

Ment.io Case

Summary:

- Ment.io was created behind the need for human insights to drive data-decisions
- The goal was to enable '*knowledge analytics*'
- At its core, Ment was a virtual meeting room where you could start discussions the same way you would do in a boardroom
- One of the major drivers behind the confidence that Ment would succeed is the fact that according to a 2018 survey it revealed that **44%** of workers believed face-to-face meetings would decrease and **70%** believed that they would spend more time online
- Supposedly, one of the major forces behind the product creation was the fact that junior officers did not have a 'real voice' and this was meant to help empower them
- The company was born out of a pivot from a prior pilot project that went sideways after the market confirmed that it was *overcomplicated* for its target audience
- In terms of discussions, the intention was to "*highlight the wisdom of the crowd*"
- Near the end of the case, Rosenberg appears to have a disagreement with his own team where he sees the power of his platform to *possibly* drown out the opinions of those fewer in number

Questions:

1. **Based on the reading, do you think that it was a wise decision that Rosenberg avoided creating invitation-only groups in pursuit of *transparency*?**
 - a. *Should all discussions truly be transparent to all employees and board members?*
 - b. *What do you think that drivers were behind this decision?*
2. It appears that to receive a higher score for your comment or discussion, you're dependent on the 'Communal Perception' of its validity and merit.

It was even mentioned that the score provided does not necessarily represent the truth, implying that comments and discussions could be rated positively or negatively but not truly deserve that rating. **To what extent was this a good or bad decision in terms of platform design?**

- a. *How could natural animosity between employees and organization cause the platform to show favoritism versus actual merit and support?*
3. **Was it a wise decision for Ment to enable and focus on building Personal Analytics, or could they just be perceived as 'vanity' metrics?**
 4. **Is it a good thing to have something such as a "think alike" metric, where employees see which other members of the team have the same way of thinking as them? Could it lead to any form of bias – if so which types?**
 5. Near the end of the case, it's noted that Rosenberg appears to have a disagreement with the rest of his team in terms of what should be prioritized in terms of the next product enhancement. **Is it fair to have the direction of the company be steered by the majority? If so, how does this hold if there's a major misalignment in numbers of employees per team?**
 6. **How would you go about making the decision on whether to focus on the algorithm or the UI?**
 7. **If you were to recommend other decisions that the CEO would have to make to ensure the viability of his product, what would they be?**

