

Solutions

2.1

Quiet 24; group 16.

2.2

Forty respondents; 200 residents served.

2.3

Any three, B1 each: 120 residents is not an observed population count; B asks for group space rather than talking everywhere; a value priority does not make all evidence irrelevant; no approved or measured successful schedule exists.

2.4

Quiet access/group-space importance; 24 or 16 preferences among 40 respondents; time-slot demand, noise or switching/setup effort remains unknown.

3.1

Names two actual options; identifies two relevant criteria; compares the first criterion without invented results; compares the second criterion; recommendation states priority and condition rather than approval; relevant demand/noise/setup check.

3.2

Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: accurate twenty-four/sixteen of forty result; voluntary respondents distinct from two hundred residents; fair quiet-access viewpoint; fair group-space viewpoint; explicit comparison criteria; proposed schedule distinct from approved/measured outcome; relevant next question/check without invented census or motives; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The voluntary survey records twenty-four quiet-study preferences and sixteen group-activity preferences among forty respondents. It does not establish how all two hundred residents would answer. Quiet access matters to residents without a calm space, while group activities also need space; neither view means banning the other activity everywhere. We should compare options against access, noise and setup effort, rather than let the count settle every priority. A scheduled-use trial might help explore both needs, but it is not approved or proven successful. Could we record demand by time slot and test switching arrangements before recommending a final schedule?”