

1.7 Evidence-based case analysis

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 24 marks**

KEY WORDS fact • assumption • conclusion • case analysis
• review metrics

Objective

Structure a case analysis that separates facts from assumptions, choose between options with a weighted decision table built honestly, and send every recommendation out with its assumptions and review metrics attached.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

■ **Fact, assumption, conclusion – sort every claim**

A **fact** carries a source and a definition: "Nimbus' two shops sold an average of 420 loaves per day in October (shop tills)". An **assumption** is something treated as true for now: "pre-order customers would have bought less without pre-order". A **conclusion** follows from both under stated criteria.

Case analysis fails at this sorting step more than anywhere else: numbers quoted without a source are assumptions wearing fact costumes.

■ **The weighted decision table**

Fix the criteria and weights BEFORE scoring, or the scores will quietly arrange themselves around the option you already like.

Worked example (Nimbus). Third shop vs pre-order expansion. Weights fixed first: profit impact 0.5, risk 0.3, fit with staff skills 0.2.

Criterion (weight)	Third shop	Pre-order
Profit impact (0.5)	6	5
Risk (0.3)	4	7
Staff fit (0.2)	7	8
Weighted total	5.6	6.2

Pre-order wins on the weights as stated. The table's value is not the number – it is that a disagreement now has a location: change the weights, and you can see exactly how the answer changes.

■ **A recommendation travels with its monitoring**

The final structure: situation (facts, sourced) → problem (a decision question with real options) → analysis (frameworks carrying evidence, not adjectives) → recommendation (one option, chosen against the criteria, risks named) → **review metrics** (what would prove it wrong, and by when).

"Open a stall for eight Saturdays; if average daily stall profit is below the shop break-even within eight weeks, stop" is a recommendation. "Expand because bakery demand is growing" is not – no option, no criteria, no falsifier.

2 Practice

2.1 For each claim, label fact or assumption and say why in one clause: (a) "Our customers love us"; (b) "Till records show repeat purchases by 55% of customers each month"; (c) "A third shop would pay back in two years". [3]

2.2 In the Nimbus table, profit impact is scored 6 for the third shop but 5 for pre-order. State two questions you would ask before accepting those two scores, one about the numbers and one about what "profit impact" means. [4]

2.3 Recompute both weighted totals with weights changed to profit 0.6, risk 0.2, staff fit 0.2 (scores unchanged). State which option wins and what the change demonstrates about the method. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Nimbus is offered a lease on a third shop near a new university campus (opens in 9 months, no bakery within 1 km today). The owner also has a pre-order expansion plan (existing shops, app costs 8,000 fixed per year).

Build a decision table with three criteria you choose and justify (state each weight and one sentence why). Score both options with a stated basis for each score, compute the weighted totals, and recommend one option. Then list the two assumptions your recommendation most depends on and one review metric with a deadline. [8]

3.2 A consultant reports: "Nimbus should open the third shop – the campus will bring thousands of customers and the brand is strong."

Rewrite this as an evidence-based recommendation by: (a) naming the hidden assumption in “will bring”, (b) stating what evidence would test it, and (c) writing one review metric with a falsifying threshold. Explain in one sentence why a recommendation without a falsifier cannot be reviewed. [6]