Follow up 4/08/2011 meeting

Attendees: Christie, Clamann, Kaber, Gil, Qin, Yu, Zhu

Hello everyone,
As a follow-up to the meeting on 4/08/2011, below are the notes and the action items I recorded. Please advise if I have missed anything.

Meeting Notes

1) Additional experiment.
   i. Issues: we have 6 augmented VR, 7 basic VR and 8 native BD subjects. In order to use all of the subjects with balanced conditions \((8^3)\), we need three more subjects for 2 augmented VR, 1 basic VR subjects. However, it makes our subjects unbalanced gender.
      1. We decided to ignore gender balance.
      2. We will just recruit 3 more subjects to make a balance for each condition.
      3. There are two subjects starting from next Tuesday (4/12).

2) ROCF Scoring:
   i. Purpose of using the automated scoring program.
      1. Non-expert can score the ROCF.
   ii. Caesar’s scoring results are machine scores not expert score.
   iii. They will not be compared with expert’s scores (Dr. Tupler).
   iv. Results of comparing post and pre ROCF machine scores:
      1. ANOVA results indicated that there was no significant effect of condition.
      2. There are 8 negative score differences.
         a. This is just a negative value. It could be just a decreased skill.
         b. We will compare these values with Dr. Tupler’s results (expert’s results) to see what the differences are.
      3. The results of augmented VR shows the least variable while basic VR shows the largest variable.
      4. With respect to the average of differences, augmented VR results shows the highest improvement while basic VR shows the least improvement of motor skill.
      5. Both show identical results.
   v. Divided ROCF analysis
1. Caesar divided RCOF into unit sets for scoring that can represent different types, areas or shapes.
2. Some units show worse scores than others such as a diamond, cross and circle.
   a. Some of them may have less interest to draw something.
   b. (MICHAEL) We will prepare questionnaire for motivation of a second ROCF drawing.
   c. These analysis methods can be used to identify which type of shape or drawing can be improved by our rehabilitation method.

3) Additional data analysis
   i. (Janet) Need to analyze confidence-rating questionnaire.

4) Preparation of full experiment:
   i. We need to discuss augmented VR features for the full experiment.
      1. Other feedback methods (e.g., audio cue)
      2. Remove force feedback
   ii. (Linus) check augmented VR program
      1. When subject picks the side surface, the visual cue shows wrong pattern. That may be caused by not picking a top surface.

5) Report & publication:
   i. Report need to be submitted before June 30.
   ii. Everyone needs to prepare the report for his or her part.
      1. Introduction:
         a. Michael, Biwen, Gukho
      2. Therapy session data analysis:
         a. Biwen
      3. Pre & Post MR, BD data analysis:
         a. Janet, Zeno
      4. ROCF Scoring data analysis:
         a. Caesar
      5. Basic and Augmented VR BD program development:
         a. Linus
      6. Number 2, 3, 4 and 5 need the contents for...
         a. Methodology 1 or 2 paragraph)
         b. Analysis (1 or 2 paragraph)
         c. Results (1 or 2 paragraph)
         d. Discussion (1 or 2 paragraph)
   iii. Prepare detail outline in next meeting.
iv. Please refer our tasking file for your deadline.

These are all the items that I noted or recalled from the meeting. If you have other points, please let me know.
Guk-Ho Gil