# **Technical Inspection Checklist**

For a Track & Field Meet Server

Version 2.0

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of MSE

Tracy Marshall

CIS 895 - MSE Project

Kansas State University

### **Table of Contents**

1.	Introduction	. 3
2.	Items to be Inspected	. 3
3.	Technical Inspectors	. 3
4.	Technical Inspection Checklist	. 3

#### 1.Introduction

The purpose of this document is to list the parts of the Track & Field Meet Server (TFMS) that need to be inspected. This document will guide the technical inspectors as they perform their inspection. They should use this document to assure coverage of the major components of the project. The technical inspection will be done to provide feedback on the correctness of the TFMS.

#### 2. Items to be Inspected

The items listed below will be inspected for consistency and correctness.

1. Executable Prototype

The inspection will act as a formalized buddy review also known as a peer review. More details about what will be reviewed are contained in the final section of this document.

### 3. Technical Inspectors

- Blake Knedler
- Keith Moyer

# 4. Technical Inspection Checklist

Inspection Item	Pass/Fail/Partial	Comments
Code readability - Did variable names make sense? - Did function names make sense? - Could you read through the code and understand the intent?	Pass	The code was pretty straight forward to follow, including good use of vertical and horizontal whitespace. Some inconsistency in function naming convention (capitalization), but not problematically so.
Code documentation and comments  - Were comments useful?  - Did there need to be more comments?	Pass	There are virtual no comments present. At this stage in the project, the code is mostly "obvious" to follow, but I would expect narrative comments be added as more functionality is implemented.
Common coding practices - Is duplicate code removed? - Are unused variables removed? - Are there any unnecessary imports?	Pass	The "vulture" utility detected a number of unused functions, variables, and attributes. However, it is not excessive and further development could correct it.
Modular decoupled code  - Was the code structured in such a way to easily add and remove functionality?	Pass	The code appears to be sufficiently modular for a project of this size.
Code efficiency - Is there any unnecessary processing? - Is there any processing that is done in the wrong place?	Pass	The code paths are of reasonable length for the processing being performed, and it appears to be well-placed and well-organized.

Inspected by: Keith Moyer

Signature: Kirthoge