

# **EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ANALYSIS (EqIAA)**

## **CONTRIBUTORY CHARGE FOR POST 16 TRAVEL ASSISTANCE**

### **SECTION 1 – INTRODUCTION**

As the local authority, the council has both duties and powers in relation to providing assistance with travel to school, and college/further education.

The starting point is that parents are responsible for their children's travel but in certain circumstances the council will provide assistance.

Children of school age (5-16 years) are entitled by law to receive assistance with home to school travel if:

- they attend the nearest appropriate school to home (as identified by the local authority);
- and the school is more than the legal walking distance from home: more than 2 miles (for under 8s) or more than 3 miles (over 8s).

There is additional provision for children from low income families (entitled to free school meals/the maximum level of Working Tax Credits) as follows:

- children aged between 8 and 11 where they live more than 2 miles from their nearest qualifying school;
- children aged between 11 and 16 where they attend one of their 3 nearest qualifying schools and the distance is between 2 and 6 miles;
- children aged between 11 and 16 attending the nearest faith school on faith grounds where the distance is between 2 and 15 miles.

Children who have special educational needs, disabilities or mobility problems are entitled to assistance even if the distance threshold is not met where they cannot reasonably be expected to walk.

In all the above circumstances, the council will provide free travel either by providing a bus pass or a seat on a hired/contract vehicle.

In other circumstances, the local authority has discretionary powers to provide assistance with travel but that assistance does not have to be free of charge.

Young people over the age of 16 do not have a general entitlement in law to travel assistance free of charge. This is because the law on travel assistance is linked to the school age range of 5-16 years.

However, the local authority does have a responsibility to consider the travel needs of young people aged 16+ in attending education and training. In doing so, they must, particularly, consider the needs of the most vulnerable, those in danger of social exclusion and those with learning difficulties and/or disabilities.

The policy of the local authority on travel assistance for post 16 students must be set out and published in the Transport Policy Statement by 31 May in each year.

In recent years, South Gloucestershire has provided travel assistance for some post 16 students particularly where those students have learning difficulties or disabilities.

As far as possible, assistance is given by a pass to use on public transport. This is to encourage independence skills; in appropriate cases, training is given to assist in encouraging this independence. In other cases, a seat may be provided on an individual hired/contract vehicle.

Until now, no contributory charge has been required for this assistance. The current consultation is about the possible introduction of a charge from September 2016 (except for students from low income families).

All local authorities are facing intense financial pressures and need to review whether available money is being spent as effectively as possible on the whole range of services.

Expenditure on travel assistance is a significant part of the council's expenditure. In the financial year 2014-15 it amounted to £5.6 million. The post 16 element cost about £400,000.

In order to focus expenditure on the highest priority areas and critical services, the council has set savings targets for a number of budget areas. In travel assistance, the target for savings in 2015-16 is £900,000.

The introduction of a contributory charge for post 16 travel assistance would assist in meeting this target.

A contributory charge is already required from pupils and students aged 5-16 receiving travel assistance on a discretionary basis.

## SECTION 2 – RESEARCH AND CONSULTATION

There are currently over 600 recipients of non-contributory travel assistance with a special educational need or disability, and approximately 100 are in post-16 provision. The tables below show an overview of current recipients in respect of protected characteristics based on the overall cohort of children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities.

### Research Findings

#### Disability

The protected characteristic of 'Disability' applies to all current recipients of non-contributory travel assistance. Table 1 provides an indication of current 'need'.

*Table 1 – Table to show current need of current recipients, based on the overall cohort of children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities.*

Need	Percentage
Autistic Spectrum Disorder	20.9%
Autism	0.9%
Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties	13.4%
Hearing Impairment	2.7%
Moderate Learning Difficulties	16.7%
Multi-sensory Impairment	0.1%
Other	0.2%
Physical Difficulties	9.1%
Profound Medical	0.3%
Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties	2.0%
Severe Language and Communication Needs	17.2%
Severe Learning Difficulties	10.3%
Specific Learning Difficulties	0.9%
Under Assessment	3.8%
Visual Impairment	1.4%

#### Gender

Table 2 provides details of the gender of current recipients.

*Table 2 – Table to show gender of current recipients, based on the overall cohort of children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities.*

Gender	Percentage
Female	25.9%
Male	74.1%

## Ethnicity

Table 3 provides details of the ethnicity of current recipients.

**Table 3 – Table to show ethnicity of current recipients of non-contributory travel assistance, based on the overall cohort of children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities.**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Arab	0.0%
Asian/Asian British – Bangladeshi	0.2%
Asian/Asian British – Indian	0.5%
Asian/Asian British - Pakistani	0.4%
Asian/Asian British – Chinese	0.2%
Asian/Asian British – Other	0.6%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British – African	0.6%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British – Caribbean	0.6%
Black/African/Caribbean/Black British – Other	0.4%
Gypsy or Traveller of Irish Heritage	0.8%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups – White & Asian	0.6%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups – White & Black African	0.2%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups – White & Black Caribbean	1.2%
Mixed/Multiple Ethnic Groups – other	1.6%
White – English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	85.1%
White – Irish	0.2%
White – Other	1.7%
Other ethnic group	0.6%
Unknown	4.7%
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Total:	10.2%

## Charging Policies in Other Local Authorities

Table 4 provides details of other local authorities which apply a charge for post-16 travel assistance for students with special educational needs or disabilities.

**Table 4 – Table to show charges applied by other local authorities for post-16 travel assistance for students with special education needs or disabilities.**

<b>Local Authority</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Gloucestershire	£456
Leicestershire	£546
Norfolk	£495
Somerset	£675
Staffordshire	£550
Wiltshire	£446

The average charge as based on the above data from the six local authorities listed is £528, as compared the proposal under investigation here of £396 from September 2015 and £414 from September 2016.

## Consultation Results

Public consultation was conducted and an initial EqIAA was published as part of the consultation in order to promote and allow for specific feedback to be received in respect of equalities issues. The consultation ran from 26 October 2015 until 7 December 2015.

The consultation gained feedback from 69 respondents with overall feedback as follows:-

***Do you agree that a contributory charge should be introduced (except for low-income families) with effect from 1st September 2016?***

Yes - 30%

No - 62%

Unsure - 7%

The Age, Gender Disability and Ethnicity data relating to respondents is shown within the consultation report.

In addition to data relating to the key question asked within the consultation, it is important to understand the detailed comments received. These comments received have been grouped under eleven key themes. The information below shows the key themes with the key comments emerging in respect of each and which relate to equalities issues. A full list of each comment received is shown in Appendix 1.

### 1. General Supportive Comments

- *I understand that cuts have to be made and appreciate that families on benefits won't have to pay.*
- *There are many demands on resources for high priority needs and therefore the costs of support services like travel have to be reduced.*
- *Other councils already charge and often far more than is being proposed here.*

### 2. General Unsupportive Comments

- *These are some of most vulnerable members of society & are disadvantaged enough already; as are their families.*
- *To now charge is to say we are not going to provide for your needs because you are disabled; and if you want to go somewhere that does we will charge you.*
- *These children; travelling for special education; are our most needy and vulnerable individuals. They need more support as their parents are stressed and burdened enough without adding another tier of anxiety. They must be protected from cuts.*

### 3. 16+ Education Expectations

- *With the change in compulsory education until 18; the council should support until 18.*

#### **4. Financial Implications**

- *I gave up a very good job to care for my son but we fall outside the benefit category; and once again we are being targeted to fund a service that my son couldn't do without; so what choice do we have?*
- *Those on low incomes should be exempt from any charge and students with a disability should be considered sympathetically*

#### **5. Issue of local provision**

- *If our son could have had his needs met at a local school and he was able to get there himself then we would have obviously taken that option. There is an acute shortage of post 16 placements for young people with learning disabilities therefore forced to allow their children to travel further from home.*

#### **6. Issue of ability to travel independently**

- *Our special children do not have the option of using public transport like other able 16-18 year olds. They require special arrangements such as transport so why discriminate against them in this instance.*

#### **7. Potential Impact on other services/ provision**

- *If parents/carers can't afford the costs then these pupils could be removed from education and would then cost the local authority much much more in an appropriate care package that will be the legal entitlement of every young adult.*

#### **8. No Alternative Options**

- *The school bus is the only form of public transport that can get my child to her school;*

#### **9. Potential impact on educational choices**

- *This charge could put families in a situation where they decide not to send the young person into post 16 education. This would result in the wrong decisions being made for the wrong reasons ultimately affecting the young person's right to post 16 education.*

#### **10. Policy Queries**

- *Some college courses are part-time and £414 per year is far too high for a student using transport for only part of a week. The amount payable should be pro rata for students attending college part-time and pro rata where transport is used for certain journeys only.*
- *If we were made to make a charge towards transport would we get a say in the type as the mini bus journey is a lot longer than by taxi.*

#### **11. Other**

- *I see other authorities have already adopted this so my guess that this isn't a consultation; more a warning of what's coming.*

## SECTION 3 – IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF EQUALITIES ISSUES AND IMPACTS

As a result of the research information collated, key issues emerging in respect of equalities are:

- The protected characteristic of ‘Disability’ applies to 100% of current recipients of non-contributory travel assistance affected by the proposed change.
- In respect of ethnicity, the data in relation to current recipients broadly mirrors the area’s population.
- The majority of current recipients are male.

This information shows that:

- Males are proportionately more likely to be impacted should the proposed change occur, although females would be impacted also.
- Disabled people would be the key group impacted, as all current recipients have the protected characteristic of ‘Disability’.

As a result of the consultation information received, key issues emerging in respect of equalities are:

Issues Emerging as a Result of Consultation	Response
<p><b>General Unsupportive Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>These are some of most vulnerable members of society &amp; are disadvantaged enough already; as are their families.</i></li> <li>– <i>To now charge is to say we are not going to provide for your needs because you are disabled; and if you want to go somewhere that does we will charge you.</i></li> <li>– <i>These children; travelling for special education; are our most needy and vulnerable individuals. They need more support as their parents are stressed and burdened enough without adding another tier of anxiety. They must be protected from cuts.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The feedback received as part of this key theme concerns the negative impact which would be experienced by children with special educational needs and disabilities and their families by the introduction of a contributory charge. This mirrors the data which also evidences the negative impact which would be experienced by the introduction of a contributory charge.</p> <p>An action which provides some level of mitigation has been identified via the introduction of an exemption for low income families as part of the proposals.</p> <p>This EqIAA has not identified that the implementation of the proposed contributory charge would result in an unlawful negative impact as the law does not preclude charging for transport. However, it is clearly noted that impact of introducing the proposed contributory charge would be negative and relates specifically to the protected characteristic of “Disability”.</p>

Issues Emerging as a Result of Consultation	Response
<p><b>16+ Education Expectations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>With the change in compulsory education until 18; the council should support until 18.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Young people over the age of 16 do not have a general entitlement in law to travel assistance free of charge. This is because the law on travel assistance is linked to the school age range of 5-16 years.</p>
<p><b>Financial Implications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>I gave up a very good job to care for my son but we fall outside the benefit category; and once again we are being targeted to fund a service that my son couldn't do without; so what choice do we have?</i></li> <li>– <i>Those on low incomes should be exempt from any charge and students with a disability should be considered sympathetically</i></li> </ul>	<p>The proposals clearly indicate that any contributory charge should be remitted for low income families (defined as entitled to the maximum level of Working Tax Credit).</p>
<p><b>Issue of local provision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>If our son could have had his needs met at a local school and he was able to get there himself then we would have obviously taken that option. There is a acute shortage of post 16 placements for young people with learning disabilities therefore forced to allow their children to travel further from home.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Places for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities across South Gloucestershire are reviewed on a regular basis and provision adjusted to meet demand. In addition the most recent SEN Review and resulting Strategy have considered future demand and actions are in place to ensure the continued availability of places into the future.</p>
<p><b>Issue of ability to travel independently</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Our special children do not have the option of using public transport like other able 16-18 year olds. They require special arrangements such as transport so why discriminate against them in this instance.</i></li> </ul>	<p>These proposals intend to continue with the provision of appropriate transport arrangements which meet the needs of individual children and young people. In some cases, particularly with the support of independent travel training, some students are able to access public transport.</p>

Issues Emerging as a Result of Consultation	Response
<p><b>Potential Impact on Other services/provision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>If parents/carers cant afford the costs then these pupils could be removed from education and would then cost the local authority much much more in an appropriate care package that will be the legal entitlement of every young adult.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The proposals clearly indicate that any contributory charge should be remitted for low income families (defined as entitled to the maximum level of Working Tax Credit).</p> <p>It is recognised that those who fall just outside the entitlement to Working Tax Credit may be impacted as they would not meet the exemption criteria proposed.</p>
<p><b>No Alternative Options</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The school bus is the only form of public trnsport that can get my child to her school;</i></li> </ul>	<p>School bus services will not be affected by this proposal and pupils will be able to continue to use the school bus by contributing to the cost of this service.</p>
<p><b>Potential impact on educational choices</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>This charge could put families in a situation where they decide not to send the young person into post 16 education. This would result in the wrong decisions being made for the wrong reasons ultimately affecting the young persons right to post 16 education.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The council has a statutory duty to consider the needs of post 16 students in accessing education or training. This will continue. The contributory charge would assist in continuing to provide transport while also helping to safeguard other high priority services.</p>
<p><b>Policy Queries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Some college courses are part-time and £414 per year is far too high for a student using transport for only part of a week. The amount payable should be pro rata for students attending college part-time and pro rata where transport is used for certain journeys only.</i></li> <li><i>If we were made to make a charge towards transport would we get a say in the type as the mini bus journey is a lot longer than by taxi.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Consideration can be given to pro-rata payments although the Council does have to pay for some travel passes on a 5 day week basis.</p> <p>The mode of transport is within the decision of the council having regard to the most effective arrangements which includes consideration of the number of passengers and type of journey. In the case of contract vehicles, the proposed contributory charge is much less than the true unit cost of the provision.</p>
<p><b>Other</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>I see other authorities have already adopted this so my guess that this isn't a consultation; more a warning of what's coming.</i></li> </ul>	<p>All information and data collated as part of this review will be considered as part of the decision making process.</p>

It is worth noting that 'level' of impact would differ depending on the family's ability to pay the proposed charge. Ability to meet the proposed charge, and with it, the 'level' of impact, cannot be assessed in a 'sweeping' or 'broad brush' manner to all people by virtue of their sharing of a particular protected characteristic (e.g. ethnicity, disability, gender etc.). Not all people would be unable to meet a charge solely because they have certain protected characteristic(s). The Equality Act 2010 is also clear that there is no provision for treating a particular protected characteristic group more favourably where there is no identified need.

Applying an approach that is based on ability to meet the proposed charge brings with it the opportunity to advance equality of opportunity in a way that does not impose a 'one size fits all' approach to a protected characteristic group, but which focuses on ensuring people are treated in accordance with their individual circumstances (which are such that assistance is required and of a high value, and not solely by virtue of a particular protected characteristic). As such, provision has been made for the proposed charge to be exempted where the student/family is on a low income - defined as entitled to the maximum level of Working Tax Credit (the free school meals threshold).

It is important to note that should a contributory charge be introduced for post-16 travel, this would clearly result in a negative impact for young people with special educational needs and disabilities and their families. This impact covers 100 children and their families. There would also be a proportionately greater negative impact for Males who form 74.1%.

This identified impact needs to be balanced against the need to focus expenditure on the highest priority areas and critical services and the need to review whether available money is being spent as effectively as possible on the whole range of services.

## SECTION 4 – EqIAA OUTCOME

This section will be completed after the end of the consultation once responses have been gathered and analysed.

Outcome	Response	Reason(s) and Justification
<b>Outcome 1:</b> No major change required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Adjustments to remove barriers or to better promote equality have been identified.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Continue despite having identified potential for adverse impact or missed opportunities to promote equality.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>Any decision to implement the proposed contributory charge would result in a negative impact, particularly affecting the protected characteristic of “Disability”. “Males” would also be proportionately more negatively impacted as they form 74.1% of current recipients of non-contributory travel assistance.</p> <p>This identified negative impact needs to be balanced against the need to focus expenditure on the highest priority areas and critical services and the need to review whether available money is being spent as effectively as possible on the whole range of services.</p> <p>Some level of mitigation is in place through the proposal to implementation exemption where the student/family is on a low income</p>
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Stop and rethink.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## SECTION 5 – ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN AS A RESULT OF THIS EqIAA

- Should the proposed approach be adopted, work to ensure that the charge is exempted where the student/family is on a low income (defined as entitlement to the maximum level of Working Tax Credit – the free school meals threshold) should commence without delay.
- Consideration will be given to pro-rata payments.

## SECTION 6 – EVIDENCE INFORMING THIS EqIAA

- South Gloucestershire Council data in respect of current recipients of non-contributory travel assistance.
- Consultation results received and full consultation report.
- Research data in relation to charging policies of other Local Authorities.

## Appendix 1

### Full list of consultation comments received

#### Please use this space to make any additional comments

---

The majority of post-16 students with SEN & disabilities travel independently and this should be encouraged

My son is 13 and I think that is appalling that in 3yrs I will have to contribute to the cost of transport. He is unable to travel independently; therefore that is why he needs assistance with transport.

My disabled son has to travel 25 miles to Stroud to attend St.Roses. We did try and place him in S.Glos but the level of support required to meet his needs was not in place. We feel introducing this will penalize the most vulnerable in our society

I am concerned that by applying a contributory charge; children/parents will decide they cannot afford to attend colleges/schools. Those with learning difficulties-maturity of primary school age especially cannot be expected to use public transport safely. These students need to retain their assisted travel to school with no charges applied. It will be a great concern for parents of these children to be travelling alone as some of these children do not have the skills to engage confidently with the general public.

Is the charge proportional-some children only travel a few days a week; others every day-so why isn't it pro rata? This charge might mean some children go into a residential placement as then they won't need to travel as much and their family won't have to pay.

No! These are some of most vulnerable members of society & are disadvantaged enough already; as are their families.

### Please use this space to make any additional comments

our soon has learning disabilities/autism. He has had to travel outside our local area as the special schools near to us could not meet his needs. (he had a time at both) He now travels approx 20miles each way to school in a mini bus as we have been told a taxi is too expensive. This takes over an hour and a quarter each way. He is unable to access public transport on his own, even if it were available. If we were made to make a charge towards transport would we get a say in the type as the mini bus journey is a lot longer than by taxi. This has been a cost cutting exercise. We do believe that by having our son as a day pupil rather than residential does already say the council considerable money. We also have concerns of the fee will administered and the costs involved with that. What happens if parents don't pay. Also is the contribution likely to increase or be distance related in the future. If our son could have had his needs met at a local school and he was able to get there himself then we would have obviously taken that option. There is a acute shortage of post 16 placements for young people with learning disabilities therefore forced to allow their children to travel further from home.

our soon has learning disabilities/autism. He has had to travel outside our local area as the special schools near to us could not meet his needs. (he had a time at both) He now travels approx 20miles each way to school in a mini bus as we have been told a taxi is too expensive. This takes over an hour and a quarter each way. He is unable to access public transport on his own, even if it were available. If we were made to make a charge towards transport would we get a say in the type as the mini bus journey is a lot longer than by taxi. This has been a cost cutting exercise. We do believe that by having our son as a day pupil rather than residential does already say the council considerable money. We also have concerns of the fee will administered and the costs involved with that. What happens if parents don't pay. Also is the contribution likely to increase or be distance related in the future. If our son could have had his needs met at a local school and he was able to get there himself then we would have obviously taken that option. There is a acute shortage of post 16 placements for young people with learning disabilities therefore forced to allow their children to travel further from home.

If a transport requirement has been identified in a statement or EHC plan, then there should not be a contributory charge. I agree with a contributory charge in other cases.

school bus is the only form of transport to get my child to school for 9am no other buses on route plus my child has learning and speech difficulties

school bus is the only form of transport to get my child to school for 9am no other buses on route plus my child has learning and speech difficulties

no I don't agree with a contributory charge; these individuals struggle financially enough with you adding more charges.

It is disgraceful you are taking away services from disabled people and their families. why are the government always taking help away from people who need more help not less!

Education is compulsory now until age 18 is post 16 and students attending special schools which are not necessarily local to them should be penalised in this way when there is no choice in where they attend for their post 16 education. They are already disadvantaged enough.

I understand that cuts have to be made and appreciate that families on benefits won't have to pay. I gave up a very good job to care for my son but we fall outside the benefit category, and once again we are being targeted to fund a service that my son couldn't do without; so what choice do we have? I see other authorities have already adopted this so my guess that this isn't a consultation, more a warning of what's coming.

Although my son will have left college by sept 16 I would be against these charges; My son did not attend an out of county college out of choice but because there was no alternative within south glos. To now charge is to say we are not going to provide for your needs because you are disabled; and if you want to go somewhere that does we will charge you.

## Please use this space to make any additional comments

My daughter has Autism and learning difficulties which make accessing the community including school difficult .

0-25 disability service not 5-16 these children's needs and mobility issues don't stop at 16

This will affect my brother and my family; I don't think it fair

These children;travelling for special education;are our most needy and vulnerable individuals. They need more support as their parents are stressed and burdened enough without adding another tier of anxiety. They must be protected from cuts.

With the change in compulsory education until 18; the council should support until 18.

Our grandson is one the special needs16+ that uses the free transport he needs 24 hour care His parents would find it difficult to raise the £400needed the parents of these special needs children have more than enough to worry about without this obstacle put in thier path.

How can a child be charged just because there is no closer alternative place the can go. They may be post 16 but with their individual difficulties the schools are their security and life. Charging to make this accessible is outrageous. The schools will empty and pressure on post 16 social services would be immense

Our special children do not have the option of using public transport like other able 16-18 year olds. They require special arrangements such as transport so why discriminate against them in this instance. Don't able children get free bus passes etc? My son is at a severe special school and cannot speak. He could not use or understand any form of transport himself. He'd need 1:1 support to do this or I will have to take him to school and we do not live that locally! Absurd! Maybe some children might be able to cope; so why not assess on an individual basis to be fair? If my son could use public transport I definitely wouldn't use council transport! Weed out the needy and eliminate those taking advantage!

A child that has a ehcp/stament should not be expected to fund there transport

As a parent of a 16 year old, this will greatly impact our lives. we cannot afford to pay for this transport; my son is not capable of getting himself to school. Other parents cannot afford this charge and cannot drive; this means their child will no longer be able to attend school. Our lives are hard as it is and this will just make it even harder

how can young adults who need 24/7 supervision not be entitled to free travel to their place of education as without adult support the could not reach the destination on their own. if parents/carers cant afford the costs then these pupils could be removed from education and would then cost the local authority much much more in an appropriate care package that will be the legal entitlement of every young adult.

My daughter attends college 3days a week she has learning difficulties and goes by taxi perhaps the council should look at the funding of residential colleges which cost a lot of money compared with local provision I

Some college courses are part-time and £414 per year is far too high for a student using transport for only part of a week. The amount payable should be pro rata for students attending college part-time and pro rata where transport is used for certain journeys only. The amount paid should also be means tested according to the income and savings of the parent/carer for under 18's; or of the student if s/he is 18 or over

My daughter attends college she has Down's syndrome I am a single working parent I know I might be exempt but could not afford to fund transport and she is unable to use public transport

As my son is post 19 surely it is his income that should be used not ours to decide whether or not he should contribute.

- Travel is not provided for mainstream post-16 pupils so this would bring provision more in line with mainstream pupils

### **Please use this space to make any additional comments**

Accepting the council needs to make savings I think this is a reasonable option in favour of protecting other services

Travel is not provided for mainstream post-16 pupils so this would bring provision more in line with mainstream pupils

In these times of austerity all areas of council funding needs to be reviewed; as I understand it this proposal will bring the council in line with other authorities who already charge for this service.

Travel is not provided for mainstream post-16 pupils so this would bring provision more in line with mainstream pupils

It does not seem logical that someone under the age of 16 could be making a contributory charge and then pay NIL when over 16, the arrangements should be the same for all ages

Appropriate for families to pay for something that other families are required to pay for.

There are many demands on resources for high priority needs and therefore the costs of support services like travel have to be reduced. This would be a reasonable contribution toward what is likely to be a far higher cost service. Travel is not provided for mainstream post-16 pupils so this would bring provision more in line with mainstream pupils. Other councils already charge and often far more than is being proposed here. The majority of post-16 students with SEN & disabilities travel independently and this should be encouraged. Low income families are exempt so the charge will only impact families that can afford to pay; and for something that the majority of families also pay for or do themselves.

This would be a reasonable contribution toward what is likely to be a far higher cost service. Travel is not provided for mainstream post-16 pupils so this would bring provision more in line with mainstream pupils. Other councils already charge and often far more than is being proposed here. Providing travel is clearly very expensive so all opportunities should be looked at to reduce costs. The majority of post-16 students with SEN & disabilities travel independently and this should be encouraged.

The government have dictated that children HAVE to stay in some form of education until they are 18 years old; therefore they should support ALL their education years.

I think the value of the contributory charge should be based on a sliding scale according to the household's gross annual income.

#### **WILL THIS AFFECT OVER 80'S WITH BUS BUS PASSES**

if a contribution has to be made we should have some say regarding escorts & drivers as our feelings are not taken into account when they put different drivers and escorts on our route which disturbs the children

This policy is not fair as it will penalise the young adults who are not in the exempt categories. These non exempt families can still struggle with this new hefty charge. The Council should not levy a charge or at least lower this cost to the families who will not be exempt. If my child didn't have a genetic condition (Downs Syndrome) they would be walking to the local post 16 Secondary School or getting a bus by themselves to college. My child would be making choices. Sadly; my child will never be able to do this. My child's EPCH states that they are a young vulnerable person. We have chosen Warmley Park Post 16 for Sept 16. Warmley Park Post 16 is the nearest local special school who can accommodate all my child's needs and give them the best continuing education and life skills. If there was a local post 16 special school much near where I live my child could go there; but there isn't; so we have no choice. Vulnerable young people should not be subject to this unfair change.

Just because a family is not in receipt of free meals it does not mean they can afford to contribute to school transport as they do not have a choice whether to stay in education or training between the ages of 16 and 18 anymore

Seems reasonable as other councils charge more