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- **Education:**
  - BS & MS-EE (BGU), PhD-CS (FSU)

- **Professional experience:**
  - Florida Tech, Motorola/Freescale, TX State

- **Areas of Interest:**
  - Incremental classification of Big Data
  - Power-aware scheduling,
  - Data Compression,
  - Usability
Aspects of Knowledge and Knowledge Sharing

• Representation Mechanisms
• Formalisms
• Standards
• Quality Assurance
• Ethics/Legal aspects
• Knowledge vs. Information vs. Data
  • Knowledge engineering
  • Data mining
  • Data analytics
  • Patterns / pattern recognition
  • Knowledge is power
• Knowledge vs. Belief vs. Values
• Applications
Panel Discussion Topics

1) knowledge vs. information vs. data - Dan
2) Knowledge representation
   A Knowledge management perspective of requirements engineering - Hermann
3) Crowdsourcing and collaborative social networks - Brian
4) Quality assurance of published knowledge - Dieter
Knowledge; information; data; belief

- Formalism (good news)
  - Data - Results of measurements
  - Self Information - $I = \log\left(\frac{1}{P(j)}\right)$
    - Surprise, no-news = good news
  - Knowledge
    - Result of sound deduction
    - Result of “sound” empirics
- Belief – Seeing is believing?
  - Implicitation and other fallacies
- Limitation of the formalism (Bad news)
  - The theory of absurd – absurdism
    - The conflict between the human tendency to seek inherent value and meaning in life and the human inability to find any.
Crowdsourcing and Collaborative Social Networks

Panel Member – Dr. Brian Thoms
Affiliation – California State University, Channel Islands
“Information consumes the attention of its recipients; a wealth of information creates a poverty of attention and a need to allocate that attention amongst the overabundance of information sources that might consume it.”
Herbert Simon (1971)
TMI (2)

Bad News
- Too much information
- Too many tools
- Cannot simply throw technology at the problem
- Identifying the right solution takes resources

Good News
- Peer Recommender Systems
- News Aggregators
- Learning Algorithms
- System Design Improvements
Brrrrrr. The Cold Start Problem
Cold Start (2)

Bad News
- If you build it, there is no guarantee they will come
- When they come, there is no guarantee they will participate
- When they participate, there is no guarantee that what they produce is of any value

Good News
- Not everyone needs a niche community
- Large-scale communities through Linked-In, Facebook, WordPress, Media-wiki, etc. thrive.
- Active community members facilitate knowledge construction and help to establish community expectations
I think, therefore, I am... I think.
Identity Online (2)

Bad News
- Many challenges to creating an online identity
- Gatekeepers.
- Finding a signal through the noise.

Good News
- The purpose of online community is to facilitate identity.
- Gatekeepers can also be a good thing.
Thou Shalt Not Steal

Who Owns Your Content Online?

March 05, 2014 Rachel Boothroyd

Myspace got into hot water last year for deleting years of users' blog posts before its re-launch. In response, Myspace created an export tool to allow users to download their old posts from the site.

Were a user's rights to get upset? Did Myspace have to hand over old posts to users whose accounts had been deleted?

The short answer is that, legally, it didn't have to do a thing.

WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS TO THE CONTENT YOU POST?

If you regularly post content to a social network or blogging platform, you should consider two issues:

1. Who owns the rights to the content you post?

2. The availability of the platform on which the content appears.

Let's look first at who owns the rights to the content. It's fairly straightforward: if you created the content, you own it. That is, assuming you haven't assigned rights to another party (for example, a company which paid you to create the content) — and it doesn't

The New York Times

Plagiarizing Wikipedia Is Still Plagiarism, at BuzzFeed or the New York Times

The New York Times says it is “looking into” accusations that a recent article on the painter Piero di Cosimo lifted most of its first paragraph straight from Wikipedia. The similarities, in a piece by reporter Carol Vogel, were first pointed out by MediaMatters.org, and are of particular media interest following the firing of BuzzFeed's viral politics editor Beany Johnson for similar offenses (albeit at least 41 of them), which included plagiarism not only from Wikipedia but even thinner sources like About.com and internet compool Yahoo! Answers. But with journalism living increasingly online, where prominent attribution via links is a vital part of the lexicon, and aggregation widely accepted so long as proper credit is given, the source of the words is irrelevant.

Here's Vogel's apparent offense from the Times:

Artists can be eccentric, but the quirk俩 of the Italian Renaissance master Piero di Cosimo are legendary. He is said to have been terrified of thunderstorms and so pyrophobic that he rarely cooked his food, subsisting mostly on hard-boiled eggs that he prepared go at a time while hot-airing glue for his art. He didn't clean his studio. He didn't trim the trees in his orchard. Giorgio Vasari, the Renaissance biographer, described Piero as living "more like a beast than a man."
Copyright and Ownership (2)

Bad News
- Countries with no explicit privacy laws.
- For most online software, privacy is determined by the application owners, not the individual.
- Content ownership may deter participants.
- Difficulty in identifying the ‘true’ owner of the content.

Good News
- Terms of service are in place to let the user know who owns information.
- P3P provide universal guidelines.
- Tools are available to catch plagiarism and theft.
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Quality assurance of published knowledge specifically how to measure the quality of professional conference and journal publications
Quality Assurance – Why?

• Science generates new knowledge
  ➔ contributes to overall knowledge pool
• Future science builds on previous results

Isaac Newton, :
“If I have seen further
it is by standing on
the shoulders of giants.”
Need for Publications?

• Documentation of scientific progress
• Essential for scientific career paths
  – Curriculum Vitae
  – Publication List
  – h-index
  – Citations
• Important for research grants
• Quality over quantity
Problem: Author names

• Spelling of your name can highly influence online publication lists:

  Kranzlmüller, Kranzlmuelle, Kranzlmuller, Kranzmüller, Kranzmueller, Kranzmuller, Kranzelmüller, Kranzelmueller, Kranzelmuller, Granzlmüller, Kanzlmüller, Ganzlmüller, ...
Conflicting goals

- Publisher: more papers, higher prizes
- Conference organizer: more papers, more registrants
- Academic Institutions: more papers, better reputation → better ranking

- Journal: often long reviewing – still up-to-date?
- Conference: shorter review cycle, less pages, less quality?
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Peer reviews

• Peers check the quality of submitted work
• Feedback for authors to improve work
• Acceptance of paper based on judgement of peers (experts in the field)

Problem:
• Number of reviews needed to assess quality (statistics)
• Amount of work for reviewing (increasing number of publications/conferences)
• Plagiarism check is time consuming (despite Google)
Problem: **Reproducibility**

- Publication is only part of the scientific work ➔ Documentation of methodology and results
- Source code and data are more and more important ➔ Why publish only papers?
- Reproducibility requires the same computing environment as before, from operating system to floating point precision
- Program runs on large-scale computing infrastructures are costly
Quality Assurance

(1) Submit to well-known conferences and journals

(2) Use/trust reliable reviewers

(3) Offer incentives for reviewers

(4) Seek references to source code/data/virtual machines
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A Knowledge Management Perspective of Requirements Engineering

Hermann Kaindl
Vienna Univ. of Technology, ICT, Austria

Introduction

- Exchange of knowledge among stakeholders and requirements engineers
- Requires the willingness to share knowledge
  → Adopt Knowledge Management (KM) for Requirements Engineering (RE)
  - Insights about knowledge transfer and transformation
  - Understanding issues involved and addressing them by adopting a KM view of RE
- Based on Pilat & Kaindl, RCIS’10
Managing Knowledge in RE
A Cyclic View of the Spiral of Requirements Knowledge

- Internalization (experience)
- Socialization (interaction)
- Combination (synthesis)
- Externalization (codification)

Managing Knowledge in RE
Facilitating Requirements Knowledge Exchange

- Make sharing of requirements knowledge work
- Knowledge Map
  Association of knowledge holders with the relevant knowledge they have
- Incentives to make knowledge holders “share”
  - Increase perceived “pay-off”
  - Promote “group-identity” and feeling of “ownership”
- Appropriate form for codified knowledge
While doing requirements, focus on the knowledge sharing process:

- Identifying “knowledge holders” may be more important than identifying “stakeholders”.
- Individual factors affecting the pay-off perceived by the knowledge holders for sharing are important.
- New knowledge holders should be involved if key knowledge is found to be missing.

Establish spiral of knowledge to iteratively increase the knowledge about the requirements and the domain in the project.

Thank you for your attention!