|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Learning outcome | Quiz grade | Required grade | Percentage | Weighted grade |
| 1 | 3.8 | 3 | 20% | 0.6 |
| 2 | 4.0 | 3.25 | 25% | 0.8125 |
| 3 | 2.5 | 3.5 | 25% | 0.875 |
| 4 | 3.5 | 2.75 | 15% | 0.4125 |
| 5 | (Passed) | 2 | 15% | 0.3 |
| Total | Passed | Passed | 100% | **3 = 60%** |

# Self-evaluation:

## Analyze requirements to determine appropriate testing strategies [3]

### Range of requirements, functional requirements, measurable quality attributes, …

A full set of requirements was listed and categorized into functional and non-functional.

Grade: 3

### Level of requirements, system, integration, unit.

The list covered the different levels of testing that could be applied to the requirements. (check 1.2.txt).

Grade: 3

### Identifying test approach for chosen attributes.

Different approaches were chosen to test the chosen requirements.

Grade: 3

### Assess the appropriateness of your chosen testing approach.

Appropriateness was discussed in a good shape, and more elaboration was extended in 1.4-appropriateness.txt

Grade: 3

## 2. Design and implement comprehensive test plans with instrumented code [3.25]

### 2.1. Construction of the test plan

A test plan was constructed in an organized way, and a schedule was included. (Check Test\_plan.docx)

Grade: 3.5

### 2.2. Evaluation of the quality of the test plan

The evaluation was done to analyze how the testing will be done.

Grade: 3

### 2.3. Instrumentation of the code

Drivers were used and a model was prepared ahead for R1 which is about recognizing faces.

Grade: 3.5

### 2.4. Evaluation of the instrumentation

Evaluation of the drivers used was done to check how useful they were.

Grade: 3.0

## 3. Apply a wide variety of testing techniques and compute test coverage… [3.5]

### 3.1. Range of techniques

Various techniques were applied, and testing tools were explored and some of them were used. (Check Testing.docx, r1.py, r1.parallel.py, test\_r1.py, r2.py, test\_r2.py)

Grade: 4

### 3.2. Evaluation criteria for the adequacy of the testing

Test suites were selected carefully to match the design rules to follow the notion of inadequate testing criteria. (Check Testing.docx)

Grade: 3.25

### 3.3. Results of testing

Results were documented for the various tests. (Check Testing.docx)

Grade: 3.5

### 3.4. Evaluation of the results

Results were evaluated and any conflicts were analyzed and matched to a bug in the code. (Check Testing.docx, test\_modified\_r1.py, test\_modified\_r2.py)

Grade: 3.25

## 4. Evaluate the limitations of a given testing process [2.75]

### 4.1. Identifying gaps and omission in the testing process.

Deficiencies were identified with analysis to what might be done to have them fixed.

Grade: 3

## 4.2. Identifying target coverage/performance levels for the different testing procedures.

Identification was done but limited time and effort were devoted to this area.

Grade: 2.5

## 4.3. Discussing how the testing carried out compares with the target levels.

A comparison was done between what was done and what was aimed for.

Grade: 2.75

## 4.4. Discussion of what would be necessary to achieve the target levels.

Following to 4.1, necessary procedures were discussed to overcome the deficiencies and achieve the target levels.

Grade: 2.75