

BA Practice Lab — explained answers and reviewer guide

LAB-SERVICE-01 · v3 review preview · Fictional practice · Participant testing pending

Read only after the participant saves the baseline and completes the attempt. These are fictional worked examples for comparison after your attempt. Wording may vary when the evidence boundary and sequence remain sound.

Source trace

The exact source brief is: “A fictional community support team receives requests by email. A support coordinator assigns each request. A caseworker records the response. The coordinator checks that the request has been resolved before closing it. The team wants to replace its shared spreadsheet.” REQ-01 says: “Send reminders automatically and close every request after seven days.” SN-01 says, “I see a backlog of requests and want a clearer hand-off.” SN-02 says, “Some items wait for a reply from the requester.” SN-03 says, “I need a visible way to distinguish work I have finished from work the team has closed.”

These quotations support questions, not invented policy. The service-owner title does not establish authority. The coordinator is the strongest source for current process evidence; the caseworker explains response and resolution evidence; a confirmed policy authority must be established separately.

Exercise 1 — good answer shape

Supplied scope: the team wants to replace a shared spreadsheet used in an email-based request process involving assignment, response recording, resolution checking, and closure. Inference: the team may want clearer hand-offs, but the source supplies no baseline or success measure for that inference.

A defensible current map is: email request → coordinator assigns → caseworker records response → requester/team follow-up may loop → coordinator checks resolution → coordinator closes. SR-101 illustrates waiting for information; SR-103 illustrates an unassigned request. Neither establishes urgency or a reminder rule.

Useful questions quote “Send reminders automatically” and ask who receives them; quote “after seven days” and ask what event starts the interval and what day definition applies; quote “before closing it” and ask what evidence counts as resolved; quote SN-03’s “visible way” language and ask who may record resolution. Mark decision authority unconfirmed until established.

Exercise 2 — AI critique

“For compliance” invents an authority. The sources provide no compliance basis. “All unresolved cases must close” conflicts with BR-01’s coordinator resolution check and must not be treated as a requirement. “Seven working days” invents both a day definition and a timing interpretation. “Email the requester daily” invents recipient and frequency. Replace each claim with a decision question linked to REQ-01, SN-02, or another exact source.

A safe candidate future flow is receive → assign → record response → distinguish response from resolution → coordinator review → closure. A reminder decision can be shown beside unresolved work as an open dependency. It must not be drawn as an approved step.

Decision Card A — baseline answers

Card A supplies D-01, D-02, and D-03. D-01: only the coordinator may close after checking resolution; elapsed time alone must not close. D-02: the caseworker may move Open to Resolved; the coordinator may move Resolved to Closed; no actor may move Open directly to Closed. D-03 leaves reminder recipients, frequency, and day interval undecided, with no compliance basis.

R-01 v1 — baseline: A caseworker may move a request from Open to Resolved when recording resolution. Only the coordinator may move a Resolved request to Closed after checking resolution. No actor may move Open directly to Closed, and elapsed time alone must not close a request. Supporting decisions: D-01 and D-02. Open dependency: D-03.

Decision Card B — current change

Card B reveals D-04 only after the baseline is saved. D-04 is a confirmed fictional teaching decision: requests already classified urgent require duty lead approval after the coordinator's resolution check and before the coordinator closes. Duty lead is an explicit teaching-case role. The classification rule and exact approval-record format remain open dependencies.

R-01 v2 — current baseline-qualified rule: retain R-01 v1's normal state path and closure actor. For an already-classified urgent request, the coordinator must complete the resolution check, then duty lead approval must exist, before the coordinator closes. No automatic or direct closure.

R-02 — urgent approval: Only the coordinator may move an already-classified urgent request from Resolved to Closed, and only after the coordinator's resolution check and duty lead approval, in that order. Open dependencies: how urgency is classified and what exact approval record is required.

Eight designed acceptance examples

These are expected outcomes, not executed tests.

Test	Fixture and action	Observable expected outcome	Version / decision
T-01	Resolved non-urgent request; coordinator checks resolution and closes	State becomes Closed	R-01 v1 / D-01,D-02
T-02	Given an Open request, invoke the scheduled time-based closure action without resolution or coordinator confirmation	Closure is rejected; state remains Open; no closure event is recorded	R-01 v1 / D-01
T-03	Open request; any actor attempts direct closure	Transition is prevented; state remains Open	R-01 v1 / D-02
T-04	Resolved request; caseworker attempts closure	Transition is prevented; state remains Resolved	R-01 v1 / D-01
T-05	Open request; caseworker records resolution	State becomes Resolved, not Closed	R-01 v1 / D-02
T-06	N102 is explicitly constructed as non-urgent and Resolved; coordinator checks and closes	Coordinator can close without duty-lead approval; no urgency is inferred from neutral SR-102	R-01 v2 / D-01,D-02,D-04
T-07	U102 is explicitly constructed as urgent and Resolved; coordinator checks, then duty lead approves, then coordinator closes	State becomes Closed only after the ordered approvals	R-01 v2,R-02 / D-04
T-08	U102 is urgent and Resolved. Case A: no duty lead approval follows the coordinator check. Case B: approval occurred before the check, with no approval afterwards. In each case the coordinator attempts closure	Transition is rejected and state remains Resolved in both cases	R-01 v2,R-02 / D-04

N102 and U102 are fixture variants, not edits to neutral SR-102. Do not label any example Pass.

Seven-criterion rubric

Criterion	Demonstrated	Partly demonstrated	Not yet demonstrated
Evidence	Exact quotes and clear supplied/inferred/open separation	One or more blurred boundaries	Invented fact presented as source
Consequence	Explains effect on flow, state, actor, or test	Issue noticed with thin effect	No operational consequence
Ownership	Evidence provider separated from confirmed authority	Roles named but authority unclear	Title or AI output treated as authority
Requirement	R-01 v1 baseline and R-01 v2/R-02 current versions trace to decisions	Traceability or versioning incomplete	Closure rule contradicts decisions
Acceptance	Starting fixture, actor/action, ordered observable outcome	One element vague	Opinion or non-observable result
AI review	Rejects compliance, timing, recipient, frequency inventions	Spots some unsupported claims	Accepts polished answer as policy
Change handling	Preserves baseline and applies D-04 approval order, with dependencies open	Impact partly recorded	D-04 ignored or invented into full policy

Ratings are feedback, not certification, hiring assessment, or a pass mark. Accept reasoned alternatives that preserve the same evidence and approval boundary.

Authored feedback illustration

Invented illustration — not a testimonial, learner result, or observed model output: “Your strongest move was separating the response from resolution and showing why U102 cannot close before duty lead approval. To strengthen the work, quote the source for the reminder question and label urgency classification and approval-record format as open.”

The reviewer’s single written response should use this kind of specific, source-linked observation. It should not imply employment readiness or ongoing coaching.