

INDICANT DEMONSTRATION REPORT · Fictional school, pupils and evidence. Illustrative data only. Not an inspection judgement.

INDICANT INCLUSION

FULL LEADERSHIP REPORT

Indicant Inclusion Diagnostic

Indicant Demonstration School

Academic year	2026/27
Diagnostic	Baseline
Framework	Indicant Inclusion Framework 0.2
Generated	14 October 2026, 21:56
Report template	Full Inclusion Diagnostic Report v1
URN	999999

This report synthesises school context, diagnostic judgements, evidence confidence, quantitative evidence and System Signals. It is designed to support leadership decision-making rather than replace professional judgement.

Executive summary

The current inclusion profile is **Developing**.

Overall maturity	Evidence confidence	System Signals	Active priorities
2.90 / 4	Moderate	2	3

Strongest current domains

- Curriculum access and inclusive teaching (3.55/4)
- Leadership, culture and governance (3.35/4)

Domains requiring greatest attention

- Attendance, engagement and belonging (2.25/4)
- Behaviour, suspension and exclusion (2.42/4)

Overall position

Classification	Maturity	Evidence	Diagnostic completion
Developing	2.90 / 4	Moderate	100%

2 significant diagnostic gaps · 2 leadership variance flags · 1 evidence mismatch flags.

Change since the previous completed diagnostic

Overall inclusion maturity has strengthened by 0.27 points since the previous completed diagnostic. Curriculum access and inclusive teaching shows the strongest improvement, while behaviour, suspension and exclusion has deteriorated and warrants investigation.

Comparison: 2025/26 · Year End. Movements within ±0.10 are treated as broadly stable; ±0.25 or more is highlighted as material.

COMPLETED DIAGNOSTIC HISTORY				
2.45 2024/25 · Year End	2.63 2025/26 · Year End	2.90 2026/27 · Baseline		
DOMAIN	PREVIOUS	CURRENT	CHANGE	INTERPRETATION
Leadership, culture and governance	3.05	3.35	+0.30	Strengthened
Curriculum access and inclusive teaching	3.20	3.55	+0.35	Strengthened · maturity band improved
Attendance, engagement and belonging	2.10	2.25	+0.15	Strengthened
Behaviour, suspension and exclusion	2.70	2.42	-0.28	Reduced · maturity band deteriorated

Change signals for leadership attention

Material deterioration · Behaviour, suspension and exclusion

This domain has reduced materially since the previous completed diagnostic and warrants leadership investigation.

Previous 90-day plan impact evidence

3 Completed actions	2 Impact reviews	67% Review coverage	1 Outcomes achieved
-------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------

Domain profiles

DOMAIN	POSITION	MATURITY	EVIDENCE	INTENT / IMPLEMENTATION / EXPERIENCE / IMPACT
Leadership, culture and governance	Developing	3.35 / 4 	High	I 3.70 · Im 3.20 · E 3.10 · Ip 3.40
Curriculum access and inclusive teaching	Secure	3.55 / 4 	Moderate	I 3.60 · Im 3.50 · E 3.40 · Ip 3.70
SEND identification and support	Developing	3.12 / 4 	High	I 3.40 · Im 3.20 · E 3.00 · Ip 2.90
Attendance, engagement and belonging	Vulnerable	2.25 / 4 	High	I 3.20 · Im 2.60 · E 1.90 · Ip 1.30
Behaviour, suspension and exclusion	Vulnerable	2.42 / 4 	Moderate	I 3.30 · Im 2.80 · E 2.00 · Ip 1.60
Alternative provision and reintegration	Developing	2.85 / 4 	Moderate	I 3.20 · Im 2.80 · E 2.60 · Ip 2.80
Pupil and family experience	Developing	2.68 / 4 	Low	I 3.10 · Im 2.80 · E 2.50 · Ip 2.30
Outcomes, destinations and equity	Developing	2.95 / 4 	High	I 3.20 · Im 3.00 · E 2.80 · Ip 2.80

Evidence confidence

Evidence Confidence is reported separately from maturity. It indicates how strongly the current judgement is supported by triangulated evidence.

Pupil and family experience

Evidence confidence: **Low**.

Diagnostic gaps

Practice-Experience Gap · Behaviour, suspension and exclusion

Implementation is materially stronger than experience. Difference: 0.80 points.

System Signals

HIGH SIGNAL

SEND attendance differential

Observation: Attendance for pupils with SEND is materially below the whole-school rate.

Why it matters: A sustained differential may indicate barriers that whole-school attendance activity is not addressing.

Questions to investigate:

- Which groups account for the differential?
- What changes when attendance improves?

MEDIUM SIGNAL

Leadership variance

Observation: Leaders have materially different views on aspects of behaviour implementation.

Why it matters: Variation can signal uneven implementation or different access to evidence.

Questions to investigate:

- What explains the different judgements?

Leadership variance

No material leadership variance is currently identified at the configured threshold.

Quantitative trends

14 of 18 configured metrics contain evidence.

METRIC	CURRENT	PREVIOUS	TWO YEARS PRIOR	YOY CHANGE
Overall attendance	94.70 %	93.80	92.90	+0.90

METRIC	CURRENT	PREVIOUS	TWO YEARS PRIOR	YOY CHANGE
SEND attendance	88.40 %	89.10	90.00	-0.70
Persistent absence	20.20 %	22.40	24.10	-2.20
SEND suspension rate	18.50 %	16.20	14.90	+2.30

Leadership priorities

PRIORITY 1 · ACCEPTED

Strengthen SEND attendance response

The attendance differential is the highest-severity current System Signal.

PRIORITY 2 · ACCEPTED

Investigate behaviour experience divergence

Reported implementation is stronger than pupil experience and outcome evidence.

PRIORITY 3 · RECOMMENDED

Strengthen pupil and family evidence

The domain judgement currently rests on low-confidence evidence.

90-Day Improvement Plan

PRIORITY/ACTION	ACTION	LEAD	SUCCESS CRITERIA	EVIDENCE	REVIEW	STATUS
-----------------	--------	------	------------------	----------	--------	--------

Strengthen SEND attendance response	Complete a cohort-level review of SEND attendance patterns and remove the two highest-frequency barriers.	Deputy Headteacher	SEND attendance gap narrows and severe absence reduces.	Attendance dashboard; pupil/family review evidence	28 Dec 2026	In progress
Investigate behaviour experience divergence	Triangulate behaviour data, adjustments and pupil experience across three year groups.	Assistant Headteacher	Leadership can evidence whether adjustments are implemented consistently and identify corrective action.	Suspension data; QA; pupil voice	12 Jan 2027	Not started

Methodology

Indicant analyses inclusion through four connected lenses: Intent, Implementation, Experience and Impact. Maturity is scored separately from Evidence Confidence. The platform highlights divergences, leadership variance and configured System Signals that warrant investigation.

Interpretation boundary

Indicant identifies patterns that merit leadership investigation. Differences, correlations, rater disagreement and System Signals do not establish causation. This report is not an Ofsted grade prediction, statutory compliance certificate or decision-making tool about individual pupils.