Cheryl Burris
EDIT 891-2
11 May 2026

Feature Matrix: ASD Compatibility and Fading Candidates Columns

ASD Compatibility column: Classifications

ASD-Specific: Features built for the ASD path; not on the ADHD path, or explicitly serve ASD needs

- Compatible: Serves ASD users as intended; no conflict with ASD design principles
- Neutral: No significant ASD interaction; ADHD-primary feature
- Potentially harmful: May amplify ASD-specific distress or undermine ASD design principles; monitoring required during the next phase

Fading Candidates column (From BS-5, Blind Spots Register v1.7). All assignments are provisional design questions for the future.

- Heavy = current phase scaffolding
- Light = hypothesis for next phase
- Signal = behavioral indicator

Feature	Version	ASD Compatibility	Compatibility Notes and Flags for the Next Phase	Fading?	Fading Logic: Heavy scaffold → Light scaffold hypothesis | Signal
Estimate vs. actual time capture	v2	Neutral	Time capture and calibration are not inherently ASD-conflicting. Both populations benefit from estimate-actual awareness. Caveat: if gap display is prominent or uses evaluative language, it could trigger performance anxiety. Language must stay non-punitive and non-comparative.	YES	YES Heavy: System prompts for estimate at every task entry. Light: System prompts only when estimate-actual gap exceeds threshold. Signal: Calibration gap narrows over four or more weeks.

Session anchor / initiation ramp	v2	Compatible	Structured initiation sequence aligns with ASD predictability need. Provides Now/Next clarity, and is structurally similar to P1 (Predictability Ladder) on the ADHD path. ADHD-primary feature that is ASD-compatible: predictable entry points reduce the cost of initiating a session.	YES	YES Heavy: System offers next micro-step for every task selected. Light: System offers micro-step only for high-difficulty tasks. Signal: User adds next-step notes without prompting.
Priority field (P1/P2/P3)	v3.1	Compatible	Fixed priority hierarchy (Do first / Do next / Do later) supports ASD predictability framing: the user knows what sequence the planner expects. Caveat: externally-imposed priority changes (unexpected assignments, rubric updates, instructor messages) can disrupt the established hierarchy and trigger distress. The feature is compatible. The course environment's unpredictability is the ASD-relevant risk.	YES	YES Heavy: Priority set manually per task at entry. Light: System prompts priority only for high-estimate tasks. Signal: User tags priority without prompting across four or more weeks.
Weekly Prep Ritual (AI)	v2	Potentially harmful	AI output varies session to session. For ASD users who benefit from predictability, variable suggestions create cognitive burden rather than reducing it. L3 ASD-v failure mode (Failure Taxonomy v2): AI suggestions accepted because they provide predictability. The user stops authoring the plan and defers to AI to reduce the cognitive demand of deciding. Predictability need exploits rather than supports self-authorship. Monitoring will be required. Consider whether a template-based or consistent-structure alternative should be offered on the ASD path.	No	No

Pomodoro timer	v2	Compatible	Predictable time-interval structure (25/5 pattern) supports ASD need for predictable session rhythm. Caveat: enforced break interruptions may conflict with autistic hyperfocus states. Interrupting deep engagement at the timer signal can trigger distress. The predictable interval is compatible. The required break is potentially disruptive for users in hyperfocus. V6-2 minimize behavior: see fading candidate note.	YES	YES Heavy: Timer visible full-size by default on all four performance pages. Light: Timer defaults to minimized; user expands when needed. Signal: User initiates minimize/expand without prompting across four or more weeks.
Overdue task quiet prompt (v4)	v4	Compatible	Non-punitive, quiet, dismissible design was specifically motivated by Raymaker et al. (2020) autistic burnout framing. One of the clearest ASD-compatible features in the planner. No urgency badges. One-line prompt. Resets each session. Aligns with P8 (Recovery and Re-Entry Flow). The language must not escalate or accuse.	No	No
Orphan recovery / Pre-Flight prompt	v4	Compatible	Same rationale as overdue quiet prompt. Quiet, session-level, dismissible. No urgency signals. Inline orphan scheduling panel (V5-2/V6-1) preserves page context. No unexpected navigation transitions. Aligns with ASD preference for predictable context.	No	No
Sensory-Social Demand Check-In (v4 / ASD path)	v4	ASD-Specific	ASD-specific feature. Direct implementation of P2 (Sensory-Social Demand Check-In). Not surfaced on ADHD path.	YES	YES Heavy: System prompts check-in at every session start.

			Structural counterpart to ADHD Cognitive Load Check-in (V5-1): same interface-quieting output, distinct input mechanisms. ASD = context-driven sensory/cognitive demand (Mantzalas et al., 2022; Lage et al., 2024).		Light: Check-in offered only when prior session ended early or logged Heavy. Signal: User initiates demand adjustment without prompting.
Calm Mode toggle (v4)	v4	ASD-Specific	Direct implementation of P3 (Calm Interface Contract). Pan-ND, autism-relevant. Compatible by design for ASD. V6-B calmMode additive-only constraint: compatible with ASD protective design. This cannot reduce quieting below check-in floor. See DDR-21. L3 ASD-v risk: Calm Mode can become a safety object rather than a support. Monitor in next phase. If ASD users show increasing distress when calm mode is unavailable, the feature has shifted from support to dependency.	YES	YES Heavy: System enforces calm mode when Heavy sensory load is selected. Light: User-controlled toggle only; no system enforcement. Signal: User activates calm mode independently without check-in prompt.
Recovery and Re-Entry Flow (P8 / ASD pattern)	v4	ASD-Specific	Direct implementation of P8 (Recovery and Re-Entry Flow). Autism-primary, ADHD-compatible. One-screen restart pattern: what matters now, what can wait, one safe next step. Avoids punitive language and escalating visual debt. Aligns with autistic burnout recovery framing (Mantzalas et al., 2022; Raymaker et al., 2020).	No	No
Rescope modal / Pace modal	v4	Potentially harmful	Explicitly naming plan deviation can amplify distress for ASD users. For ADHD users, the modal's plan-adjustment function is well-designed. For ASD users, the language of deviation is the design risk.	No	No

			L2 ASD-v failure mode (Failure Taxonomy v2): rescope triggers distress when plan deviation is named. The modal works as intended. It surfaces the gap between plan and performance. But, this is precisely what can cause distress on the ASD path. Priority for the next phase: monitor whether ASD users avoid the Pace modal, leave it without completing, or show distress indicators after use. Consider ASD-specific modal language variant.		
AI task chunking	v2	Potentially harmful	Variable AI chunking output creates unpredictability. Additionally, AI may restructure tasks in ways that conflict with an ASD user's carefully established task organization. L3 failure mode applies to both populations but differently: ADHD (agency erosion = AI replaces user judgment) and ASD (predictability disruption = AI introduces variability into a task structure the user may have carefully constructed for predictability reasons). Consider whether AI chunking should be opt-in on the ASD path, or whether the suggestion should be presented as a template the user edits rather than a delivered output.	No	No
ADHD Cognitive Load Check-in (V5-1)	v5	Neutral	ADHD-specific feature. Not surfaced on ASD path. ASD users encounter the Sensory-Social Demand Check-in instead. The mechanisms are structurally distinct and separately documented. This is the direct design response to BS-3 (Learner-as-Moving-Target). ADHD check-in = arousal/activation framing (Isaac et al., 2024).	No	No

			ASD check-in = context-driven sensory/cognitive demand framing. Neutral designation: ASD users do not encounter this feature. No compatibility risk.		
Inline Orphan Scheduling Panel (V5-2 / V6-1)	v5/v6	Compatible	Inline design (no page navigation; stays on threshold surface) preserves predictable context. Aligns with ASD need to avoid unexpected transitions. Structured date fields and per-task Skip options are predictable and low-demand. No urgency signals. Language is non-punitive. Visual feedback (dimmed + strikethrough for skipped tasks) is quiet and clear.	No	No
AI Suggestions on Agenda view (V6-4)	v6	Potentially harmful	Highest-risk feature for ASD compatibility in v6. Agenda is the most structured surface in the planner. AI suggestions introduce variability at the most predictability-sensitive view. L3 ASD-v failure mode (Failure Taxonomy v2): AI suggestions accepted because they provide predictability. The user stops authoring the agenda structure and defers to AI output to reduce the cognitive demand of deciding. Predictability need exploits rather than supports self-authorship. This is a failure mode where a design feature works against the population it is designed to serve. Priority for the next phase: track AI suggestion acceptance rate on Agenda view specifically for ASD-path users.	No	No

			If above 80% without revision, flag as L3 ASD-v failure.		

Integration note:

- Add columns *ASD Compatibility*, *ASD Compatibility Notes*, *Fading Candidate (Y/N)*, and *Fading Logic* to the feature matrix. Copy values from this document. Rows with *Potentially Harmful* ASD classification require monitoring protocols during the next phase. P1 (Predictability Ladder), P4 (Communication Choice Set), and P5–P7 ASD patterns require separate fading logic entries when those rows exist in the full matrix.
- ASD patterns not in this feature list that have fading candidates (BS-5): P1 Predictability Ladder (the fading signal = the user generates their own sequence without the ladder prompt), P4 Communication Choice Set (the fading signal = the user formulates help requests without template support). Add these when P1 and P4 rows exist in the full matrix.

References:

Isaac, V., Lopez, V., & Escobar, M. J. (2024). Arousal dysregulation and executive dysfunction in attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 14*, Article 1336040. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1336040

Lage, C., Smith, E. S., & Lawson, R. P. (2024). A meta-analysis of cognitive flexibility in autism spectrum disorder. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *157*, Article 105511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2023.105511

Mantzalas, J., Richdale, A. L., Adikari, A., Lowe, J., & Dissanayake, C. (2022). What Is autistic burnout? A thematic analysis of posts on two online platforms. *Autism in Adulthood*, *4*(1), 52–65. https://doi.org/10.1089/aut.2021.0021

Raymaker, D. M., Teo, A. R., Steckler, N. A., Lentz, B., Townsend, M., Classen, A., & Nicolaidis, C. (2020). “Having all of your internal resources exhausted beyond measure and being left with no clean-up crew”: Defining autistic burnout. *Autism in Adulthood, 2*(2), 132-143. https://doi.org/10.1089/aut.2019.0079