence we are just doing AB functional testing and not AB UI testing.**
- Will implement the stats, schedule and text editor tool after midterm.
- Need to finish media uploads too.
- Improving existing functions is a wrong answer.
- Effectiveness of checkpoint and timer must be tested- prof likes this idea.
- Results should look like this: the group that has done the checkpoint and timer has done better than others.
- Can you say anything by comparing the two user tests? Can you draw a link between the two?
- What if BP's evaluation is better than students? Good
- What if vice versa? Collect feedback as to what can be improved.
- Irrespective of whether there is a synergy between BP and SMU user tests or not we need to draw parallels.
- Stress importance of BP's feedback in case of vast difference in feedback.
- Text editor: even if there are 100 Singapore based downloads it is a good thing.
- Impressify is a new technology: first FYP team to use this system.

- **1 slide on why Impressify and not its competitors.**
- Can't say "magazines suggested that Impressify is best". Must say "our evaluation is"
- **Contact Barthaz and ask him to help us put a link**
- In mid-term say "we've already contacted him/her"
- This x factor is good for mid term
- Need to be careful while saying "Deployment". Deployment in our case means test or sandbox deployment and **not** live.
- **November deployment must be done to get points for deployment (Go Live)**
- Showing proof the slides now ...
 - o Identify the personas.
 - o He likes the flow of the presentation
 - o Highlight changes in scope and schedule. This part is 5%.
 - o Bug metrics shouldn't take much time. They are more of backup.
 - o More time should be allocated to technical complexity and system demo and more meaty stuff.
 - o Inputting more visuals (just like team Zircon) would help in highlighting complexity.
- T – Test for quantitative analysis of responses from UAT
- Highlight the purpose of both UAT's and how they complemented each other

Prepared by,
Aniket Pinakin Pujara

Edited and vetted by,
Siddhant Kanaujia