KENT BUSINESS COLLEGE
School of Education and Wellbeing



KBC-INC-04

Neurodiversity and Inclusive Learning Support

A task failure or an instruction failure? · End-of-module analytical report

KBC design for proposed Level 7 study

Awarding-body decision pending | Version 1.0 | November 2026

A task failure or an instruction failure?

Develop and defend a support trial for an apprentice who solves faults accurately when working alone but loses steps after a rapid verbal handover. The manager wants a diagnostic label before changing instruction.

Case file • fictional evidence supplied to every learner

1. Across four simulated handovers, two included a written sequence. Both written-sequence tasks were completed accurately; one of the two verbal-only tasks was accurate.

2. The written tasks were also less noisy, so format and noise are confounded. The learner asks for fewer simultaneous instructions.

3. Speed of safe fault diagnosis matters to the job; unaided recall of a long spoken brief is not listed in the target outcome.

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 trial schedule, accessible instruction sample and decision rule.

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.

LO4.1 / AC4.1 Formulate a functional account

Explain two possible mechanisms using observed performance and the learner's account. Identify the boundary between educational support and diagnosis.

LO4.2 / AC4.2 Evaluate research transfer

Critique evidence on neurodiversity at work and inclusive learning. Explain how context, co-occurrence and individual preference constrain generalisation.

LO4.3 / AC4.3 Design a co-produced comparison

Plan a counterbalanced or otherwise defensible small trial. Vary format and noise thoughtfully, document consent and keep the target task equivalent.

LO4.4 / AC4.4 Interpret and revise

Define meaningful measures of accuracy, independence, time and burden. State what you would retain, change or discontinue under contrasting outcomes.

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

What evidence would distinguish the effects of a written prompt from the quieter environment? 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.

AC4.1 Formulate a functional account

Pass evidence: Explain two possible mechanisms using observed performance and the learner's account. Identify the boundary between educational support and diagnosis.

Refer example: States a diagnosis as the cause of four observations.

AC4.2 Evaluate research transfer

Pass evidence: Critique evidence on neurodiversity at work and inclusive learning. Explain how context, co-occurrence and individual preference constrain generalisation.

Refer example: Lists general traits without evaluating the evidence.

AC4.3 Design a co-produced comparison

Pass evidence: Plan a counterbalanced or otherwise defensible small trial. Vary format and noise thoughtfully, document consent and keep the target task equivalent.

Refer example: Changes noise and format together without addressing confounding.

AC4.4 Interpret and revise

Pass evidence: Define meaningful measures of accuracy, independence, time and burden. State what you would retain, change or discontinue under contrasting outcomes.

Refer example: Reports speed alone while errors or burden rise.

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

Doyle, N. (2020). Neurodiversity at work: a biopsychosocial model and the impact on working adults. British Medical Bulletin, 135(1), 108–125.

Examine how job design affects interpretation of performance.

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.

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.