SESSION ONE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Having completed the process to model and understand safety engineering practice, you are now invited to state your levels of agreement with the following statements. Each statement is written at the start of a row, and you are requested to place an 'X' in the column which aligns your level of agreement with that statement. To avoid any ambiguity of responses, please complete this table digitally, using an appropriate word-processing software package (such as Microsoft Word), and only place an 'X' against one column for each statement (statements have a suffix of `EQn').

At the end of each question, a free-text box is provided for you to make any comments you wish to. There is no word count limit, but please complete this digitally using an appropriate word-processing software package (such as Microsoft Word), so that we can ensure all comments are fully legible.

This is not a 'test' of your knowledge, and there is no 'correct' or 'incorrect' answer. Your opinion matters.

Statement	Fully Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Neither Agree/ Disagree 3	Somewhat Agree 4	Fully Agree 5
Ease of Use: Reflecting on your experience with using the symbology that was supplied to you for the purposes of creating / assessing a model, we would like your opinion on how much you agree with the following two statements					
EQ2: The modelling symbology is easy to understand (you knew what the different shapes and lines represented)				x	
EQ3: The modelling symbology is easy to use (you could easily use the different shapes and lines to construct assess a model)			x		
Wrt EQ2: I needed the reference key to remind me – would probably be less required with frequent use, but would likely need a 'refresh' after gaps in use. Wrt EQ3: I found the scope of the models being compared were not the same, and used different terminology – even where the terms used were the same (or similar) it was not clear that they meant the same thing					
Ease of Use: Reflecting on your experience of following the steps in the process to model and assess software safety engineering practice, we would like your opinion on how much you agree with the following two statements.					

Statement	Fully Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Neither Agree/ Disagree 3	Somewhat Agree 4	Fully Agree 5
EQ4: The process to model software safety engineering practice can be carried out without any prior knowledge of formal modelling (i.e. no training in model-based systems engineering was required)					x
EQ5: The process can be instantiated by anyone with access to standard 'Office' applications (such as Visio, Lucid Chart, Word, Pages, Google Docs etc.)				x	
The 'editorial' aspects of applying colours uses similar skills, but the judgement of equivalence is a different skillset.					
Ease of Use: Reflecting on your experience of following the steps in the process to assess software safety engineering practice, we would like your opinion on how much you agree with the following statement					
EQ7: The process instructions to assess software safety engineering practice (the way in which comparisons are made) are easy to follow			x		
I had to make a lot of inferences, and I wasn't confident that this process would be repeatable without further guidance					
Effectiveness: Having applied part of the process to understand software safety engineering practice through the modelling and assessment of practice, we are interested in your thoughts on the overall usefulness of this process. How much do you agree with the following two statements? In considering your response, we ask that you also consider applications and technologies not covered by the artefacts we provided you with (i.e. from experience throughout your career), and don't restrict your response to just the artefacts sent to you					

Statement	Fully Disagree 1	Somewhat Disagree 2	Neither Agree/ Disagree 3	Somewhat Agree 4	Fully Agree 5
EQ8: Using the modelling process allows me to understand all elements of software safety engineering practice		x			
EQ9: Using the modelling process allows me to assess all aspects of software safety engineering practice (through comparisons between the elements of practice and their relationships)		x			
My main 'disagreement' is with the 'all' part of the statement. There are benefits in making explicit an interpretation of written processes and standards. I take 'practice' to mean what is actually performed in an instantiation of those processes to realise satisfaction of a standard. I can see no step in the evaluation that deals with completeness.					

If you have any additional comments on the process, or on this specific evaluation you are invited to make them in the box below. There is no word count limit, but please complete this digitally using an appropriate word-processing software package (such as Microsoft Word), so that we can ensure all comments are fully legible.

the evaluation doesn't seem to handle well the differing purposes, abstraction levels (hierarchy and conceptual) or non-like-for-like models

Standards may be goal based or prescriptive, and may be a step on the path between legislation/regulation (which are inherently very abstract and non-specific) to tasking at the coal face. Standards tend to set out to avoid constraint on the detail of implementation – deliverately so to permit innovation, and to allow application to a broad spectrum of real world problems.
I think it is inevitable that there will be disconnects between the four nodes of the diamond, because they are doing different things.
The modelling seems to have some benefits in understanding self-consistency and coherence of any one of the nodes, but the relationship between them is more complex that a traffic light rating can communicate.