

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
I understood the symbols and concepts. I needed a key as a reminder for the exercises but once more familiar with the notation am sure would be fine.					
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
Reflecting on this I'm not sure I can answer EQ4 with confidence because I am familiar with these MBSE concepts?					
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	
The instructions were fine to follow the principles of what needed to be done. I needed a little clarification on how to use the RAG colouring.					
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	
<p>The modelling helps me understand how individual processes works. Interpretation is needed where there are mismatches in levels of abstraction.</p>					

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.

It was hard to separate criticising (or praising!) individual processes from assessing differences between them.

I'm not very familiar with the ARP which may have slowed me down.

I've done a lot of comparisons of internal sw processes to standards. There are usually strengths and weaknesses and sometimes those don't matter in context. For example, WCET analysis not done but the system isn't time critical. Or lacking separate requirements document from a manual/design diagrams when the sw has existed for a long time. The latter can be okay for generating tests in some circumstances. In step 8 task 4 – reasons for why they are different, does the

process thinking about whether it matters that they are different? (I think this is different than comparing the as observed but you may well have covered it).