KENT BUSINESS COLLEGE
School of Education and Wellbeing



KBC-INC-07

Person-Centred Inclusion Planning and Review

A plan that changes a workplace decision · End-of-module analytical report

KBC design for proposed Level 7 study

Awarding-body decision pending | Version 1.0 | November 2026

A plan that changes a workplace decision

Act as review chair for an inclusion plan that reads “provide more support”. The apprentice prioritises completing an independent client task; the coach wants attendance measures and the employer wants productivity data. Bring findings from earlier modules into a defensible review decision.

Case file • fictional evidence supplied to every learner

1. Baseline: one of four observed client tasks was independently completed. After four weeks: three of four, but two were simpler tasks.

2. The apprentice valued advance instructions but found daily check-ins intrusive. Cover supervisors did not implement the adjustment consistently.

3. Only two further observations can be funded this month. The employer seeks a copy of the full support record.

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 anonymised one-page plan, a review decision record and a leadership summary.

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.

LO7.1 / AC7.1 Synthesise a person-centred formulation

Integrate evidence from learner, coach and employer. Explain a conflict of values, limitations of the baseline and how learner voice shapes the goal.

LO7.2 / AC7.2 Construct an accountable plan

Specify outcomes, owner, resources, information permissions and contingencies. Compare at least two feasible approaches and justify the chosen level of support.

LO7.3 / AC7.3 Evaluate the apparent improvement

Interpret the follow-up evidence with attention to task difficulty, fidelity and competing explanations. Propose an economical way to reduce uncertainty.

LO7.4 / AC7.4 Defend a strategic review decision

Choose whether to continue, adapt, transfer or close actions. Specify a review date, residual risks, and what senior leaders should learn without receiving identifiable records.

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 reports better access while observed competence does not improve, what do you change first? 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.

AC7.1 Synthesise a person-centred formulation

Pass evidence: Integrate evidence from learner, coach and employer. Explain a conflict of values, limitations of the baseline and how learner voice shapes the goal.

Refer example: Writes the plan around staff targets alone.

AC7.2 Construct an accountable plan

Pass evidence: Specify outcomes, owner, resources, information permissions and contingencies. Compare at least two feasible approaches and justify the chosen level of support.

Refer example: Offers support without ownership or information permissions.

AC7.3 Evaluate the apparent improvement

Pass evidence: Interpret the follow-up evidence with attention to task difficulty, fidelity and competing explanations. Propose an economical way to reduce uncertainty.

Refer example: Attributes the entire improvement to the plan.

AC7.4 Defend a strategic review decision

Pass evidence: Choose whether to continue, adapt, transfer or close actions. Specify a review date, residual risks, and what senior leaders should learn without receiving identifiable records.

Refer example: Closes the case without checking fidelity or learner priorities.

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

Ratti, V., Hassiotis, A., Crabtree, J., Deb, S., Gallagher, P. & Unwin, G. (2016). The effectiveness of person-centred planning for people with intellectual disabilities: a systematic review. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 57, 63–84.

Compare evidence of implementation with evidence of benefit.

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.

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.