KENT BUSINESS COLLEGE
School of Education and Wellbeing



KBC-INC-03

Equity, Belonging and Social Inclusion

Who gets the client-facing work? · End-of-module analytical report

KBC design for proposed Level 7 study

Awarding-body decision pending | Version 1.0 | November 2026

Who gets the client-facing work?

Write an equity decision paper for a joint training and employer panel. Client briefs are allocated during an informal evening meeting. Attendance is optional on paper, but the briefs provide most evidence for progression.

Case file • fictional evidence supplied to every learner

1. Eight of 20 apprentices attend regularly. They received 14 of the last 18 client assignments; the other 12 received four.

2. A carer and a learner dependent on public transport separately report that the meeting time excludes them. Individual identity-category data are incomplete.

3. Employer policy requires client readiness; the current readiness rating was assigned by the same supervisors who allocated the opportunities.

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 allocation decision matrix and a compact proposed monitoring dashboard.

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.

LO3.1 / AC3.1 Interrogate an opportunity gap

Calculate a meaningful opportunity measure with correct denominators. Explain selection effects, missing data and why the figures alone cannot establish a cause.

LO3.2 / AC3.2 Evaluate intersecting barriers

Compare two plausible mechanisms using case evidence and scholarship. Design a non-stigmatising way to hear learner voice without requiring disclosure of protected characteristics.

LO3.3 / AC3.3 Defend an equitable allocation method

Compare transparent rotation with readiness-based allocation. Address safety, fairness and a foreseeable unintended consequence.

LO3.4 / AC3.4 Evaluate change over time

Design a review covering offers, uptake, supported practice and independent performance. Set a trigger for reviewing the rules.

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

How would you detect a fair-looking allocation policy that changes offers but not actual participation? 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.

AC3.1 Interrogate an opportunity gap

Pass evidence: Calculate a meaningful opportunity measure with correct denominators. Explain selection effects, missing data and why the figures alone cannot establish a cause.

Refer example: Compares raw assignment totals without group sizes.

AC3.2 Evaluate intersecting barriers

Pass evidence: Compare two plausible mechanisms using case evidence and scholarship. Design a non-stigmatising way to hear learner voice without requiring disclosure of protected characteristics.

Refer example: Infers discrimination from the distribution alone.

AC3.3 Defend an equitable allocation method

Pass evidence: Compare transparent rotation with readiness-based allocation. Address safety, fairness and a foreseeable unintended consequence.

Refer example: Rotation is proposed without addressing readiness or support.

AC3.4 Evaluate change over time

Pass evidence: Design a review covering offers, uptake, supported practice and independent performance. Set a trigger for reviewing the rules.

Refer example: Counts invitations while ignoring who actually participates.

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

Kahu, E. R. & Nelson, K. (2018). Student engagement in the educational interface. Higher Education Research & Development, 37(1), 58–71.

Distinguish an engagement indicator from evidence of learning.

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.

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

Use the book to contrast individual and structural explanations.

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.