SE 3XA3: Test Report MAC Schedule Importer

Team 12, Team 0C Cassandra Nicolak, nicolace Michelle Leung, leungm16 Winnie Liang, liangw15

December 3, 2018

Contents

1	Func	tional Requirements Evaluation	1			
2	Nonf	functional Requirements Evaluation	2			
	2.1	Usability	2			
	6	2.1.1 GUI Testing	2			
	2.2 1	Performance	2			
	6	2.2.1 Title todo1	2			
	6	2.2.2 Title todo2	2			
	2.3	etc	3			
3	Com	parison to Existing Implementation	3			
4	Unit	Testing	3			
	4.1	GUI Testing	3			
	4.2]	Parse Testing	3			
	4.3	Connector Testing	3			
	4.4	Converter Testing	4			
5	Changes Due to Testing					
	5.1	GUI Testing	4			
	5.2 1	Parse Testing	4			
	5.3	Connector Testing	4			
	5.4	Converter Testing	4			
6	Auto	mated Testing	4			
	6.1	GUI Testing	4			
	6.2 1	Parse Testing	5			
	6.3	Connector Testing	5			
	6.4	Converter Testing	5			
7	Trace	e to Requirements	5			
8	Trace	e to Modules	6			
9	Code	e Coverage Metrics	6			

List of Tables

1	Revision History
2	Test for AMT-1
3	Test for AMT-2
4	Test for AMT-3
5	Test for AMT-4
6	Trace Between Tests and Requirements
7	Trace Between Tests and Modules

List of Figures

Table 1: Revision History

Date	Version	Notes
12/02/18	1.0	Revision 0
12/03/18	1.1	Notes

This document ...

1 Functional Requirements Evaluation

Description of Tests: The purpose of these tests is to ensure that the user is able to use the software according to the requirements in the Specifications Documentation. These tests will include: .

Test Name: FRT-1

Results: The user is able to ...

Test Name: FRT-2

Results: The user is able to ...

Test Name: FRT-3

Results: The user is able to ...

Test Name: FRT-4

Results: The user is able to ...

2 Nonfunctional Requirements Evaluation

2.1 Usability

2.1.1 GUI Testing

Description of Tests: Usability of the Graphical User Interface (GUI) was tested by a small test group of three McMaster students who are not in a technical-related field of study. This will allow for the most basic knowledge of our intended users. After the participants were finished with testing the application, each participant filled out a feedback form that evaluated the system on its usability.

Test Name: NFT-1

Results: All participants were able to successfully complete the task of

Test Name: NFT-x

Results: All participants were able to successfully complete the task of in-

stalling the program...

2.2 Performance

2.2.1 Title todo1

Description of Tests: Desc.

Test Name: NFT-x Results: Desc.

2.2.2 Title todo2

Description of Tests: Desc.

Test Name: NFT-x

Results: Desc.

Test Name: NFT-x

Results: Desc.

2.3 etc.

3 Comparison to Existing Implementation

This section will not be appropriate for every project.

4 Unit Testing

4.1 GUI Testing

Test Name	AMT-1
Initial State	stuff
Input	stuff
Expected Output	The requested action is

Table 2: Test for AMT-1

4.2 Parse Testing

Test Name	AMT-2
Initial State	stuff
Input	stuff
Expected Output	The requested action isd

Table 3: Test for AMT-2

4.3 Connector Testing

Test Name	AMT-3
Initial State	stuff
Input	stuff
Expected Output	The requested action isd

Table 4: Test for AMT-3

4.4 Converter Testing

Test Name	AMT-4
Initial State	stuff
Input	stuff
Expected Output	The requested action isd

Table 5: Test for AMT-4

5 Changes Due to Testing

5.1 GUI Testing

After conducting usability test on the GUI, it was decided that some methods were to become more modular. Click events only call a function and do nothing else.

5.2 Parse Testing

There have been no changes to the methods of testing as a result of completed tests.

5.3 Connector Testing

There have been no changes to the methods of testing as a result of completed tests.

5.4 Converter Testing

There have been no changes to the methods of testing as a result of completed tests.

6 Automated Testing

6.1 GUI Testing

Not Applicable

6.2 Parse Testing

Description of tests: For automated testing of the output, xxxx

6.3 Connector Testing

todo

6.4 Converter Testing

todo

7 Trace to Requirements

Requirements		
Functional Requirements Testing		
FRx		
ctional Requirements Testing		
NFx, NFx		
NFx, NFx		
Automated Testing		
FRx, FRx		
FRx, FRx		
FRx, FRx		

Table 6: Trace Between Tests and Requirements

8 Trace to Modules

Test	Modules	
Functional Requirements Testing		
FRT-1	Mx	
FRT-2	Mx	
FRT-3	Mx	
FRT-4	Mx	
Non-functional Requirements Testing		
NFT-1	Mx	
NFT-2	Mx	
	Automated Testing	
AMT-1	Mx	
AMT-2	Mx	
AMT-3	Mx	

Table 7: Trace Between Tests and Modules

9 Code Coverage Metrics

The 0C team has managed to produce approximately xx percent code coverage through our tests. This number is based off the fact that all of the modules have been covered in testing. Please refer to the trace to modules section to see how all of our modules have been covered.