9th May

- Top bio entrepreneurs post
    - No-one has rated
    - Ben Kuhn commented that we shouldn't be working on novel analysis in this area. See my comment in response.

(gap here due to the annual review)

28th Feb

1. Interview with Matt Gibb
    a. Ben: I think it would have been nice to have more of his story, hold him up as an awesome member. The content was good though.
    b. would have been good to link to the other tech ent interviews
2. The two case study write ups
    a. Ozzie: liked the should I finish my degree one.
        i. Still a bit uneasy about the format.
    b. Roman: not sure about the lesson's learned - mainly for us rather than readers
        i. Ben: aim is transparency here, rather than being the most helpful to readers
            1. Should this be the right aim?
3. Should you do a degree
    a. Roman: quite long, so just remembered that it was in favour.
        i. Impression while reading it is that it seems clear and persuasive
    b. Ben: should we put out stuff like this without more in-depth research behind it?
        i. Ozzie: seems good for this topic.
        ii. Does it apply to enough people? Maybe should have waited for it to come up again. Not high enough priority.
            1. On the other hand, good to have as an example of case study research.
    c. Ozzie: photo is bad
        i. I agree

14th Feb

1. Politics estimate
    a. Roman gave 5 for transparency, Ben only gave 3, since penalises things if there's a lot of gut judgements

2. Social value of Google
    a. Ben gave it slightly higher scores, because I was taking it in unison with the LW post.

7th Feb

1. Which careers make the most difference
    a. Overall
        i. Roman only gave 4 - mainly due to not having rated much before, could also be more reliable and shorter
    b. List
        i. try out summing the scores - consulting is getting overly promoted by donation potential of 4 vs 5 for tech ent and finance
    c. Ozzie: seems a bit odd to score this on the same scale as the other blog posts since it's so different.
    d. Ben gave lower on transparency since relied a lot on judgement calls
    e. Ben gave it 3 for expert VOI since wasn't sure.
        i. Roman: the experts didn't know these criteria,
    f. Sam:
        i. Agreed with us
        ii. Would be nice if it was a consistent linear scale
            1. Roman: would also let us

24th Jan

1. Which cause is most effective
    a. Good overall
    b. Reliability
        i. Very hedged
    c. How to organise better?
        i. Should we have split it into more posts?
        ii. Ozzie: sounded like the start was loads of hedging, quite offputting
            1. Could instead 2-3 hedging sentences at start, and link to the rest of the hedging
        iii. Could sub out the justification
        iv. Could structure the descriptions more clearly: e.g. pros and cons, justification for each score
        v. Judgement calls bit could be on a separate document

            1. Could just have a list of assumptions, then ways you could assume differently
    d. Would have preferred more engagement
        i. Very long, so people don't read - then don't comment
        ii. Ozzie's comments above
        iii. Why?
            1. Kind of a draft of the upcoming cause pages
    e. Sam and Peter broadly agreed
        i. Peter gave lower VOI since has reservations about causes
        ii. Interesting Peter really liked the value judgement post
2. Reasoning about influence
    a. Ben: my transparency was probably too high, since relies on gut judgements at the end
    b. Reliability
        i. Ben: I was unsure, but went fairly high since seemed appropriately hedged. Docked VOI in response. Maybe should have made it even lower.

17th Jan

1. News: we've started to draft the next version of rubric
2. <u>Earnings of software</u>
    a. Anon1 seems to be making a mistake - I've explained in the comments - which reduced their overall ranking.
    b. Ozzie, why a '3' for transparency?
        i. Ben: this seems pretty much as transparent as possible
        ii. Ozzie: seems overly harsh
    c. I gave VOI it a 3 because it seems fairly narrowly applicable. But everyone else gave it a 4-5.
3. <u>Peter's case study</u>
    a. Only rated by team, but very large amount of agreement
    b. Roman: subheadings could be easier to skim, engagingness a little low because it's quite long (though: definitely very clear)

20th Dec

1. Cause framework

    a. Good agreement on the ratings
    b. Problem with the rubric - doesn't weight VOI highly enough, so this much more in-depth, novel post doesn't score much higher than a much smaller post or an interview
    c. Ben: why did Ozzie and Nick only give a VOI of '4'? What would it take?
        i. Ozzie is just using very high standards for '5'.
    d. Ozzie: concerned about how robust it will be
2. medicine vs etg
    a. Obviously too many typos
    b. VOI of 2 seems unfair
        i. Lots was explained for not dedicated EAs, so should lower expert VOI, but not VOI
    c. Ozzie: should we have aimed to polish this better and make more sharable?
        i. Ben: planning to do the sharable posts after doing a couple of similar case studies when we've got more to make our case on
3. Satvik interview
    a. Didn't perform well. Maybe because it's a bit unclear what it's adding.

13th Dec

1. Why pick a cause
    a. Quite a lot of agreement
    b. The value of picking a cause
        i. Ben: I think this is pretty high, because it's a key step in our process (when you persuade someone of picking a cause, it's a big step)
            1. Others seem to disagree, except for the anon
    c. Ozzie: the engagingness is very low, so hard to get high VOI.
        i. Ben: does this fall in a bad middle group - not that relevant to dedicated EAs, but too researchy for normal readers
    d. Ozzie: Better way to present this
        i. 2 stories of people tryng to lead their career and failing, so we decided to go for causes
    e. saying 'near zero' seems too extreme and offputting
    f. Sam's comment about just picking a cause
        i. Add link to the framework

6th Dec

1. Should the comments be publicly viewable?
    a. Sameer

        i. Think it could help with being more credible
            1. Though maybe just the score
        ii. Discussion is normal and looks good
        iii. Will make the content better
        iv. Will look better if we also defend our criticisms
2. **We're going to add a new type: 'useful resources' for posts which are just links to other resources.** Both of the posts this week would count as this.
3. Economics phd is the only one worth getting
    a. People quite divided about overall quality
        i. Solution: Change the type to make the aims clearer
    b. Transparency
        i. Didn't flag how we found it or why we picked it
    c. Content
        i. Would have been good if we'd picked up on some of the errors
        ii. Should have beem more cautious about quality
            1. Lower reliability?
    d. there's a trade off between VOI and reliability when we quote other sources. that our rating is not showing up
        i. New policy for authors:
            1. Flag the conclusion
                a. Are we endorsing what they say?
                    i. Higher VOI, reliability more at risk
                b. Or are we just reporting what they say?
                    i. Low VOI high reliability
4. Should we have a different rubric for each type?
    a. Seems good in the longterm, but quite a bit of effort to set up
    b. People are already rating a bit differently e.g. 'overall'
5. How to change the overall rating?
    a. Currently there's no reference class
    b. Change to: How valuable is this to our audience?
        i. Better for the aim of tracking whether we're improving 80k as a resource
6. Problem with VOI in general
    a. Includes many variables: usefulness, percentage of audience and accuracy
7. Expert VOI
    a. Still unclear
8. New policy
    a. 'research' is high priority to rate
    b. 'case studies' and 'interviews' and 'discussion' are medium priority
    c. 'useful resources' is low
    d. 'updates' don't rate
9. Proposed changes
    a. Major
        i. Updates - don't rate

ii. Interviews and useful resources
    1. VOI and good process (to be spelt out)
iii. Case studies - don't rate
iv. Research
    1. how valuable = useful + reliable + transparent + clarity
v. Discussion
    1. VOI + clarity + engagingness

b. short term
    i. clarify the rankings to spread them out a bit more
    ii. clarify overall

10. AP
    a. Ben to draft a new rubric for next week and will send round

29th Nov

1. <u>An attempt to create a new AMF</u>
    a. Everyone disagreed with Ben that the content was relevant to 80k
    b. Ben: I thought it was about how to set up a new effective non-profit, which is one of our top recommended careers
        i. Should have explained this more or not featured it
    c. Agree some problems with clarity e.g. no summary, very long, jargon
    d. Should have Ben's name on the introduction
    e. Shouldn't be "the next AMF" since non EAs won't find it useful
    f. Should have talked more about the intervention. Had a youtube inteview with them.
    g. Conclusion: Probably shouldn't have posted this, and otherwise should have explained the relevant to careers much better. Put in 'what we've been reading' on mailing list, twitter and FB.
2. <u>How to pick a degree</u>
    a. Ben: agree that it was low quality with the evidence, but only took 2 hours and was pretty useful
        i. I think this was the right decision, but I'm pretty unsure
    b. Major disagreements over transparency
    c. Importance of a good school
        i. If find people who got into Harvard with same ACT scores, you'll do just as well. Was in a recent paper.
            1. Elite common sense could be wrong on this
    d. Links could be easier to follow. Two many layers.
    e. 80% statistic is easy to misunderstand
    f. Ozzie: Sounded elitist and snobby

        i. Re-write in a dilemma format. If you have to make the choice…
        ii. “great people”
        iii. remove “get into”
    g. Clarify which country
        i. Talk about “university”
    h. why is 2 intended
    i. Vote: should I have posted this, or waited for more evidence behind it?
        i. Sameer - posted
        ii. Ozzie - waited
        iii. Thomas and Collin - spend another hour neatening it and toning down the language, then post.
    j. Conclusions
        i. In the future, either reference evidence directly, or explain where it is more clearly.
        ii. Could be good to write up more fully into a major piece, and have lots of useful feedback on how to do that
        iii. Will make a few more edits to avoid giving the impression of elitism
3. General trade-offs
    a. Are we striking the balance between broad and strong appeal correctly?
    b. Are we striking the balance between quality of each post and number of posts?

Previous