

## University of Illinois: Bugs – Bad For Crops, Worse for Software



### Testing Projects @ a Glance

- Testers: 150 (all from US and Canada)
- Testing Type: Functional
- App type: Web
- OS: Windows
- Browser & OS: All major versions

### Customer Spotlight

- Location: Monmouth, Illinois
- Industry: Consumer product data
- Company Size: 20 employees; 5 developers; no QA personnel
- Methodology: Agile; bi-weekly sprints

“Software never works the way you want it to at first,” admitted Paul Schuytema. Working in the Office of Creative Software Development at the University of Illinois Extension, Paul led the latest redevelopment of [MarketMaker](#) – an interactive mapping system that connects businesses and consumers with producers in local agriculture markets. As previous versions gained popularity, Paul saw the need for a formal QA process, but didn’t see money for it in the budget.

Their prior method of testing primarily involved customers reporting bugs. It was certainly cost-effective, he joked, but not all that useful in assuring quality. And so with a tightening budget, no QA team and a fast-approaching deadline for their next release, Paul began hunting for a simple, scalable testing solution. “We knew we had to try something different,” he said. “We just didn’t know what it was going to be.”

The University of Illinois has cultivated some of the software industry’s most innovative thinkers. Because of this culture, Paul was introduced to uTest’s global community by a colleague, and signed up in October of 2008. Through functional and compatibility testing, uTest’s QA professionals enabled Paul’s development team to produce a variety of new features, for new customers.

### In their own words...

#### On testing coverage:

*“Keeping up with all of the QA requirements got to be overwhelming. With uTest, all we had to do was to specify the type of environments we needed testing for and didn’t have to worry about it.”*

#### On time to market:

*“With uTest being able to put such a large group of testers on our release, we were able to meet a deadline that would have otherwise been impossible.”*

#### On testing options:

*“We looked around for outsourced options, but we really needed the ability to view and approve the bugs – that was the most critical factor in our decision-making process.”*

*- Paul Schuytema  
Extension Specialist at University of Illinois*