

Online responses

Q1	Q2	Q3	School/College/Other	Comments
No	No	Don't know	School	My daughters currently attend Aston All Saint School at Aston and we live in Ulley. There is no safe walking route to school ie no footpaths or street lighting. I feel strongly that my children should still receive free transport to school due to this and also
No	No	Don't know	School	No child should suffer by losing their transport to school, just because the authority is required to make cut backs ! Look elsewhere to make the cuts !
No	No	Don't know	School	faith schools such as St Bernards would suffer and children wishing to use that school would be disadvantaged.
No	No	Don't know	School	There is little opportunity for 16-18 yr olds at present and expecting them to pay to study increases the vhnace of them not studying
No	No	Don't know	School	n/a
No	No	No	College	There are a number of factors that you the authority must consider, my son who already accesses post 16 transport has met the criteria therefore this has established his vulnerability, to withdraw transport at this stage of his education would be extremely detrimental as he has not yet completed his course. RMBC made a commitment when it agreed transport would be available to my son and the placement at college was only an option because of this. RMBC like all organisations working with children and young people up to the age of nineteen have to work to the five every child/learner matters outcomes, discontinuing and charging for this service would have a negative impact on all those outcomes, one of the aims to achieving economic well-being is to have access to transport. Without this service my son would not have access to transport because due to the effect his disability has on him he is unable to access public transport and paying for the service is out of the question. It appears that RMBC are punishing and charging people for being disabled which is totally immoral and more so when the authority are not providing appropriate post 16 provision within the borough.
No	No	No	College	No
No	No	No	College	No
No	No	No	College	is it fair for a student to pay full fare when they have no income it will be yet anothor bill for the working parent my daughter is at wickersley 6th form and has to travel on two buses to get there we pay Â£10 a week now
No	No	No	College	This is most unfair to disabled/learning difficulties young people who find it difficult to get out anyway. It will cause them to be even more restricted in their choices which are restricted anyway. It is often difficult enough to find a suitable course without the restriction of no transport. Help the vulnerable!!
No	No	No	College	My daughter travels to college on the bus each day currently costing Â£5 a week, if the discretionary bus pass is withdrawn this will more than double the cost. She has yet to secure herself a part time job and therefore has no income other than that we as parents provide. As a family our income is already considerably stretched due to the current economic climate and funding the bus fare would stretch this even more. I understand that the Council is also stretched financially and need to consider all options, but would it not be possible rather than withdrawing this facility to charge pensioners a nominal fee towards their journey, say 20p? It is appreciated that pensioners are also stretched financially but 20p is a small cost. My daughter does at least contribute towards the cost of her journey. <input type="checkbox"/>
No	No	No	College	<input type="checkbox"/> I have spoken to other people about your proposal and many seem unaware of this. We found out through receiving your correspondence dated 11 November distributed via Wickersley College, I do know of a student at Thomas Rotherham College not being given the same information. Have you actually made every effort to inform anyone who may be affected by

No	No	No	College	In the CYP plan 2010-2013 it shows that the number of LD and disabilities leavers who are NEETs is 14.5%. this is going to get worse if the young people have less choice of courses because they cannot get to the college of their choice that runs the course they want. It also states "within the borough of Rotherham the options for post 16 learning are currently limited" and yet you are aiming to limit the options even more.... this doesn't make sense. Transport is needed by very few young people but it is a gateway to give them the post 16 education they want and deserve. these young people have spent their lives struggling with the curriculum don't restrict their choice now they have one post 16.
No	No	No	Other (please state:)	This is an essential service for young people with learning difficulties and disabilities. Home to school transport is an area of significant difficulty for some families of children with learning difficulties and disabilities (particular families with children in different mainstream and special schools). The discretionary service should continue.
No	No	No	School	it would be unfair to charge 16-18 year olds full fare whilst they are not earning.
				As a society we should be encouraging our children to further their education, not penalising them for attending 6th form/college. <input type="checkbox"/>
				<input type="checkbox"/>
No	No	No	School	If this is introduced it could be the deciding factor on whether a young person continues with their education or not. As there are limited job opportunities for young people will this not drive up the number of NEETs in Rotherham and cost the public sector more in the long term?
No	No	No	School	N/A
No	No	No	School	leave the travel concessions as they are
No	No	No	School	st bernards school has had top marks from ofsted most children who attend need a bus pass. otherwise some parents will not be able to afford bus fares
No	No	No	School	Parents are having to fund children more than ever these days as they can't get jobs and can't save to leave home so the burden rests on parents all the time. With jobs as they are with no pay rises, yet rising inflation we are finding it harder and harder to make ends meet and this will only add to the financial burden.

Proposal to withdraw free transport for St Bernards Catholic school is in contradiction to a letter issued and a response given by Michael Gove and in contradiction to Article 2 of the First Protocol: Right to Education

□

In September, a group of charities and teaching unions wrote an open letter to Education Secretary Michael Gove expressing concerns about the cuts to school transport.

A Department for Education spokesman said: "Local authorities already have a legal duty to provide free school transport for pupils to attend their nearest suitable school, provided the school is beyond the statutory walking distances."

□

This Legal Duty is also clarified below as part of Article 2 of the First Protocol which guarantees a right of access to education.

□

Article 2 of the First Protocol stipulates:

No person shall be denied the right to education. In the exercise of any functions which it assumes in relation to education and to teaching, the State shall respect the right of parents to ensure such education and teaching in conformity with their own religious and philosophical convictions.

□

By removing the "function" (transport) of being able to attend a school which is in conformity to religious beliefs it could be conceived that a) this is in direct conflict with the Department of Education statement and is also a breach of Article 2 of the Human Rights Act.

□

In addition it is clearly stipulated with precedents set in case law the following must be adhered to:

Section 76 of the 1944 Education Act (replicated in Section 9 of the 1996 Education Act), Principle 7 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child and Article 2 of the First Protocol of the European Convention of Human Rights reinforce the principle that no child shall be denied the right to education in accordance with the wishes of the parents, especially with regard to their

No	No	No	School	
No	No	No	School	no
No	No	No	School	no
No	No	No	School	No
No	No	No	School	Transport costs are a major factor in planning further education and I would hope the choice to continue in education is not affected by the financial burden of transport costs.
No	No	No	School	The local authority should consider other ways to generate savings.
No	No	No	School	stop messing about and leave the school free bus passes alone!
No	No	No	School	i think it would make life very hard for families if the system was changed
No	No	No	School	No
No	No	No	School	in this economic climate things are difficult for parents, especially at school holiday times with everywhere charging double because they know you will have to pay it, with all the tax we pay i think the free school travel for children should not be even considered to be discontinued, yet another kick in the teeth for parents trying to make ends meet and extra bus fare to pay would certainly end in more children skipping school
No	No	No	School	Please do NOT remove the discretionary transport for St Bernards.
No	No	No	School	leave it as it is, it will affect parents already struggling financially
No	No	No	School	how do you apportion cost - same bus fare as a non disabled person needs to go on a bus - but lots of disabled children need adapted vehicles and additional staffing and equipment. Rotherham cannot currently meet the needs of severely disabled students in Rotherham so how do you think removing transport or making prohibitively inflated costs is a step in the right direction of educating young people locally (which I disagree with any way)

				As parents of disabled, vulnerable children and in light of the 2013 compulsory post 16 education we along with other families are researchign out of authroity placements whre our young people will be safe, happy and not at risk resulting from travel to and from colleges/provision in rotherham. The only other alternative is to give up work again and this apart from impacting economically on our faimly would be a step back in terms of idependence for our 14yr old who travels with an escort. Priority has to be the safety of our vulnerable young person. It appears ludicrous that colleges are providing quality education and our young people will be excluded becasue they cannot get there safely and independently.
No	No	No	School	
No	No	No	School, College	No.
				I feel that the removal of the free school bus for St Bernards RC Comprehensive is discriminatory to children of the Catholic faith. Ofsted have classified St Bernards performance as 'Outstanding' and children who are high achievers but from less financially stable homes will be denied a chance to take up a place at a school that teaches 1: Their faith and religious beleifs and 2: matches the childs high achievements and expectations. With the care and attention that St Bernards offers and Ofsted have highlited children's talents and education can be nurtured and developed. The removal of the free bus can effectively damage not one but many childrens futures. I am wholeheartedly against this action!
Yes	No	No	School	
No	Yes	No	School	I think that people with special needs get allowances etc these should be used to pay transport costs.
				some children like my daughter would be unable to access public transport due to saftey issues regarding roads, my daughter has had travel training but wouldn't be able to catch the 2 busses she would need to access newman school. I feel it would be a saftey issue for her to catch 2 buses and cross east bawtry road to catch the bus back. I think it would be unfair to use the criteria of free school meals to means test fees for this service. I would not be against a charge for this service if it was a realistic charge
No	Yes	No	School	
Yes	Yes	No	School	
				It seems totally unfair that children who live away from the main school area eg Thurcroft who attend Wales High school will have to undertake 2 bus journeys to go to school, travelling out to Dinnington to come back around to arrive at Wales High School. This will cost more than the already imposed 50p per journey and will take considerably longer. Our children are trying to progress their qualifications to help towards a suitable career and are being penalised. Perhaps the council ought to look at saving money by other means for example not spending on Christmas lights across the borough and use that money to help our young people and their families. Many families are already struggling to make ends meet in this uncertain economic climate and you are now trying to impose more financial problems. School buses already run from Thurcroft to Wales High, removing the sixth form pupils is not going to enable the bus company to remove a bus from the schedule each day. I would continue to pay the 50p or perhaps increase to Â£1 if absolutely essential to keep my child travelling to school on the 'school bus'. Also it has always been the ethos that 6th form pupils 'keep an eye' on younger pupils and stop any 'problems' which may arise. Who will this fall to?? How does the corporation bus company feel about the possible influx of
Yes	Yes	No	School	
No	No	Yes	College	All young people should have access to an education not just able bodied. Denying transport will also mean denying education in a lot of instances and surely that is discriminating against these young people.
No	No	Yes	Other (Please state:)	I don't currentlu use any.
No	No	Yes	School	Children with disabilities should be able to access whatever transport their disability requires when still in full time education.
No	No	Yes	School	no
				I have 2 children at Wales comp, we have always paid bus fare{we live at north anston}, but have always thought it unfair how ALL{ ie not means tested}children from Thurcroft have never had to pay bus fare.My oldest is now in 6th form, in september we are going to have to pay above Â£20 a week in bus fares just to get them to school if he has to pay adult fare,,surely this can't be fair when they are stll at school and not working! My youngest son will have to stay on at school, they dont have an option now, so will it be the same for them?
No	No	Yes	School	

No	Yes	Yes	School	<p>How can you say that the changes would bring greater fairness and equity in transport provision for this group of people? Whilst I have indicated that I wish you to consider introducing charges for Post 16 learners who have physical and medical needs, what about those who do not, and would have to catch 2 buses to get to school? My son is due to start in Sept at Wales High school and his older sister would need to get 2 buses on public transport - we are willing to pay for her to get on the same bus as her brother, but this does not appear to be an option, so how is this fair? She is now having to consider 6th form education at Wickersley where she would only need to catch one bus. She would need to catch 2 buses from Thurcroft to Dinnington and then Dinnington to Wales, and she already catches 1 school bus at 7.40 - what time would she need to set off to catch 2 buses, and why can't she travel with her brother and pay if the reasons are due to "major financial challenges" as you state? It is not fair that children with Special may be considered with an option of paying - what about everyone else? Have you considered how few may be remaining in 6th form from Sept 2012, compared to future years when the school</p>
No	Yes	Yes	School	<p>Other groups of post 16 learners have learning difficulties which prevent them from accessing public services (eg young people with severe learning difficulties or autism). These young people's needs should be considered alongside the needs of young people with physical or medical needs. The council should consider alternative approaches eg. providing independent travel training and personalised support so that young people can use public transport. This would be a more sustainable and inclusive approach.</p>
No	No		School	<p>1. Why is the on line survey different to the paper survey ? 2. You are not providing free transport for post 16 learners, they already pay Â£1.00 per day. 3. You speak of fairness and equity ! The people who need transport to school should have it provided, if they are at a location where it is not required why would you presume that it is not fair or equitable ?</p>
No	No		School	<p>If the people who were either unwilling to work or could afford to pay for public transport had not been provided with free public transport, then genuine tax payers who are struggling financially would not find themselves in this position. Yet another example of the mis-use of public money!</p>
No	No		School	<p>A significant number of pupils leaving special education at 16 have significant needs other than medical or physical; many are behaviourally, socially and emotionally very vulnerable. I fear that the progress and safety of this type of pupil would be significantly compromised should LA transport entitlement be withdrawn and an increase in NEETS may result.</p>
No	Yes		Other (Please State)	<p>Means testing against benefits and student bursary for special schools</p>
No	Yes		School	<p>ONCE AGAIN YOU ARE HITTING THE VENERABLE PEOPLE WHO CANNOT ANSWER FOR THEMSELVES, WE ARE WORKING PARENTS OF A CHILD WITH SPECIAL NEEDS AND RELY ON THIS SERVICE FOR OUR DAUGHTER, MAKE A CHARGE FOR EVERYONE MAKING SURE THAT IT IS FAIR WHETHER YOU WORK OR NOT.....</p>