

Solutions

2.1

Packs set aside for rework at first inspection; number of packs.

2.2

Batch B:5 packs; batch C:11 packs.

2.3

The counts 8,5,11 do not fall steadily and the labels are categories rather than dates; set-aside packs are not necessarily permanent waste; three batch records do not establish a future or universal rate.

2.4

First-inspection ready count 92; set-aside proportion 8%; rework outcomes, success rate or reasons for differences are unknown.

3.1

Inspect the seal; passing packs enter the ready tray; failing packs are labelled for rework; reinspect after rework and record the later result separately; the procedure avoids automatically discarding all failed packs; it prevents release without the required reinspection.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: correct chart variable and unit; equal 100 inspected packs per batch; accurate 8/5/11 comparison; no invented time trend, future rate or waste cause; inspection and passing-pack branch; rework followed by required reinspection; separate later records and unknown rework outcomes; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The bar chart compares packs set aside for rework in three inspected batches. Each batch contained one hundred packs. Eight were set aside in A, five in B and eleven in C, so B had the lowest recorded count and C the highest. These categories do not show a steady time trend or a future waste rate. Inspect every pack’s seal first. A passing pack goes into the ready tray; a failing pack is labelled for rework. After rework, inspect it again before release and record the later result separately. The records do not explain the differences or report rework success.”