

Solutions

2.1

Thirty staff replied; eighteen respondents preferred Tuesday.

2.2

Room A seats twenty; two sessions cost 120 credits before additional fees.

2.3

Eighteen of thirty replies is not all forty staff; twenty seats cannot accommodate thirty or forty people in one session; two A sessions cost 120 before unknown extras, not a guaranteed 60.

2.4

A proposed two-session workshop; the manager must approve before booking; productivity improvement has not been measured.

3.1

Capacity labels 20 and 30 seats; costs 60 and 90 credits per session; two A sessions 120 credits before extras; spoken explanation relates capacity to possible attendance; availability, attendance or extra-fee check; manager approval before booking.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, 8 × B1: two-session proposal subject to approval; accurate 18 of 30 replies from 40 invited; availability remains unknown; relevant labelled comparison visual; correct capacities and per-session costs; two A sessions 120 before extra fees; no invented booking approval or productivity proof; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “We propose a two-session staff workshop, subject to your approval. Eighteen of thirty poll respondents preferred Tuesday, but forty staff were invited and we have not checked everyone’s availability. Our comparison slide should show both room capacity and hire cost per session. Room A seats twenty at sixty credits per session; room B seats thirty at ninety. Two room-A sessions would cost 120 credits before any additional fees. We still need to check attendance, fees and approval before booking. The briefing provides no measured productivity improvement, so we should present the workshop as a proposal rather than a proven solution.”