

All slide notes are courtesy of ...

Ginny A. Eiwen, PMP

CSC Exceed Quality Office Manager CSC Financial Services Group

Ginny's knowledge of this presentation was augmented through the previous exposure of bringing New Instruction's 3-day workshop in-house for her team.

Outline

Test Methodologies and Checklists Testing methodologies enable testers to compute their test coverage and have confidence that all requirements will be tested. The use of methodologies in testing is an essential element of a quality as surance organization.

Factor Analysis

OATS — Orthogonal Array Testing Strategy
 Pairs and Magic Squares

Risk Analysis In our applications not everything can be tested, so prioritizing the tests is a major requirement of the tester. For most systems a thorough set of tests may be impractical so identifying those crucial tests becomes imperative to the tester, we will help to identify those crucial situations.

Categorical Analysis
 Factor Breakdown / Operational Matrix

Test Plan Reviews The test plan is the verification document for the tester; the accuracy of this document could be the most important phase of the product delivery process. Scrutinizing the application for testability, completen ess, sequencing, structure, and timings are the important factors for determining if the correct amount of testing has been completed.

Test Modifications All of our systems will be upgraded or enhanced at some time; th e applications must be tested to ensure that the existing functionality continues to function, but that the new functionality is working correctly. Analyzing the processes involved making modifications and the testing of those modifications is crucial to product success. • Maintenance Issues

- Maintenance Testing
- Estimating the Modifications
 Cost Benefit Identification

Defect Prevention

A primary concern for the organization should be ensuring that **h**e mistakes of the past are avoided in the future. The examination of the past lessons and suggests approaches to resolving problems. It recognizes that the chief responsibility of testing is defect prevention not defect detection. • Checklists

- Functional Specification Defects
 Design Defects
 Coding Defects
 Coding Defects

- Testing Defects
 Coding / Testing Rules

Test Management Recording results and investigating the origin of defects allows testers to develop measures that will be used as guidelines for future projects. These documents play a significant role in organizing and planning the final stages of the

- development effort. Test Logs Sample Defect Tracking Report

 - Test Log Scenarios
 Retesting and Follow-up Procedures
 Root Cause Analysis

10 Changes to Make Now to Improve Testing These are the ten items that New Instruction recommends for the improvement of quality in any organization. These suggestions when implemented correctly will

Acust of the second sec

- 4. Regression Testing 5. Test Execution Process Management
- 6. Incorporating Standards into Our Teams 7. Formalized Reviews and Walkthroughs 8. Installing Traceability Into Our Systems
- 9. Test Automation 10. Staff Development & Cross Training

Quality "Deep-Dive"

(973) 744-3339

© 2009 New Instruction, LLC





Ways of uncovering tests that might not be obvious from requirements.





For each test factor, take the number of test options, and add those to identify the minimum number of test cases required. Maximum number of tests determined by multiplying the number of options together – on Compute Home Insurance Rate slide, the range of test cases would be 22 to 1800 test cases.



...aka 'Pairwise Testing'

Minimize the number of test cases required by looking at factors in combination.

For each possible factor it can be included / excluded in a test.

Assumes that as long as each pair of factors is tested in SOME paired combination, you can eliminate test cases that would contain redundant combinations of factors



OATS tables use a NAMING CONVENTION – don't confuse NAMING CONVENTION with a calculation.



OATS (Orthogonal Array Testing Strategy):

L _{RUNS} (LEVELS ^{FACTORS}) RUNS = ((FACTORS -1) * LEVELS) Factors = the number of questions Levels = the maximum number of selection options for any one factor Runs = number of test cases required – determined by a table look-up

Once you have naming convention, you can look up the actual table



The Example provided (Lunch options on the slide) shows how that 9 runs are required to test all combinations.

Getting the TABLE is the MOST IMPORTANT part of this process!

Factors map to the options available (Factor 0 = the first selection / option for each factor, Factor 1 – the second selection / option for each factor, etc.

If a field is optional, make sure that blank is included as one of the options.

To find the table, see the URL on the slide, or just search Internet for OATS tables



Order options sequentially starting at 1.

Map numbers to magic square, and build test cases based on horizontal and/or vertical combinations.

Code Toad website has combinations and Magic Squares.





Starts with basic testing and moves to unscripted testing based on tester knowledge. (I wonder what happens if I)

The key to this testing is that it won't do everything, but it allows greater flexibility in our testing. The difficulty with this type of testing is to be able to define exactly what happened to generate the error so the error can be recreated.

First phase – not documented, not scripted.

Second phase – should be documented and scripted to become part of the test suite.











Must be determined as part of test planning – too late to try and do this in the actual testing window.

Help determine the number of test cases required in a particular system area.

Confidence Levels – Developers' confidence in the work completed – lower confidence should indicate need for additional testing.



Identifies the make-up of the DOCUMENTED project test plan.

High - 10-15% - includes critical functions - things that would stop all business continuation.

Medium - 15-25% - includes combinational errors / hiders / no showstoppers.

Low -60-75% - typically test only one feature / one function.







Test plan reviews serve as verification that plans are detailed enough for someone other than the author to be able to execute a particular test.





Primary purpose for doing reviews – Knowledge transfer. Reviews are excellent training tools for new employees – they can hear questions being asked and learn from both questions and answers.



ALWAYS have more than one expert on a certain domain area. Encourage 'interchangeable parts' approach. This requires excellent process and product documentation and standard processes and documents.



Author provides a review session document, including test plan, requirements being tested, test data information to all participants.

Participants include 2 - 3 other testers, 1 - 2 programmers (hopefully with application knowledge), 1 - 2 BAs (with application knowledge), 1 - 2 observers (new employees present to learn).

One of the other testers is charged with presenting the test plan – this is important because it gets around pride of ownership issues, provides a check on thoroughness of test plan (because if presenter can't provide information, then test plan is not detailed enough).

Techs are present to understand why tests are being conducted as planned, to ensure that they have complete understanding of requirement.

BAs are present to ensure that customers' needs are being met,

Testers are present to ensure they understand what testing will be done and how testing will take place.

Review meeting should be no longer than 1 - 1.5 hours.

In the actual Review meeting, if anyone hasn't reviewed material prior to the meeting, they are asked to leave – because they will slow down the meeting unacceptably.

Can go line by line through test plan, or better, is to go around the room asking each participant what questions they had.

Author is present to answer any questions that the presenter can't cover - in which situation the test plan should be updated with the new information.

In last 10 minutes of the meeting, next steps / updates required are summarized

A follow up meeting, which should take no longer than 30 minutes, is scheduled to ensure that all updates have been completed.

Testers and BAs should be included in CODE REVIEWS – if non-technicians can understand the logic of the program, then technicians who have to actually do the code should easily understand the work before them.







Need documented guidelines for implementing new ideas.

No 'on the fly' changes. No 'inspirational code' – that only one person can understand / maintain.





Micro-Estimating

Most precise, preferred method of estimating.

Break project into component phases, activities, tasks – estimate at task level and roll up to develop the project level estimate.

Most error-prone method of estimating – if not broken down correctly or if pieces are missed, then estimates are inaccurate.

Requires intricate knowledge of the function.

Top Down / Global

Off the top of the head.

Doesn't include detailed review of content / tasks.

Weighted Average

Good first technique if not using any formal method currently.

(A + 4B + C) / 6, where estimate A = best case, estimate B = most likely, and estimate C = worst case.

Rand – Delphi Appropriateness

Bring 3 - 4 very knowledgeable people together, have them separately document their estimate, including their concerns and rationale in developing the estimate.

They rotate estimates, and update the estimate in front of them, in turn, for all estimates developed.

End result is a set of documents containing estimates and factors / considerations in building the estimate and plans.

Re-Estimation by Phase

Develop detailed estimate by phase for each phase based on output from prior phase activities.

Historical Estimates - base estimates on actual historical data from prior projects

Compare current project to prior comparable projects.

Must compare to ACTUALS not to prior project estimates.

Estimation is NOT negotiation.

Quality "Deep-Dive"

(973) 744-3339

© 2009 New Instruction, LLC

This matrix represents are tight. We manage system. All percentag	a test strategy the test cases a es are target lev	where the test budg ccording to a three-t els for test coverage	et and timeframe ier management e.
LEVEL OF RISK	RELATIVE COST OF TEST		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
HIGH	85%	60%	40%
MEDIUM	50%	30%	0%
LOW	30%	0%	0%
If we assume budget a change horizontally in In the MEDIUM risk ca the LOW risk category	and timeframe a the HIGH risk a itegory the HIGH the MEDIUM ris	re reasonable, the n rea by about 15% a I cost number increa k category increases	umbers above cross the board. ases by 30% and in s by 15%.

Focuses on ROI for test investment.





Moves from programmer to system tester to execute.

Module / component level.

Continues until entire application is completely coded.



(Conducted by malicious QA group!)

System Testing – negative testing.

Acceptance Testing – positive testing – done after System testing is completed at a component level, usually by the same person.

Users don't always do a good job of acceptance, requiring QA or Systems testing to be more thorough.



"A fool with a tool ... is still a fool."

Must know what to test, how to build a good test plan before attempting to automate.

Standard tests should be automated (60% on average), the remaining portion becomes manual. As systems become more stable, that percentage moves heavier toward manual testing.

Alfa uses Quick TestPro for automation, CSC P&C uses Compuware's Xpediter Code Coverage Tool.



Comprehensive test of entire system to ensure new code not inadvertently breaking the system.

Especially should focus on Critical Function.

Identify 'regional testing' pieces – sections that don't touch each other, which allow sections to be tested in parallel, reducing elapsed execution time.

Example: 100 test cases in suite, for new release, run all 100 test cases, identify problem, fix problem, get next release, run entire test again, find new problems, fix problems, get next release, run entire test again, continue until all problems fixed OR re-test only the function that failed in previous execution and then on last pass, re-test everything that wasn't run on last successful test.



Regression test should NOT encounter a high find rate. Failures in regression test indicate a failure in earlier testing phases.

ANY defect that QC group finds cost justifies the existence of the QC group – because in theory, there should be NO defects available for QC to find, and without the group, those defects would have leaked out to the end users / customers.





The chief responsibility of testing is defect prevention – not defect detection!

Different activities in different phases can help with prevention.



Checklists for life cycle phases highlight symptoms that result when defects are not being adequately prevented.



Coding / Testing Rules should be in place in every organization.









Test Tools		
Automated Regression Tools	Test Case / Script Generators	
Test Data Generators/Managers	Automated Code Reviewers	
Complexity Measurement	Path Analyzer / Coverage Analyzer Tools	
Performance Analyzers	Network Performance Simulators	
Comparators	Protocol Analyzers	
Probes & Traffic Monitors	Code Optimizers	
Network Modeling & Simulation Tools	Transaction Processing Monitors	
Application Partitioning Tools	Server Database Monitoring Tools	
Pre-Compilers	Memory Leak Detectors	
State Transition Diagrammers	Report Generators	
Prototypers	Database Integrity Checkers	
Real-Time Test Tools	Image Quality Checkers	
Network Diagnostic Tools	Maintainability Evaluators / Re-Engineering Tools	
Communications Emulators	Back-up & Disaster Recovery Tools	
System Configuration Managers	Error Handling & Recovery Systems	
Defect Tracking Tools	Reliability and Defect Predictors	
Traceability Matrix Maintenance Tools	Version Control Tools	



Allows measurement of test density – the number of tests associated with each requirement.



Tests to be executed must be prioritized when conditions exist limiting test coverage.

	Tes	st Logs	
	Description	Brief Description	
	Test ID #	Case # / Script # / Run # Traceability Matrix Reference	-
	Time & Date		
	People	Initiating Test Recording Results Receiving Results	
	Result	Pass or Fail / Suspend or Resume	
	Version of Software		
	Test Database Configuration	Initial Test Conditions Disposition of Modified Databases Platform Video / Memory / Operating System / GUI	
	Fails	Expected Result Actual Result All Diagnostic Information Concurrent Activity	
	Follow-up	Problem Tracking Number Retest Scheduling Notifications	~
Quality "Deep-Dive"	(9	73) 744-3339 © 2009 New In:	struction, LLC

Documents test execution. Most organizations capture date / time / result only.

Company:	Date/Time: Problem Report #		
Program:	Release:	Version:	
Report Type:	(1-Coding, 2-Design, 3-Suggestion, 4-Documentation, 5-Hardware)		
Severity Level:	(1-Fatal, 2-Serious, 3-Minor, 4-Undefined at this time, 5-Not Significant)		
Environment:	Configuration:		
Attachments (Y	ments (Y/N): Reproducible (Y/N): Attempts to Reproduce:		
Test Case Num	ber:		
Test Case Num Problem Descri	ber: ption:		
Test Case Num Problem Descri Functional Area	ber: ption: : Si	uggested Fix:	
Test Case Num Problem Descri Functional Area Reported By:	ber: ption: : Si Date/Time:	uggested Fix: Assigned To:	 Date/Time:
Test Case Num Problem Descri Functional Area Reported By: Comments:	ber: ption: : Si Date/Time:	uggested Fix: Assigned To:	Date/Time:
Test Case Num Problem Descri Functional Area Reported By: Comments: Status:	ber: ption: :: Si Date/Time: (1-Open, 2-Closed, 3-Pending)	uggested Fix: Assigned To: Priority: (1-High, 2	Date/Time: 2-Medium, 3-Low)
Test Case Num Problem Descri Functional Area Reported By: Comments: Status: Resolution:	ber: ption: :: Si Date/Time: (1-Open, 2-Closed, 3-Pending) (1-Pending, 2-As Designed, 3-Fixi	uggested Fix: Assigned To: Priority: (1-High, 2 ed, 4-No Fix, 5-Deferred, 6	Date/Time: 2-Medium, 3-Low) -More Info.)
Test Case Num Problem Descri Functional Area Reported By: Comments: Status: Status: Resolution: Version:	ber: ption: :: Si Date/Time: (1-Open, 2-Closed, 3-Pending) (1-Pending, 2-As Designed, 3-Fix: Tested By: Date/T	uggested Fix: Assigned To: Priority: (1-High, 2 ed, 4-No Fix, 5-Deferred, 6 ime:	Date/Time: 2-Medium, 3-Low) -More Info.)

Reviewing report portfolio gives insight into defect sources – process / procedures that need to be improved.







Key step in future defect prevention. Analysis is typically owned by the QA group (whether or not part of the ISQA group). This analysis becomes part of their process improvement efforts.





- 1. Requirements and Specifications should be documented separately. Requirements capture 'what' is needed / the system should do. Specifications define 'how' the function will be done. Diagrams / pictures / charts are extremely effective in conveying details.
- 2. Estimates of the testing effort build estimates based on number of test scripts based on number of spec pages.
- 3. Document system and unit test plans.
- 4. Conduct automated regression testing.
- 5. Have a Documented Test Execution Process What will happen when a test fails? What is your process to work through to completion?
- 6. Incorporate standard processes and procedures in teams.
- Formalize review and walkthrough processes just the expectation that work will be reviewed improves quality. Managers are NOT included in the review process – because it could discourage the truth – people don't want to admit in front of a manager that there are problems.
- 8. Install traceability into systems helps to keep focus, identifies tests that need to be run for changes to functionality.
- 9. Automate tests Development team and test team must be in agreement in the testing tool selected. Total commitment to the tool is required the tools are expensive, you need to be sure that it's the right / best tool for your situation before you buy.
- 10. Conduct staff development and cross-training.





2	b. Estimates of the Tes	ting Efforts	
Element	Example	Practice	Estimate
Functional Specifications	40 pages	10-15 test scripts / page	400-600 scripts
Test Scripts	500 scripts	2 - 3 test cases / script	1,000-1,500 cases
Test Case Development	1,250 cases	15 cases / day (5-75 range)	80 days
Test Execution	1,250 cases	50-100 per day	13-21 days
Test Re-run Overhead	1,250 tests (cases)	@ 15% - 20%	200 re-runs
		ł	-
Quality "Deep-Dive"	(973) 74	4-3339 ©	2009 New Instruction, LLC











7a. Formalized Reviews and Walkthroughs		
SDLC Phase	Review	
Concept & Viability	Customers and developers negotiate the functionality of the new system. The review is careful to emphasize customer expectations, not technical feasibility. The walkthrough will also evaluate test acceptance criteria.	
Analysis & Design	The design reflects the MIS understanding of how the new softwa will function. The User Manual may be reviewed to verify that the requirements and implementation are accurate and satisfactory to the customer.	
Build	Code walkthroughs have value, but walkthroughs occurring before actual coding provide a critique on the approach, language, platform, etc.	
Test	Evaluates the test plan and reviews the test methodology, procedures, and test tools.	
Installation & Production	The walkthrough will examine the plan for installation and the best approach for switching customers to the new product.	
Enhancement	The original design should reflect the inevitability of "enhancing the system" and how well the product supports change.	
Quality "Deep-Dive	e" (973) 744-3339 © 2009 New Instruction, LLC	

7b. Formalized Reviews and Walkthroughs

ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Finds Defects Early	Time Commitments
Promotes Communication	Availability of SME's
Expectation of a Review Increases the Quality	Interruptions
Builds Involvement	Defensive Authors
Promotes Uniformity	Insensitive Audiences
Trains in Functionality & Design	Long Meetings
Identifies Opportunities for Improved Practices	Negative Rewards
	Unfocused Meetings
	Not Following Through on the Results
Quality "Deep-Dive" (973) 74	4-3339 © 2009 New Instruction, LLC







