

Appendix 2

Breakdown of Survey Responses

Online

The analysis conducted is presented below;

Page	Question	Answers	No	Percentage
P1. About you	Q1. Are you:	A parent or carer	201	82%
		A representative of an early years provider, school, academy or college	4	1%
		A representative of a group or organisation	2	0%
		An elected member	0	0%
		A Council officer	4	1%
		A member of the public	23	9%
		Other	10	4%
P5. Reviews	Q1. Do you feel that your child's transport needs should be reviewed annually in conjunction with of their Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP)?	Strongly agree	47	23%
		Agree	66	32%
		Neither agree or disagree	38	18%
		Disagree	31	15%
		Strongly disagree	19	9%
P6. Personal budgets	Q1. Should parents and carers with children travelling on high cost single or dual occupancy taxis be offered a personal transport budget for their child or children to travel from school or college?	Strongly agree	27	13%
		Agree	45	22%
		Neither agree or disagree	58	28%
		Disagree	33	16%
		Strongly disagree	38	18%

P6. Personal budgets	Q2. If you opted for a personal transport budget, if approved, how would you like the cost to be determined?	Distance calculation	90	44%
		Monthly allowance through a band system	44	21%
		Other	67	33%
P8. Independent travel	Q1. Would supporting your child to develop the necessary skills to travel independently be something you might consider, given the right support and training?	Strongly agree	6	2%
		Agree	25	12%
		Neither agree or disagree	20	9%
		Disagree	34	16%
		Strongly disagree	116	57%
P8. Independent travel	Q2. At what age or stage do you feel independent travel training should be accessible to your child?	Age 11 - primary school to secondary school transfer	28	13%
		Age 14+ - changing from Year 9 to Year 10	173	86%
P9. Further education	Q1. Do you think young people in further education (college, sixth form) should only have access to personal transport budgets? This could include bus passes or cycle/moped grant schemes?	Strongly agree	29	14%
		Agree	26	12%
		Neither agree or disagree	41	20%
		Disagree	41	20%
		Strongly disagree	64	31%
P10. Mobility benefits	Q1. Should the Council take these payments into consideration?	Strongly agree	13	6%
		Agree	23	11%
		Neither agree or disagree	31	15%
		Disagree	44	21%
		Strongly disagree	90	44%

P12. Reviews	Q1. Do you feel that a student's transport needs should be reviewed annually in conjunction with of their Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP)?	Strongly agree	19	44%
		Agree	13	30%
		Disagree	8	18%
		Strongly disagree	3	6%
P13. Personal budgets	Q1. Should parents and carers with children travelling on high cost single or dual occupancy taxis be offered a personal transport budget for their child or children to travel from school or college?	Strongly agree	6	13%
		Agree	18	41%
		Disagree	9	20%
		Strongly disagree	10	23%
P13. Personal budgets	Q2. If approved, and families opted for personal transport budget, how do you think the cost should be determined?	Distance calculation	19	44%
		Monthly allowance through a band system	15	34%
		Other	9	20%
P15. Independent travel	Q1. Is supporting children and young people to develop the necessary skills to travel independently something that should be considered, given the right support and training for them?	Strongly agree	11	25%
		Agree	20	46%
		Disagree	6	13%
		Strongly disagree	6	13%
P15. Independent travel	Q2. At what age or stage do you feel independent travel training should be accessible to children and young people?	Age 11 - primary school to secondary school transfer	16	37%
		Age 14+ - changing from Year 9 to Year 10	27	62%
P16. Further education	Q1. Do you think young people in further education (college, sixth form) should only have access to personal transport budgets? This could include bus passes or cycle/moped grant schemes?	Strongly agree	10	23%
		Agree	14	32%
		Disagree	12	27%
		Strongly disagree	7	16%

P17. Mobility benefits	Q1. Should the Council take these payments into consideration?	Strongly agree	11	25%
		Agree	9	20%
		Disagree	13	30%
		Strongly disagree	10	23%
P18. Age group	Q1. Which age group do you represent?	Under fives	6	10%
		5 to 16 year olds	22	36%
		Ages 16+	13	21%
		Ages 25+	19	31%

Drop in Sessions

Drop in session: Monday 2 October at Rotherham Parent Carer Forum

3 parents/carers representatives attended and the RPCF lead

Drop in session: Wednesday 4 October 2017 Maltby Customer Service Centre

2 parents/carers attended.

Drop in session: Thursday 5 October at Aston CSC Library

11 parents/carers attended

Drop in session: Monday 9 October at Riverside House Library

6 parents/carers attended

Drop in session: Tuesday 10 October at Swinton CSC Library

7 parents/carers attended

Drop in session: Monday 30 October 2017 at Riverside House Library

5 parents/carers attended.

Drop in Session: Wednesday 1 November 2017 at Riverside House Library

7 parents/carers, 1 young person and 2 members of public attended.

Additional enquiries

Number of contacts from CSC 84

Number of follow up telephone calls by PST 27

Number of additional e mail queries to PST 20

Issues and general comments raised

Transport being removed from their child with complex needs and being given a PTB might cause financial difficulties.

Children who did not have physical medical mobility difficulties could not use public transport because of social and communication difficulties associated with autism.

When parents/carers received more information about the principles of ITT and PTB they were more reassured. Others would welcome such schemes when their children were older and considered more capable.

If young people received grants and other payments for help with travel then the Council should not be expected to fund everything. PTBs for older children going into placements and sixth forms may be more suitable and helps them choose. They could use taxi transport for the mornings and use ITT for home time journeys as they may finish at different times to schools so buses may be less busy.

Transition issues from 18/19 into adult services transport and placements which did not align with the EHCP guidance of age 25. A young person between services and different criteria was a source of frustration for many families. The 16 to 19 policy was already embedded and families were used to the small charge towards transport provision.

Families would object to their DLA being used to pay towards transport as this was a national benefit and could not be used for those in statutory education. Other families may welcome a personal transport budget if it suited their family circumstances.

Children in early years provision should never go in a taxi and it should be family who take them to and from a nursery. Travel training is available in other local authorities. Some young people themselves want to travel but their families may not be confident they can do this safely. The RPCF will consult young people to gain their views as part of this public consultation.

Concerns about post 16 travel and other sudden changes taking place. Families did live quite a long distance away from the special school where their child attended so journeys on buses would be very time consuming. Families did not usually attend a school in their local walking area and sometimes the only option was a taxi.

The needs of the child's transport should be included as part of their EHCP and some aspects of national benefits should be used as it was awarded for the child.

The low contribution of 80p per journey for post 16 travel is cheap and a higher charge would be reasonable.

Contractual changes at Easter were traumatic for their children. It was felt that once transport was given that children should keep it until they leave school.

Some families felt whatever the Council did it would affect them in a negative way. They did not have the choice to attend a more local special school when it was already full. This had an impact on their child not being able to mix with other pupils out of hours so they could be more isolated.

ITT for those attending out of area schools was a big concern. The public transport links did not exist and young people attending such provision had complex needs.

It was reasonable for families to contribute to transport as it was very accessible and convenient for them and their children travel on minibuses.

School Meeting Sessions

3 October 2017: Abbey Special School

3 parents/carers attended

5 October 2017: Kelford Special School

15 parent/carers attended and two reps. from RPCF in attendance

6 October 2017: Hilltop Special School

23 parent/carers attended one young person, head teacher and one rep. from RPCF in attendance.

27 October 2017: The Willows Special School

12 parents/carers attended and one rep. from RPCF and head teacher in attendance.

Summary of school sessions and additional comments from families:

Thought the meeting was good and informative.

Wants transport to stay as it is. Children suffer every time changes take place.

Sometimes the operators are late or too early and drivers and assistants are changed.

When another pupil joins transport, it can cause disruption to routines.

Consultation should have been separated into mainstream and special needs.

A contribution from all families would be less disruptive than the Council making savings to the whole service as a cost cutting exercise.

It is a very stressful life for those with disabled children and transport can be complicated.
DLA and a family vehicle is not for school journeys.

Independent travel training:

Severe and complex children are unsuitable for ITT. Some children will never achieve this and will have long term dependencies as adults.

Some families thought they would have to teach their child ITT and were not clear that the Council would be setting up schemes. In some special schools, older pupils are already identified for ITT as part of their life skills.

Some young people already have access to a disabled person's pass but often need to travel with an adult on public services.

For children attending out of area schools the journey is too complicated and time consuming so the best option is a taxi or minibus.

Families sometimes did not have the choice of their child attending their local school because of their complex needs and other schools being full.

Attending more distant schools does have a negative effect on their child's ability for social and leisure activities.

Young people need to make progress with ITT to help them join and travel in their local community and giving them extra time to become a young adult.

PTB:

More details about PTBs is needed as financial hardship might be incurred.

Would like the option of trying a PTB but being able to re-join contracted transport.

If a child has to come out of school early or has an appointment then family have to collect them anyway.

Increased traffic around schools and lack of parking facilities if families used a PTB for their own vehicles so may be issues with safety.

If families have other children in other schools then transport provision is not always suitable or easy for the whole family.

More information about the future PTB policy and funding was needed before families chose this option.

For those in further education a PTB might help them for attending placements and off site provision with individual timetables.

Not all learners attend special schools and some would like the option of help with driving lessons.

A PTB in further education would help families with transition to eg adult services such as direct payments.