

Solutions

2.1 Strength: revising her own text in response to readers, or submitting her text on time. Value: accessible explanations, or time to improve after feedback. Do not award drawing the map as Mei's strength; her teammate did that.

2.2 B needs a subject explanation that Mei has not prepared. A friendly setting is a preference about experience, not the required product.

2.3 For example: A involves revising a guide, and Mei changed her own guide after three classmates' feedback, but she has not tested a changing client brief or new readers outside that group. Accept another relevant bounded claim. Merely liking design earns no evidence point.

2.4 For example: "By Friday I will draft my own short subject explanation in the booked computer hour", "keep the draft and notes from Wednesday's discussion", "then review what I enjoyed, what was difficult and which route needs another check". Do not award guaranteed acceptance or a permanent perfect-career claim. Accept a feasible Route A exploration that still uses a review point.

3.1 Award 2 marks per paired criterion: one accurate detail for A and a relevant contrast or connection for B. Profile: A uses guide revision; B uses clear subject explanation; both connect with accessible information and feedback. Preparation: Mei has suitable original guide text for A if she identifies the map's author; B's subject explanation is missing. Unknown demand: A needs a check of changing briefs; B needs a check of subject investigation. Repeating "both are interesting" is not an evidence-based comparison. Do not treat either sample condition as admission permission.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: chooses a next investigation rather than a guaranteed career; first accurate profile detail; second distinct accurate profile detail; considers the other route; uses Wednesday's agreed discussion for a relevant question; uses Friday's booked hour for a feasible original task; names a review of evidence and an unresolved demand; clear coherent 100–130 word recommendation without invented permission. Example: "Mei should investigate learning-resource work next week while keeping communication design as an alternative. She values accessible explanations and has revised her own guide after feedback from three classmates. That supports exploring clear information, but it does not show whether she enjoys researching subject detail or changing briefs. On Wednesday she can ask her teacher what preparation and revision resource writing involves. In Friday's booked computer hour she can draft her own short subject explanation and keep it beside her guide text. Afterwards she should review what interested her, what was difficult and which questions remain for both routes. She should check workshop permission separately. This week produces evidence for another decision, not proof of a perfect career."