

Verification and Validation Report: Software Engineering

Team 14, Reach
Aamina Hussain
David Moroniti
Anika Peer
Deep Raj
Alan Scott

March 4, 2024

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	2
4.1	Usability	2
4.2	Performance	2
4.3	etc.	2
5	Comparison to Existing Implementation	2
6	Unit Testing	3
7	Changes Due to Testing	3
8	Automated Testing	3
9	Trace to Requirements	3
10	Trace to Modules	3
11	Code Coverage Metrics	3

List of Tables

List of Figures

3 Functional Requirements Evaluation

User Data

1. DT-1 Result: **Passed** - New account can successfully be created, and data is stored successfully in the database. Therefore, the tester was able to verify that the data is persistent, and so this test was successful.
2. DT-2 Result: **Passed** - Account information can successfully be updated, and the changes are reflected in the database. Therefore, the tester was able to verify that the updates are persistent, and so this test was successful.
3. DT-3 Result: **Not run** - reason being that the database application we used will ensure the issue brought up by this test can never happen.

Program Information

1. PT-1 **Passed** - The tester was able to verify that the FAQ system can be viewed by a user (whether they are logged in or not), and so this test was successful.

Searching

1. ST-1 **Not run** - Functionality tested by this test was removed from the requirements prior to conducting testing.
2. ST-2 **Passed** - The tester was able to conduct a search based on a patient profile, and view the resulting trials. Therefore, this test was successful.
3. ST-3 **Failed** - When attempting to search for trials with no profile data selected, the app did not behave as intended (it still tried to conduct a search), therefore this test was unsuccessful.
4. ST-4 **Passed** - The tester was able to switch between multiple profiles, and conduct a search based on each respective profile.

5. ST-5 **Passed** - Upon selecting a displayed trial, the tester was able to verify that the location displayed on the map updates and displays correctly.

Bookmarking

1. BT-1 **Passed** - The tester was able to save a trial, and view the trial in the bookmarks page. Additionally, there was an indication that the trial was saved, upon saving the trial. Therefore, this test was successful.
2. BT-2 **Passed** - The tester was able to delete a trial that was previously saved, and verified that the deletion was recognized in the frontend (i.e., by no longer being part of the list of saved trials). Therefore, this test was successful.
3. BT-3 **Passed** - The tester was able to verify that the details provided by the saved trial are the same as the details related to the trial on the search trial page.
4. BT-4 **Passed** - The tester was able to verify that the saved trials are filtered correctly upon selecting a profile to filter by. When selecting a profile, only the trials saved under that profile are displayed, and when selecting no profile, all saved trials are displayed to the user.

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

References

Appendix — Reflection

The information in this section will be used to evaluate the team members on the graduate attribute of Reflection. Please answer the following question:

1. 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.)