KENT BUSINESS COLLEGE
School of Education and Wellbeing



KBC-INC-01

Foundations of Inclusive Apprenticeship Practice

Who owns the barrier? · End-of-module analytical report

KBC design for proposed Level 7 study

Awarding-body decision pending | Version 1.0 | November 2026

Who owns the barrier?

Advise the quality director whether to change induction, task allocation or both. A placement manager attributes uneven progress to motivation. The apprentice describes never being invited to observe a full job. The provider wants a defensible decision before the next intake.

Case file • fictional evidence supplied to every learner

1. Cohort of 24: 19 completed induction; only 8 independently demonstrated the target task. The two counts are unlinked.

2. One apprentice reports receiving written instructions after, not before, a practical. A coach reports that the same learner can explain the procedure orally.

3. Two managers recorded no practice opportunities. Others left the field blank. Staff have capacity for one change this month.

Your client and decision

Address the report to a joint provider and employer quality panel. State the decision you recommend, the strongest competing option and why the trade-off is justified. Distinguish supplied facts, assumptions and information you would still need.

Evidence exhibit

A one-page barrier and evidence map plus a protocol for the next observed task.

Workplace alternative

Use the supplied case or an assessor-agreed, anonymised equivalent of similar complexity. A simulated pilot with labelled illustrative data is acceptable. Never invent observations and present them as workplace findings. Actual changes to assessment or support need local authorisation.

What to submit

Submit a 3–5 page professional report (about 1,200–1,800 words as a guide), plus references and the specified exhibit. Put the decision on the first page. Use numbered headings so the assessor can find each criterion.

LO1.1 / AC1.1 Critically appraise models of inclusion

Apply two competing explanations to the observations; explain which facts would discriminate between individual, environmental and instructional barriers.

LO1.2 / AC1.2 Evaluate evidence quality

Build an evidence map distinguishing reporting gaps, opportunities and demonstrated competence. Specify a feasible way to link the next data collection without exposing identities.

LO1.3 / AC1.3 Justify a provider–employer response

Compare induction redesign with guaranteed workplace practice. Defend one intervention, address a resource constraint and allocate safeguarding or specialist escalation appropriately.

LO1.4 / AC1.4 Design a test of impact

Specify a baseline, follow-up task, timescale and a decision rule. Explain what result would make you change your recommendation.

Evidence standard

Use the KBC chapter, at least two credible scholarly sources and current guidance where relevant. Evaluate the strength and transferability of evidence. Cite claims consistently and give page numbers for quotations. Identify the original source of any data.

Short verification conversation

Which unobserved fact could reverse your decision, and how would you obtain it? Be ready to defend one limitation and explain how your conclusion would change.

How the report is marked

Proposed KBC standard: Pass or Refer. All four criteria must reach the threshold. Strength in one criterion cannot compensate for missing evidence in another. The assessor records a page or exhibit reference and a reason for each decision.

AC1.1 Critically appraise models of inclusion

Pass evidence: Apply two competing explanations to the observations; explain which facts would discriminate between individual, environmental and instructional barriers.

Refer example: Treats missing entries as zero opportunities.

AC1.2 Evaluate evidence quality

Pass evidence: Build an evidence map distinguishing reporting gaps, opportunities and demonstrated competence. Specify a feasible way to link the next data collection without exposing identities.

Refer example: Compares raw counts without considering who could practise.

AC1.3 Justify a provider–employer response

Pass evidence: Compare induction redesign with guaranteed workplace practice. Defend one intervention, address a resource constraint and allocate safeguarding or specialist escalation appropriately.

Refer example: Offers a generic training session without testing the mechanism.

AC1.4 Design a test of impact

Pass evidence: Specify a baseline, follow-up task, timescale and a decision rule. Explain what result would make you change your recommendation.

Refer example: Uses satisfaction as the only measure of competence.

Judgement and feedback

A strong response makes a reasoned decision under uncertainty and explains when it should be revised. For a referral, the marker names the unmet criterion, identifies the gap and sets a resubmission scope under centre policy. Retain the original decision and subsequent evidence for internal quality assurance.

Read, test and reference

Core text: Kent Business College, Inclusiveness and Learning Difficulties Diploma, seven-chapter programme handbook, chapter 1. Use the original reading in this module. Identify one claim to test against independent research.

Florian, L. & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. British Educational Research Journal, 37(5), 813–828.

Test whether a principle from the observed classrooms transfers to a workplace.

Shakespeare, T. (2014). Disability Rights and Wrongs Revisited, 2nd edition. Routledge.

Use the book to contrast individual and structural explanations.

Moriña, A. (2017). Inclusive education in higher education: challenges and opportunities. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 32(1), 3–17.

Identify a constraint that may differ in apprenticeships.

Academic integrity and access

Submit your own analysis, a reference list and a short statement of any assistance or AI use. Remove learner names, employer identifiers and health details. Request an accessible brief or equivalent response format through your coach before submission; the same decision criteria apply.

Submission checklist

Include the module code, your learner identifier, version, decision, evidence exhibit, limitations and references. Use the private submission route agreed with your KBC assessor. Public reviews and discussion boards are unsuitable for assessment evidence.

This is a KBC assessment for a proposed pathway. OTHM recognition, RQF level, credit, title and certification remain subject to written awarding-body decisions.