## **SYLLABUS**

# 1. Information regarding the programme

| 1.1 Higher education  | Babes-Bolyai University                     |
|-----------------------|---|
| institution           |   |
| 1.2 Faculty           | Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science |
| 1.3 Department        | Department of Computer Science              |
| 1.4 Field of study    | Computers and Information Technology        |
| 1.5 Study cycle       | Bachelor                                    |
| 1.6 Study programme / | Information Engineering                     |
| Qualification         |   |

# 2. Information regarding the discipline

| 2.1 Name of the discipline To |   |          |   | st Design Techniqu                   | ies |             |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|---|--------------------------------------|-----|-------------|----------|
| 2.2 Course coordinator        |   |          |   | Lecturer PhD Camelia Chisăliță-Crețu |     |             |          |
| 2.3 Seminar coordinator       |   |          |   | Lecturer PhD Camelia Chisăliță-Crețu |     |             |          |
| 2.4. Year of                  | 4 | 2.5      | 8 | 2.6. Type of                         | C   | 2.7 Type of | Optional |
| study                         |   | Semester |   | evaluation                           |     | discipline  | DS       |
| 2.8 Discipline MLE5110        |   |          | • | •                                    | -   |             |          |
| Code                          |   | MILESTIU |   |                                      |     |             |          |

## **3. Total estimated time** (hours/semester of didactic activities)

| 3.1 Hours per week  | 5  | Of which: 3.2 course | 2  | 3.3                | 1 LP + |  |
|---|----|----------------------|----|--------------------|--------|--|
| Para and Para Date  |    | 31                   | _  | seminar/laboratory | 2 P    |  |
| 3.4 Total hours in the curriculum   | 70 | Of which: 3.5        | 28 | 3.6                | 42     |  |
|   |    | course               |    | seminar/laboratory |        |  |
| Time allotment:   |    |                      |    |                    | Hours  |  |
| Learning using manual, course support, bibliography, course notes                     |    |                      |    |                    | 20     |  |
| Additional documentation (in libraries, on electronic platforms, field documentation) |    |                      |    |                    | 8      |  |
| Preparation for seminars/labs, homework, papers, portfolios and essays                |    |                      |    |                    | 20     |  |
| Tutorship   |    |                      |    |                    | 2      |  |
| Evaluations   |    |                      |    |                    | 5      |  |
| Other activities:   |    |                      |    |                    | -      |  |
| 27 T. 1' 1' 1 1 . 1 1   |    |                      |    |                    |        |  |

| 3.7 Total individual study hours | 55  |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| 3.8 Total hours per semester     | 125 |
| 3.9 Number of ECTS credits       | 5   |

## **4. Prerequisites** (if necessary)

| 4.1. curriculum   | <ul> <li>OOP, Programming Fundamentals, Advanced Programming<br/>Methods</li> </ul> |
|-------------------|---|
| 4.2. competencies | Good programming skills in at least one of the programming languages Java, C#       |

## **5. Conditions** (if necessary)

| 5.1. for the course       | Course hall with projector                              |
|---------------------------|---|
| 5.2. for the seminar /lab | Laboratory: computers and use of a programming language |
| activities                | environment   |

6. Specific competencies acquired

| Professional competencies | <ul> <li>C3.2 Using interdisciplinary knowledge, solution patterns and tools, making experiments and interpreting their results</li> <li>C3.3 Applying solution patterns using specific engineering tools and mehods</li> <li>C3.4 Comparatively and experimentally evaluation of the alternative solutions for performance optimization</li> <li>C4.4 Managing the life cycle of hardware, software and communications systems based on performance evaluation</li> </ul> |
|---------------------------|--|
|                           | • C4.5 Developing, implementing and integrating software solutions   |
| Transversal               | <ul> <li>CT1 Honorable, responsible, ethical behavior, in the spirit of the law, to ensure the professional reputation</li> <li>CT3 Demonstrating initiative and pro-active behavior for updating professional, economical and organizational culture knowledge</li> </ul>   |

# **7. Objectives of the discipline** (outcome of the acquired competencies)

| 7.1 General objective of the  | • Enhance the students understanding of testing and test design techniques.           |
|-------------------------------|---|
| discipline                    | • Provide the students with an environment in which they can explore the              |
|                               | usage and usefulness of software testing and test design concepts in                  |
|                               | various business scenarios.   |
|                               | • Induce a realistic and industry driven view of software testing concepts            |
|                               | and their inherent benefits.  |
| 7.2 Specific objective of the | • Give students the ability to explore various test design techniques                 |
| discipline                    | applied to different levels of testing.   |
|                               | <ul> <li>Improve the students' abilities to tackle on goal driven testing.</li> </ul> |
|                               | • Enhance the students understanding of test design techniques value in               |
|                               | business.   |
|                               | • Students will be able to use various tools for the testing process (i.e., test      |
|                               | management, test running, test reporting and bug reporting).                          |
|                               | • Students will be able to design test cases according to an established              |
|                               | testing goal and using specific test design technique in order to                     |
|                               | investigate the software.   |

# 8. Content

| 8.1 | Course  | Teaching methods                              | Remarks |
|-----|---|---|---------|
| 1.  | <b>Software Testing. Test Design Techniques</b> | <ul> <li>Interactive exposure</li> </ul>      |         |
|     | 1.1. Software Testing. Goals. Scope             | <ul> <li>Explanation. Conversation</li> </ul> |         |
|     | 1.2. Test Design Technique. Attributes          | <ul> <li>Didactical demonstration</li> </ul>  |         |
|     | 1.3. Taxonomy of Test Design Techniques         |   |         |
| 2.  | Coverage-based Techniques I                     | <ul> <li>Interactive exposure</li> </ul>      |         |
|     | 2.1. Focus. Objectives                          | <ul> <li>Explanation. Conversation</li> </ul> |         |
|     | 2.2. Tours. Logical Expressions                 | <ul> <li>Didactical demonstration</li> </ul>  |         |
| 3.  | Coverage-based Techniques II                    | <ul> <li>Interactive exposure</li> </ul>      |         |
|     | 3.1. Specification-based Testing;               | • Explanation. Conversation                   |         |
|     | 3.2. Requirements-based Testing;                | <ul> <li>Didactical demonstration</li> </ul>  |         |
| 4.  | Risk-based Techniques I                         | <ul> <li>Interactive exposure</li> </ul>      |         |
|     | 4.1. Focus. Objectives                          | <ul> <li>Explanation. Conversation</li> </ul> |         |
|     | 4.2. HTSM. Failure modes                        | <ul> <li>Didactical demonstration</li> </ul>  |         |
| 5.  | Risk-based Techniques II                        | <ul> <li>Interactive exposure</li> </ul>      |         |
|     | 5.1. Risk Management-based Techniques           | • Explanation. Conversation                   |         |
|     | 5.2. Quick-tests. History-based Testing.        | <ul> <li>Didactical demonstration</li> </ul>  |         |

| Usability Testing   |  |
|---|--|
| 6. Activity-based Techniques I  | Interactive exposure   |
| 6.1. Focus. Objectives  | Explanation. Conversation  |
| 6.2. Use Cases Testing. Scenario Testing  | Didactical demonstration   |
| 7. Activity-based Techniques II   | Interactive exposure   |
| 7.1. Guerilla Testing. All-pairs Testing  | Explanation. Conversation  |
| 7.2. Coverage-based Techniques vs Activity-based Techniques                           | Didactical demonstration   |
| 8. Evaluation-based Techniques  | Interactive exposure   |
| 8.1. Focus. Objectives  | • Explanation  |
| 8.2. Function Equivalence Testing. Self-  | • Conversation   |
| verifying data  | Didactical demonstration   |
| 9. Desired result-based Techniques  | Interactive exposure   |
| 9.1. Focus. Objectives  | • Explanation. Conversation  |
| 9.2. Confirmation Testing. User Acceptance  | Didactical demonstration   |
| Testing   | 5 Blatter demonstration  |
| 9.3. Desired-based Techniques vs Evaluation-  |  |
| based Techniques  |  |
| 10. Tester-based Techniques   | Interactive exposure   |
| 10.1.Focus. Objectives  | Explanation. Conversation  |
| 10.2.User Testing. Alpha Testing. Beta Testing  | Didactical demonstration   |
| 10.3.Bug Bashes. Paired Testing.  |  |
| 10.4.Coverage-based Techniques vs Tester-based  |  |
| Techniques  11. Test Design Techniques Analysis                                       | - Interactive even sum   |
| 11. 1 Test Design Techniques Analysis 11.1. Tester-based Techniques vs Activity-based | <ul><li>Interactive exposure</li><li>Explanation. Conversation</li></ul> |
| Techniques  Techniques  | Didactical demonstration   |
| 11.2.Risk-based Techniques vs Coverage-based  | • Didactical demonstration   |
| Techniques  |  |
| 11.3.Desired result-based Techniques vs Risk-   |  |
| based Techniques  |  |
| 12. Security Testing  | Interactive exposure   |
| 12.1.Terminology  | Explanation. Conversation  |
| 12.2.Types  | Didactical demonstration   |
| 12.3.Advanced Techniques  |  |
| 13. Bug Reporting   | • Interactive exposure   |
| 13.1.Challenges   | Conversation   |
| 13.2.RIMGEA Strategy 14. Project Presentations  | - Interactive even sure  |
| 14. I Toject Fresentations  | • Interactive exposure   |
|   | Conversation   |

## **Bibliography**

[Kaner99] C. Kaner, J. Falk, H.Q. Nguyen, Testing Computer Software, Wiley, 1999.

[Brn02] I. Burnstein, Practical Software Testing, Springer, 2002.

[Kaner02] C. Kaner, J. Bach, B. Pettichord, Lesson Learned in Software Testing, Wiley, 2002.

[Mye04] Glenford J. Myers, *The Art of Software Testing*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004.

[Nai08] K. Naik, P. Tripathy, *Software testing and quality assurance. Theory and Practice*, A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008.

[Crs09] L. Crispin, J. Grecory, *Agile testing: a practical guide for testers and agile teams*, Addison-Wesley, 2009.

[Pres10] R. S. Pressman, *Software engineering: a practinioner's approach*, seventh edition, Higher Education, 2010.

[BBST2008] BBST – Bug Advocacy,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/bugadvocacy/BugAdvocacy2008.pdf

[BBST2010] BBST – Fundamentals of Testing, Cem Kaner,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/foundations/BBSTFoundationsNov2010.pdf.

[BBST2011] BBST – Test Design, Cem Kaner,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/testdesign/BBSTTestDesign2011pfinal.pdf

[Whitt2012] J. Whittaker, J. Arbon J. Carollo, *How Google Tests Software*, Google, Pearson Education, 2012.

[OWASP2014] QWASP, Testing guide 4.0, 2014, https://owasp.org/www-project-web-security-testing-guide/assets/archive/OWASP Testing Guide v4.pdf

[NRVR2014] Ana Filipa Nogueira, José Carlos Ribeiro, Francisco Fernández de Vega, Mário Alberto Zenha-Rela, *Object-Oriented Evolutionary Testing: A Review of Evolutionary Approaches to the Generation of Test Data for Object-Oriented Software*, International Journal of Natural Computing Research 4(4):15-35, October, 2014.

[KMS2014] Kaur, Manpreet and Rupinder Singh. A Review of Software Testing Techniques, 2014.

[Meer2014] Joris Meerts, Functional Testing Heuritics,

https://www.testingreferences.com/docs/Functional\_Testing\_Heuristics.pdf

[Draghia2019] Claudiu Draghia, *Gamificarea in software testing. Testing Challenges*, <a href="http://testingchallenges.thetestingmap.org/">http://testingchallenges.thetestingmap.org/</a>, 2019.

[ForK2019] István Forgács, Attila Kovács, *Practical Test Design Selection of traditional and automated test design techniques*, BCS, 2019.

[BSR2021] F. A. Bhuiyan, M. B. Sharif and A. Rahman, *Security Bug Report Usage for Software Vulnerability Research: A Systematic Mapping Study*, IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 28471-28495, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3058067.

[AIW2021] Samah W.G. AbuSalim, Rosziati Ibrahim, Jahari Abdul Wahab, *Comparative Analysis of Software Testing Techniques for Mobile Applications*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, vol 1793, 2021.

[PLGM2022] Sheena Panthaplackel, Junyi Jessy Li, Milos Gligoric, Raymond J. Mooney, *Learning to Describe Solutions for Bug Reports Based on Developer Discussions*, ACL 2022, pp. 2935 – 2952.

| Describe Solutions for Bug Reports Based on Developer Discussions, ACL 2022, pp. 2955 – 2952. |                                       |         |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------|--|--|--|
| 8.2 Seminar / laboratory  | Teaching methods                      | Remarks |  |  |  |
| 1. Laboratory 1   | Presentation, Conversation,           |         |  |  |  |
| Testing Project Setup   | Problematizations, Discovery, Other   |         |  |  |  |
|   | methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |
| 2. Laboratory 2   | Presentation, Conversation,           |         |  |  |  |
| Coverage-based Techniques   | Problematizations, Discovery, Other   |         |  |  |  |
|   | methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |
| 3. Laboratory 3   | Presentation, Conversation,           |         |  |  |  |
| Risk-based Techniques   | Problematizations, Discovery, Other   |         |  |  |  |
| •   | methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |
| 4. Laboratory 4   | Presentation, Conversation,           |         |  |  |  |
| Test Automation Tools   | Problematizations, Discovery, Other   |         |  |  |  |
|   | methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |
| 5. Laboratory 5   | Presentation, Conversation,           |         |  |  |  |
| Activity-based Techniques   | Problematizations, Discovery, Other   |         |  |  |  |
| •   | methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |
| 6. Laboratory 6   | Presentation, Conversation,           |         |  |  |  |
| Desired result-based Techniques   | Problematizations, Discovery, Other   |         |  |  |  |
|   | methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |
| 7. Laboratory 7   | Evaluation                            |         |  |  |  |
| Project turn-in   |                                       |         |  |  |  |

#### **Bibliography**

[Kaner99] C. Kaner, J. Falk, H.O. Nguyen, Testing Computer Software, Wiley, 1999.

[Brn02] I. Burnstein, *Practical Software Testing*, Springer, 2002.

[Kaner02] C. Kaner, J. Bach, B. Pettichord, Lesson Learned in Software Testing, Wiley, 2002.

[Mye04] Glenford J. Myers, *The Art of Software Testing*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004.

[Nai08] K. Naik, P. Tripathy, *Software testing and quality assurance. Theory and Practice*, A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008.

[Crs09] L. Crispin, J. Grecory, *Agile testing: a practical guide for testers and agile teams*, Addison-Wesley, 2009.

[Pres10] R. S. Pressman, *Software engineering: a practinioner's approach*, seventh edition, Higher Education, 2010.

[BBST2008] BBST – Bug Advocacy,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/bugadvocacy/BugAdvocacy2008.pdf

[BBST2010] BBST – Fundamentals of Testing, Cem Kaner,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/foundations/BBSTFoundationsNov2010.pdf.

[BBST2011] BBST – Test Design, Cem Kaner,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/testdesign/BBSTTestDesign2011pfinal.pdf

[Whitt2012] J. Whittaker, J. Arbon J. Carollo, *How Google Tests Software*, Google, Pearson Education, 2012.

[OWASP2014] QWASP, Testing guide 4.0, 2014, <a href="https://owasp.org/www-project-web-security-testing-guide/assets/archive/OWASP\_Testing\_Guide\_v4.pdf">https://owasp.org/www-project-web-security-testing-guide/assets/archive/OWASP\_Testing\_Guide\_v4.pdf</a>

[NRVR2014] Ana Filipa Nogueira, José Carlos Ribeiro, Francisco Fernández de Vega, Mário Alberto Zenha-Rela, *Object-Oriented Evolutionary Testing: A Review of Evolutionary Approaches to the Generation of Test Data for Object-Oriented Software*, International Journal of Natural Computing Research 4(4):15-35, October, 2014.

[KMS2014] Kaur, Manpreet and Rupinder Singh. A Review of Software Testing Techniques, 2014.

[Meer2014] Joris Meerts, Functional Testing Heuritics,

https://www.testingreferences.com/docs/Functional\_Testing\_Heuristics.pdf

[Draghia2019] Claudiu Draghia, Gamificarea in software testing. Testing Challenges,

http://testingchallenges.thetestingmap.org/, 2019.

[ForK2019] István Forgács, Attila Kovács, *Practical Test Design Selection of traditional and automated test design techniques*, BCS, 2019.

[BSR2021] F. A. Bhuiyan, M. B. Sharif and A. Rahman, *Security Bug Report Usage for Software Vulnerability Research: A Systematic Mapping Study*, IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 28471-28495, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3058067.

[AIW2021] Samah W.G. AbuSalim, Rosziati Ibrahim, Jahari Abdul Wahab, *Comparative Analysis of Software Testing Techniques for Mobile Applications*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, vol 1793, 2021.

[PLGM2022] Sheena Panthaplackel, Junyi Jessy Li, Milos Gligoric, Raymond J. Mooney, *Learning to Describe Solutions for Bug Reports Based on Developer Discussions*, ACL 2022, pp. 2935 – 2952.

| Desc  | Describe Solutions for Bug Reports Bused on Developer Discussions, Nell 2022, pp. 2735 2732. |   |         |  |  |  |  |
|-------|--|---|---------|--|--|--|--|
| 8.3 ] | Project  | Teaching methods  | Remarks |  |  |  |  |
| 1.    | Week 01 Software Project Presentation Software project goals Team organization               | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations,  |         |  |  |  |  |
| 2.    | Week 02 Application Context Information Objectives (Part I and Part II)                      | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |  |
| 3.    | Week 03 Testing Mission (Part I and Part II) Testing Strategy (Part I and Part II)           | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |  |
| 4.    | Week 04  Test Design Technique Selection (part I and Part II)                                | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |         |  |  |  |  |
| 5.    | Week 05 Test Design (Part I)   | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study,           |         |  |  |  |  |

|   | exercises   |
|---|---|
| 6. Week 06 Test Design (Part II)                      | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 7. Week 07 Test Implementation (Part I)               | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 8. Week 08 Test Implementation (Part II)              | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 9. Week 09 Testing Report (Part I)                    | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 10. Week 10 Testing Report (Part II)                  | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 11. Week 11  Bug Reporting (Part I)                   | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 12. Week 12 Bug Reporting (Part II)                   | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 13. Week 13  Testing project presentation preparation | Presentation, Conversation, Problematizations, Discovery, Other methods – individual study, exercises |
| 14. Week 14 Project turn-in                           | Evaluation  |

### **Bibliography**

[Kaner99] C. Kaner, J. Falk, H.Q. Nguyen, *Testing Computer Software*, Wiley, 1999.

[Brn02] I. Burnstein, Practical Software Testing, Springer, 2002.

[Kaner02] C. Kaner, J. Bach, B. Pettichord, Lesson Learned in Software Testing, Wiley, 2002.

[Mye04] Glenford J. Myers, The Art of Software Testing, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2004.

[Nai08] K. Naik, P. Tripathy, *Software testing and quality assurance. Theory and Practice*, A John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008.

[Crs09] L. Crispin, J. Grecory, *Agile testing: a practical guide for testers and agile teams*, Addison-Wesley, 2009.

[Pres10] R. S. Pressman, *Software engineering: a practinioner's approach*, seventh edition, Higher Education, 2010.

[BBST2008] BBST – Bug Advocacy,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/bugadvocacy/BugAdvocacy2008.pdf

[BBST2010] BBST – Fundamentals of Testing, Cem Kaner,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/foundations/BBSTFoundationsNov2010.pdf.

[BBST2011] BBST – Test Design, Cem Kaner,

http://www.testingeducation.org/BBST/testdesign/BBSTTestDesign2011pfinal.pdf

[Whitt2012] J. Whittaker, J. Arbon J. Carollo, *How Google Tests Software*, Google, Pearson Education, 2012.

[OWASP2014] QWASP, Testing guide 4.0, 2014, https://owasp.org/www-project-web-security-testing-guide/assets/archive/OWASP Testing Guide v4.pdf

[NRVR2014] Ana Filipa Nogueira, José Carlos Ribeiro, Francisco Fernández de Vega, Mário Alberto Zenha-Rela, *Object-Oriented Evolutionary Testing: A Review of Evolutionary Approaches to the Generation of Test Data for Object-Oriented Software*, International Journal of Natural Computing Research 4(4):15-35, October, 2014.

[KMS2014] Kaur, Manpreet and Rupinder Singh. *A Review of Software Testing Techniques*, 2014. [Meer2014] Joris Meerts, *Functional Testing Heuritics*,

https://www.testingreferences.com/docs/Functional\_Testing\_Heuristics.pdf

[Draghia2019] Claudiu Draghia, Gamificarea in software testing. Testing Challenges,

http://testingchallenges.thetestingmap.org/, 2019.

[ForK2019] István Forgács, Attila Kovács, *Practical Test Design Selection of traditional and automated test design techniques*, BCS, 2019.

[BSR2021] F. A. Bhuiyan, M. B. Sharif and A. Rahman, *Security Bug Report Usage for Software Vulnerability Research: A Systematic Mapping Study*, IEEE Access, vol. 9, pp. 28471-28495, 2021, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3058067.

[AIW2021] Samah W.G. AbuSalim, Rosziati Ibrahim, Jahari Abdul Wahab, *Comparative Analysis of Software Testing Techniques for Mobile Applications*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series, vol 1793, 2021.

[PLGM2022] Sheena Panthaplackel, Junyi Jessy Li, Milos Gligoric, Raymond J. Mooney, *Learning to Describe Solutions for Bug Reports Based on Developer Discussions*, ACL 2022, pp. 2935 – 2952.

# 9. Corroborating the content of the discipline with the expectations of the epistemic community, professional associations and representative employers within the field of the program

- Students will know how to apply test design techniques for a software product, in a similar way they are used in industry.
- Students will be able to understand the differences between the goals and scope of the various test techniques applied to a software system.

#### 10. Evaluation

| Type of activity                   | 10.1 Evaluation criteria  | 10.2 Evaluation methods | 10.3 Share in the |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------|
|                                    |   |                         | grade (%)         |
| 10.4 Project                       | Design and develop a testing solution (project) for a software product with focus on test design techniques. The corresponding grade is denoted by <b>P</b> . | Oral Examination        | 70%               |
| 10.5 Seminar/laboratory activities | Each lab activity will be graded. The arithmetic average of the grades is denoted by <b>L</b> .   | Laboratory Activity     | 30%               |

#### Remark:

- Laboratory assignments will pe achieved in groups of 2-3 students.
- Testing project will pe achieved in groups of 4-5 students.

### 10.6 Minimum performance standards

• Students will be able to apply test design techniques according to established goals for a software system.

- Students will be able to unstandard the differences between software testing goal, scope, and test design technique concepts.
- The final grade (M) is computed as follows: M = 30%L + 70%P.

• At least  $M \ge 5.00$  is favourable to pass this course exam.

Date

Signature of course coordinator

Signature of seminar coordinator

17.05.2022

Lect. PhD. Camelia Chisăliță-Crețu,

Lect. PhD. Camelia Chisăliță-Crețu,

Christita

Christitz

Date of approval

Signature of the head of department

Prof. PhD. Laura Dioșan

24.05.2022