KENT BUSINESS COLLEGE

School of Education and Wellbeing



KBC-INC-06

Inclusive Teaching and Assessment

Redesign the assessment without changing the judgement · End-of-module analytical report

KBC design for proposed Level 7 study

Awarding-body decision pending | Version 1.0 | November 2026

Redesign the assessment without changing the judgement

Lead a design review for a vocational risk recommendation. Learners have 90 seconds to read a dense slide and give a spoken answer. The intended outcome is prioritising risks and justifying a response.

Case file • fictional evidence supplied to every learner

1. The rubric allocates 40% to polished speaking although the published outcome concerns decision quality. Three of ten candidates could justify their decisions in a later written task.

2. The later task used an easier case, so the result does not demonstrate equivalence. Screen-reader order on the original slide is incorrect.

3. A second marker disagrees on two of five scripts. The centre can pilot two parallel cases before the next cohort.

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

One redesigned candidate task, a matched comparator and an annotated marking grid.

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.

LO6.1 / AC6.1 Evaluate construct validity

Map the intended construct, method demands and marking model. Identify threats to fairness, reliability and comparability.

LO6.2 / AC6.2 Critically select design principles

Compare an accessible revision with a genuinely different response format. Justify choices using research and separate classroom changes from formal approval requirements.

LO6.3 / AC6.3 Produce an equivalent assessment

Create two parallel tasks, an accessible brief and common decision criteria. Demonstrate how a keyboard or low-bandwidth user can access essential information.

LO6.4 / AC6.4 Design moderation and impact checks

Plan marker calibration, disagreement resolution and a pilot. Define the evidence needed to retain a change or revise a criterion.

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 could your change improve access while accidentally making one route easier? 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.

AC6.1 Evaluate construct validity

Pass evidence: Map the intended construct, method demands and marking model. Identify threats to fairness, reliability and comparability.

Refer example: Rewards fluency even when the construct is risk judgement.

AC6.2 Critically select design principles

Pass evidence: Compare an accessible revision with a genuinely different response format. Justify choices using research and separate classroom changes from formal approval requirements.

Refer example: Assumes any alternative format is automatically equivalent.

AC6.3 Produce an equivalent assessment

Pass evidence: Create two parallel tasks, an accessible brief and common decision criteria. Demonstrate how a keyboard or low-bandwidth user can access essential information.

Refer example: The two tasks require different technical judgements.

AC6.4 Design moderation and impact checks

Pass evidence: Plan marker calibration, disagreement resolution and a pilot. Define the evidence needed to retain a change or revise a criterion.

Refer example: Counts agreements without investigating disagreement.

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

Nieminen, J. H. Assessment for Inclusion: rethinking inclusive assessment in higher education. Teaching in Higher Education.

Test whether the proposed marking design changes access or the assessed construct.

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.

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.

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.