



Institute Of Neurodiversity™

Below is a school self-assessment tool that leadership teams, governors, and inspection leads can use.

It is system-level, non-diagnostic, and explicitly designed around “all-human inclusion” rather than labels.

It works for primary and secondary, and it separates design failures from individual need.

## ALL-HUMAN INCLUSIVE SCHOOL – SYSTEM SELF-ASSESSMENT

From the Modelled Human to Education for Real Humans

### HOW TO USE THIS TOOL (IMPORTANT)

- Complete as a leadership team, not individually
- Evidence matters more than aspiration
- If answers vary by classroom → score the **system**, not best practice
- This is not a SEND audit and not a staff performance tool

**If inclusion depends on heroic individuals, the system is not inclusive.**

# SECTION 1 — DESIGN ASSUMPTIONS

## Who is the school built for?

Score each statement:

- 0 = Not true
- 1 = Sometimes / inconsistently
- 2 = Consistently true

- Our school is not designed around one “ideal” learner profile
- Variation in attention, regulation, pace and communication is assumed
- Success does not require masking or conformity
- Difference is treated as normal, not exceptional

Section score: /8

# SECTION 2 — STRUCTURE & PREDICTABILITY

## Does structure support humans or control them?

- Daily routines are predictable and visible to all students
- Transitions are planned and supported system-wide
- Instructions do not rely solely on verbal processing
- Students know what is expected without constant correction

Section score: /8

**If predictability depends on “good teachers”, it is not structural.**

# SECTION 3 — LEARNING & CURRICULUM DESIGN

## Same outcomes, different pathways

- Learning goals are clear and shared
- Students can demonstrate learning in multiple ways
- Pace can vary without penalty
- Mistakes are treated as part of learning, not failure

Section score: /8

# SECTION 4 — ASSESSMENT & EXAMS

## What does success really measure?

- Assessment reflects sustained understanding, not just performance under pressure
- High-stakes exams are balanced with portfolio or project-based evidence
- Timed assessment is not the sole indicator of competence
- Assessment does not disproportionately disadvantage predictable groups

Section score: /8

**Exams are a design choice, not a law of nature.**

# SECTION 5 — ENVIRONMENT & REGULATION

## Does the environment create distress or reduce it?

- Sensory load (noise, light, crowding) is actively considered and regulated to work for everyone
- Movement is normalised, not punished
- Calm / low-stimulus spaces are available without stigma
- Emotional dysregulation is treated as information

Section score: /8

# SECTION 6 — TRAUMA vs NEURODIVERSITY CLARITY

## A critical safety distinction

- Staff are trained to distinguish trauma responses from neurodiversity traits
- Neurodiversity is not treated as pathology
- Trauma responses are met with safety, not discipline
- SEND processes are not used as a proxy for trauma support

Section score: /8

**Confusing trauma with neurodiversity causes harm.**

## SECTION 7 — RELATIONSHIPS & CULTURE

### Is belonging designed or accidental?

- Every student is known by at least one trusted adult
- Behaviour policies allow professional judgement
- Shame-based discipline is actively avoided
- Bullying is addressed as a system issue, not a victim issue

Section score: /8

## SECTION 8 — TECHNOLOGY & AI USE

### Does technology reduce or amplify exclusion?

- Technology is used to personalise learning, not standardise it
- AI (where used) supports different learning styles and pacing
- Teachers are not expected to deliver content in 25 different ways
- Data use is ethical, transparent, and non-punitive

Section score: /8

**AI should reduce teacher load, not increase surveillance.**

## SECTION 9 — STAFF SYSTEMS & SUSTAINABILITY

**Can this model survive real humans working in it?**

- Teacher roles prioritise guidance and relationships, not content delivery alone
- Staff wellbeing is considered a system responsibility
- Adaptation is supported, not punished
- Burnout is treated as a design signal

Section score: /8

## SECTION 10 — GOVERNANCE & ACCOUNTABILITY

**Is inclusion a board-level responsibility?**

- Inclusion is discussed as system design, not individual need
- Data on exclusion, distress and disengagement is reviewed regularly
- Governors understand trauma vs neurodiversity distinctions
- Inclusion is part of the school risk register

Section score: /8

## TOTAL SCORE: /80

### INTERPRETATION

- 0–25 → System built for the modelled human
- 26–45 → Patchwork inclusion (high individual effort, weak design)
- 46–65 → Structurally inclusive, inconsistent delivery
- 66–80 → All-human inclusive by design

### FINAL REFLECTION (MANDATORY)

As a leadership or governance team, discuss:

**Who succeeds here without having to adapt who they are and who succeeds only by suppressing themselves?**

If those groups are predictable, the system is still exclusionary.