System Verification and Validation Plan Checklist

Spencer Smith

October 10, 2019

- Follows the template, all parts present
  - ☐ Table of contents
  - ☐ Pages are numbered
  - ☐ Revision history included for major revisions
  - ☐ Sections from template are all present
  - ☐ Values of auxiliary constants are given (constants are used to improve maintainability and to increase understandability)
- Grammar, spelling, presentation
  - ☐ No spelling mistakes (use a spell checker!)
  - ☐ No grammar mistakes (review, ask someone else to review (at least a few sections))
  - ☐ Paragraphs are structured well (clear topic sentence, cohesive)
  - ☐ Paragraphs are concise (not wordy)
  - ☐ No Low Information Content (LIC) phrases (List of LIC phrases)
  - ☐ All hyperlinks work
  - ☐ Every figure has a caption
  - ☐ Every table has a heading
  - ☐ Symbolic names are used for quantities, rather than literal values
- LaTeX

- ☐ Template comments do not show in the pdf version, either by removing them, or by turning them off.
- ☐ References and labels are used so that maintenance is feasible

- Overall qualities of documentation
  - ☐ Test cases include SPECIFIC input
  - ☐ Test cases include EXPLICIT output
  - ☐ Description over specification, when appropriate
  - ☐ Plans for what to do with description data (performance, usability, etc). This may involve saying what plots will be generated.
  - ☐ Plans to quantify error for scalar values using relative error
  - ☐ Plans to quantify error for vector and matrix values using a norm of an error vector (matrix)
  - ☐ Plans are feasible
  - ☐ Plans are ambitous enough for an A+ effort
  - ☐ Survey questions for usability survey are in an Appendix (if appropriate)
  - ☐ Plans for the use of student colleague reviewers beyond just assigning them to review - maybe introduce task based inspection?
  - ☐ Very careful use of random testing