

# CS280r Final Project Report

## Project Name

My Name

---

### Abstract

---

#### 1. Introduction

Correctly specifying an agenda helps to keep meeting topics on track, on time and helps to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the meeting (Schwartz, 2015) (Lehmann-Willenbrock et al., 2013). Schwartz (2015) continues by stating the importance of including items in the agenda that reflect the needs of the individuals in the team. Lehmann-Willenbrock et al. (2013) assert that unmanaged social interaction leads to poor decision making, ineffective communication and unnecessary conformity. In this light, we have revisited the Care Coordination work presented by Amir et al. (2015) and focus on designing a human-computer collaboration tool that is able to manage the creation of an agenda that is relevant for a diverse team of individuals. (Arber, 2008) is in agreement with the thesis here that meetings significantly affect the performance of the medical team and on the care that the patient receives. The purpose of this system is to extend Procaccia et al. (2016) ‘Voting Rules’ framework and text mining techniques to create an initial set of structured agenda items that can then be agreed upon in advance. Furthermore, some of the specific obstacles to efficient teamwork demonstrated in the Amir et al. (2015) study shows that members of the team often find large meetings unproductive and not related to the work that they are doing with the patient. Having a structured agenda in advance will help the team members filter through the potentially time wasting and irrelevant content such that they can address the pertinent issues at hand. Following Schwartz (2015) framework for creating an effective meeting agenda, we propose an agent that is able to source the relevant agenda items, action points and required duration from the team prior to the meeting occurring.

(Fatima et al., 2004) present a view of negotiations where agents all benefit by reaching an agreement but all have conflicting ideas over how certain tasks should be executed. In a similar way, agents in Amir et al. (2015) medical setting may have differing opinions on the best and most important treatment plans that require discussion, but reaching a feasible agreement in advance...

## 2. Body of the Paper

- **Experimental Design.** A description of the experiment that was run; enough detail should be provided that the reader could reasonably duplicate the experiment. Results should not be reported in this section.
- **Results.** A report of the results of the experiments, and their significance.

### 2.1. Citations

Here are two examples of how to cite a paper properly:

- ? shows that ...
- Prior work has shown that ... (?).

## 3. Related Work

Discussion of previous important, similar work in the area with comparison to the particular approach taken and results of the paper. Avoid simply providing a laundry list of other work that is somehow related to the subject of the paper. This section should contain brief, in depth discussions of the work most similar to your project, i.e., to research that takes an approach to the problem or produces results with which your project should be compared. As is always the case with written work, throughout the paper you should have citations to work that you draw on. For example, if you have adapted a system, include a citation to the system when you first mention it; if you are extending a formalization, include a citation to the original on first mention. If you are unclear about whether a simple citation suffices or an extended discussion is needed in the Related Work section, look at the papers read for class this semester for models. If you are still unsure, check with the teaching staff.

## 4. Conclusion

Describes the insights that can be taken away from the work reported in the paper.

## 5. Future work

Suggests extensions or challenges raised by the project.

R. Schwartz, How to Design an Agenda for an Effective Meeting, Harvard Business Review .

N. Lehmann-Willenbrock, J. A. Allen, S. Kauffeld, A sequential analysis of procedural meeting communication: How teams facilitate their meetings, Journal of Applied Communication Research 41 (4) (2013) 365–388.

- O. Amir, B. J. Grosz, K. Z. Gajos, S. M. Swenson, L. M. Sanders, From care plans to care coordination: Opportunities for computer support of teamwork in complex healthcare, in: Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, ACM, 1419–1428, 2015.
- A. Arber, Team meetings in specialist palliative care: Asking questions as a strategy within inter-professional interaction, *Qualitative Health Research* 18 (10) (2008) 1323–1335.
- A. D. Procaccia, N. Shah, Y. Zick, Voting rules as error-correcting codes, *Artificial Intelligence* 231 (2016) 1–16.
- S. S. Fatima, M. Wooldridge, N. R. Jennings, An agenda-based framework for multi-issue negotiation, *Artificial Intelligence* 152 (1) (2004) 1–45.