## SESSION ONE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Modelling Process Evaluation
It would be beneficial for us to be able to argue over your expertise in the field of software safety practice. To that end we would be grateful if you could list the attributes of your experience as a software safety practitioner and indicate in parentheses afterwards the number of years' experience you have.  For example:

1. Software Safety Engineer (5 years)
2. Principle Software Safety Engineer (3 years)
3. Safety Manager (3 years)
4. Independent Safety Assessor (2 years).

Please use the text box below and list all attributes you believe are relevant.   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.

> System Safety Engineer (30 years)(company considers system safety and software safety as two different disciplines)
> Working closely with/Industrial researcher Software Safety Engineering (25 years)
> Sporadic involvement with Safety Management & Independent Safety Assessment

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Completeness**: Reflecting on your understanding of the process to understand software safety engineering practice, we would like your opinion on the following statement. 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 | | | | | |
| EQ1: The process considers all elements that together constitute software safety engineering practice (the 10 'steps') | | X | | | |
| **Subsidiary processes, such as quality, configuration management, etc, are not typically defined in standards or desired practice but are implicitly assumed, yet software safety is implicitly dependent upon them.** | | | | | |
| **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 three statements. | | | | | |
| EQ6: The modelling process instructions are easy to follow (you could follow each step) | | | | X | |
| **Standard bits were very easy, but nuances were far more difficult to work out the best approach, e.g. how selection of activities can be modified via the Safety Management Plan, which would impact on how the generic process is modelled.** | | | | | |
| **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 four 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EQ10: The process to understand software safety engineering practice will help to identify potential impediments to achieving best practice for software safety engineering | | | | | X |
| **(Pan-industry Applicability)** EQ11: The process to understand software safety engineering practice can be used for any industry and any technological application | | | X | | |

**Theoretically, I believe it _could_ be applied to all industries and applications, however, the nature of some industries, where process is low priority, would make it very difficult to apply.  I think its fair to say that it should be able to be used effectively for all safety involved industries!**

**(Consistency)** 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 consistency of the outputs which the process creates. How much do you agree with the following two statements?

| Statement | Fully Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree/ Disagree 3 | Somewhat Agree 4 | Fully Agree 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| EQ12: The process uses consistent terminology when considering each different element that constitutes software safety engineering practice | | | | | X |
| EQ13: The process creates models whose symbology is consistent across all elements of software safety engineering practice | | | | X | |

The interpretation of nuance in standards or observed practice will lead some people to model things in different ways to others.  I don't think that can ever be fully resolved, but this type of standardisation goes a long way towards helping with that!

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.