----Post mortem----

# ---testing plan---

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strengths | Weaknesses |
| * All information is clear to find with the TOC and the information has good structure | * Layout of the plan isn’t the best and looks a bit messy, an organised chaos if one would say. |

# ---testing process---

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strengths | Weaknesses |
| * Was an accurate and precise testing plan that was able to be increased or decreased based on the number of questions required. | * Most of the time would be spent filling out the document. Could have been made better. |

# ---Proposed changes---

* Spend more time organising the layout of the plan and process to allow the numbers and graphs to be seen easier.
* Make the layout more satisfying to the human eye to provoke an engagement of the document.

# ---QA team members---

# Bayley Fisher

* Didn’t notify the team if he was late and or not appearing unless asked. Worked well in creating his bug report and discovering techniques for new test concepts. Due to not being here on the day of most of the documentation being created he did not have a major role in the creation of the documentation. However, is very welcoming of constructive criticism.

# Blake Andrews

* Arrived on time majority of the time and notified the team if he was running late. Worked well in terms of documentation and note taking for the team. was able to adjust based on what role he was given/chose.

# Stan Katunin

* Arrived on time majority of the time. Was always growing and learning new ways to create documentation. Worked well with other members and was good with taking constructive criticism.