

Solutions

2.1 Arun can claim that he revised written instructions after feedback: his separated dates were identified correctly by the same two classmates. The professional-qualification claim is unsupported: no professional certificate is recorded and the leaflet is a classroom sample, not such a qualification. Accept an accurate assigned-deadline skill supported by the on-time text file.

2.2 Award B1 each for two corrections: Arun wrote the text, while a teammate supplied layout and photographs; he delivered his assigned file, not the whole project schedule; the same two classmates passed a repeat check, not everyone or a group of new readers. Do not turn a small result into universal proof.

2.3 Award B1 per distinct relevant action: use only the text Arun wrote rather than the whole group file; remove the student's phone number; remove photographs/other people's material; confirm the copy stays within the teacher's stated classroom-only permission. Removing only a name does not remove a visible phone number or establish permission for photographs. An attribution alone is not permission to publish.

2.4 Explain the borrowing procedure for 90 seconds to the agreed partner on Thursday lunchtime; ask the partner to repeat the key steps and note omissions or confusion; revise the wording/order of any unclear step and arrange a further check without claiming its result. Feeling confident or being selected alone is not an understanding measure within Arun's control.

3.1 Award 2 per concern-action pair: one relevant detail, one appropriate action. Examples: phone number exposes another student's contact information, so remove it from a practice copy; photographs/group layout lack recorded public permission, so do not publish the original file and seek the appropriate permission if future sharing is proposed; "every part" misstates authorship, so identify Arun's text contribution and the teammate's work; classroom-only text permission is not public publication permission, so keep the copy in the permitted setting. Three distinct pairs earn six. Treat photographs and group-layout permission as one concern if the same missing permission/action is repeated. Do not award "credit everyone" as a complete solution to missing consent.

3.2 Local analytic rubric, $8 \times B1$: connects evidence to the helper task; accurately states Arun's own text role; first reader difficulty; specific revision and repeat result; states on-time assigned-file evidence without whole-project leadership; limits the repeat check; feasible spoken practice with understanding measure; coherent truthful 100–130 words without invented qualification or selection. Example: "I would like to help the library club because I enjoy making instructions clearer. I wrote the borrowing text for our group leaflet; a teammate supplied its layout and photographs. When two classmates confused the return date with the meeting date, I separated those details. The same two then identified the return date correctly. This shows a useful revision, but it does not prove that every new reader will understand the text. I delivered my assigned file before review, rather than managing the whole schedule. I still need spoken practice. On Thursday lunchtime I will explain the procedure to my agreed partner in 90 seconds, ask them to repeat the steps, and revise any unclear instruction."