

SAP C_THR82

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Performance and Goals

For More Information – Visit link below:

<https://www.examsempire.com/>

Product Version

- 1. Up to Date products, reliable and verified.**
- 2. Questions and Answers in PDF Format.**



<https://examsempire.com/>

Visit us at: <https://www.examsempire.com/c-thr82>

Latest Version: 4.1

1. Meridian Pharma Calibration and Rating Roll-Up Configuration

2. Micro Skill Drill Exam

Topic: 1

Meridian Pharma Calibration and Rating Roll-Up Configuration

Business Context

Meridian Pharma Group is a global pharmaceutical manufacturer headquartered in Switzerland, with research, manufacturing, and commercial operations spread across roughly forty thousand employees in EMEA, the Americas, and Asia-Pacific. The organization runs its annual performance process on SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals, where scientists, plant operators, quality specialists, and commercial staff are all evaluated through a shared web-based administration environment. A central People Operations group in Basel owns the configuration, while regional HR business partners manage local execution of each review cycle.

Program Direction

For the current cycle, Meridian's talent leadership has committed to a structured calibration process so that ratings are comparable across very different functions before they are finalized. The calibration design draws its rating data from the performance form rather than from a separate dataset, and the People Operations team has been asked to stand up calibration settings and templates and then run sessions by function and region. Leadership wants facilitators to be able to compare and adjust ratings within a controlled population without altering the underlying form structure.

Form Landscape

The performance form template in use combines several section types. A goal section surfaces objectives from the employee goal plan, an attribute section captures competency evaluation, and a summary section consolidates the result that calibration will later draw upon. Section permissions in the form template determine which roles can see and edit each part of the form, and those permissions are evaluated as the form moves through the route map steps from self-evaluation into manager evaluation and review.

Rating Roll-Up Context

The overall rating that feeds calibration is assembled from the weighted contribution of the goal and competency sections into the summary. During configuration validation, the People Operations team observed that the consolidated rating shown on some manager copies did not match what reviewers expected from the individual section results. The discrepancy appeared most often on forms where a section had been adjusted late in the design, and it surfaced only after the forms had advanced past the first route map step.

Population Scoping

Regional HR partners raised a separate observation during a dry run. When a calibration session was opened for one manufacturing region, the participant list pulled in employees whose forms were still sitting at an earlier route map step, while a handful of expected senior scientists did not appear at all. Facilitators were uncertain whether the population was being governed by the session's own configuration or by something happening earlier in the form lifecycle.

Access and Governance

Meridian operates under tight access discipline because compensation decisions follow performance outcomes, and the company must demonstrate that only authorized roles could view or change ratings. Some regional administrators had been granted broad access to expedite the rollout, and an internal review questioned whether facilitators in one region could see calibration data for populations outside

their remit. The People Operations group needs to reconcile who can act in a session against who can see and edit ratings on the form itself, since these are governed in different places.

Adjustment Traceability

Talent leadership also expects that any rating moved during a calibration session is traceable and that an adjustment made in a session is reflected consistently when the form is reopened. In an early test, a rating changed during a session appeared to revert when a manager later reopened the form, raising questions about how session adjustments and form-level edits interact across the route map.

Operational Pressure

The configuration window is short. Manufacturing sites are entering a seasonal validation freeze, commercial teams are mid-reorganization, and the talent leadership team wants sessions completed before merit planning begins. People Operations must finalize calibration settings, the calibration template, the rating roll-up behavior on the form, and the access model in a coordinated way, because a change to one of these areas tends to expose a dependency in another. The team has been asked to validate each area against observable system evidence rather than assumption before the first live sessions open.

Validation Expectation

Each configuration area is expected to be confirmed against what the system actually shows — the population that loads into a session, the consolidated rating that appears on the form, the access a given role experiences, and the persistence of an adjusted rating — so that the cycle can proceed with ratings that leadership can defend.

Your assignment

You are acting as a performance configuration administrator for Meridian Pharma Group, working in the customer-facing administration environment of SAP SuccessFactors Performance & Goals. The annual cycle uses a performance form template with goal, competency, and summary sections moving through a defined route map, and a calibration process that draws its ratings from the performance form. Your task is to configure and validate calibration settings, the calibration template, the form rating roll-up, and the supporting access model, and to confirm each against observable system evidence before live sessions open. Work only within the configuration surfaces appropriate to a customer administrator, and validate by what the system shows rather than by assumption

1. CHALLENGE 1 — Calibration Data Source and Session Population Scoping

- Confirm that the calibration configuration is set to use performance as the data source so that session ratings are drawn from the performance form rather than a separate dataset.
- Configure the session population and review which forms qualify for inclusion, taking into account the route map step the forms currently occupy.
- Reconcile cases where expected participants are missing or unexpected participants appear by examining the form state and the session's population configuration together.
- Validate the loaded participant list against the intended population for the region and function before opening the session.

Checkpoints

- The participant list that loads in the session matches the intended population, and any exclusion or inclusion can be traced to form state or session configuration.
- The rating data visible in the session corresponds to what the underlying performance forms hold.

2. CHALLENGE 2 — Performance Form Rating Roll-Up and Section Weighting

- Review how the goal and competency section results are weighted into the summary to produce the consolidated rating that calibration will consume.
- Investigate forms where the consolidated rating diverges from the expected section results, focusing on changes made to a section after forms were already in progress.

- Determine the corrective configuration so that the roll-up reflects the intended weighting consistently across the population.
- Confirm the consolidated rating on representative forms before allowing sessions to draw on it.

Checkpoints

- The consolidated summary rating reflects the intended section weighting on representative forms across functions.
- Forms previously showing a divergent rating now resolve consistently after the corrective configuration.

3. CHALLENGE 3 — Calibration and Form Access Governance Across Roles

- Distinguish the access that lets a role facilitate or participate in a session from the section permissions on the form template that control who can view or edit ratings.
- Scope facilitator and participant access so that each role can act only on the populations within its remit, across regions.
- Review broadly granted administrator access against the principle of least privilege and reconcile it with the form's section permissions.
- Validate that a role experiences only the visibility and edit rights it is authorized for, in the session and on the form.

Checkpoints

- A facilitator can act only on the population within remit, and cannot view calibration data outside it.
- Form section permissions and session access together produce a consistent, authorized view for each role.

4. CHALLENGE 4 — Session Adjustment Persistence Through the Route Map

- Establish how a rating adjusted during a session is written back and how it relates to subsequent edits when the form advances through route map steps.
- Investigate the case where an adjusted rating appears to revert after a manager reopens the form, considering the order of session adjustment and form-level edit.
- Determine the configuration and sequencing that keeps an adjusted rating persistent and traceable through the remaining steps.
- Validate persistence by reopening representative forms after a session adjustment.

Checkpoints

- An adjusted rating remains consistent when the form is reopened and as it advances through the route map.
- Any change to a rating is traceable to the session or the form-level edit that produced it.

Question: 1

CHALLENGE 1 — Calibration Data Source and Session Population Scoping

During setup, the team must confirm where the calibration session obtains the ratings it displays for each employee.

Which configuration choice correctly establishes the rating source for the sessions Meridian intends to run?

- A. Set calibration to use performance as the data source so session ratings come from the employees' performance forms
- B. Set calibration to use a separately maintained rating dataset and synchronize it back to the forms once sessions close

- C. Set calibration to read ratings straight from the goal plan, treating it as the system of record for the rating
- D. Set calibration with no data source and let facilitators key in each employee's rating manually at the start of the session

Answer: A

Explanation:

Meridian's design draws calibration ratings from the performance form, which corresponds to using performance as the data source so the session reflects the underlying forms. This keeps the session and the form aligned without a separate rating store.

Question: 2

CHALLENGE 1 — Calibration Data Source and Session Population Scoping

A session opened for a manufacturing region pulled in employees whose forms were still at an earlier route map step, while several expected senior scientists did not appear.

What is the most appropriate way to reconcile the unexpected participant list before opening the session?

- A. Remove the missing scientists from the talent population so the list matches what currently loads, then open the session as-is
- B. Open the session as loaded, since the population is fixed at creation and cannot be influenced by the state of any form
- C. Examine the route map step of included and excluded forms alongside the session's population configuration to trace each case
- D. Re-create the form template so every employee re-enters the process at the same step, then reload the session population

Answer: C

Explanation:

Because ratings are drawn from the form, the population reflects both the session's configuration and the lifecycle state of the forms, so tracing each inclusion and exclusion isolates whether form state or session scoping is governing the list.

Question: 3

CHALLENGE 1 — Calibration Data Source and Session Population Scoping

Before opening sessions, the team wants to confirm that the rating data shown in a session is trustworthy.

Which validation gives the strongest evidence that the session data is correct?

- A. Confirm the session opens without an error and shows roughly the number of participants the facilitators were expecting

- B. Confirm the calibration template was activated and saved without surfacing any warnings during the activation step
- C. Confirm that the facilitators reviewed the list and feel the ratings look reasonable for the teams they manage day to day for that population
- D. Confirm the ratings shown in the session match the consolidated results held on the underlying forms for a sample of employees

Answer: D

Explanation:

Since the data source is the performance form, the decisive check is that session ratings match the consolidated form results for sampled employees, which directly validates the source-to-session link with observable evidence.

Question: 4

CHALLENGE 1 — Calibration Data Source and Session Population Scoping

A facilitator asks why two employees in the same region appear in one session but not in another that was scoped for a different function.

What is the soundest explanation to give before proceeding?

- A. The population in each session reflects how that session is scoped against form state, so the same employee can qualify for one and not another
- B. Sessions ignore function entirely, so any difference between two session populations must be a defect that has to be logged
- C. Employees can only ever belong to a single session, so their appearance in two lists means one of the sessions was built incorrectly
- D. Facilitator visibility alone determines the population, so the difference simply reflects which facilitator opened each of the sessions across the two lists

Answer: A

Explanation:

Each session's population is governed by its own scoping against the state of the forms, so an employee can legitimately qualify for one session and not another without any defect being present.

Question: 5

CHALLENGE 2 — Performance Form Rating Roll-Up and Section Weighting

On some forms the consolidated rating on the summary did not match what reviewers expected from the section results, most often where a section had been adjusted late in design.

What is the most likely cause of the divergence?

- A. The summary section is purely descriptive and never reflects section results, so any consolidated value shown there is coincidental

- B. The weighting that combines the goal and competency sections into the summary was changed after forms were already in progress
- C. Calibration sessions retroactively altered the section ratings on those forms, even though no live session had yet been run for them
- D. The goal plan template rather than the form controls the consolidated rating, and that template was the element that was misconfigured

Answer: B

Explanation:

A late change to the section weighting that feeds the summary explains why forms already in progress carry the earlier roll-up while the design expectation reflects the new weighting. The divergence clustering on late-adjusted sections points to this interaction with form state.

Question: 6

CHALLENGE 2 — Performance Form Rating Roll-Up and Section Weighting

The team must correct the roll-up so the consolidated rating reflects the intended section weighting across the population.

Which approach best resolves the divergence while keeping ratings consistent?

- A. Manually overwrite the consolidated rating on each affected form to the value the reviewers had originally expected to see
- B. Set every section's weight to an equal share so the summary always averages the sections regardless of the intended design
- C. Align the section weighting to the intended design and re-validate the consolidated rating on affected forms so they resolve consistently
- D. Disable the summary section so that reviewers read the individual section results instead of any single consolidated figure for those forms

Answer: C

Explanation:

Correcting the weighting to the intended design and re-validating affected forms restores a consistent roll-up at the source rather than patching individual values, making the consolidated rating reproducible across the population.

Question: 7

CHALLENGE 2 — Performance Form Rating Roll-Up and Section Weighting

Leadership wants assurance that the corrected roll-up is dependable before sessions draw on it.

Which validation most directly confirms the roll-up is now correct?

- A. Confirm the consolidated summary rating reflects the intended weighting on representative forms, including ones previously divergent

- B. Confirm that no manager has reported a complaint about ratings in the day since the weighting change went into effect across the population
- C. Confirm the form template saved successfully and without errors after the section weighting change was applied to it
- D. Confirm that the calibration session count now matches the number of regions the team intends to run sessions for

Answer: A

Explanation:

Checking that representative forms — including the previously divergent ones — now show a consolidated rating consistent with the intended weighting is the direct, observable confirmation that the roll-up is fixed across functions.

Question: 8

CHALLENGE 2 — Performance Form Rating Roll-Up and Section Weighting

A reviewer notes that one function's forms show a goal section contributing more to the summary than competencies, and asks whether this is an error.

What is the most appropriate response before changing anything?

- A. Treat it as an error immediately and equalize the weights, since goal and competency must always contribute the same amount to the summary
- B. Confirm the configured weighting matches the intended design for that function before deciding whether any change is warranted at all
- C. Assume the form is corrupt and rebuild that function's template, because uneven section contribution indicates a damaged form definition
- D. Ignore the observation, since the summary figure is informational only and the section ratings are what actually carry forward to calibration

Answer: B

Explanation:

Uneven section contribution can be the intended design, so the correct first step is to confirm the configured weighting against the design for that function before concluding anything is wrong.

Question: 9

CHALLENGE 3 — Calibration and Form Access Governance Across Roles

An internal review questioned whether a facilitator in one region could view calibration data for populations outside their remit.

Which understanding correctly frames where this access is governed?

- A. Form section permissions on their own fully determine who can facilitate a session, so no separate session access needs to be configured for the regional roles

- B. Anyone who can edit a rating on the form can by default facilitate any session, so the two capabilities are effectively the same thing
- C. Granting broad administrator access automatically narrows a facilitator's session visibility down to a single region's population
- D. Session facilitation access and form section permissions are governed separately, so each must be scoped to keep a facilitator within remit

Answer: D

Explanation:

Acting in a session and viewing or editing ratings on the form are configured in different places, so both must be scoped to confine a facilitator to the intended population. Treating them as one layer is what allowed the cross-region visibility concern.

Question: 10

CHALLENGE 3 — Calibration and Form Access Governance Across Roles

Some regional administrators had been granted broad access to expedite the rollout, and the team must reconcile this against Meridian's access discipline.

What is the most appropriate corrective action?

- A. Re-scope each role to least privilege so facilitators and administrators act only within remit, then validate the effective access
- B. Leave the broad access in place until after the cycle, since narrowing it now would risk slowing down the regional rollout work
- C. Remove all administrator access entirely so that only the central Basel team is able to operate every region's sessions and forms
- D. Grant the same broad access to all regions so that visibility is at least consistent everywhere rather than varying region by region

Answer: A

Explanation:

Re-scoping each role to least privilege and then validating the effective access aligns the model with Meridian's compensation-linked access discipline while still letting regions operate, with validation confirming the boundaries actually hold.

Question: 11

CHALLENGE 3 — Calibration and Form Access Governance Across Roles

The team wants to confirm that the reconciled access model behaves correctly before sessions open. Which validation best demonstrates that access is correctly governed?

- A. Confirm the access change was saved and that the affected administrators each received a notification that their access had changed

- B. Confirm a facilitator can act only within remit and cannot view calibration data outside it, with form permissions giving the authorized view
- C. Confirm the number of configured facilitators is equal to the number of regions that the team intends to run calibration sessions for
- D. Confirm the broadest administrator can still open every session in every region, which would prove that the access model is functioning in every region

Answer: B

Explanation:

The decisive check is the effective experience: a facilitator confined to remit, unable to see outside it, with form section permissions producing the authorized view, which tests both governance layers against observable behavior.

Question: 12

CHALLENGE 3 — Calibration and Form Access Governance Across Roles

A regional administrator needs to adjust ratings in sessions but should not be able to alter rating fields directly on forms outside the session.

How should access be arranged to meet this?

- A. Give the administrator broad form edit rights everywhere, on the assumption that session work will require that level of access anyway for the assigned remit
- B. Withhold all session access and grant only form edit rights, so every change is made directly on the forms rather than within sessions
- C. Scope session facilitation to the remit while keeping form section permissions limited, so direct form edits stay outside the granted access
- D. Grant identical session and form access for the whole company, so the administrator never encounters a boundary while doing the work

Answer: C

Explanation:

Because session and form access are governed separately, scoping facilitation to remit while keeping form section permissions limited lets the administrator adjust ratings in sessions without gaining direct form-edit rights outside them.

Question: 13

CHALLENGE 4 — Session Adjustment Persistence Through the Route Map

In an early test, a rating changed during a calibration session appeared to revert when a manager later reopened the form.

What is the most likely explanation for the apparent reversion?

- A. Calibration adjustments are always discarded by design, so no change made in a session can ever persist back to a performance form

- B. The goal plan overwrote the rating at the moment the form was reopened, replacing the session value with one drawn from the objectives when the form reopens
- C. The form template stores no ratings at all, so whatever value appears after the form is reopened must have been generated at random
- D. The interaction between the session adjustment and a later form-level edit across the route map steps determined which value the form kept

Answer: D

Explanation:

Because both a session adjustment and form-level edits can write to the rating as the form moves through steps, the order and step at which each occurs determines the retained value, which explains the apparent reversion as a sequencing interaction.

Question: 14

CHALLENGE 4 — Session Adjustment Persistence Through the Route Map

The team must configure the flow so an adjusted rating stays persistent and traceable through the remaining steps.

Which approach best achieves persistent, traceable adjustments?

- A. Tell managers never to reopen a form after a session so that the adjusted value is simply never put at risk of being changed
- B. Lock the entire form once the first session completes so that no further route map progress can occur to overwrite the value
- C. Re-enter each adjusted rating by hand on the form after every session, treating that manual entry as the real system of record after each session
- D. Set the sequencing and configuration so a session adjustment is written back and not overwritten later, then validate by reopening forms

Answer: D

Explanation:

Defining the sequencing and configuration so the session write-back survives later steps, then validating by reopening forms, directly addresses the interaction that caused the reversion and proves the result holds.

Question: 15

CHALLENGE 4 — Session Adjustment Persistence Through the Route Map

Leadership wants assurance that adjustments will hold before live sessions begin.

Which validation most directly confirms adjustment persistence?

- A. Confirm that each calibration session closed cleanly without an error after the facilitator had finished making the adjustments during the cycle

- B. Confirm an adjusted rating stays consistent when a representative form is reopened and as it advances through later route map steps
- C. Confirm that the facilitators all saved their sessions before logging out at the end of each calibration meeting that was held
- D. Confirm that the number of adjusted ratings recorded across the session matches the number of participants who were in scope

Answer: B

Explanation:

Reopening a representative form and advancing it to confirm the adjusted rating holds across steps is the direct, observable test of persistence through the route map, exercising the exact path where the earlier reversion appeared.

Question: 16

CHALLENGE 4 — Session Adjustment Persistence Through the Route Map

A facilitator wants to know the safest sequence when both a session adjustment and a manager form edit are expected for the same rating.

What is the soundest guidance?

- A. Make the two changes in any order, since the system always keeps the higher of the two rating values regardless of when each was entered for the same rating
- B. Always let the manager edit win automatically, because manager edits should override any adjustment that was agreed within a session
- C. Establish a defined order so the later write reflects the intended final rating, rather than relying on whichever edit happens to occur last
- D. Always let the session adjustment win automatically, because calibration outcomes should override any change a manager makes on the form

Answer: C

Explanation:

Since the retained value depends on which write occurs last across the steps, establishing a defined order so the final write reflects the intended rating is what prevents an accidental overwrite.

Topic: 2

Micro Skill Drill Exam

Question: 17

Lindqvist Precision Tools, a cutting-tool maker in Eskilstuna, is configuring its annual performance form. The consultant built a form template with a goals section, a competency section, and a summary section, and defined a route map so the form moves from employee self-evaluation to manager evaluation and then to a 1:1 signature step. Before testing, the goal plan it pulls from was confirmed active and populated, and a pilot form was launched for two test employees to exercise the full route map end to end. During testing, the overall calculated rating in the summary does not include any

contribution from the goals the employee worked on, even though the competency ratings are reflected correctly. The administrator confirms the goals section displays the employee's goals, the route map advances normally, and ratings are entered in both sections. As observable evidence, the summary score on the pilot forms matches the competency average exactly, with no movement when a goal rating is changed and the form is reopened. The objective and competency weighting that should combine both sources into the overall score appears to produce a competency-only result. The HR director needs the summary to reflect both goal achievement and competency performance before the cycle opens company-wide. The administrator must determine why the goals contribution is missing from the calculated summary and correct it at the form-template level rather than re-entering ratings. Why is the goals contribution missing from the calculated overall rating, and what should the administrator correct in the form template?

- A. Employee edit permission on the goals section is missing, so grant the employee role edit rights so goal ratings flow into the calculated overall result.
- B. The summary's objective/competency configuration omits the goals section as a weighted source, so configure it to combine both sources into the overall score.
- C. The 1:1 signature step is blocking score calculation, so reorder the route map so the signature step follows the summary calculation and both rating sources are then included.
- D. The competency section weight is set too high, so lower the competency weight so the goal contribution becomes visible in the overall calculated rating.

Answer: B

Explanation:

The objective/competency summary is the configuration that combines goal achievement and competency results into a single weighted overall rating. When the goals section is not included as a weighted source, the calculation falls back to competency-only output exactly as observed. Configuring the summary to weight both the goal and competency sources restores the intended combined score at the form-template layer, satisfying the requirement before the cycle opens.

Question: 18

Nordkvist Marine Engines, a marine propulsion manufacturer in Gothenburg, is rolling out its first SuccessFactors goal plan for the production-engineering division. The consultant configured a goal plan template and asked the HR administrator to verify it before launch. During verification, managers report that goals they create cannot be linked upward to their own director's strategic goals, even though the directors' goals already exist in the same plan year. The administrator confirms employees and managers can each create and edit goals, the template is the current type, and field permissions allow editing in the active state. The plan was migrated from an older configuration earlier in the project. A test manager creates a goal, opens it, and finds no control to associate it with a parent goal. The implementation lead needs the upward-linking capability working before the division-wide launch and wants the cause identified at the template-configuration layer rather than treated as an end-user training gap. The administrator must determine why the parent-child linking behavior is absent and what to correct in the goal plan template so cascading works. What is the most likely cause that the upward goal-linking capability is unavailable, and what should be corrected in the goal plan template?

- A. The directors' goals were saved as private, so switch their visibility to public and instruct managers to refresh the goal plan to reveal the linking control.
- B. The plan year is locked for editing, so reopen the plan period in the template settings so managers can associate their goals with the relevant parent goals.
- C. Field-level permissions deny managers edit access in the active form state, so re-grant edit rights to the manager role for that state to expose the linking control.
- D. Goal alignment is not enabled in the template, so enable the alignment setting that lets goals be cascaded and linked to a parent goal.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Goal alignment is the template capability that lets goals be cascaded and linked to a parent or higher-level goal, producing the parent-child relationship managers are trying to create. Because the plan was migrated from an older configuration, the alignment setting was not carried into the current template, which is why no association control appears even though directors' goals exist and editing works. Enabling alignment in the template restores the linking control at the correct configuration layer and satisfies the cascade requirement before launch.

Question: 19

Hagström Bearings, a precision-bearing manufacturer in Lund, is preparing its first calibration sessions to align manager ratings across the engineering organization. Earlier in the cycle the administrator launched the performance forms for the engineering population, then configured calibration settings and a calibration template, created a session, and added that same population. As a prerequisite check, the administrator confirmed the calibration template maps to the same rating scale used on the performance form. When facilitators open the session, the participant ratings that should populate from the performance process are blank, so there is nothing to compare or adjust. The administrator confirms the session includes the correct employees, the facilitators have access, and the calibration view loads without error. As observable evidence, the facilitator grid lists every participant by name but every rating cell is empty rather than showing a placeholder error. The performance forms for the population are still in an early self-evaluation step and managers have not yet completed their evaluation. The HR lead expected calibration to be ready and wants the administrator to explain why ratings are missing and what condition must be met. The administrator must identify why the calibration session shows no ratings and what the correct dependency is, rather than reconfiguring the session itself. Why does the calibration session display no ratings to compare, and what is the correct explanation the administrator should give?

A

- A. The calibration template is missing a rating scale, so add a scale to the template and the population's ratings will appear in the session for comparison.
- B. The session was created before the population was added, so recreate the session after adding employees and the performance ratings will then load correctly.
- C. The facilitators lack permission to view ratings in the session, so grant them rating-view access and the population's existing scores will then populate the calibration view.
- D. Calibration draws ratings from the performance form, so until the forms reach the step where manager ratings exist, the session has nothing to display.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Calibration uses the performance form as its data source, meaning session ratings are drawn from the performance process rather than entered independently in calibration. Because the forms are still in an early self-evaluation step and managers have not yet rated, no manager ratings exist for the session to surface, which is why the comparison view is blank. The correct explanation is that the session depends on the performance forms reaching a step where ratings are present, not on reconfiguring the session.

Question: 20

Sundqvist Wind Components, a turbine-component manufacturer in Malmö, has enabled ongoing performance tracking so employees can log activities and achievements and hold check-ins with managers between formal cycles. The rollout followed a pilot with one engineering team, after which the capability was extended to the wider population once the pilot group confirmed activities and check-ins worked. Separately, the HR team wants employees to be able to request written feedback from peers on those logged activities. After configuration, employees can create activities, record achievements, and complete check-ins, but no one can request peer feedback anywhere in the experience. The administrator confirms the ongoing-performance capability is enabled and working, the relevant roles have access to it, and check-ins function as expected. As observable evidence, the activity detail screen offers options to add achievements and schedule check-ins but presents no control to request feedback from a peer. The HR manager assumed enabling ongoing performance would also turn on the ability to request peer feedback and is now asking why that capability is absent before the wider launch is announced. The administrator must explain the relationship between the two capabilities and identify what still needs to be done so employees can request peer feedback, without disturbing the working ongoing-performance setup.

Why can employees not request peer feedback even though ongoing performance is working, and what should the administrator do?

- A. The roles lack permission to request feedback within ongoing performance, so grant that permission and the existing feedback capability will become available to employees.
- B. Achievements must be marked complete before feedback can be requested, so have employees finalize their achievements and the request-feedback option will then become available to them.
- C. Continuous Feedback is configured separately from ongoing performance, so configure it to enable requesting and giving peer feedback.
- D. Peer feedback requires manager approval that is disabled, so enable the approval option in the ongoing-performance settings and the request capability will appear.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Continuous Feedback, which supports requesting and giving feedback, is configured separately from the ongoing-performance capability that handles activities, achievements, and check-ins. Because only the ongoing-performance side was enabled, the feedback request capability never existed, which is why it is

absent everywhere. Configuring the Continuous Feedback capability enables employees to request peer feedback without disturbing the working ongoing-performance setup.

Question: 21

Aaltonen Steel Profiles in Tampere runs a goal plan that separates objectives into a business-results category and a development category. The HR administrator added a new "Risk Rating" field to the goal plan so managers can flag high-exposure objectives. After deployment, managers confirm the field appears and is editable on business-results goals, but on development-category goals the field does not appear at all. The administrator checks and finds the field was defined once in the template and that the manager role holds edit rights for the field in the active state. The development category was created later in the project than the business-results category. No error is logged, and employees in both categories can otherwise create and view goals normally. The project lead wants the Risk Rating field visible and editable on goals in both categories and asks the administrator to fix this at the template level so it is consistent for the upcoming planning cycle. The administrator must identify why the field renders in one category but not the other and apply the correct template correction.

Why does the Risk Rating field appear only on business-results goals, and what should the administrator correct?

- A. The development category was created after the field, so rebuild the field definition so its creation timestamp precedes both categories and renders in each.
- B. The field is associated only with the business-results category, so add it to the development category's field set so it renders there too.
- C. The manager role lacks edit permission for the field in the development category, so grant the role edit rights there so the field appears and becomes editable for managers.
- D. Employees cannot view the field on development goals, so extend employee view permission for the field to make it visible across both categories.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Goal plan fields are associated with the categories in which they should appear, so a field surfaces only on goals belonging to a category that includes it. Because the development category was created later, the new field was associated with the business-results category but not with the development category, which is exactly why it renders in one and not the other. Adding the field to the development category's field set makes it appear and behave consistently for goals in both categories at the template layer.

Question: 22

Brännholm Hydraulics in Västerås is mid-way through its performance review cycle, with several hundred forms already launched and distributed to managers. The HR business partner requests a change so that, during the manager-evaluation step, managers can edit a "Promotion Readiness" comment field that until now had been visible but read-only for the manager role. The administrator updates the field's permission for the manager role and confirms the change saved in the template. To check the result, the administrator opens one in-flight form and launches a separate single-employee test form from the same template. However, forms that are currently sitting in the manager-evaluation

step still show the field as read-only for managers, while the newly launched test form correctly shows it as editable. Nothing else about the route map or the field has changed, and managers are otherwise able to edit other fields in their step. The HR business partner is frustrated that the in-flight forms did not pick up the new permission and wants to understand whether the configuration is wrong or whether something about how permission changes apply is at play, especially with the cycle deadline approaching. The administrator must explain the behavior and recommend the correct course of action for the in-flight population.

Why do in-flight forms still show the field as read-only while a new form is editable, and what should the administrator do?

- A. Permission changes apply to forms launched after the change, so in-flight forms keep their original step permissions; relaunch or apply the change to existing forms through the supported correction path.
- B. The field is locked by the employee step, so advance every in-flight form past self-evaluation and the manager edit permission will then take effect automatically.
- C. The route map was edited instead of the permission, so revert the route map and managers across all forms will immediately gain edit access to the field.
- D. RBP access for managers was removed, so restore the manager role's role-based permission and the field will become editable on all existing forms.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Form-template permissions are bound to a form when it is launched, so changes made to the template apply to forms launched afterward while in-flight forms retain the permissions they carried at launch. That is precisely why the newly launched test form is editable but existing forms remain read-only. The correct action is to apply the change to the existing population through the supported correction path or relaunch, rather than assuming the template edit is wrong.

Thank You for Trying Our Product

Special 16 USD Discount Coupon: NSZUBG3X

Email: support@examsempire.com

**Check our Customer Testimonials and ratings
available on every product page.**

Visit our website.

<https://examsempire.com/>