



SOFTWARE TESTING ACADEMY

# PR4: 1<sup>st</sup> Pilot Report

---

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

# INDEX

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>2. DEMOGRAPHICS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2. AGE DISTRIBUTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3. GENDER DISTRIBUTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.4. NATIONALITY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2.5. COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.6. PREFERRED LANGUAGE</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.7. EDUCATION LEVEL</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.8. EXPERIENCE IN SOFTWARE TESTING</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.9. AWARENESS OF THE PROGRAM</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2.10. SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3. EVALUATION OF THE 1ST PILOT – PLATFORM</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>3.2. QUANTITATIVE FEEDBACK</b> .....	<b>8</b>
3.2.1. <i>Overall Ratings</i> .....	8
<b>3.3. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.3.1. <i>Common Themes</i> .....	9
3.3.2. <i>Participant Satisfaction</i> .....	10
<b>3.4. SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>4. EVALUATION OF THE 1ST PILOT – LEARNING PATHS</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>4.1. OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION DISTRIBUTION</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>4.2. AGILE TESTING PATH</b> .....	<b>11</b>
4.2.1. <i>Quantitative Ratings</i> .....	11
4.2.2. <i>Key Themes from Written Suggestions</i> .....	11
4.2.3. <i>Participant Satisfaction</i> .....	12
<b>4.3. ACCESSIBILITY IN TESTING PATH</b> .....	<b>12</b>
4.3.1. <i>Quantitative Ratings</i> .....	12
4.3.2. <i>Key Themes from Written Suggestions</i> .....	12
4.3.3. <i>Participant Satisfaction</i> .....	13
<b>4.4. AUTOMATION IN TESTING PATH</b> .....	<b>13</b>
4.4.1. <i>Quantitative Ratings</i> .....	13
4.4.2. <i>Key Themes from Written Suggestions</i> .....	13
4.4.3. <i>Participant Satisfaction</i> .....	13
<b>4.5. SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>5. CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>15</b>

# 1. Introduction

This report provides a detailed analysis of the first pilot evaluation of the training program, conducted with a diverse group of 67 participants. The program aimed to offer specialized learning experiences through three carefully designed paths: Agile Testing, Accessibility in Testing, and Automation in Testing. These paths were tailored to address key areas in software testing, enhancing participants' professional competencies while fostering a deeper understanding of industry practices.

The evaluation covered three main areas: participant demographics, platform evaluation, and paths evaluation. The demographic analysis sheds light on the diverse profiles of the participants, including their professional backgrounds, expertise levels, and motivations for enrolling in the program. This data helps contextualize the feedback and ensures that the program's impact is assessed with a comprehensive understanding of the audience it served.

The platform evaluation examines the usability and functionality of the online environment that hosted the program. Participants were asked to assess the platform's user-friendliness, navigation experience, and overall effectiveness in supporting their learning journey. This feedback is critical in determining whether the platform adequately facilitated engagement and content delivery.

The paths evaluation focuses on the specific learning experiences provided in Agile Testing, Accessibility in Testing, and Automation in Testing. Through quantitative ratings and qualitative feedback, participants evaluated the content's relevance, clarity, and practical applicability, as well as the engagement level of activities and discussions. Suggestions for improvement were also collected, providing actionable insights to refine future iterations of the program.

By analyzing the feedback across these three dimensions, this report offers a holistic view of the program's performance during its first pilot run. The findings not only highlight areas of success but also identify opportunities for improvement, serving as a foundation for optimizing the program to better meet participants' learning needs and align with industry standards. This report is a vital step in the program's iterative development, ensuring its continued growth and relevance in the field of software testing.

## 2. Demographics

### 2.1. Introduction

This chapter analyzes the demographic profile of individuals who engaged in the first pilot of the Software Testers Academy, an Erasmus+ project. The Academy aims to provide free learning opportunities in software testing, particularly to those in need, by developing an accessible and inclusive platform. A total of 99 participants took part in the first pilot test. This demographic analysis highlights the age, gender, nationality, country of residence, language preferences, education levels, and prior experience of these participants, as well as the methods through which they discovered the program.

### 2.2. Age Distribution

Participants were grouped into four age categories:

- 16–20 years: 37 respondents (37.4%)
- 21–30 years: 29 respondents (29.3%)
- 31–40 years: 29 respondents (29.3%)
- 41–50 years: 4 respondents (4%)

The majority (66.7%) were aged 30 or younger, highlighting the program's strong appeal to younger individuals who may be seeking educational and professional growth opportunities.

### 2.3. Gender Distribution

The gender breakdown among respondents was as follows:

- Male: 62 participants (62.6%)
- Female: 37 participants (37.4%)

While the majority were male, the participation of 37 women demonstrates the project's potential to attract a diverse gender audience, contributing to inclusivity in software testing education.

### 2.4. Nationality

Participants represented 16 different nationalities, showcasing the project's international reach. The largest groups included Portuguese (37.4%), Zimbabwean (13.1%), and Brazilian (12.1%) participants. Other notable nationalities included German (8.1%), Spanish (6.1%), and Ukrainian (5%).

---

Nationality	Percentage
Portuguese	37.4%
Zimbabwean	13.1%
Brazilian	12.1%
German	8.1%
Spanish	6.1%
Ukrainian	5%
São Tomense	5%
Nigerian	3%
Colombian	2%
Argentine	2%
Other (single respondents)	6.3%

This diversity reflects the Academy's capacity to reach participants across multiple continents, emphasizing its global perspective and mission.

## 2.5. Country of Residence

The distribution of participants by country of residence also highlights the Academy's international scope:

- Portugal: 48.5%
- Poland: 23.2%
- Spain: 11.1%
- Germany: 10.1%
- Brazil: 4%
- São Tomé and Príncipe: 3%

The majority of participants reside in Portugal and Poland, demonstrating the strong impact of local partnerships in these countries.

## 2.6. Preferred Language

Participants were asked about their preferred language to engage in the pilot program. The responses were as follows:

- English: 49.5%
- Portuguese: 36.4%
- German: 7.1%
- Spanish: 6.1%
- Local language of São Tomé and Príncipe: 1%

English was the most preferred language, aligning with the Academy's international nature, but Portuguese was also significant, indicating the need for multilingual accessibility in the platform.

## 2.7. Education Level

Respondents reported their highest level of education as follows:

- Secondary School: 53.5%
- Bachelor's Degree: 27.3%
- Master's Degree: 17.2%

Over half of the participants (53.5%) had completed secondary school, making the program particularly relevant to individuals at the start of their educational or professional journey. The data also highlights the presence of participants with higher education, reflecting a diverse mix of educational backgrounds.

## 2.8. Experience in Software Testing

An overwhelming majority (93.9%) of participants reported having **no prior experience** in software testing. This confirms the Academy's success in attracting individuals new to the field and underscores the importance of offering beginner-friendly content.

## 2.9. Awareness of the Program

Participants discovered the Software Testers Academy through various channels:

- Project partners contacted me: 67.7%
- Social media: 27.3%
- Word of mouth: 2%

The data demonstrates the effectiveness of targeted outreach by project partners as the primary method of engagement, with social media playing a significant supporting role.

## 2.10. Summary

The demographic analysis of the first pilot demonstrates that the Software Testers Academy is effectively reaching its target audience: individuals who may benefit the most from free software testing education. The pilot engaged a diverse, predominantly young, and multinational group, with the majority having no prior experience in software testing. English emerged as the most preferred language, but the strong demand for Portuguese highlights the importance of multilingual resources. With participants from a wide range of educational and professional backgrounds, the Academy shows great potential to empower individuals and foster inclusivity in the software testing field.

## 3. Evaluation of the 1st Pilot – Platform

### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter evaluates feedback gathered from the 67 participants who completed the evaluation questionnaire for the first pilot of the **Software Testers Academy**. The analysis includes both quantitative and qualitative insights, assessing the platform's usability, course content, interactivity, support, and participant satisfaction. These findings provide a foundation for refining the platform and courses to better serve the Academy's target audience.

### 3.2. Quantitative Feedback

#### 3.2.1. Overall Ratings

Participants rated various aspects of the course and platform on a scale from 1 (worst) to 5 (best). Table 1 summarizes the results for each criterion:

Evaluation Criterion	Rating 1	Rating 2	Rating 3	Rating 4	Rating 5
The content of the course met my learning objectives	-	-	7	31	28
The online platform was user-friendly and easy to navigate	-	2	9	19	36
The overall design of the course and platform supported learning	-	3	7	26	30
The level of interactivity enhanced my learning experience	-	3	12	21	30
Technical support was readily available and helpful when needed	-	-	12	23	31
Interaction with the instructor was effective and supportive	1	-	12	20	33
The assessment methods were fair and relevant to the course content	-	-	12	26	28



## Key Insights:

- The majority of participants rated all aspects of the platform and courses positively, with the highest scores (4 and 5) making up most of the responses.
- Participants were particularly satisfied with the user-friendliness of the platform, technical support, and interaction with instructors.

### 3.3. Qualitative Feedback

#### 3.3.1. Common Themes

The written feedback provided by participants has been categorized into strengths and areas for improvement.

##### *Strengths:*

Theme	Example Feedback
Structure and Content	"The course is well-structured into three different paths that allow us to choose where to start."
Intuitive Platform Design	"The platform was very intuitive."
Usefulness of Videos	"The videos were very good."

##### *Areas for Improvement:*

Theme	Example Feedback
Navigation and Usability	"The navigation is quite strange, not intuitive. Requires a lot of back and forth."
Assessment Methods	"The 'fill the blank' questions can be unfair as they require specific words and don't accept synonyms."
Visual and Interactive Content	"Include more graphics and visual information to better understand."
Technical Issues	"One link wasn't working."
Course Levels and Practicality	"Course should have different levels to accommodate beginners and experts."

### 3.3.2. Participant Satisfaction

Table 2 shows an overview of participant satisfaction with the platform and courses:

Satisfaction Level	Example Feedback
Very Satisfied	"I am very satisfied with the work done. I feel prepared for day-to-day tasks."
Satisfied	"The course is well structured, but for the platform, there should be some improvements."
Moderately Satisfied	"I liked the structure of the course, but the dashboard isn't very intuitive."
Room for Improvement	"There are still some issues with difficulties in studying the material, and the interface could be smoother."

### 3.4. Summary

The feedback from the first pilot evaluation highlights both the strengths and areas for improvement for the **Software Testers Academy** platform and courses. The main strengths include:

- Well-structured and comprehensive course content.
- Intuitive platform design and user-friendly interface.
- Effective use of video materials to support learning.

Recommendations for Improvement:

1. **Simplify Navigation:** Streamline the dashboard and course layout to make navigation more intuitive.
2. **Enhance Assessments:** Revise "fill in the blank" questions to allow synonyms and broader answers.
3. **Incorporate More Visuals:** Add graphical content, videos, and interactive elements to engage learners better.
4. **Fix Technical Issues:** Address bugs, broken links, and errors in localized versions of the platform.
5. **Tailor Course Levels:** Develop separate tracks for beginners and advanced learners, and integrate more hands-on exercises.

These findings and recommendations will help refine the platform and ensure it meets the needs of a diverse audience, providing accessible and high-quality software testing education.

## 4. Evaluation of the 1st Pilot – Learning Paths

This chapter summarizes and evaluates feedback provided by participants on the three learning paths offered during the pilot: Agile Testing, Accessibility in Testing, and Automation in Testing. Each section includes quantitative ratings, qualitative suggestions for improvement, satisfaction levels, and additional feedback.

### 4.1. Overview of Evaluation Distribution

Learning Path	Number of Participants Evaluating
Agile Testing	33
Accessibility in Testing	28
Automation in Testing	31

### 4.2. Agile Testing Path

#### 4.2.1. Quantitative Ratings

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
The path content was relevant to my learning objectives.	-	-	3	14	16
The instructions and explanations were clear and easy.	-	3	2	14	14
The provided materials were helpful.	-	-	7	12	14
The activities and discussions promoted engagement.	-	2	3	11	17
The online platform was user-friendly.	-	1	5	13	14

#### 4.2.2. Key Themes from Written Suggestions

Area	Feedback Examples
Visual Content	"Add a mind map summarizing the path content to make it easier to understand theoretical concepts."
Repetition	"Some lessons addressed the same topic repeatedly but described it differently, causing confusion."
Practicality	"Include more practical exercises and examples instead of lengthy text."
Assessment Issues	"Revise 'fill in the blank' questions to accept synonyms or provide options."
Overall Feedback	"The path was well-developed and comprehensive, though more practice and visual aids would improve the experience."

### 4.2.3. Participant Satisfaction

Satisfaction Level	Example Feedback
Very Satisfied	"The course was complete and clear. I feel confident revisiting the materials later."
Satisfied	"The content was solid, though the platform navigation could improve."
Suggestions for Improvement	"A comprehensive visual map and more integration exercises could make the learning experience more engaging."

## 4.3. Accessibility in Testing Path

### 4.3.1. Quantitative Ratings

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
The path content was relevant to my learning objectives.	-	-	4	8	16
The instructions and explanations were clear and easy.	-	-	4	9	15
The provided materials were helpful.	-	1	2	11	14
The activities and discussions promoted engagement.	-	1	2	11	14
The online platform was user-friendly.	-	-	3	10	15

### 4.3.2. Key Themes from Written Suggestions

Area	Feedback Examples
Practical Content	"Include more practical examples and exercises to enhance learning."
Technical Issues	"Ensure external links are functional and include content directly on the platform."
Accessibility Features	"Provide subtitles for videos and text versions for audio files."
Overall Feedback	"The path is highly relevant and helped me learn a lot about accessibility in testing."

### 4.3.3. Participant Satisfaction

Satisfaction Level	Example Feedback
Very Satisfied	"This course was essential for understanding accessibility testing concepts."
Suggestions for Improvement	"A progress tracker or dark mode could enhance the user experience."

## 4.4. Automation in Testing Path

### 4.4.1. Quantitative Ratings

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
The path content was relevant to my learning objectives.	-	-	4	11	16
The instructions and explanations were clear and easy.	-	-	4	12	15
The provided materials were helpful.	-	1	5	9	16
The activities and discussions promoted engagement.	-	-	3	12	16
The online platform was user-friendly.	-	1	3	12	15

### 4.4.2. Key Themes from Written Suggestions

Area	Feedback Examples
Assessment Issues	"Revise 'fill in the blank' questions to provide options instead of requiring exact wording."
Practical Content	"Include more practical examples and projects to apply learned concepts."
Uniform Design	"Standardize fonts and visual design across materials."
Technical Issues	"Fix broken links in course resources."

### 4.4.3. Participant Satisfaction

Satisfaction Level	Example Feedback
Very Satisfied	"The path provided comprehensive and useful content, especially for beginners."
Suggestions for Improvement	"Increase interactivity and make the content more uniform visually."

## 4.5. Summary of Key Recommendations

For **Agile Testing**, participants suggested adding visual aids such as mind maps to better summarize and organize the content. They also recommended reducing repetitive materials, especially those that described the same concepts in different contexts, as this caused confusion. Additionally, more practical exercises and interactive activities were proposed to balance the theoretical focus of the path.

For **Accessibility in Testing**, the key suggestions included adding subtitles to videos and providing text versions for audio files to ensure accessibility for all users. Participants also emphasized the need for more hands-on exercises and practical examples to reinforce learning. Ensuring that all external links are functional and integrating more content directly onto the platform were additional points raised.

For **Automation in Testing**, participants recommended revising "fill in the blank" questions in assessments to allow for more flexibility (e.g., accepting synonyms or providing multiple-choice options). They highlighted the need to fix broken links within course materials and suggested standardizing fonts and visual elements to create a more consistent design. Increasing interactivity through additional projects or practical examples was also proposed as a way to enhance engagement.

These suggestions provide a clear path for improving each learning path, addressing specific concerns while building on their existing strengths.

## 5. Conclusion

The first pilot evaluation of the training program demonstrated promising outcomes while highlighting valuable insights for refinement. With 99 participants involved and 67 providing detailed feedback, the program effectively engaged a diverse audience and addressed critical areas of professional development in software testing.

The evaluation revealed that the digital platform successfully supported learning, with participants acknowledging its user-friendliness and navigation features. However, some areas for improvement were identified, such as enhancing interactivity and providing additional technical tools to facilitate a more dynamic learning experience.

The assessments of the three learning paths — Agile Testing, Accessibility in Testing, and Automation in Testing — underscored the program’s relevance and potential. Participants consistently praised the clarity of instructions, the quality of materials, and the alignment of content with their learning objectives. At the same time, the feedback emphasized the need for greater practical application, additional visual aids, and refined content organization to avoid redundancy and confusion.

The qualitative suggestions, ranging from integrating more interactive exercises to addressing challenges with assessment methods, reflect participants’ genuine engagement and desire for improvement. Their detailed observations and actionable recommendations provide a clear roadmap for enhancing the program in future iterations.

Overall, this pilot served as a critical step in validating the program’s objectives and delivery. While the results highlight significant achievements, they also uncover areas for growth. By addressing the feedback and refining the content, platform, and methodologies, the program can better meet the evolving needs of learners and maintain its relevance in the competitive field of software testing education.