

Solutions

2.1 Interest: comparing how notices help readers find information. Value: making information usable for different readers, or having time to improve after feedback. An interest names an area to explore; a value names what matters in a choice.

2.2 Award B1 each for two evidence-based corrections, for example: only two new visitors were tested, not all readers; the teammate selected pictures and the teacher checked print, so Lina did not do everything alone; the notes support a tested revision, not brilliance in every design or leadership task. Do not award unsupported praise as a correction.

2.3 For example: “I organised the approved versions in a list”, “and I submitted the approved file before the deadline”, “but this single project does not show that I can estimate every project’s time”. Accept another sensible limit to one project’s evidence. Do not require a claimed exact time saving.

2.4 For example: rehearse a two-minute explanation using three cue words; ask a partner whether the order is clear and note where Lina loses her place; review after two rehearsals next week, comparing the observed interruptions. Accept a feasible dated check. “Be confident soon” is not an observable task or review.

3.1 Three supported evaluations, 2 marks each: identify a weakness and relevant evidence, explain its effect on an adviser’s interpretation. Examples: universal success from only two test readers overstates scope; claiming solo work hides the teammate’s pictures and teacher’s print check; permanent inability ignores small-group success and an untested cue-word strategy; course fame is not evidence of fit with interests, values or actual demands. Accept any three distinct supported weaknesses. Repeating “too confident” earns no additional point.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times$ B1: accurate interest; accurate value; revision/testing strength with evidence; organisation strength with version-list/deadline evidence; honest limit; own contribution separated from shared work; observable presentation task with a review check; coherent 100–130 word profile without invented qualifications. Example: “I am interested in how public notices help people find information. I value making a message usable for different readers and improving it after feedback. For a club poster, I moved the meeting date after two visitors missed it; two new visitors then found it. I also kept an approved-version list and submitted the final file before the deadline. My teammate selected the pictures and my teacher checked the print, so these were shared results. The small reader check does not represent everyone. I explain changes clearly in a small group, but lose my place when reading a long presentation script. Next week I will rehearse with three cue words and ask a partner to check the order.”