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# introduction

The follow report outlines the contents of meetings held between Mr A. Ramnath, Miss K. Nathoo and Mr C. Noble.

The minutes discussed various issues that arose during the project investigation which sought to improve the web browsing experience for the elderly. The team members, K. Nathoo and C. Noble, met the Mr A. Ramnath, an experienced software developer and lecturer at Wits University, to ensure that the investigation did not deviate from its designated purpose. The meetings were held between the 6th of September and the 16th of October. Meetings were held on an almost weekly basis.

# minutes

## 6 September

* Project should investigate specific application interfaces.
* Interface should be easy enough to learn for appropriate audience (elderly).
* An investigation should be done to determine what sorts of web browsing the elderly would like. Consider duplicating such sites.
* Achieve functionality early so that testing can be commenced early.
* Later versions may include some sort of audio feedback of pages.
* Meetings will generally be held on Mondays at 14:00 except for next week, which will be Tuesday.

## 20 September

* Rigorous (broad) testing procedure vs. scientific (specific) testing procedure disused. Up to us as what approach to take.
* Use of Iterations mentioned.
* Possibility of conducting some tests on simple WebPages discussed and then extending to test if principle still holds on more complicated pages.
* Should find people who are computer literate for better testing
* The difference between proving and testing was discussed. This experiment is a test and not a proof. This means that an extensive sample space is not required.
* Possibly scout out old age homes
* A large of aim of the project is about understanding and working around the target audience and not about complex code implementation
* The finally report should make proposals with the results found

## 25th September

* Possibility of server side processing discussed
* The tradeoffs of creating pages dynamically (annotating) vs. hard coding the pages
* Find re-occurring elements of popular WebPages (for instance, drop down boxes etc.)
* Compare the different voice referencing techniques on simple and more complex WebPages
* Architecture of implementation is not vital as this is not the main aim of the project
* Result biasing of informal experiments discussed
* Have a demonstration ready for next meeting
* Testing should have set manual questions if not everything can be incorporated into the site
* Start building in a few extra program features

## 3 October

* Make the navigation more user friendly now
* Automatic mode for speech recognition is better
* Try find ways of avoiding or rather detecting explicit problems with the PAI.
* Think generally about how we can make the third iteration more user-friendly. That is. How do we give it a better interface?

## 10 October

* Content of the poster was discussed. Should include, title, name, school name. Not too much righting should be put on the poster
* What aspect specifically of numerical referencing is better than spoken link names
* Might want to test one or two individuals to help results. This is fine, so long as actual implementation is done by open day
* Make the last iteration more of a qualitative assessment
* Look at making burden on system user earlier by improving interface
* Project should be able to derive suggestions for future work
* Each use case should highlight individual features of the program one at a time (for the last iteration)
* Consider addressing problems of region problems on pages
* Possibly introduce a bookmarking feature
* Issue of HTML frames discussed
* Numerical could be adjusted to modify pages for more complicated pages (e.g. According to sections etc.)
* Some features do not have to be implemented. These can just be asked in the form of survey
* Surveys should ask the questions of whether or not they consider the webpage a close enough resemblance to real pages
* Ask more experienced test subjects specifically about problems they might perceive with the current implantation
* Final report must demonstrate the decision judgement (thought)

## 16 October

* Paper size of poster discussed. Flexible
* Airtime used for data bundles to conduct testing can be claimed form the budget
* Poster should not be too wordy
* Photos can be put up on a secondary poster
* Consider having a short section for technologies used
* Await email confirmation from Aveer regarding venues
* We can keep testing up until open day
* Report should highlight future work

# conclusion

This report has provided an outline of the minutes taken during project meetings between the project supervisor, Mr A. Ramnath at Wits University, and two student project members, Miss K. Nathoo and Mr C. Noble. Various important aspects of investigations were highlighted during the meetings. One such aspect being that investigation projects do not aim to provide eloquently structured complete software packages, but rather, enabling particular investigation questions to be answered by achieving required functionality with specifically designed software. This principle was a chief guiding factor for the duration of the project.