

MECHANIC ROSTER

ACADEMY / STUDY BOOK

Service Management & Shop Process

Manage intake, dispatch, documented recommendations, ethical selling, approvals, quality control and customer follow-through.



Scan to continue this course online and find more Academy training.
<https://mechanicroster.com/index.php/academy/service-management-shop-process>

How to use this book

Read the lessons, work each example, then complete the practice questions before checking the answer explanations. Write your evidence and next step in the exercises. Training examples are not vehicle service specifications.

Mechanic Roster Academy is independent.

Edition 2026.10.15 | Free to download and print with branding retained.

Before you begin

Estimate Transparency and Customer Communication are recommended. Intended for service advisors moving into management and independent-shop managers.

Learning objectives

- Control a repair order from intake to verified delivery.
- Dispatch by skill, capacity and readiness rather than promised sales alone.
- Turn evidence into documented recommendations and ethical sales conversations.
- Manage approvals, revisions, quality checks and customer updates.
- Use balanced process measures without rewarding unnecessary repairs.

Course contents

Own the repair-order workflow

Plan capacity and dispatch responsibly

Document recommendations and sell on evidence

Control approvals, revisions and communication

Make quality control and delivery real gates

Manage with balanced measures and coaching

Worked shop cases / Practical worksheet / Practice assessment / Answer explanations / Further study

Own the repair-order workflow

A service manager coordinates a chain of commitments: intake, authorized diagnosis, inspection, recommendation, customer decision, parts and technician readiness, repair, quality control, delivery and follow-up. A vehicle should have an explicit current state and owner. "In the shop" is not enough to tell staff whether it is waiting for approval, parts, diagnosis or verification.

At intake, confirm the concern, vehicle, authorized contact, scope, promised update and practical constraints. Separate an appointment from a guaranteed completion time. Capture prior history and any pre-existing condition under the approved process. A clear repair order prevents the technician from having to infer the customer's request.

Use a work-in-progress board with states that mean something: awaiting diagnosis, awaiting customer decision, awaiting parts, ready for work, in progress, quality check, ready for delivery and on hold. Define what evidence permits each transition. "Ready for work" should mean the scope is approved, required parts and information are available, and a qualified technician can perform it.

Process gate

A repair has customer approval but the required hardware has not arrived. Mark it awaiting parts, not ready. Starting it merely to make the board appear busy can occupy a bay and disrupt other commitments.

Every hold needs a reason, next action, owner and next review time. The manager's role is to remove the right obstacle without bypassing authorization or safety.

Turn a workflow into operating rules

A status board is useful only when everyone means the same thing by each status. Write an entry condition, an exit condition and a responsible owner for every stage. "Awaiting customer decision" means a defined recommendation and price have been communicated and a decision is outstanding. It does not mean that a technician informally mentioned an issue to an advisor. "Ready for work" requires authorization, the correct parts and information, a suitable bay and an appropriately skilled technician.

Use a short morning work-in-progress review. For each vehicle, state the current stage, the obstacle, the next action, its owner and the next customer update. Focus on exceptions rather than reading every line of every invoice. A vehicle awaiting a part needs a delivery confirmation and contingency; one awaiting diagnosis needs allocated skill and test time. Moving both cards to "in progress" makes the board busier without removing either constraint.

Build the repair-order header

Capture vehicle identity, the concern in the customer's words, an authorized contact, approved initial scope, relevant history and a promised update time. Record the customer's practical constraint, such as needing a decision before arranging transportation. Distinguish that request from a completion promise. The technician should receive a question that can be investigated, not "customer says replace whatever is bad." At shift handoff, the record-not the advisor's memory-must carry the commitment.

Operate a repair-order board with real entry gates

A work-in-progress board should show the next decision, not just where a vehicle is parked. Define the conditions for each state and assign an owner. An approved job with missing hardware is awaiting parts, not ready for work. A completed installation awaiting verification is not ready for delivery. These distinctions prevent optimistic labels from hiding dependencies.

Review holds at a defined interval. Each hold should include a reason, next action, owner and review time. The manager's job is to remove the actual obstacle, not move the card to make the board look productive. Preserve the customer's update commitment while the dependency is being resolved.

States must reflect evidence

- Awaiting decision
- Ready for work
- Verified delivery

Approval, resources, qualified assignment and verification are separate gates. A board label cannot replace any of them.

MECHANIC ROSTER

Try it before reading the answer

A job is approved, the technician is available, but required hardware has not arrived. What is its accurate status?

Worked answer and reasoning

Awaiting parts, with an owner and next follow-up. Availability and approval do not establish that the required resources are ready.

Plan capacity and dispatch responsibly

Match work to skills, equipment, bay availability and actual readiness. A technician's scheduled hours are not identical to usable repair capacity. Meetings, approved breaks, training, diagnostic uncertainty, quality checks and interruptions consume time. Do not book every paid hour as if it were guaranteed uninterrupted production.

Use estimates as planning inputs with uncertainty, not promises that cannot change. Diagnostic work often needs a decision checkpoint before repair time can be scheduled. Parts arrival estimates also require confirmation. Protect time for verification and customer updates instead of treating them as optional tasks squeezed into overtime.

Consider dependencies. A vehicle waiting for authorization may not be a productive next assignment; a smaller ready job may be. Avoid repeatedly interrupting a complex diagnostic task without reason. When priorities change, communicate the new owner, scope and expected update so work is not duplicated or abandoned.

Capacity exercise

Three technicians each have eight scheduled hours: 24 hours. If planned non-job commitments total four hours across the team, nominal remaining time is 20 hours before allowing for variability. This is a planning exercise, not a universal productivity target. Booking 24 hours of promised repairs ignores known commitments.

Track actual constraints rather than blaming staff for every delay. Missing parts, unclear approvals or unavailable equipment are process problems that require management action.

Capacity is not the same as hours sold

Scheduled attendance, available productive time, estimated job time and billed labor are different quantities. Three technicians scheduled for eight hours provide 24 attendance hours. Known meetings, training and other non-job commitments reduce the nominal time available for work. Uncertainty, parts delays, diagnostic complexity and bay constraints can reduce what is realistically achievable further. A sold-hour total is a planning input, not proof that enough time or capability exists.

Assign work by readiness and skill as well as workload. A job requiring a specialist cannot automatically be divided among three employees simply because three names appear on the schedule. A single alignment rack may be the bottleneck even when technicians have spare time. Reserve room for expected variation and urgent authorized diagnosis rather than filling every minute with optimistic estimates. Update the customer commitment when new evidence changes the plan.

Dispatch exercise

Suppose two general technicians each have six usable hours and an alignment technician has five. General work requires eight hours, alignment work requires seven, and both alignment jobs need the same rack. Total demand of 15 hours is below the 17-hour total capacity, but alignment demand still exceeds the five specialist hours. The correct response is not "we have two hours spare." Resolve the skill/rack constraint, revise sequencing or commitments, and communicate before promising completion.

Plan capacity without selling every scheduled minute

Scheduled team hours and usable job capacity are not identical. Deduct known non-job commitments and allow for uncertainty, diagnostics, verification and communication. A nominal capacity calculation is a planning input, not a promise that every remaining hour will become billed labor.

In the fictional day below, three eight-hour shifts provide 24 scheduled hours. Four hours of known non-job commitments leave 20 nominal hours before variability. Dispatch should also consider skill, equipment, bay constraints and job readiness. A high-value job waiting for approval may be a worse immediate assignment than a lower-value job that is authorized and ready.

Fictional capacity planning

Input	Hours
Scheduled team time	24
Known non-job commitments	4
Nominal remaining time	20
Uncertainty allowance	Still required; not included above

Try it before reading the answer

If ready work requires 23 estimated hours, does this plan support promising all of it today?

Worked answer and reasoning

Not on these inputs. The estimate exceeds the 20 nominal hours even before allowing for variability. Reevaluate readiness, priorities and commitments rather than treating scheduled attendance as guaranteed production.

Document recommendations and sell on evidence

Require a recommendation record that links concern or inspection item, observation, measurement or image, applicable reference, interpretation, proposed action, priority and price. Add the responsible technician and date. A recommendation should be understandable to an advisor who did not perform the inspection.

Classify the reason accurately: safety-related finding, confirmed repair, scheduled maintenance, further diagnosis or optional improvement. Do not use one red label for every opportunity. The manager should challenge unsupported phrases such as “definitely failing soon” when no evidence supports that prediction.

Coach an ethical conversation: explain the finding, why it matters, what is proposed, the complete cost, timing and alternatives. Ask for the customer's decision and confirm understanding. Address price objections by clarifying scope and compatible choices, not by inventing urgency or hiding required steps. A declined recommendation is a documented customer choice, not permission to pressure or shame them.

Recommendation log sample

Finding: measured condition at named location. Reference: applicable limit or schedule. Action: specified repair or next test. Priority: evidence-based explanation. Price: complete proposed scope. Decision: approved, declined or pending, with person and time. Follow-up: owner and agreed next contact.

Measure recommendation quality separately from conversion. A high approval rate can reflect good explanation, but can also conceal overpressure or selective presentation. The underlying evidence and customer understanding matter.

A recommendation is a documented decision aid

Train advisors to use a consistent recommendation record: customer concern; observed condition; measurement or other evidence; applicable reference; meaning; proposed scope; price; timing; and customer decision. Classify the reason honestly. A measured defect, scheduled maintenance, an unconfirmed symptom and an optional improvement do not all justify the same urgency. A generic photograph is educational material, not evidence that this customer's part is damaged.

Use a short conversation structure. Ask permission to explain the finding, describe the evidence without jargon, connect it to the relevant consequence, present the appropriate option and price, then ask for a decision. Pause for questions. If the customer objects to cost, clarify whether the concern is affordability, timing, value or trust. Discuss legitimate choices without removing required work silently or implying a guaranteed failure date. “What information would help you decide?” is more useful than repeating a pressure phrase.

Document a decline accurately

A declined recommendation remains an observed condition plus a recorded decision; it is not automatically a waiver of every responsibility. Record what was explained, who decided and when, the scope declined, and any required escalation under shop policy and applicable law. Never fabricate approval because the repair seems beneficial. A manager should audit both approved and declined recommendations for evidence quality, not reward advisors solely for converting every recommendation into a sale.

Coach recommendations using evidence and complete scope

A manager should be able to trace a recommendation from finding to customer decision. Require the observation or measurement, applicable reference, proposed scope, priority explanation, complete price and decision. A red status or confident technician statement is not a substitute for the underlying record.

During coaching, identify the missing behavior specifically. “Add the measured value and reference before presenting this” is more useful than “sell harder.” Review both accepted and declined recommendations so the process does not reward pressure or selective documentation. A high approval percentage alone cannot establish that the work was necessary or well explained.

Recommendation quality

- Finding Actual observation or measured value
- Reference Why the finding matters
- Proposal Scope, timing, price and alternatives
- Decision Approved, declined or pending with a record

Try it before reading the answer

A recommendation says only “urgent brakes, \$600.” What information should the manager request before presentation?

Worked answer and reasoning

Request the actual findings and reference, affected positions, proposed work, evidence-based priority, complete scope/price and relevant options or uncertainty. The word urgent and a total alone do not explain the recommendation.

Control approvals, revisions and communication

The manager owns the system that prevents unauthorized work. Staff should be able to identify the approved estimate version, selected items, amount, person, time and method. Pending and declined items must not appear in the technician's approved work list. Possession of the vehicle is not blanket permission.

When scope changes, pause the affected added work, prepare a linked revision and explain evidence, price and timing. Preserve earlier versions. Confirm substitutions that materially change the agreed product, coverage or cost. Follow the current approved legal and shop process rather than inventing a universal allowable overrun.

Assign customer-update ownership. A promised update remains due even when testing or parts are incomplete. Staff should distinguish a confirmed fact from an estimate, then specify the next action and contact time. A shift handoff must transfer those commitments explicitly.

Manager intervention

A technician discovers a second fault after diagnosis was approved. The advisor is busy and asks them to "just do it." The process must stop the added repair until the appropriate customer decision is recorded. A manager's internal instruction does not replace the customer's required authorization.

Audit a small sample of repair orders for scope/authorization matching, missed updates and unclear statuses. Use findings to coach the process, not to backfill fictional approvals after the fact.

Control changes without losing the trail

Give each estimate revision a date or version. Preserve the earlier approved scope and record what changed: additional finding, changed part, changed method, price difference or completion impact. State the new total as well as the increment. An advisor saying "another hundred" can be misunderstood if the previous total was unclear. Confirm the authorized contact and capture the decision through the applicable process before additional work begins.

Communication ownership matters during delays. A useful update states what is known, what is not yet known, what action is underway and when the next update will occur. A promised update is a commitment the shop controls even when a supplier's delivery is uncertain. If a supplier says "probably tomorrow," do not translate it into a guaranteed morning completion. Record the dependency and the contingency instead.

Manager review point

Before release to repair, compare the job instructions with the latest authorization. Before invoicing, compare completed work with that authorization and explain any permitted differences. If there is a discrepancy, stop the handoff and resolve it; do not ask the cashier to explain an undocumented addition at pickup. This course teaches a control process, not a universal legal authorization form. The shop must apply current requirements for its jurisdiction and transaction.

Make approvals and updates visible to the whole team

The technician's approved work list should match the customer's current decision, not the entire inspection opportunity. Link revisions to earlier versions and preserve what changed. Internal management direction cannot replace required customer approval. A busy advisor is a reason to improve the workflow, not a reason to bypass the decision.

Assign ownership for customer updates and transfer it explicitly across shifts. A promised update remains due while parts or testing are incomplete. Audit records for missing decisions and missed commitments, then correct the process honestly. Do not create fictional approvals after work to make a dashboard appear compliant.

Example manager review

Check	Question
Scope	Do performed items match accepted items?
Revision	Can the changed decision be traced?
Update	Was the promised contact completed?
Handoff	Who owns the next action now?

Try it before reading the answer

A technician is told to perform a newly discovered repair before approval because the advisor is busy. What should the manager do?

Worked answer and reasoning

Stop the added repair pending the appropriate customer decision, arrange the needed communication and correct the workflow bottleneck. Internal urgency does not create customer authorization.

Make quality control and delivery real gates

Define a completion checklist appropriate to the work: correct parts and procedures, required fastener or fluid checks, initialization/calibration where applicable, static safety checks and verification of the original concern. High-risk or complex work may need an additional qualified review under shop policy. A payment-ready invoice is not proof the vehicle is technically ready.

Keep “repair complete” distinct from “verified ready for delivery.” A technician may have installed the part while a required test remains. Do not let a promised pickup time erase verification. If the original symptom persists, record it and communicate the next decision rather than calling the job successful because the labor operation was performed.

Reconcile the invoice to the approved work. Explain performed work, results, warranty terms, declined findings and follow-up. Confirm that the customer knows whom to contact with a concern. Review requests should come after a clear handoff and should not be tied to pressure for a particular rating.

Comeback review

A vehicle returns with the same complaint. Secure the appropriate inspection and review the original conditions, evidence, work and verification. Do not assume either technician fault or customer fault before examining facts. Name an owner and update time for the recovery process.

Document what the shop learned. Repeated missed calibrations, unclear findings or skipped verification suggest a process defect that needs correction, not just another apology.

Define quality gates that can be checked

“Technician finished” and “ready for delivery” should be separate states. The first indicates that the assigned repair steps are complete. The second requires the applicable verification, documentation, vehicle condition and communication checks. Assign responsibility for these gates before the job reaches the last hour of the day. A manager should not sign a generic “checked” box for a test they did not perform or review.

The verification plan should refer back to the original concern and the actual work. Include required static checks, measurements, calibrations and appropriate functional checks. A road check does not replace torque, leak or assembly checks. Some work cannot be verified by a short road check at all. If the original intermittent fault cannot be reproduced during the final check, describe the conditions and uncertainty rather than recording a stronger conclusion than the evidence supports.

Delivery conversation

Explain the authorized work completed, the verification result, any remaining recommendation, applicable customer instructions and the invoice. Ask whether the customer has questions before ending the interaction. Assign follow-up ownership for unresolved concerns. If a comeback occurs, preserve the record, assess immediate safety and transportation needs, and investigate without automatically blaming either the customer or the original technician. The purpose of the review is correction and learning, not erasing an inconvenient event.

Treat verification as work that needs capacity

Plan verification into the job rather than treating it as spare-time work after the invoice is ready. Required static checks, initialization, calibration or concern verification depend on the actual repair and vehicle procedure. The manager should know which step is pending and who is qualified to complete it.

For a comeback, review the original condition, evidence, authorization, work and verification before assigning blame. The same customer symptom may or may not have the same cause. Name the investigation owner and next update. Repeated missing checks suggest a process control problem that needs a specific corrective action.

Ready for delivery

- Work complete Authorized operations performed
- Required checks Vehicle-specific completion steps
- Concern verified Outcome and limitations documented
- Customer handoff Invoice, coverage and open items explained

Try it before reading the answer

Payment is collected, but a required calibration remains. Is the vehicle technically ready for delivery?

Worked answer and reasoning

Payment does not establish technical readiness. Complete the required qualified checks and document the result before representing the job as verified ready.

Manage with balanced measures and coaching

Use measures that reflect both business health and service quality. Examples include promised updates completed on time, repair orders with complete authorizations, jobs awaiting parts, verified delivery readiness, comeback patterns and recommendation-record completeness. Define the denominator and time period before comparing numbers.

In a fictional week, 18 of 24 promised updates occurred on time: $18 \div 24 = 75\%$. If 30 of 50 separately documented recommendations were approved, approval rate is 60% under that definition. Those figures describe process outcomes; they do not prove whether recommendations were technically appropriate or whether customers were pressured.

Distinguish technician attendance, time on jobs and billed labor when discussing utilization or efficiency. Different definitions produce different percentages. Do not compare staff using inconsistent inputs or use a single sales metric to reward unnecessary work. Pair commercial measures with quality, documentation and customer outcomes.

Weekly review agenda

Review overdue holds and missed promises, inspect a sample of recommendation evidence, discuss one repeat concern, assign corrective actions and schedule relevant training. Each action needs an owner and a due date. At the next review, check completion rather than repeating the same discussion.

Coach using specific behavior: "This recommendation lacks the measurement and reference; add those before presentation." That is more useful than "sell harder." The purpose of the service-manager certificate is to demonstrate knowledge of a disciplined, transparent process-not to authorize technical work beyond the manager's competence.

Use balanced measures with clear definitions

A percentage needs a numerator, denominator and period. An on-time-update rate could be updates made by the promised time divided by updates due during the week. Do not count only customers who were easy to reach, or the metric stops representing the promise process. Define how attempts, rescheduled commitments and missing records are handled. Show the count with the percentage: three of four and 75 of 100 are both 75%, but they carry different amounts of evidence.

Balance commercial measures with customer and quality measures. Sales per repair order alone can encourage unnecessary scope or discourage small jobs. Pair it with authorization completeness, verification completion, rework, on-time communication and customer feedback. None is a perfect verdict by itself. A high comeback count may reflect a changing job mix, weak verification, incomplete diagnosis or coding inconsistency. Review the underlying cases before assigning blame or a coaching plan.

Coach a process, not a personality

Choose a specific observed behavior: "Three revised estimates lacked a recorded customer decision," not "you are careless." Review one case together, identify why the step was missed, practice the corrected handoff and agree on a follow-up sample. Supply the necessary time, form or system change. Recheck a small defined set of future jobs. A metric improves meaningfully when the underlying process improves, not when staff learn to omit difficult cases from the denominator.

Use a balanced weekly review

Define every metric before interpreting it. An on-time-update rate needs the number of completed on-time promises and the total promises for the same period. A recommendation approval rate needs an agreed unit of count; counting repair orders in one week and individual items in another creates misleading comparisons.

In the fictional week, 18 of 24 promised updates were on time: 75%. Thirty of 50 documented recommendations were approved: 60%. Neither percentage proves technical appropriateness. Review evidence quality, customer understanding, holds, comeback patterns and verification alongside commercial results. Give each improvement an owner, due date and a way to verify completion.

Fictional weekly review

Measure	Calculation	Result
On-time updates	$18 \div 24 \times 100$	75%
Recommendation approvals	$30 \div 50 \times 100$	60%
Missed updates	$24 - 18$	6 commitments
Quality context	Review actual evidence	Not inferred from conversion

Try it before reading the answer

Next week reports 40 approvals out of 50, but the definition changed from individual recommendations to repair orders. Is a direct trend comparison valid?

Worked answer and reasoning

No. Reconcile the unit of count, population and time period first. A changed denominator definition can create an apparent improvement without a comparable change in performance.

Work the shop cases

Plan a constrained day without overpromising

Northline has two general technicians with six usable hours each and one alignment technician with five. A brake job needs four general hours, a maintenance visit needs two, and authorized diagnosis needs three. Two alignment jobs need three hours each. One alignment customer's car is not arriving until noon. A parts delivery for the brake job is not confirmed. The advisor promised every customer completion today without consulting dispatch.

Create a board showing readiness, owner, constraint and next update for every job. Calculate demand by skill, not just the total. Identify which promises require review, what information must be obtained and what work can proceed without occupying a bay prematurely. Write one customer update that communicates uncertainty without making a new unsupported promise.

Your evidence, decision and next step:

Compare with the model answer

General demand is $4+2+3 = 9$ hours against 12 nominal usable hours. Alignment demand is $3+3 = 6$ against five specialist hours. The overall 15-hour demand is below 17 total hours, but the specialist constraint remains. The late arrival also limits sequence, and the brake job is awaiting parts rather than ready for repair.

Assign someone to confirm the brake delivery and someone to review alignment sequencing and customer commitments. Proceed with ready, authorized work matched to available skill. Do not dismantle a vehicle solely to mark it active if doing so blocks a bay with no credible parts plan. A useful update is: "Your approved brake work is waiting on a confirmed part delivery. We are checking that now and will update you by 11:00; we cannot yet confirm today's completion." The sample plan should preserve diagnosis capacity and include a reassessment time, not simply move every deadline to the end of the day.

Audit a recommendation from evidence to delivery

A repair order contains a measured brake finding, a filter due under the applicable maintenance schedule and an unconfirmed vibration. The advisor groups them as "three urgent repairs." The customer approves the brake work only. A technician later adds the filter because it was on the estimate. The brake verification record is blank. The invoice includes both parts, and the shop's dashboard counts the job as a successful sale with no exceptions.

Identify the classification, authorization, quality and reporting failures. Draft a corrected recommendation log and a manager response before pickup. Choose two process measures to monitor next week, including their definitions, and write a coaching action that addresses the cause rather than only the employee's attitude.

Your evidence, decision and next step:

Compare with the model answer

The three items have different evidence and reasons: a measured finding, scheduled maintenance and a symptom needing diagnosis. Only the brake scope was approved; appearing on an estimate did not authorize the filter. The verification gate is incomplete, and a sales-only dashboard conceals the exception. Hold the delivery handoff, establish the facts, complete the required safety/quality process, and resolve the unauthorized-work issue through the applicable policy and requirements. Do not invent a retrospective approval.

The log should record each item's evidence, reason, scope, price and separate decision. Suitable measures include revised scopes with a traceable decision before work divided by revised scopes audited, and jobs with required verification documented before release divided by jobs audited. Pair counts with rates. Coach the handoff: show how an approved line differs from a proposed line, require a pre-work scope check and audit a defined sample the next week. A target of 100% approval sales would not correct the underlying control failure.

Apply it to a job

Build a sample repair-order board with state, owner, next action and update time. Plan a day from 24 scheduled team hours and four hours of known non-job commitments. Complete a recommendation log for a measured brake finding, scheduled filter and unconfirmed noise. Role-play a price objection without pressure. Audit an estimate against its approvals and invoice, then calculate 18/24 on-time updates and define one corrective action.

Concern / scenario

Observation, measurement and reference

Interpretation and next action

Unknowns and who needs to review

Verification and handoff

Check your understanding

- Build a workflow board with meaningful entry and exit conditions.
- Calculate skill-specific capacity and identify a bottleneck hidden by total hours.
- Role-play a recommendation and price objection without pressure or unsupported urgency.
- Trace an estimate revision through authorization, work and invoice.
- Define a verification gate and two balanced measures with denominators.
- Write a specific coaching plan with an observable follow-up check.

Practice assessment

Ungraded practice, separate from the final assessment. Answers and reasoning follow in the next section.

1. A job is approved but essential parts are missing. Which status is accurate?

- A. Awaiting parts
- B. Ready for work
- C. Quality verified
- D. Ready for delivery

2. The team has 24 scheduled hours and four known non-job hours. Nominal remaining capacity is what?

- A. 24 guaranteed repair hours
- B. 20 hours before variability
- C. 28 hours
- D. Four repair hours

3. A recommendation says only “urgent repair.” What is missing?

- A. A stronger pressure phrase
- B. A guaranteed failure date
- C. Evidence, reference, scope, reason, price and customer decision context
- D. A quota target

4. An advisor tells a technician to add unapproved work. Does internal direction replace customer authorization?

- A. Yes if the advisor is busy
- B. Yes if the price is reasonable
- C. Yes if parts are on hand
- D. No

5. A part is installed but required verification is pending. What is the correct state?

- A. Awaiting verification, not ready for delivery
- B. Ready because installation ended
- C. Ready because payment is due
- D. Automatically closed

6. Eighteen of 24 updates were on time. What is the rate?

- A. 60%
- B. 75%
- C. 80%
- D. 125%

7. Three eight-hour shifts minus five known non-job hours leave what?

- A. 19 nominal hours
- B. 24 guaranteed hours
- C. 29 nominal hours
- D. 5 available hours

8. Thirty of 50 recommendations are approved. What is the rate?

- A. 40%
- B. 60%
- C. 75%
- D. 166.7%

9. Which hold record can be acted upon?

- A. On hold only
- B. Vehicle in bay only
- C. Reason, next action, owner and review time
- D. Customer name only

10. Which coaching request improves recommendation quality?

- A. Increase every urgency label
- B. Avoid recording declines
- C. Use a stronger pressure phrase
- D. Add the measurement and applicable reference

11. A customer update is due but parts have not arrived. What should occur?

- A. A factual update with the next commitment
- B. Silence until delivery
- C. An invented arrival guarantee
- D. Automatic cancellation of the promise

12. A repeated missed-verification pattern needs what?

- A. Only blame
- B. A corrective action with owner, due date and completion check
- C. Only a new slogan
- D. Only a discount

Answer explanations

1. Awaiting parts

Approval is only one readiness condition; missing parts keep the job from being ready.

Review: Own the repair-order workflow

2. 20 hours before variability

Subtract known commitments. The result is still a planning estimate, not guaranteed output.

Review: Plan capacity and dispatch responsibly

3. Evidence, reference, scope, reason, price and customer decision context

A priority label without supporting information is not a complete recommendation.

Review: Document recommendations and sell on evidence

4. No

Internal workflow authority does not create the customer's required decision.

Review: Control approvals, revisions and communication

5. Awaiting verification, not ready for delivery

Technical completion requires the specified checks and original-concern verification.

Review: Make quality control and delivery real gates

6. 75%

$18 \div 24 \times 100 = 75$. The defined denominator is all 24 promised updates.

Review: Manage with balanced measures and coaching

7. 19 nominal hours

$24 - 5 = 19$ before variability.

Review: Plan capacity and dispatch responsibly

8. 60%

$30/50 \times 100 = 60$.

Review: Manage with balanced measures and coaching

9. Reason, next action, owner and review time

A complete hold record supports follow-through.

Review: Own the repair-order workflow

10. Add the measurement and applicable reference

Specific evidence-based coaching improves the information.

Review: Document recommendations and sell on evidence

11. A factual update with the next commitment

The communication commitment remains.

Review: Control approvals, revisions and communication

12. A corrective action with owner, due date and completion check

Systemic problems require traceable process correction.

Review: Make quality control and delivery real gates

Further study

Use current vehicle and equipment information for actual service. These resources support further learning; lessons and questions in this book are original.

ASE service-consultant subject scope

<https://ase.com/tests/c1/>

ASE maintenance subject scope

<https://ase.com/tests/g1/>