

Appendix A – Options to address increase need for pupils diagnosed with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

	Options	Advantages	Disadvantages	Considerations	Actions	Next steps
1	Status quo – do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No capital cost 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children’s needs not being met. Risk of increased number of tribunals. Increased cost to the LA. 	Swansea has a statutory requirement under the 1996 Education Act to identify, assess and make appropriate provision for all learners with sever and complex special educational needs.	NA	Carry forward as benchmark
2	Establish 2 x 2 class primary and 1 x 2 class secondary STF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets needs of learners within the LA thus avoiding tribunals and expensive out of county placements. Planning for predicted growth in need. If appropriately situated potential reduction in journey time for children. Linked to review of special school provision potential for retaining pupils within county and hence overall cost saving to LA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No capital provision secured. Capacity and revenue will be need to be determined once schools identified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rising demographic taking up surplus places in schools. Addresses immediate need but will require continuous review of special school provision. Link with Band B and LDP opportunities. 	<p>Analysis of pupil costs now compared to increase provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned places revenue cost and individual pupils cost in mainstream are identical. <p>Review assessment criteria and assess the phasing of facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary classes accommodation needed asap, but could be phased e.g. infants 2017, juniors 2019. Secondary similar, KS3 2017, KS4 2019. Assessment 	

					<p>criteria are set by Health, but level of function criteria for STF are very clear to SEN panel.</p> <p>Capacity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of schools with potential capacity to be identified 	
3	Increasing number of planned places in existing ASD provisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More pupils in each STF could reduce the pending list, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It has already been taken as far as is practicable, and all the ASD STFs are already well above their original planned places of 16 each (see table) ▪ Autistic pupils have sensory issues which mean that high numbers around them and high background noise levels can have a very negative effect on their behaviour. 			
4	Change designation of current STF provision thus displacing children with moderate learning difficulties into mainstream classes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minimal capital costs. ▪ Children with ASD are provided for. ▪ Additional ASD STF places could mean that existing MLD/SLD places are opened up and therefore reduce pending list as pupils are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could require staff training or possible redundancies. ▪ Needs of children with moderate to severe learning difficulties are not met as they will be displaced into 			

		designated the appropriate provision for their need.	<p>mainstream, where there is also a pending list of learners awaiting MLD/SLD STF places</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased risk of tribunals from MSLD parents and again additional demands on schools and mainstream resources. ▪ Increase in referrals for MLD/SLD places (higher than ASD referrals) 			
5	Ask schools to collaborate 'collegiately' to set up and host specialist ASD classes within a geographic cluster (not necessarily a Comprehensive School cluster)	▪	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A high risk strategy which could portray the LA as absolving itself of its' statutory duty to identify, assess, and make provision for all learners with additional learning needs. ▪ Governance and admissions arrangements would be problematic in terms of the LA determining needs, provision and placement via SEN Panel. Host school or cluster may see that as their right and thus this initiative 			

			<p>would not serve the needs of the LA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ STF provision in Swansea is formally constituted, including full public consultation and registration with Welsh Government. ▪ Delegated funding through the Delegated Powers Planned Places Paper secures continuity. ▪ Transport commissioning and funding are currently managed by the LA. ▪ If it is voluntary the school may change their minds and seek to cease the provision as they are not registered. ▪ There would inevitably be Tribunals if learners, provision were to be disrupted or entry refused. 			
6	Accommodate children within a special school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Children's needs are met. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would require an additional special school at significant capital cost. ▪ It is inconsistent with the LA policy on inclusion. 	Link with Band B and LDP opportunities.		

7	Increase out of county placements	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Meets the needs of the children	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Significant increase in revenue costs and more children educated away from their home, families and communities.▪ Difficult to place in neighbouring authorities due to similar capacity issues.▪ Increase risk of tribunals.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Review provision in neighbouring authorities.	
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--