



KNOWLEDGE ANALYSIS AND EXTRACTION USING MODEL EVALUATION TECHNIQUES IN SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

G.Vaigai

M.Sc Student,

Department of Computer Science,

Rajeswari College of Arts and Science for Women,

Bommayapalayam, Tamil Nadu, India.

Email ID: vaigaigovindan@gmail.com

Abstract

Medium-sized businesses have grown significantly over the last several years, and thousands of such businesses exist worldwide. Software engineering is a new field of study developed to meet this type of instigation. It varies in many ways, such as the requirement for agiling the different process models, elaborating the approaches and techniques to be framed for modelling, developing techniques for one or more navigational approaches, various architectures framework, continuous application processes, and various testing methodologies. It has been noted that one of the main issues facing these businesses is software process improvement. A systematic review (SR) was aimed at identifying and discussing the paradigms and tactics that medium-based organization. Identifying the research issues to be examined, finding pertinent literature, extracting data from chosen studies, and synthesize data were all crucial stages of our SR. create responses;

and hold a formal debate to pinpoint research gaps and trends. A great illustration of SPI efforts in software instigation is the Semi's Capability Maturity Model. However, medium-sized software companies are creating new SPI challenges. There are concerns regarding the viability of using SPI techniques such as CMM because of the difficulties associated with these kinds of instigation. Knowledge management, specifically the management of people and information in sanitation, is referred to in the knowledge-driven model (KDM). It is broadly divided into two categories: explicit and tacit forms of knowledge, which can be expressed in the form of documents, reports, database information, and individual thoughts. The study examines the difficulties medium-sized businesses confront and offers two literary approaches to address the issue of SPI in medium-sized Organizations.

Keywords: Medium-Sized Businesses, Knowledge-Driven Models, Software Process



Improvement, Capability Maturity Models, and Key Process areas.

The Knowledge Driven Model:

Information repositories must be regularly updated and engineered in accordance with the project environment's baseline needs, and the significance and influence of information gained through learning is apparent in process improvement projects. Schneider & son Shunning state that "without a learning attitude and some appreciation for continuous process improvement even the best repositories will not make experiences fly. "There are five stages.

- ✓ Phase of Initiation.
- ✓ Phase of Diagnosis.
- ✓ Phase of Establishment.
- ✓ Phase of Action.
- ✓ Phase of Leveraging.

Stages	KDM Events
Starting	Recognize the necessity of enhancement
	Obtain sponsorship
	Showcase improved infrastructure
Making a Diagnosis	Gather Current Books
	Obtain Implicit Knowledge
Creating	Packaging Information for functioning Put knowledge engineering techniques into practice.
	Utilize DSS knowledge management technologies.
Behaving	Obtain the information needed for SPI planning and implementation.
	Describe a feature for each procedure separately.

Making use of	Fill repositories and conduct information analysis
	Obtain Specific Knowledge
	Create Hybrid Knowledge by Combining Different Ideas.

Extraction of Data

The aim of the data extracting stage is to compile pertinent information that will subsequently be utilized to create quality ratings and summary tables, and address Se's research objectives. Two extraction forms were developed to obtain the data required to respond to the research questions on Si and evaluate the calibration of each study. The data extracted for the qualitative investigation were saved in one form, whereas the data extracted for the quantitative study were stored in another form.

Data Synthesis & Results

Each question was evaluated separately in light of the findings during the data synthesis step, which involved tabulating and summarizing the results from all findings. These findings are helpful for determining the present research gaps.

The synthesis procedure for each research question is explained in detail in the following section.

Research Questions

It asks, "Which models/techniques for software process improvement are used by small and medium organization?"

Some studies have proposed a model that can be used to improve the software processes of medium-sized businesses,



whereas others have relied only on a collection of models that are thought to be essential for the cause. Models are tried-and-true methods of carrying out particular activities that have implications for the order in which they are to be finished. Techniques can be applied within a model or stand alone to accomplish a particular goal. Because models serve as a framework or occasionally as experience-based patterns, they are more comprehensive than techniques which we used and exist at a higher complexity level.

Queries to be evaluated to find the performance of medium scale organization:

- ✓ Do your peers share what they know?
- ✓ Are your peers sharing their knowledge?
- ✓ Which process domain do you experience?
- ✓ Does this procedure require further enhancement?
- ✓ Are you familiar with the KDM and CMM standards?
- ✓ What other alternatives would you recommend for an organization's improvement?
- ✓ How could you learn?
- ✓ How would you impart the wisdom you gained from your years of experience?
- ✓ Which software development procedures do you think require improvement?

Capability Maturity Models:

The CMM software identifies 18 Key Process Areas (spas) and five levels. Numerous case studies and surveys have demonstrated the applicability of five maturity levels for directing software process

improvement, which consists of a ladder with four steps and an initial level.

Level 1:

An environment in a state of chaos is character by Level 1. The competence of the individuals involved is the only factor responsible for an organization's success at this level.

Level 2:

"Repeatable," or Level 2, implies that success can be repeated, but only for identical tasks. Projects function in a variety of ways. At this level, the following are the Key Process Areas:

- ✓ Overseeing Requirements
- ✓ Planning for Software Projects
- ✓ Monitoring and supervising software projects
- ✓ Software Subcontract Management
- ✓ Assurance of Software Quality
- ✓ Configuration Management for Software

Level 3:

Level 3 is characterized by the presence of an organizational common process, but one that is tailored for individual projects in a controlled manner.

- ✓ The Key Process Areas are as follows.
- ✓ Focus on Organizational Processes
- ✓ Definition of Organizational Processes
- ✓ Program for Training
- ✓ Management of Integrated Software
- ✓ Product Engineering for Software
- ✓ Coordination between groups
- ✓ Reviews by Peers

Level 4:

This level, known as "Managed," is distinguished by metrics related to the products and processes. Important Process Areas are as follows:

- ✓ Management of Quantitative Processes
- ✓ Management of Software Quality
- ✓ Management of Process Change

Level 5:

Level 5, "optimizing," denotes the culture of ongoing process enhancement.

The Important Process Areas are as follows:

- ✓ Preventing Defects
- ✓ Management of Technology Change
- ✓ Management of Process Change

Challenges to be faced in CMM/KDM in medium scale organizations:

Difficulties	The CMM	The Concept of KDM
Personal Reliance	Experts are required.	Acquire knowledge by itself
People who are overburdened	Assignment of several jobs	The necessity of statistical reports
Human elements	Lower	Lower
number of initiatives	Lower	Significant
Communication with customers	Low to average	Easy to use and intuitive
Financial limitations	Significant.	Lower

Characteristics of a medium scale organization evaluating the performance evaluation:

Qualities	KDM Model		Version CMM	
	Increased	a low value	Increased	a low value
Conditions	Indeed			Indeed
Process Assistance	Indeed			Indeed
Organizational Assistance		Indeed	Indeed	
Price and Timetable		Indeed	Indeed	
Services and Testing	Indeed		Indeed	

Conclusion

In medium-sized organizations, it is more effective than CMM and KDM, as evidenced by the outcomes of employing KDM models, scheduling projects with appropriate resources, using all available cost and budget management techniques to prevent delays and overruns, and enhancing quality and performance through communication with clients in the process and organization to enhance development processes.

References

1. Orc i, Utter, Lard, Arid, "Dynamic CMM for Small Organizations", Retrieved from:
2. Paulk, Mark C., "Using the Software CMM in Small Organizations" (1998). Institute for Software Research. Paper 5 ht://repository.emu.ecu/ish/5
3. Horatio, Romano Evade, Roman, Ivan and Gyros, Josef, "Managing the Complexity of SPI in Small Companies"
4. Rita Hidden, "How Saleable are CMM Key Practices?" Crosstalk: The Journal of Defense Software Engineering, Vol. 11, No. 4, April 1998, pp. 18-20, 23.



5. Donna L. Johnson and Judith G. Broodmare, "Applying the CMM to Small Organizations and Small Projects," Proceedings of the 1998 Software Engineering Process Group Conference, Chicago, IL, 9-12 March 1998.
6. John J. Abbott, "Software Process Improvement in a Small Commercial Software Company," , Proceedings of the 1997 Software Engineering Process Group Conference, San Jose, CA, 17-20 March 1997.
7. J.G. Broodmare and D.L. Johnson, "What Small Businesses and Small Organizations Say About the CMM," Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Software Engineering, IEEE Computer Society Press, Sorrento, Italy, 16-21 May 1994, pp. 331-340.
8. Donna L. Johnson and Judith G. Broodmare, the LOGOS Tailored Version of the CMM for Small Businesses, Small Organizations, and Small Projects, Version 1.0, August 1996.
9. Donna L. Johnson and Judith G. Broodmare, "Tailoring the CMM for Small Businesses, Small Organizations, and Small Projects," Software Process Newsletter, IEEE Computer Society Technical Council on Software Engineering, No. 8, Winter 1997, p. 1-6.
10. James Herbal, David Brow, Dennis Golden-son, Will Hayes, and Mark Paul, "Software Quality and the Capability Maturity Model," Communications of the ACM, Vol. 40, No. 6, June 1997, pp. 30-40.
11. Patricia K. Wallis, Robert M. Flow, and James B. Chordal, "A Correlational Study of the CMM and Software Development Performance," Crosstalk: The Journal of Defense Software Engineering, Vol. 8, No. 9, September 1995, pp. 21-25. Reprinted in Software Process Newsletter, IEEE Computer Society Technical Council on Software Engineering, No. 7, Fall 1996, pp. 1-5.
12. Bradford K. Clark, "The Effects of Software Process Maturity on Software Development Effort," PhD Dissertation, Computer Science Department, University of Southern California, August 1997.
13. Y. Spandex, S. Uruguayan, A. Ginige, Hansen et al., Web Engineering, Journal of Web Engineering, 1(1), 2002.