KENT BUSINESS COLLEGE
School of Education and Wellbeing



KBC-INC-02

Physical and Sensory Accessibility

An accessible practical with the same safety standard · End-of-module analytical report

KBC design for proposed Level 7 study

Awarding-body decision pending | Version 1.0 | November 2026

An accessible practical with the same safety standard

Commission an access redesign for a timed equipment-isolation demonstration. Candidates must identify an unsafe state and choose a safe isolation sequence. The room is noisy, the observation area requires standing and the instructions are delivered verbally.

Case file • fictional evidence supplied to every learner

1. Two of six apprentices could not hear the second instruction. Nobody recorded who missed it.

2. One apprentice describes fluctuating fatigue and requests seating; another prefers written prompts. A supervisor says all candidates must work identically.

3. A room change is available twice a month; portable lighting and seating can be trialled next week. No clinical information is required for this task.

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

An accessible rehearsal script and two-condition observation sheet.

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.

LO2.1 / AC2.1 Analyse access demands

Produce a task-demand analysis separating safety-critical judgement from sensory, mobility and endurance demands. Identify where an adjustment could inadvertently introduce risk.

LO2.2 / AC2.2 Critique possible adjustments

Compare two packages under ordinary and difficult-day conditions. Use learner preferences, available resources and relevant research to justify your selection.

LO2.3 / AC2.3 Specify an implementation trial

Design a safe rehearsal, consent process, responsible staff and contingency. Identify any formal assessment-body decision needed before changing assessment conditions.

LO2.4 / AC2.4 Evaluate equivalence

Specify how an observer would compare independent decisions before and after the trial while holding the occupational standard constant.

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

If the learner performs better after the room change, what competing explanation remains? 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.

AC2.1 Analyse access demands

Pass evidence: Produce a task-demand analysis separating safety-critical judgement from sensory, mobility and endurance demands. Identify where an adjustment could inadvertently introduce risk.

Refer example: Conflates the access method with the safety standard.

AC2.2 Critique possible adjustments

Pass evidence: Compare two packages under ordinary and difficult-day conditions. Use learner preferences, available resources and relevant research to justify your selection.

Refer example: Prescribes an adjustment from a diagnosis alone.

AC2.3 Specify an implementation trial

Pass evidence: Design a safe rehearsal, consent process, responsible staff and contingency. Identify any formal assessment-body decision needed before changing assessment conditions.

Refer example: Changes safety-critical conditions without approval or rehearsal.

AC2.4 Evaluate equivalence

Pass evidence: Specify how an observer would compare independent decisions before and after the trial while holding the occupational standard constant.

Refer example: Compares different tasks without a common criterion.

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 2. Use the original reading in this module. Identify one claim to test against independent research.

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.

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H. & Gordon, D. (2014). Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice. CAST.

Compare an anticipatory design decision with an individual adjustment.

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.