## Members of the group and roles

Reed Harston

Coleen Hull

Rochak Kunwar

Jenifer Paye Llerena

# TEACH 04: INSPECTION PLAN

## Roles

1. Author:
   1. Description: Person who the documents are sent to be repaired and removed in the later stage of the review process. [1]
   2. Assignment: Andrew Nelson (Teacher)
2. Moderator/Technical Writer :
   1. Description: Manages the inspection team. Will combine all bug reports from the testers into a final bug report. [1]
   2. Assignment: Coleen Hull
3. Tester/Inspector:
4. Description: It is their job to go over the code written and see if they can see any bugs that would cause a problem. [1] [2]
5. Assignment: Coleen Hull and Reed Harston

Jenifer Paye and Rochak Kunwar

## Process

Our first step will be to have all individuals in the group perform a private review. Each inspection procedure will be tracked by saving pertinent information such as date, identity or testers, the product being inspected, the number of bugs found, and list of bugs. [1] After the private review, we will be using the modified inspection process *“two-person inspection”*. We modified the *“two-person inspection*” as we do not have the author of the code. Instead, we will have two teams of two tester/inspectors and a

moderator/technical writer.

For our software inspection, we will combine two-person inspection with the phase inspection which has more than one team go over the source code. Each team will go over the entire source code for review and submit their reports to the moderator/technical writer [1] Each group of two who will work together and review the code and submit their reports back to the moderator. This method will allow for a few sweeps to make sure no bugs were missed the first time around. At the end of the week, we will meet and can go over the overall report to ensure nothing was missed. We will also be using a checklist created by the team together before the inspection starts.

We will be using electronic communication per Mashayekhi. [1] We will speak online using zoom and using google docs to share our written communications. We will also use putty/mobaXterm and visual studio to review the source code given for this week’s assignment.
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