

Student Casebook

Public cases and measurement practice

Author	Jason Hreha
Version	1
Audience	Product and innovation leaders
Date	September 5 2026
License	Original content CC BY 4.0

How to use this document

Choose one public decision packet and complete the Decision Workbook before reading its worked response in the Facilitator Guide. The case facts, instructions, and fictional measurement records needed for practice are printed here. External source URLs are supplied for later inspection.

The three companion files are Decision Workbook, Student Casebook, and Facilitator Guide. Their PDFs and editable Word versions share those names. Use the student material before opening worked responses. Source URLs are reference links; the printed instructions and fictional records support offline practice.

Public facts, participant recollections, instructor analysis, proposed tests, and invented observations are labelled separately. No featured organization is claimed to have used DRIVE, BMF, or BFA. No participant study or independent validation of this teaching pack is reported.

Contents

1. M PESA Choose the Next Use
2. Instagram Choose the Next Behavior
3. Verify Define Success
4. Measurement Lab
5. Fictional measurement records for offline practice

References and online companions

M PESA Choose the Next Use

A payment can succeed on a phone and still fail the person who needs the money. This exercise uses [Behavior Market Fit](#) [1] to ask which complete action is worth supporting, for whom, and under what conditions.

Your task: recommend the next bounded investment after a mobile-money pilot. Compare a loan-repayment service, a person-to-person transfer service, and an extension that resolves a specific uncertainty. Submit a decision and a test that could overturn it.

Status: public-source teaching reconstruction, version 1.0. The decision role, option menu, prompts and proposed tests are original instructional material. The historical participants are not known to have used DRIVE, BMF or BFA. This exercise does not establish that those methods improve decisions.

The decision setting

Imagine a product team reviewing the M-PESA pilot in Kenya during 2006. Its task is to select a first commercially supportable service. The team can improve the current workflow, test a different use, or defer expansion while resolving a named uncertainty. It cannot assume unlimited agent capacity, free distribution or ongoing project-team rescue.

This is an **invented decision meeting**, not a recovered board paper. The factual packet draws on accounts published around or after the pilot. It limits the exercise to pilot-stage observations, but it cannot reproduce everything a real decision maker knew at one date. The actual next steps and later outcomes are on the separate worked page.

Choose a direction before opening that page. If you already know M-PESA's history, write down what you remember and set it aside. Assess the options using the packet's evidence and its gaps.

The public evidence packet

A The service and its early limits

A WRI chapter in Vodafone's *Economic empowerment through mobile*, reviewing the 2006 setting, describes a loan-repayment pilot with Faulu, Safaricom and Commercial Bank of Africa. Customers could also transfer money, buy airtime and exchange cash with agents. The report describes reduced repayment travel, but also limited agent access and withdrawal constraints. It says use beyond repayment was slow and commercial acceptance remained unresolved because phones and service were free. Its relevant notes cite an April 2006 pilot review. (evidence BS-0079)

B What the participant account adds

Hughes and Lonie's 2007 account dates the pilot start to 11 October 2005 and its official end to 1 May 2006. Nearly 500 clients and eight agent stores began the pilot. Selection favored phone familiarity; clients received phones and account credit. Training covered menus, PINs and transactions. Agents needed reassurance and cash floats. Reported uses included business payments, remote family support and repayment for other people. Faulu faced reconciliation difficulties. Agent electronic balances could also run out. These are participant-reported observations, without a complete opportunity-to-completion dataset. (evidence BS-0079)

C What you cannot conclude yet

The accounts offer different emphases. Examples of an alternative use can coexist with slow adoption of that use across a pilot. Neither fact supplies a frequency distribution. We cannot calculate how many eligible people completed a remittance, how many returned at their next need, or what each successful delivery cost under ordinary operating support.

Treat the observed alternative uses as candidates to investigate. Treat the original repayment use as a candidate too. The packet does not justify a numeric BFA score, a paid-demand estimate, or a claim that all Kenyans face the same conditions.

Your choice

The following alternatives are teaching constructions. You may amend them, but keep the same business objective and explain what your amendment changes.

Improve loan repayment

Candidate action and population: A borrower makes a due payment that reaches the correct loan record

Work the service would have to support: Borrower access, collection, confirmation, group arrangements and institutional reconciliation

Most important evidence request: Are payments correctly credited with less total work for borrowers and the institution?

Test person-to-person transfer

Candidate action and population: A sender with a genuine transfer need sends money that the intended recipient can access

Work the service would have to support: Onboarding, cash conversion, correct recipient details, transfer, cash availability and error recovery

Most important evidence request: Does the full transfer work repeatedly at acceptable total cost, including both ends?

Extend the pilot before choosing

Candidate action and population: Keep expansion bounded while observing a named weak link in an existing route

Work the service would have to support: A defined observation protocol, an operating owner and a decision deadline

Most important evidence request: Which missing observation would distinguish the leading options?

Include a **less-user-work alternative** in your comparison. For example, ask whether a service could remove a reconciliation task or a separate visit instead of asking every borrower to learn another payment sequence. This is a design hypothesis. Specify who would take over the work, with what authority and cost. Moving a burden to an agent or employee does not make it disappear.

Use [workbook steps 1 and 2](#) [2] to separate the desired outcome, the observable action and the proposed feature.

Follow the money all the way through

Build an action chain for the option you favor. The table below is an instructor's analysis checklist, not a claim that every listed failure occurred in this pilot.

Actor	Action or responsibility to check	Evidence to request
Sender or borrower	Obtain usable access; understand the fee; enter the intended payment; protect credentials	Observation of the real task, including a declined attempt and any assistance
Cash-in agent	Accept and verify cash; provide the correct electronic value	Matched records; waiting time; available balance; staff time
Platform and customer support	Route the payment; confirm its status; resolve exceptions	Reconciled transaction records; delay and recovery records
Recipient and cash-out agent	Confirm the right person and amount; make funds usable when needed	Recipient confirmation; cash availability; travel, waiting and failed visits
Group treasurer or delegated payer, if used	Match each person's payment to the group's payment without losing the individual allocation	Member-level records matched to the group payment and final loan credit
Lending institution, if relevant	Credit the correct borrower; reconcile collection and settlement	Loan record matched to payment; exceptions; staff time and ownership
Bank and service finance team	Keep customer funds and system balances accounted for	Settlement and reconciliation evidence reviewed by the responsible operator
Agent manager and service owner	Train staff, maintain cash and electronic balances, fund support and own unresolved problems	A costed operating plan that ordinary staff can execute

Where does your action start? What observable event finishes it? Mark every necessary handoff. For a transfer intended to supply cash, a sent message is an intermediate event. For repayment, the lender's correct credit is part of completion.

Use [workbook step 3](#) [3]. Label each row as a historical observation, your inference, or a proposal that still needs evidence.

Submit a decision that can be challenged

Complete the [decision workbook](#) [4]. Your answer must contain:

- Decision and population.** Name the next investment, the people it serves and the complete action it should enable. State what remains outside the initial population.
- Evidence comparison.** Give the strongest reason for your choice and the strongest reason against it. Explain how you interpret the two source accounts without averaging them into a success rate.

3. **Fit and support.** Separate a durable reason to make the payment from the skills, access and support needed to execute it. Assign an owner and cost to each necessary support.
4. **A realistic test.** Specify genuine opportunities, first completion, repeat completion, the observation window, fees and ordinary assistance. Include the recipient or institution that finishes the chain.
5. **Decision rules.** Set proposed continue, revise, stop and insufficient-evidence conditions before seeing results. Explain why the thresholds would matter to the business and to users.
6. **Reversal condition.** State which result would make you choose the strongest alternative. If your choice is to extend the pilot, name the evidence that ends the extension.

Use [steps 4 through 8](#) [5] to complete the test and next decision. Any numbers you choose are proposed planning rules. They are not historical M-PESA results or universal BMF thresholds.

Source chronology and reading boundary

[WRI chapter in Economic empowerment through mobile](#) [6], printed pp. 12-13, PDF pp. 14-15

Events or observations covered: Pilot-stage evidence; relevant notes cite an April 2006 review

Publication and use in this exercise: Reviews the 2006 setting; exact publication day is not established here. It is not an April decision document.

[Hughes and Lonie, M-PESA: Mobile Money for the Unbanked](#) [7], printed pp. 70, 72-78

Events or observations covered: Pilot and subsequent development

Publication and use in this exercise: Published in *Innovations*, Winter & Spring 2007. A participant-authored retrospective; the packet uses its pilot material. The full paper reveals later decisions.

Sources checked 5 September 2026. External publications retain their own rights. The original teaching material is covered by the [teaching-pack reuse terms](#) [8].

After you record your choice: open [M-PESA: Worked Decision](#) [9] to compare two reasoned responses, a proposed test and the subsequent history.

Instagram Choose the Next Behavior

Your decision: Which action should a small product team prioritize, and what must it learn before committing further?

Use this public case to practice [behavior selection](#) [10]. Produce a short decision record using the [workbook](#) [4] or a blank page. Allow about 20 minutes as a teaching estimate.

This is an original teaching reconstruction set in **2010, before the team committed to its focused product**. The exact decision date is not established by the sources. The account below comes from later testimony, not a recovered planning document. If you recognize the company, set aside what you know happened next.

The evidence available for this exercise

In a talk on **11 May 2011**, Kevin Systrom and Mike Krieger described Burbn as venue check-ins with pictures or videos. They recalled particular enthusiasm for images and difficulty explaining Burbn to people outside their friends. These are founder recollections. (evidence BS-0080)

The inspected record provides no raw feature-use distribution, comparable completion rates, or representative sample of potential users. You cannot fill those gaps with the later company's size.

Your role is an instructor-created scenario: advise the team on its next product and research commitment. Your objective is to help a defined group share something meaningful with an intended audience, with a credible path to repeated use. You may narrow that group, challenge the objective, or recommend a test before selecting a product direction. Explain the consequence of your choice.

Compare actions before choosing features

The following options are teaching constructions, not a historical shortlist. Improve or replace them if they do not serve your objective.

Candidate	Action to examine	Question the choice creates
Place first	A person checks into a venue and adds information for other people.	Does sharing the place serve an aim that arises often enough?
Photo first	A person chooses a phone photo and makes it available to an intended audience.	Who wants to share, with whom, and at what moment?
Audience first	A person opens a collection of other people's photos and responds to something relevant.	Where will the useful material come from, and why will contributors supply it?
Less new work	A person shares through a destination they already use, with preparation or transfer work handled by the product.	Can the team create value without asking the person to establish another network?

The last option may change the route to an action rather than the action itself. State which user steps disappear and which move to the product. A feature such as a filter is a possible means of helping someone act; it is not a complete target behavior.

Make your decision

1 Define and compare your candidates

Use [workbook step 2](#) [11]. For each candidate, name the person, the situation, the observable action, its completion point and the competing action. Include an option that requires less new work from the user.

Choose an initial priority. Distinguish a priority for **investigation** from a commitment to **build or launch**. A candidate can deserve a test without having demonstrated [Behavior Market Fit](#) [1].

2 Separate evidence from interpretation

Use [workbook step 4](#) [5] to record:

- One source-backed observation relevant to your choice.
- One interpretation you are making from it.
- One important unknown.
- One finding that would move a different candidate above your current choice.

Do not invent a numerical ranking to make incomplete evidence appear precise. If you use fit categories, label them as your hypotheses and explain what would test them.

3 Follow the whole action

Draw the chain with [workbook step 3](#) [3]. Include what the user, the product and any recipient must do. Mark the step most likely to fail and distinguish a person's skill from the conditions that permit the action.

For example, knowing how to select a photo does not ensure that a usable connection or an appropriate audience is available. If your route requires assistance, say whether the service could keep providing it.

4 Specify the next observation

Use [workbook step 5](#) [12]. State who you would observe, in which real situation, using which working route or existing alternative. Define what counts as exposure, an attempt and completion. Identify any help the test supplies.

Add a repeat-opportunity rule: how will you distinguish “did not return” from “had no relevant occasion to act again”? Keep unknown observations visible. Do not claim that a demonstration or a statement of interest answers every question about repeated use.

Write the record you would take to a meeting

Complete these fields using [workbook step 8](#) [13]:

Field	Your response
Objective and population	What useful outcome, for whom?

Field	Your response
Selected action	Who does what, when, and how do you recognize completion?
Strongest alternative	Why is it still credible?
Evidence and unknown	What supports the choice, and what could reverse it?
Next commitment	What work do you recommend now, and what remains unapproved?
Decision rule	Which observation leads to continuing, changing or stopping that work?

Check that your proposed feature serves the action you selected. Also check whether your test could fail: if every possible observation leads to building the same product, it cannot resolve your decision.

Source chronology

Event described	Public record	Evidence role
Burbn development and the 2010 product decision	Founders' Stanford talk, 11 May 2011 [14]	Retrospective first-person account; no underlying usage table supplied.

Source checked **5 September 2026**. The linked talk includes later history. This packet separates the decision task from the outcome; it cannot prevent a reader from looking ahead. Neither the source nor this exercise establishes that the founders used DRIVE, BMF or BFA.

Once your record is written, open the [Instagram worked decision](#) [15] to compare the reasoning and see the historical outcome.

Original teaching material by Jason Hreha, version 1.0, licensed CC BY 4.0. External sources retain their own terms. See [teaching notes and reuse guidance](#) [8].

Verify Define Success

Your decision: What should a service team investigate next, and which completed action should determine whether that work helps users?

This exercise starts **after the National Audit Office published its Verify investigation on 5 March 2019**. The audit findings are evidence available at the decision point. Do not use them as information that an earlier team necessarily had. Allow about 20 minutes as a teaching estimate.

Use the [decision workbook](#) [4] or a blank page. The task is a public-source reconstruction for learning [Behavior Market Fit testing](#) [16], not a description of the government's actual next decision.

The public record

Verify used commercial providers to confirm identities for access to government services. The NAO's March 2019 investigation reported the following. (evidence BS-0081)

Reported item	Boundary stated by the source
Verification success was 48% in February 2019 .	The measure concerned successful Verify sign-up in a single attempt under the source's counting rules.
The earlier projection was 90% .	This was a planning expectation, not an experimental control group.
Applicants could leave before choosing an identity provider.	Those departures were excluded from the success measure.
Verification could succeed without access to the intended service.	The reported rate did not establish completion of the user's government task.

The audit also reported additional manual work for departments. It did not isolate one cause of the program's difficulties. [NAO findings](#) [17] and [full report, paragraphs 1.16 and 1.17](#) [18].

Your role and boundaries

Instructor-created scenario: you advise the owner of one online government application. The team wants an eligible person to submit the application and receive confirmation that it has been accepted for processing. Identity assurance remains a required condition. An eventual approval, payment or other service benefit is a later outcome.

You may recommend one bounded investigation or pilot for that existing service. Government-wide funding and the identity-assurance standard are outside your decision. You have no additional service-specific funnel, cost or user-research data. If a number is missing, mark it as missing.

Repair the claim before choosing an intervention

This is a **fictional briefing statement written for the exercise**:

“Verification success is 48%, so about half of people complete the government task. Increasing verification success will show that we are meeting their need.”

Use [workbook step 1](#) [2] to separate the user's useful outcome, the actions required and the intermediate system event. Write a replacement statement that preserves what is supported and names what is unknown.

Then use [workbook step 6](#) [19] to explain why subtracting the reported rate from the projection does not estimate the effect of an intervention. A performance shortfall and a causal effect are different claims.

Map the whole journey

Start before the person selects an identity provider and continue beyond verification to the application confirmation. Use [workbook step 3](#) [3].

For each step, record:

- Who acts: applicant, identity provider, service team or support staff.
- What observable event shows progress.
- What conditions or help are necessary.
- Whether an unsuccessful step means refusal, inability, a technical failure, a competing route or an unknown result.

Include repeat attempts and existing accounts. A person who tries again should not silently become a new person in the denominator. A person who uses another permitted route may still achieve the intended outcome.

Choose the next priority

These are original teaching options, not a reconstructed government shortlist.

Option	Immediate aim	Evidence you would need
Increase awareness	Bring more intended users into the route.	Whether additional entrants can complete a useful task under current conditions.
Improve registration	Help people complete the identity-provider step.	Where registration fails and whether success carries through to the service.
Repair the service handoff	Help an already verified person reach and complete the application.	Whether account, record-matching or other transition problems block the task.
Reduce or support the required work	Reuse permitted existing steps or provide a sustainable assisted route.	What work disappears or moves to staff, the resulting completion and the cost of support.

You may first recommend an investigation that distinguishes these options. Use [workbook step 4](#) [5] to explain why your choice is more useful than simply pursuing a higher intermediate percentage.

Specify a measurement plan and decision rule

Complete the following fields before reading the worked response.

Field	What your record must specify
Population and episode	Which applicants and which application journey are included?
Start and finish	What event begins the observation, and what confirms the useful task is complete?
Denominator and window	Are you counting people, attempts or applications, and for how long?
Observation gaps	How are early departures, missing links, repeat attempts and unresolved outcomes recorded?
Support and alternatives	Which help and other routes remain available, and what do they require from staff?
Next comparison	What would you need to compare before claiming that a proposed change improved completion?
Decision rule	Which finding leads to a repair, a different route, a larger test or an inconclusive result?

Use [workbook step 7](#) [20] to check the diagnosis. An unsuccessful treatment does not by itself prove that applicants cannot perform the target behavior. Equally, a successful identity check does not establish the whole journey's feasibility.

Submit your recommendation

Your record should contain a repaired briefing statement, a complete action chain and a recommendation for the next commitment. Name the strongest alternative and the observation that would make you switch to it. State which claim you would decline to make from the current evidence.

Source chronology

Observation period	Public record	Evidence role
Program performance through February 2019	NAO investigation, 5 March 2019 [21]	Independent government audit, available before this exercise's decision.
The same investigation	NAO findings release, 5 March 2019 [17]	Summary of the same audit, with no separate replication.

Sources checked **5 September 2026**. No later program outcome is needed to answer this exercise. The source record does not show use of DRIVE, BMF or BFA.

After writing your record, open the [Verify worked decision](#) [22]. Use the [measurement lab](#) [23] if your counts or observation rules remain unclear.

Original teaching material by Jason Hreha, version 1.0, licensed CC BY 4.0. External sources retain their own terms. See [teaching notes and reuse guidance](#) [8].

Measurement Lab

Purpose. Practice defining what a result measures, which people or opportunities it includes, and what next decision the evidence supports.

This lab has two public-source exercises and one invented dataset. The public studies did not test DRIVE, BMF, or BFA. The exercises are original teaching analysis. The dataset contains no actual observations, and completing the lab is not a participant study.

Work in [workbook sections 6 to 8](#) [19]. Record your answers before opening the [separate answer guide](#) [24]. Suggested time is 25 minutes for all three exercises, an instructional estimate. A host can select one exercise for a shorter session.

A Wikipedia three different results

Public source. Wikimedia's November 2020 report analyzes a randomized comparison of all Growth features with the default experience on four Wikipedias. It includes homepage, suggested tasks, and help features. Accounts that switched the features on or off were excluded from the analysis. The observed period was November 2019 to May 2020. (evidence BS-0082)

Read the [original report's glossary, findings, and methodology](#) [25]. This source was inspected on September 5, 2026; its visible revision is January 9, 2025. The later page revision is not the experiment date.

Source facts for offline practice. Activation means a first edit to an Article or Article Talk page within 24 hours of registration. Constructive activation adds that the edit is not reverted within 48 hours. Retention involves another edit on a different day in the two weeks after activation. The report detected an activation increase but did not directly detect a retention change; it inferred more retained users through increased activation. These are source definitions and findings, not an answer to the next-test task.

Your task:

1. Write separate measures for a first edit, a constructive first edit, and a return edit. Include their windows and the population each rate describes.
2. Explain how retained editors per original account differ from returning editors among people who made a first edit.
3. State what the comparison can tell you about the full feature bundle. Identify what would require another comparison to isolate suggested tasks.
4. Write a next test if the operating goal is useful repeat contributions. Define the return opportunity, quality measure, follow-up, and result that would change your decision.

Deliverable: one measurement table and a bounded next-test proposal. Do not treat an edit that remains unreverted as a complete assessment of its quality, or infer a long-term result from a short observation window.

B California EITC contact and completion

Public source. Linos and colleagues report six randomized outreach experiments conducted in California in 2018 and 2019. Their study used letters and text messages, with filing and credit-claim outcomes linked

to administrative records. The samples and control conditions must be read by experiment; the studies partly overlap. (evidence BS-0083)

Read the [November 2022 journal abstract](#) [26]. For methods and engagement details, use the [research team's November 2020 working paper](#) [27], especially its introduction and methods. Both were inspected on September 5, 2026. The working paper is identified separately from the final publication.

Source facts for offline practice. The tested outreach did not produce a detected increase in filing or claiming. Some recipients visited linked resources. The randomized outcome comparisons used administrative records; visiting a website was a separate engagement measure. The supplied source summary does not establish that everyone received or read a message, obtained usable assistance, or completed each preparation step. No numerical effect calculation is required for this exercise.

Your task:

1. Draw a proposed chain from receipt of outreach to the completed claim. Mark which steps the available evidence measures and which remain unknown.
2. Explain what visiting a linked website can establish. Name the additional evidence needed to claim that filing or claiming changed because of the outreach.
3. Assess this proposed conclusion: "The treatment did not increase claiming, so filing is the wrong behavior to target." List two other explanations that remain possible and an observation that could help distinguish them.
4. Select one next decision from the workbook. Identify the particular treatment or service route affected, and state what remains unresolved about the wider objective.

Deliverable: one behavior chain, one corrected conclusion, and one decision with its evidence limits. An address or offer for help is not evidence that hands-on help was received.

C Fictional shift handover data

Download [measurement-records.csv](#) [28]. It contains **24 invented records from 12 fictional teams**, with a first and second scheduled handover occasion for each team. The observation unit is a team on an occasion, not an independent person. The records cover a fictional two-round exercise; they are unrelated to Wikipedia or the EITC studies.

Scenario and recording rules

An outgoing lead saves a form listing the next action and owner for unfinished work. The incoming lead must acknowledge a usable handover before taking over. The useful outcome is that the next shift can act on correct ownership information; the file does not measure that later outcome.

- **Eligible:** the team belongs to the exercise roster. All rostered team-occasion records are retained.
- **Opportunity:** unfinished work requires a handover on that occasion. No unfinished work means no applicable opportunity.
- **Attempted:** the outgoing lead saves the form before the deadline.
- **Completed:** a handover with the required next-action and named-owner fields is acknowledged by the incoming lead before taking over. These fields define "usable" for this exercise. A saved form alone does not complete it; the later accuracy and use of that information are not measured.

- **Normal support:** the planned form and ordinary supervisor help.
- **Exceptional support:** extra coach time outside the planned service. It was not assigned randomly.
- **Staff minutes:** recorded help for that occasion, including help on failed or unresolved attempts. Zero means a recorded zero; unknown means the help record is missing. It excludes participant time and other operating costs.

Data dictionary

Column	Meaning and values
dataset_id	Identifies this entirely fictional exercise
record_id	Unique observation identifier
team_id	Fictional team; appears twice
occasion	First or second scheduled handover
eligible	Yes: on the exercise roster
opportunity	Yes, no, or unknown
attempted	Yes, no, unknown, or na for no opportunity
completed	Yes, no, unknown, or na for no opportunity
support	Normal or exceptional
staff_minutes	Nonnegative recorded minutes or unknown
observation_note	Invented explanation of the recorded state

Unknown records remain in the roster. Do not fill them with zeros or delete them without reporting the effect. For this exercise, a verified no-attempt on a known opportunity also means no completion. A missing completion record after a known attempt remains unknown.

Calculate and interpret

1. Count records, unique teams, known opportunities, known absences of opportunity, and unknown opportunities. Keep the units distinct.
2. Calculate attempts per known opportunity. Then calculate completion among known outcomes on known opportunities. Report unresolved outcomes beside the rate.
3. Bound completion on known opportunities by treating the unresolved completion as a failure and then as a success. Explain why these bounds do not include every source of uncertainty.
4. Calculate completion among attempts with known outcomes. Compare its denominator with the opportunity denominator. Explain the question each answers.
5. Identify the first-completing teams. Among those with a known second opportunity, calculate repeat completion among known outcomes and its bounds. Name anyone excluded for lacking another opportunity.

6. Compare normal and exceptional support descriptively. Sum recorded staff minutes, including time spent on failures and unresolved attempts. Report how many staff-time records remain unknown.
7. Evaluate the instructional rules below, then record one of the five next decisions. Include the next observation that would help distinguish a delivery problem from a problem with the selected action.

Illustrative operating rules

These rules are **invented for the exercise**, agreed before interpreting its records. They are not universal BMF thresholds or a recommended research sample size.

The fictional team would consider a limited next stage only if at least **70% of applicable handovers complete under normal support**, because it assumes its fallback can handle at most the remaining 30%. It also has a total **60-minute staff-help budget for both rounds combined**. Missing outcomes, uncertain opportunities, and the precision of a rate must be addressed before expansion. The two-round exercise cannot establish long-term repetition or a population-wide rate.

Apply the rules to the stated support condition, not whichever subgroup has the highest result. A rate above a threshold does not cancel a failed cost or data-quality requirement. Do not claim a causal advantage for exceptional help from these records.

Deliverable: your counts, clearly named fractions, a support-cost note, and a short decision memo. Then open the [answer guide](#) [24] to check the calculations and compare your reasoning.

Original exercises and fictional data: Jason Hreha, version 1, 2026-09-05, CC BY 4.0. Linked sources retain their own rights. No real participant data is used.

Fictional measurement records

These are entirely invented teaching observations. Twelve fictional teams each have a first and second scheduled handover, giving 24 team-occasion records. All are eligible roster records. The scenario and recording definitions are in the Measurement Lab. No real participants or organization supplied these observations.

Values are yes, no, unknown, or na for no applicable opportunity. Staff minutes include recorded help on unsuccessful and unresolved attempts. Unknown minutes are missing, not zero. Exceptional help was not randomly assigned. The fields below preserve every value needed for the calculations; the CSV also contains unique record IDs and explanatory notes.

First scheduled occasion

Team	Opportunity	Attempt	Complete	Support	Minutes
T01	yes	yes	yes	normal	1
T02	yes	yes	yes	normal	2
T03	yes	yes	yes	exceptional	12
T04	yes	yes	yes	normal	1
T05	yes	yes	yes	exceptional	15
T06	yes	yes	yes	normal	0
T07	yes	yes	no	normal	4
T08	yes	yes	no	normal	3
T09	yes	no	no	normal	0
T10	yes	no	no	normal	0
T11	no	na	na	normal	0
T12	unknown	unknown	unknown	normal	unknown

Second scheduled occasion

Team	Opportunity	Attempt	Complete	Support	Minutes
T01	yes	yes	yes	normal	1
T02	yes	yes	yes	exceptional	10
T03	yes	yes	yes	normal	2
T04	yes	yes	no	normal	5
T05	yes	yes	unknown	exceptional	14

Team	Opportunity	Attempt	Complete	Support	Minutes
T06	no	na	na	normal	0
T07	yes	yes	yes	exceptional	12
T08	yes	no	no	normal	0
T09	yes	yes	yes	normal	2
T10	no	na	na	normal	0
T11	yes	yes	no	normal	4
T12	unknown	unknown	unknown	normal	unknown

Observation notes

A yes completion means a usable handover was acknowledged. A no opportunity means no unfinished work required a handover. The following exceptions and additional help are part of the fictional record.

T03 first occasion: Extra coaching; usable handover acknowledged.

T05 first occasion: Extra coaching; usable handover acknowledged.

T07 first occasion: Saved form; recipient did not acknowledge by deadline.

T08 first occasion: Saved form; task owner unresolved at deadline.

T09 first occasion: Applicable handover; no form saved by deadline.

T10 first occasion: Applicable handover; no form saved by deadline.

T11 first occasion: No unfinished work to hand over.

T12 first occasion: Observation missing; opportunity and outcomes unknown.

T02 second occasion: Extra coaching; usable handover acknowledged.

T04 second occasion: Saved form; recipient did not acknowledge by deadline.

T05 second occasion: Saved form; completion recording unavailable.

T06 second occasion: No unfinished work to hand over.

T07 second occasion: Extra coaching; usable handover acknowledged.

T08 second occasion: Applicable handover; no form saved by deadline.

T10 second occasion: No unfinished work to hand over.

T11 second occasion: Saved form; task owner unresolved at deadline.

T12 second occasion: Observation missing; opportunity and outcomes unknown.

References and online companions

Numbered links identify sources or companion pages used in the text. External material retains its own rights. These links do not imply endorsement. The pack contains original teaching synthesis, not copies of third-party casebooks or proprietary exhibits.

1. Behavior Market Fit

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/glossary/behavior-market-fit/>

2. workbook steps 1 and 2

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-1>

3. workbook step 3

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-3>

4. decision workbook

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/>

5. steps 4 through 8

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-4>

6. WRI chapter in Economic empowerment through mobile

https://assets.ctfassets.net/q7ob9vms4z5k/3SiDxKfcGaiWbYiMwI5QyJ/44fb2dfd89e3bc89b93085ea5220f202/Vodafone_Group_CR_Dialogue_pages.pdf

7. Hughes and Lonie, M-PESA: Mobile Money for the Unbanked

https://www.gsma.com/mobilefordevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/innovationsarticleonmpesa_0_d_14.pdf

8. teaching-pack reuse terms

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/teaching-notes/>

9. M-PESA: Worked Decision

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/mpesa-worked-decision/>

10. behavior selection

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/methodology/choose-target-behavior/>

11. workbook step 2

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-2>

12. workbook step 5

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-5>

13. workbook step 8

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-8>

14. Founders' Stanford talk, 11 May 2011

<https://stvp.stanford.edu/av/stanford-startup-entire-talk>

15. Instagram worked decision

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/instagram-worked-decision/>

16. Behavior Market Fit testing

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/methodology/validate-behavior-market-fit/>

17. NAO findings

<https://www.nao.org.uk/press-releases/investigation-into-verify/>

18. full report, paragraphs 1.16 and 1.17

<https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Investigation-into-verify.pdf#page=18>

19. workbook step 6

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-6>

20. workbook step 7

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/decision-workbook/#step-7>

21. NAO investigation, 5 March 2019

<https://www.nao.org.uk/reports/investigation-into-verify/>

22. Verify worked decision

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/verify-worked-decision/>

23. measurement lab

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/measurement-lab/>

24. separate answer guide

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/education/measurement-lab-answers/>

25. original report's glossary, findings, and methodology

https://www.mediawiki.org/wiki/Growth/Personalized_first_day/Newcomer_tasks/Experiment_analysis,_November_2020

26. November 2022 journal abstract

<https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pol.20200603>

27. research team's November 2020 working paper

<https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Increasing-Take-Up-of-the-Earned-Income-Tax-Credit.pdf>

28. measurement-records.csv

<https://behavioralstrategy.com/downloads/teaching-pack/v1/measurement-records.csv>

Attribution and reuse

Original teaching content, exercises, and invented data: Jason Hreha, Behavioral Strategy, version 1, September 5 2026. Licensed CC BY 4.0 for the original material. Linked source text, marks, and exhibits retain their own rights. Preserve attribution, identify changes, and do not imply endorsement. No general site license or third-party rights are changed by this pack.