**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 | |
| A key to the attributes would have been useful | | | | | |
| **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 | | |
| **Visio and Lucid charts are not part of our standard office tools. Most people would probably try to use it in word or powerpoint, which would make it more difficult, I think** | | | | | |
| **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 started just marking up the company x model, then I found it hard to track which activities I had considered and which I hadn't in the ARP model, so ended up marking up both models. As red had been chosen for missing artefacts too, that ended up being a bit confusing as to which was marked up as missing (in comparison to the 'as desired' model) and which were inconsistent in the 'as required' comparison | | | | | |
| **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 | | | | | |

| Statement | Fully Disagree 1 | Somewhat Disagree 2 | Neither Agree/ Disagree 3 | Somewhat Agree 4 | Fully Agree 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | | | | | |
| 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 | |
| The two 'as required' models are pitched at different levels. The standard is at relatively high level, but the closed model is much more detailed. For example, recording outcomes in a database is far too low level for the 'open' model. Hence the implied completeness of 'all elements' is difficult to ascertain. | | | | | |

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.

| |
|---|
| I found this much more difficult than the initial modelling task. Trying to articulate an equivalence between a number of tasks in the closed standard to parts of one or more activity in the open model was tricky. That is as much a challenge of the two processes rather than a challenge of the modelling, but you could almost do with rearranging the models to group together comparable activities visually, perhaps directly under each other, during the comparison. I wonder if that might make it easier? Wish I'd tried that now! |