

## Solutions

---

### 2.1

Forty requests; six double bookings.

### 2.2

Any two, B1 each: waiting time; abandoned attempts; whether requests came from different people.

### 2.3

No trial has occurred/solution unmeasured; no rollout approval or forty-user identity count established; choosing a threshold after seeing results undermines a pre-stated evaluation.

### 2.4

Recommend measuring conflicts and access difficulties; trial duration; numerical success threshold.

### 3.1

Links operations conflicts with access difficulties; distinguishes agreed measurement recommendation from rollout; notes unresolved duration and threshold; invites correction/recorder confirmation; explains an invitation that obtains a relevant missing view; explains setting criteria before results or preserving discussion time.

### 3.2

Local analytic rubric,  $8 \times$  B1: links operational and access concerns; accurately records agreed measurement recommendation; no trial results invented; duration and threshold unresolved; requests distinct from unique users; relevant correction/recorder invitation; pre-stated evaluation planning without rollout approval; coherent truthful 80–110 word response. Example: “The seminar connected operational conflicts with access difficulties: fewer recorded double bookings would not by itself show that the proposed interface works well for users. We agreed to recommend measuring conflicts and access difficulties, with waiting times and abandoned attempts proposed as indicators. However, no trial has occurred, and its duration and numerical success threshold remain undecided. The log records forty requests, not necessarily forty different people. Recorder, does this summary represent the agreed recommendation accurately, and has any unresolved concern been missed? Our next planning step is to define the trial and evaluation criteria before observing results. We have not approved a wider rollout.”