# QA Discussion Meeting Transcript

Date: 13/06/2025

Time: 10:00 AM (UK Time)

Location: Video Call

Chair: David Hanby

Project Manager (PM): Grace Parker

Quality Assurance (QA): Muhammad Awais

Agenda: 1. Introduction 2. Appointment of Chair 3. General Discussion 4. Close of Meeting

Grace Parker (PM): Good morning, everyone. Thanks for joining. Today’s session is focused on QA—how we’re doing it, how we can improve, and where both manual and automated testing fit in our broader delivery model. I think we all agree that QA is fundamental to delivering quality software, but the details of how we execute can always be refined.

Muhammad Awais (QA): Morning Grace, David. I’m glad we’re having this conversation. Too often, QA is either brought in too late or spread too thin, and it becomes reactive rather than proactive. My hope today is that we can align on principles and set some practical steps that elevate QA’s role across the lifecycle.

David Hanby (Chair): Absolutely, Awais. I’ll take the role of Chair today, if everyone’s happy with that.

Grace Parker: No objections from me. Please go ahead.

Muhammad Awais: All good here.

David Hanby: Great. Let’s get into it. First off, Awais, could you frame for us what good QA looks like in a modern dev cycle? Not just in terms of tools, but mindset and process.

Muhammad Awais: Sure. At its best, QA is embedded early, involved in every phase from planning to post-release, and fully aligned with business goals. It’s about building quality in—not testing it in. That means engaging with user stories before development even starts, helping to define acceptance criteria, identifying test data needs, and designing tests that reflect real user flows. Tools are important, but mindset is key.

Grace Parker: That’s something we can definitely improve on. Right now, we tend to finalise stories and then hand them to QA to “test when ready,” which delays feedback and leads to missed edge cases.

Muhammad Awais: Exactly. If QA is in those refinement sessions, we can raise concerns early. I’d like to start joining your weekly backlog grooming meetings, if that works?

Grace Parker: Yes, please do. I’ll add you to the calendar invite for next week’s session. That alone should make a big difference.

David Hanby: Good start. Now, let’s split our discussion into manual and automated testing, starting with manual. What would you say are the core practices we should commit to, Awais?

Muhammad Awais: For manual testing, structure is everything. We need traceability from requirements to test cases. Each sprint should begin with a test plan outlining what will be tested manually, by whom, and when. Exploratory testing should be part of every sprint, not just a side activity. And test cases need to be reviewed regularly—we have too many legacy cases that are no longer relevant but still get reused. I’d suggest we do a full review of our current manual test suites.

Grace Parker: That’s fair. We haven’t pruned them in a while. Maybe start with the most-used regression sets from the past two releases?

Muhammad Awais: Yes, I’ll extract a list and review those this week. I’ll loop in one of the junior QAs as well to go through them with fresh eyes. We can flag which cases to keep, update, or retire.

David Hanby: Sounds good. Let’s be sure to document the decisions—so we’re not back here in six months asking the same questions.

Muhammad Awais: Will do. I’ll maintain a changelog in the test case tracker.

Grace Parker: Great. Now, switching gears—automation. Where do you think we’re strong, and where are we falling short?

Muhammad Awais: We’ve made a decent start on smoke test automation, and that’s giving us early feedback on builds, which is great. But the coverage is narrow, and we haven’t yet integrated our tests into the CI/CD pipeline properly. We’re still triggering them manually most of the time. That needs to change.

Grace Parker: Agreed. I’ll speak to the DevOps team and get an update on pipeline readiness. We need those tests to run automatically with each build, especially on staging.

David Hanby: And we’ve had issues with test stability too. Some failures are down to environment quirks, others seem flaky.

Muhammad Awais: Flakiness is a killer. I propose we run a dedicated test flakiness audit—I'll go through recent failures, identify the patterns, and clean up any unstable tests. Once that’s done, I can present a stability report and recommendations to keep things solid going forward.

Grace Parker: That would be hugely valuable. Could you aim to do that over the next 10 days or so?

Muhammad Awais: Yes, that’s realistic. I’ll start with our top 20 failing tests and work from there.

David Hanby: Let’s also think about who’s responsible for what. Should QA write all the automation, or should devs contribute as well?

Muhammad Awais: It should be a team effort. Developers should write unit and integration tests as part of their definition of done. QA should focus on E2E workflows, maintaining the framework, and test strategy. That said, we need a shared understanding of standards and practices. I suggest we run a joint dev-QA session next week to define what “good” looks like.

Grace Parker: Let’s get that scheduled—I’ll set it up. We can also use that session to align on folder structure, naming conventions, and reporting expectations.

David Hanby: That would help a lot. Now, we’ve talked about practices, but what about metrics? How do we know we’re improving?

Muhammad Awais: Good QA relies on visibility. We should be tracking test coverage—not just code, but requirement coverage too. Also, defect leakage, pass/fail ratios, time to resolution, and release confidence scores. I’ve started building a basic dashboard that can pull data from our test management and CI systems.

Grace Parker: Can we get a look at that by the end of next week?

Muhammad Awais: Yes, I’ll have a first version ready. It’ll include weekly trends and support drill-downs by test type.

David Hanby: Excellent. And maybe we include a 5-minute QA health update in every sprint review moving forward?

Grace Parker: I like that. Keeps everyone engaged in quality. I’ll add it to the standard sprint review template.

Muhammad Awais: And to support that, I’ll send a short QA summary at the end of each sprint—just the highlights, trends, and any critical issues.

Grace Parker: Having a malfunction here… sssssssssssooooooooooooorrrrrrrrrrrryyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyyy IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII dddddddddddooooooooooooonnnnnnnnnnn’’’’’’’ttttttttttttt kkkkkkkkkkkkknnnnnnnnnooooooooowwwwwwwww wwwwwwwwhhhhhhhhhhhaaaaaaaaaatttttttttttt iiiiiiiiiiiissssssssss hhhhhhhhhhhhaaaaaaaaapppppppppeeeeeennnnnnnnniiiiiinnnnnnngggggggg!

David Hanby: Perfect. As we begin to wrap up, let’s make sure we’ve got immediate next steps covered. Awais, you’ll review the current manual regression suite, complete the flakiness audit, and finish the QA dashboard prototype. Grace, you’ll set up the joint dev-QA session, add QA to backlog grooming, and talk to DevOps about pipeline automation. I’ll review the outcomes and ensure we’ve got leadership support for the resource time needed.

Grace Parker: Yes, all clear. I’ll send a follow-up email with all the invites and notes by end of day.

Muhammad Awais: Thanks both. I think we’ve made solid progress today. If we keep this momentum, we can really improve delivery confidence.

David Hanby: I agree. This has been one of our more constructive sessions. Unless there’s anything else urgent, I’d suggest we close the meeting here.

Grace Parker: All good from my side.

Muhammad Awais: Same here.

David Hanby: And as an extra topic, I think we should organize a team building session with everyone – what do you both think?

Muhammad Awais: I think that would be great, when are you thinking?

Grace Parker: We can take an hour next Friday to play an online game?

David Hanby: Next Friday is perfect and both of you look for games that you think will work well.

Grace Parker: Sounds good.

Muhammad Awais: Will be fun!

David Hanby: Great. Thanks everyone—meeting closed at 11:30 AM. I’ll circulate a summary shortly.