

## Solutions

---

### 2.1

Tuesday onward, 16:00–17:00; suggestions collected through Friday.

### 2.2

A request or invitation to act; a hedged possible benefit, not an established result.

### 2.3

Script A informs visitors and requests suggestions; Script B evaluates observations and recommends checking needs; B preserves uncertainty and neither script gives permanent approval.

### 2.4

Any three distinct supported criticisms, B1 each: learning gains were not measured; everybody exceeds the limited observations; the timetable is not permanent; Lee's silence does not establish agreement.

### 3.1

Acknowledges observed note exchanges; preserves the lack of measured learning outcomes; invites a relevant contribution from Lee; explains how acknowledgement responds to the earlier point; explains how the limit prevents overclaiming; explains how the invitation obtains a view before a recommendation or consensus.

### 3.2

Local analytic rubric, 8 × B1: acknowledges the note-exchange observation; preserves the absence of measured learning gains; correctly interprets might; proposes checking needs; invites a relevant view from a quieter participant; distinguishes silence from agreement; distinguishes recommendation from centre approval; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The observed note exchanges give us a reason to ask visitors about the discussion table, but they do not establish improved learning. The seminar speaker kept this limit by saying the table might help discussion. I suggest collecting visitors' needs before recommending a permanent timetable. Lee, which questions would help us understand when and how students want to use the table? We should hear that view rather than assume silence means agreement. After discussing the responses, we can check whether the group accepts a recommendation. The centre still needs to choose the timetable; our proposal is not its approval.”