

# Interaction Evidence Packet

Topic 9: run one working client-side behavior, trace six stages, compare three expected and actual results, diagnose one case, protect the architecture boundary, and prepare Topic 10.

|      |                    |                                               |
|------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Name | Date<br>mm/dd/yyyy | Due<br>Before Topic 10; use the LMS calendar. |
|------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>PREFERRED SUBMISSION</b></p> <p><b>One five-page PDF</b></p> <p><b>LastName-Topic09-InteractionEvidence.pdf.</b> The PDF is for paper/printing; use this editable HTML, LMS text, DOCX/export, or an approved route for accessible electronic completion.</p> | <p><b>EQUAL-CREDIT ROUTES</b></p> <p><b>Own app or course lab</b></p> <p>Tool access, generated-code volume, framework choice, and visual polish earn no automatic advantage.</p> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

**Work plan:** draft pages 1–3 in Meeting 1 and pages 4–5 in Meeting 2; plan about 35–55 minutes to finish afterward. Ask the instructor through the LMS before class for an approved accessible route; the same five-page maximum applies.

**Local-save route:** responses save only in this browser; nothing is sent, and your name is never saved. On a shared device, use fictional data, save only to personal storage, select **Clear visible responses + local draft**, remove downloads/print artifacts, and close the browser.

**Never submit:** API keys, credentials, source archives unless requested by the LMS, account/repository/device screens, secret alerts, access proof, full chats, private logs, real records, or unnecessary identity evidence.

## 1 · Route and Topic 8 oracle

**Working route**

Course Study Sprint Interaction Lab

| Authorized input | Event/action | Exact rule |
|------------------|--------------|------------|
|                  |              |            |

| Expected visible output | Expected missing-input state + preserved work |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
|                         |                                               |

**Why this route can produce the required working-interaction evidence**

Explain what the browser did.

Use responsibility language. A short source excerpt or line reference is optional; do not paste a full generated file.

| Stage        | Responsibility in this interaction | Visible or source evidence |
|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 · Input    |                                    |                            |
| 2 · Event    |                                    |                            |
| 3 · Validate |                                    |                            |
| 4 · Rule     |                                    |                            |
| 5 · State    |                                    |                            |
| 6 · Output   |                                    |                            |

Working change or configuration

One behavior implemented, configured, or intentionally preserved

What remained outside scope

Source/tool/assistance used

What I accepted, revised, or rejected—and why

**Working evidence:** use an actual course-lab or own-app run, a teacher-projected run with your own prediction/record, or an approved accessible transcript-backed interaction. A static description alone does not demonstrate the working-interaction outcome.

Run three manual tests.

Write the expected result before running the case. Record what actually happened without rewriting the oracle to make a failure pass.

| Test         | Input + action | Exact expected result | Actual result | Status    |
|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|
| 1<br>Normal  |                |                       |               | Not run ▼ |
| 2<br>Missing |                |                       |               | Not run ▼ |
| 3<br>Revise  |                |                       |               | Not run ▼ |

Test integrity

What valid state should remain after missing input?

What stale state must be replaced on revise/repeat?

Keyboard/focus or equivalent access check

What these three tests do not prove

Default course-lab oracle: normal "Read chapter" + 25 with rule 2/remaining/3 → 2/20/3; missing Task + 25 → linked message, focus/attention, preserve 25, no plan; revise 15 → 45 → 2/40/3 replaces the prior result. If you configure other allowed whole-number rule values, rewrite the expected results before running.

# Localize, change one thing, and retest.

Use a failure, surprising result, deliberately injected course-lab bug, or a deliberately selected passed edge case.

Case route

Observed failure or surprising result

▼

Exact input, action, expected, and actual evidence

⧵

Most specific pipeline stage—and confidence

⧵

Smallest supported suspected cause—or why no defect is supported

⧵

Smallest change requested/made, or simulated correction—and why

⧵

Retest evidence

Focused test + actual result

⧵

Regression check 1 + result

⧵

Regression check 2 + result

⧵

Approve, revise, reject, or defer—and why

⧵

Remaining limitation or untested condition

⧵

**Calibration:** an observed state loss supports “the state path failed.” It does not prove the exact source line until source inspection or a targeted change/retest supports that conclusion. Course-lab route: record the injected failure, choose **Prepare corrected simulation** (disables injection and restores 25), rerun, and disclose that this simulated corrected behavior rather than editing source.

# Protect the boundary and explain the handoff.

## Architecture decision

Local rule (Topic 9 required) ▼

## Evidence, added failure modes, and human responsibility

**Fictional key response: stop sharing it; notify the owner; if real, have it revoked and replaced (“rotated”) first; then, with approved help, remove it from files and inspect copies/history; never rewrite history destructively yourself; redesign the boundary**

## Plain-language explanation: trigger, input, decision, state, output, and one limitation

## Route and assistance disclosure

**Topic 10 handoff: own app = local file; lab = lab link + configuration/test record. Add essential smoke checks, limitation, and deployment/local route.**

## Submission check

- ☐ I included a working route, Topic 8 oracle, six-stage trace, and one implemented/configured behavior.
- ☐ I recorded three expected and actual results without changing the oracle to hide a failure.
- ☐ I included one calibrated diagnosis or passed edge-case analysis, focused retest, regressions, and limitation.
- ☐ I included architecture/secret safety, behavior explanation, disclosure, and Topic 10 handoff.
- ☐ I submitted no key, credential, account/device/repository screen, secret alert, access proof, full chat, private log, or real record.

**Evidence anchors:** complete evidence addresses every named element with observable expected/actual results and a calibrated approval decision; developing evidence leaves elements unclear or unsupported; incomplete evidence is largely unrun, untestable, or missing the working route. The instructor evaluates trace, behavior, tests, diagnosis, architecture/safety, explanation, disclosure, and handoff—not code volume, visual polish, framework, AI access, or account proof. Official points or course weight come from the LMS; this packet sets no automatic pass threshold.