

Verification and Validation Report: ProgName

Team #, Team Name

Student 1 name

Student 2 name

Student 3 name

Student 4 name

January 20, 2025

1 Revision History

| Date | Version | Notes |
|--------|---------|-------|
| Date 1 | 1.0 | Notes |
| Date 2 | 1.1 | Notes |

2 Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms

| symbol | description |
|--------|-------------|
| T | Test |

[symbols, abbreviations or acronyms – you can reference the SRS tables if needed —SS]

Contents

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Revision History | i |
| 2 | Symbols, Abbreviations and Acronyms | ii |
| 3 | Functional Requirements Evaluation | 1 |
| 4 | Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation | 1 |
| 4.1 | Usability | 1 |
| 4.2 | Performance | 1 |
| 4.3 | etc. | 1 |
| 5 | Comparison to Existing Implementation | 1 |
| 6 | Unit Testing | 1 |
| 7 | Changes Due to Testing | 1 |
| 8 | Automated Testing | 1 |
| 9 | Trace to Requirements | 1 |
| 10 | Trace to Modules | 1 |
| 11 | Code Coverage Metrics | 1 |

List of Tables

List of Figures

This document ...

3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

4 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

4.1 Usability

4.2 Performance

4.3 etc.

5 Comparison to Existing Implementation

This section will not be appropriate for every project.

6 Unit Testing

7 Changes Due to Testing

[This section should highlight how feedback from the users and from the supervisor (when one exists) shaped the final product. In particular the feedback from the Rev 0 demo to the supervisor (or to potential users) should be highlighted. —SS]

8 Automated Testing

9 Trace to Requirements

10 Trace to Modules

11 Code Coverage Metrics

Appendix — Reflection

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Reflection.

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?
2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?
3. Which parts of this document stemmed from speaking to your client(s) or a proxy (e.g. your peers)? Which ones were not, and why?
4. In what ways was the Verification and Validation (VnV) Plan different from the activities that were actually conducted for VnV? If there were differences, what changes required the modification in the plan? Why did these changes occur? Would you be able to anticipate these changes in future projects? If there weren't any differences, how was your team able to clearly predict a feasible amount of effort and the right tasks needed to build the evidence that demonstrates the required quality? (It is expected that most teams will have had to deviate from their original VnV Plan.)