

Section 4

Equality

Analysis Toolkit

Home to School Transport for Children and
Young People with Special Educational
Needs and Disabilities
For Decision Making Items

What is the Purpose of the Equality Decision-Making Analysis?

The Analysis is designed to be used where a decision is being made at Cabinet Member or Overview and Scrutiny level or if a decision is being made primarily for budget reasons. The Analysis should be referred to on the decision making template (e.g. E6 form).

When fully followed this process will assist in ensuring that the decision-makers meet the requirement of section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need: to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation or other unlawful conduct under the Act; to advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Having due regard means analysing, at each step of formulating, deciding upon and implementing policy, what the effect of that policy is or may be upon groups who share these protected characteristics defined by the Equality Act. The protected characteristics are: age, disability, gender reassignment, race, sex, religion or belief, sexual orientation or pregnancy and maternity – and in some circumstances marriage and civil partnership status.

It is important to bear in mind that "due regard" means the level of scrutiny and evaluation that is reasonable and proportionate in the particular context. That means that different proposals, and different stages of policy development, may require more or less intense analysis. Discretion and common sense are required in the use of this tool.

It is also important to remember that what the law requires is that the duty is fulfilled in substance – not that a particular form is completed in a particular way. It is important to use common sense and to pay attention to the context in using and adapting these tools.

This process should be completed with reference to the most recent, updated version of the Equality Analysis Step by Step Guidance (to be distributed) or EHRC guidance - [EHRC - New public sector equality duty guidance](#)

Document 2 "Equality Analysis and the Equality Duty: Guidance for Public Authorities" may also be used for reference as necessary.

This toolkit is designed to ensure that the section 149 analysis is properly carried out, and that there is a clear record to this effect. The Analysis should be completed in a timely, thorough way and should inform the whole of the decision-making process. It must be considered by the person making the final decision and must be made available with other documents relating to the decision.

The documents should also be retained following any decision as they may be requested as part of enquiries from the Equality and Human Rights Commission or Freedom of Information requests.

Support and training on the Equality Duty and its implications is available from the County Equality and Cohesion Team by contacting

AskEquality@lancashire.gov.uk

Specific advice on completing the Equality Analysis is available from your Directorate contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team or from Jeanette Binns

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Name/Nature of the Decision

Changes to the Home to School Transport Policy for Children and Young People with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities.

What in summary is the proposal being considered?

It is proposed to amend the Home to School Transport Policy for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) to include;

- A means-tested contributory charge for post 16 SEND transport to be introduced at £475 plus
- An annual increase reflective of the Retail Price Index plus 5%.

Is the decision likely to affect people across the county in a similar way or are specific areas likely to be affected – e.g. are a set number of branches/sites to be affected? If so you will need to consider whether there are equality related issues associated with the locations selected – e.g. greater percentage of BME residents in a particular area where a closure is proposed as opposed to an area where a facility is remaining open.

Affects all districts.

Could the decision have a particular impact on any group of individuals sharing protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010, namely:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/ethnicity/nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership Status

In considering this question you should identify and record any particular impact on people in a sub-group of any of the above – e.g. people with a particular disability or from a particular religious or ethnic group.

It is particularly important to consider whether any decision is likely to impact adversely on any group of people sharing protected characteristics to a disproportionate extent. Any such disproportionate impact will need to be objectively justified.

Disability

If you have answered "Yes" to this question in relation to any of the above characteristics, – please go to Question 1.

Yes

If you have answered "No" in relation to all the protected characteristics, please briefly document your reasons below and attach this to the decision-making papers. (It goes without saying that if the lack of impact is obvious, it need only be very briefly noted.)

N/A

Question 1 – Background Evidence

What information do you have about the different groups of people who may be affected by this decision – e.g. employees or service users (you could use monitoring data, survey data, etc to compile this). As indicated above, the relevant protected characteristics are:

- Age
- Disability including Deaf people
- Gender reassignment/gender identity
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race/Ethnicity/Nationality
- Religion or belief
- Sex/gender
- Sexual orientation
- Marriage or Civil Partnership status (in respect of which the s. 149 requires only that due regard be paid to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment or victimisation or other conduct which is prohibited by the Act).

In considering this question you should again consider whether the decision under consideration could impact upon specific sub-groups e.g. people of a specific religion or people with a particular disability. You should also consider how the decision is likely to affect those who share two or more of the protected characteristics – for example, older women, disabled, elderly people, and so on.

The group of people who will be affected by this decision can be identified by two specific protected characteristics; disability and age.

Typically, the transport policy for children and young people with SEND affects people aged 5 to 21 who have special educational needs and/or disabilities and are entitled to receive transport support.

Although the pupils are referred to as SEND there are two distinct groups; special educational needs (SEN) and disability (D) and a pupil who has special educational needs may, or may not, also have a disability.

Those learners who will be affected by the proposal to introduce a flat rate charge for

post 16 SEND transport support average between 450 to 520 students at any one time. All of this group will be subject to a charge for receipt of transport support to school or college.

Statistics illustrate a large gap between the attainment of pupils with Statement of Special Educational Need and other pupils.

In 2014 in Key Stage Four, the gap between pupils with a Statement of SEN and other pupils achieving 5 GCSEs A* – C in English and mathematics reduced from 52.2% to 47.8%, thanks mainly to an increase in the proportion of statemented pupils achieving the required grades (7.7% to 13.4%).

Young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are twice as likely to be not in education, training or employment (NEET) as those without. 11.6% of young people with LDD were NEET compared with 5.8% of those without as at April 2014. In the current economic climate the opportunities in the employment market for young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are likely to reduce further.

Often parents are on benefits due to full time carer responsibilities so the impact of these proposals is mitigated by the introduction of an exemption for families with low incomes.

Individuals who share other protected characteristics have been considered as follows;

Race/ethnicity/nationality

There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic. 82% of children with special educational needs or disabilities aged 5-16 in January 2014 were White British. Monitoring information would suggest that people from an ethnic minority background tend to be part of communities showing higher rates of deprivation. Consequently, post 16 learners from an ethnic minority background may be more likely to incur the reduced charge applicable to learners from families on qualifying benefits.

Sex/Gender

Monitoring information from the school census of children and young people aged 5-16 taken in January 2014 illustrates that 72.5% of pupils with a statement of special educational need are male compared to 27.5% female. This may suggest that there could be a disproportionately negative affect on the long term prospects of male children and young people with a special educational need who may be discouraged from attending post 16 learning due to the associated transport costs.

Religion/belief

We do not consistently collect data on the religion of learners who access SEND transport support and so are unable to assess the impact of these proposals on persons with this protected characteristic. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on people with different religious beliefs or with no religious belief.

Sexual orientation

We have no information on the numbers or proportion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual (LGB) communities likely to be affected by revisions to the SEND Home to School Transport Policy. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Gender Reassignment

We have no information on the numbers or proportion of Trans communities likely to be affected by revisions to the SEND Home to School Transport Policy. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic.

Marriage or civil partnership status

There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic. Those learners aged 16+ in receipt of transport support account for approximately 450 to 520 of the young people in receipt of transport support at any one time.

Women who are pregnant or on maternity leave

Information on numbers of learners who are pregnant is not collected. There is no evidence to suggest that there may be a disproportionately negative impact on persons with this protected characteristic

Question 2 – Engagement/Consultation

How have you tried to involve people/groups that are potentially affected by your decision? Please describe what engagement has taken place, with whom and when.

(Please ensure that you retain evidence of the consultation in case of any further enquiries. This includes the results of consultation or data gathering at any stage of the process)

A comprehensive public consultation on the proposed changes was undertaken from 3 February 2014 to 25 April 2014.

A document explaining the proposed changes, a covering letter explaining the consultation and a questionnaire asking for views on the proposed changes was sent to 2,587 parents/guardians of children and young people currently in receipt of SEN school or college transport. The consultation documents were also emailed to the following groups:

- neighbouring local authorities;
- independent non-maintained schools;
- Lancashire schools;
- Lancashire colleges;

- Barnardos;
- Welfare Rights;
- Parent Carer Forum;
- Lancashire Youth Council; and
- Family Information Service

The consultation was also available online to any other interested parties through the Lancashire County Council 'Have your say' website:

In total 634 questionnaires were returned, 313 paper copies and 321 online copies. 89% of responses were from a parent/guardian/carer of a pupil currently receiving transport support. Responses came from all districts in the LCC area.

Respondents to the consultation were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with the proposal of introducing the discretionary post-16 support of £475 from September 2014. Over four-fifths of respondents (83%) strongly disagree with the proposal, with another 6% tend to disagree.

Respondents were asked how strongly they agree or disagree with the proposal of a formulaic increase to future year's concessionary charge (RTI plus 5%).. Four-fifths of respondents strongly disagree (81%) with this proposal, while another 6% tend to disagree.

Respondents were asked if they would like to give reasons for their responses to the questions and were given a space to write their reasons in. 449 respondents (71%) chose to give a reason. Responses to this question were categorised and the table below shows the most common categories of response. In the chart below, responses do not add up to 100%, this is due to multiple responses or computer rounding.

Reason	Count	Percentage
Can't/won't be able to afford to pay for transport to and from school for child/children	102	23%
Other	47	10%
Lack of provision leads to children travelling further to schools/colleges	46	10%
A lot of people won't be able to afford these charges	43	9%
The charge prohibits children and young people from attending school/college of their choice/may stop them going altogether	42	9%
Transport provided is essential/needed as cannot make other arrangements	40	9%
The charge is unfair	39	9%
The charge may lead to financial hardship within families/could cause difficulties	38	9%

Not fair to parents of disabled children as they already have more costs/hardship than other parents	36	8%
The proposed rate of increase (RPI+5%) is too harsh	27	6%
The working sector are hit harder financially because not on benefits	24	5%
Transport services should be provided for free	20	5%
There are other areas which can be considered for cuts	18	4%
The proposed charge for transport is too expensive	18	4%
Children with SEND need all the help they can get	17	4%
Pupils with SEND should pay the same as non-SEND pupils	14	3%
Children could become isolated from a decreased social life	12	3%
It is not unreasonable to ask for a contribution	12	3%
If education is compulsory until aged 18 then costs should be funded up to that age	7	2%
Proposed charges should be based on income	5	1%
Charge should be means tested or stay the same	4	1%
The proposed charge is a tax on disability	4	1%
Disability/mobility allowance should be used to pay for the transport	3	1%
Parents may consider lowering hours to claim benefits and free transport	2	0%

Question 3 – Analysing Impact

Could your proposal potentially disadvantage particular groups sharing any of the protected characteristics and if so which groups and in what way?

It is particularly important in considering this question to get to grips with the actual practical impact on those affected. The decision-makers need to know in clear and specific terms what the impact may be and how serious, or perhaps minor, it may be – will people need to walk a few

metres further to catch a bus, or to attend school? Will they be cut off altogether from vital services? The answers to such questions must be fully and frankly documented, for better or for worse, so that they can be properly evaluated when the decision is made.

Could your proposal potentially impact on individuals sharing the protected characteristics in any of the following ways:

- Could it discriminate unlawfully against individuals sharing any of the protected characteristics, whether directly or indirectly; if so, it must be amended. Bear in mind that this may involve taking steps to meet the specific needs of disabled people arising from their disabilities
- Could it advance equality of opportunity for those who share a particular protected characteristic? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Does it encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so?
- Will the proposal contribute to fostering good relations between those who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, for example by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding? If not could it be developed or modified in order to do so? Please identify any findings and how they might be addressed.

The proposals for change apply to the transport policy for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities thus affecting those children and young people with SEND aged 5 to 24.

The proposal to introduce a charge for post 16 SEND learners will affect all those young people aged 16 to 19 who opt to continue in education.

The number of post 16 SEND learners who receive transport support is between 450 to 520 at any one time, all of whom, under the new proposals will be subject to a charge for receipt of transport support.

A benchmarking exercise with other local authorities has also been conducted to review the charging policies of other local authorities for this group of learners.

In addition to the impact felt by the young person any impact will also be felt across the family who, in the majority of cases, will be financially supporting the young person at this stage of their education.

Some families will struggle financially to meet the charge, juggling limited family finances to ensure that their child can attend further education. In the current economic climate many families have been affected by job losses and/or a general reduction in household income which will exacerbate their ability to find the money to meet the proposed charge.

Population figures imply that there is a higher level of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities in the known areas of deprivation across Lancashire; Burnley, Hyndburn, Pendle, Rossendale and Wyre. The areas with least deprivation, Ribble Valley and Fylde have the lowest levels of children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities. This supports national statistics that children and young people with SEND tend to come from low income families.

Often the parents are on benefits due to full time carer responsibilities so the impact of these proposals is mitigated by the proposal to apply an exemption for families on qualifying benefits.

For those families where the young person continues to enter the further education system, families may choose to utilise the public transport network rather than pay the required contribution, particularly where the young person has moderate learning difficulties.

This would result in a young person having to walk to a local bus stop and develop the skills required to navigate the public transport network.

Learners in possession of a Blind and Disabled Person Nowcard who are able to access the local bus network would fall under the concessionary scheme and would be eligible to travel free after 9.30am on weekdays, and for a heavily subsidised flat rate before 9.30am. However, they may not be able to access public transport vehicles, particularly if they have physical difficulties and low floor vehicles are not used or are used inconsistently.

Whilst a developing independence is encouraged it is noted that there is evidence of harassment of SEND young people when travelling on public transport. The Council mitigates this impact through a range of safer travel initiatives delivered through the safer travel unit in conjunction with local bus operators.

There is the possibility that the introduction of charges could deter learners from participating in further education altogether.

There is a large gap between the attainment of pupils with a statement of special educational need and other pupils. In 2013 the gap between pupils with a Statement

of SEN and other pupils achieving 5 GCSEs A* – C in English and mathematics reduced from 52.2% to 47.8%, thanks mainly to an increase in the proportion of stated pupils achieving the required grades (7.7% to 13.4%). Lancashire had a smaller gap at key stage four than that seen nationally - 47.8%, compared with 51.3%.

Young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are twice as likely to be not in education, training or employment (NEET) as those without. In the current economic climate youth unemployment is expected to rise which can intensify the lack of employment prospects for young people with SEND, particularly if they have not progressed through the further education system.

The ability to access further education can lead to positive outcomes for young people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities supporting them to develop skills and aptitudes to go into sustainable employment and participate in their community.

Failure to achieve a positive outcome can result in isolation, depression and longer term poor health leading to a long term dependency on the benefit system.

If some SEND learners are deterred from entering into further post 16 learning as a result of the proposal to introduce charges this may have a significant long term impact on their health, wellbeing and quality of life.

Question 4 –Combined/Cumulative Effect

Could the effects of your decision combine with other factors or decisions taken at local or national level to exacerbate the impact on any groups?

For example - if the proposal is to impose charges for adult social care, its impact on disabled people might be increased by other decisions within the County Council (e.g. increases in the fares charged for Community Transport and reductions in respite care) and national proposals (e.g. the availability of some benefits) . Whilst LCC cannot control some of these decisions, they could increase the adverse effect of the proposal. The LCC has a legal duty to consider this aspect, and to evaluate the decision, including mitigation, accordingly.

If Yes – please identify these.

The Welfare Reform Bill proposes a series of changes to the benefits system that include the introduction of universal credit and an overall benefit cap. This could

result in changes or reductions in the amount of benefit that families receive increasing the financial difficulty that would be faced by families incurring the charge for transport support.

Question 5 – Identifying Initial Results of Your Analysis

As a result of your analysis have you changed/amended your original proposal?

Please identify how –

For example:

Adjusted the original proposal – briefly outline the adjustments

Continuing with the Original Proposal – briefly explain why

Stopped the Proposal and Revised it - briefly explain

The service has completed a comprehensive consultation between 03 February and 25 April 2014 which has produced significant further evidence. The following observations have been made as a result of the consultation responses:

- a) It is perhaps unsurprising that a high proportion of parent/carers are reluctant to make a financial contribution for a discretionary post-16 transport service that they have enjoyed free of charge for the past 6 years.
- b) A number of respondents felt the proposed charge was too high. To mitigate the impact of the financial contribution, it is proposed that post 16 SEND students from low income families would be exempt from the charge. However, it is noted that those parents who work but may be low earners are hit harder financially because they are not on benefits. Further, some families are affected by other government policy changes to the welfare and benefits system which has resulted in a disproportionate impact on the disposable income of families with a disabled child or adult. It is also recognised that it is more expensive to raise a disabled child than a non-disabled child given the impact on increased heating, clothing and other personal expenses, the capacity for one or both parents to gain and maintain employment and the higher incidence of one parent families where there is a child with a disability.
- c) Respondents made a number of comments about means testing. Accordingly, mitigating against the impact of any future financial contribution for low income families who would be exempt from the proposed charge, a more comprehensive definition of entitlement is proposed defined by entitlement to Free School Meals for school sixth form pupils and post-16 pupils at a special school or Income Support, or Job Seekers Allowance (Income based) or support under part VI of the Immigration and Asylum Act

1999 or the guaranteed element of State Pension Creditor Income Related Employment Support Allowance or Child Tax Credit and are not entitled to Working Tax Credit and the annual income, as assessed by the Inland Revenue, does not exceed £16,190 (April 10 figure) or Working Tax Credit during the four week period immediately after employment finishes or after starting to work less than 16 hours per week or maximum amount of working tax credit.

- d) Implementation of the proposed contribution would still result in the County Council providing a large subsidy to support transport for the most vulnerable students who, due to the impact of impairment or disabling circumstances, cannot safely travel by other means to the nearest available establishment that meets their identified learning needs. The average annual cost to provide SEN transport to all eligible children and young people is £5,500 per child/young person so whilst appreciating that some respondents feel the charge is excessive, it represents a very small proportion of the actual average cost.
- e) Given the overall financial position of the Council and in developing options for amending post-16 SEND transport support, consideration has been given to the national picture where a significant number of local authorities ask for a contribution towards transport support for post 16 young people with SEND (Northamptonshire, Worcestershire, Calderdale, Devon, Essex, Norfolk, Staffordshire, Warwickshire). On average, these charges are between £500-600 per annum with the exception of Calderdale which charges £350 per annum. This suggests that the proposed charge of £475 plus an annual increase linked to the Retail Price Index + 5% is reasonable when compared with charges imposed by other shire counties or statistical neighbours.
- f) Mainstream post-16 students in Lancashire attending school sixth forms and further education colleges do not receive any financial support from the Council to fund their transport costs. Thus, the Authority is providing assistance to those with SEND beyond that given to their mainstream counterparts.
- g) Similarly, discretionary home to mainstream schools transport policy, is set at £475 per annum for parents who pay the contributory charge to faith schools, and, thereafter, by Retail Price Index plus 5%. Thus, this proposal aligns the two policies.
- h) Consideration has also been given to the importance of enabling students to access further education. A number of respondents suggested that the charge may prohibit young people from attending school/college of their choice or they may stop them going altogether. Students will not be required to move to courses at their nearest college; more rather, the post-16 transport policy will continue to enable students to attend the nearest college offering an *appropriate* course. However, the Children and Families Act 2014 and the new SEN Code of Practice place new duties on local colleges (and all FE providers including school sixth forms) which expect an enhanced and improved universal offer for students with SEND to enable them to attend their

local college wherever possible. Further, the reforms introduce new funding and study programme arrangements which should be used to tailor packages for young people with SEND including supported internships, traineeships and apprenticeships, in partnership with employers. Thus, increasingly, the SEND reforms place an expectation of an improved and enhanced local college offer so that young people with SEND can access their nearest college with suitably accessible courses offering the same opportunities for social inclusion which the vast majority of non-disabled students enjoy. The same issues also apply to school sixth forms. It is not possible with any major certainty to predict what impact the proposed contributory charge increase will have on future young people's or parental preferences.

- i) The future costs of fuel and transport cannot be predicted.
- j) The proposals take due account of the Children and Families Act 2014 published in March 2014 but publication of the new SEN Code of Practice has been delayed to mid-June. Whilst the anticipated content has been widely communicated, the delay in publication means that the annual requirement to update the Post-16 Transport Policy Statement by 31 May in anticipation of any changes for the following September has been missed. Accordingly, it is proposed that any changes to the policy approved by the Cabinet Member should be implemented from 1 September 2015 rather than from September 2014 as originally proposed. Thus, the delayed implementation will enable full account to be given to the new SEN Code of Practice and will also enable an extended period to support parents and young people in adapting to the new charging regime. The anticipated savings of £109,625 expected in 2014/15 academic year will need to be found from other efficiency savings within the Children's and Young People's Directorate. Based on an assumption that the demand for transport support for post 16 students with SEND will remain at current levels the proposals are estimated to generate revenue of around £329k per annum when fully operational in 2017/18 onwards. The proposed delay in implementation date will mean that from 1 September 2015, the contributory charge would be £475 + RPI + 5%.

Thus, following a review of the consultation findings, it is proposed that there should be an adjustment from the initial proposal to delay the implementation of the new charging arrangements until 1 September 2015 so that the implications of the new SEN Code of Practice (due to be published in mid-June 2014) can be fully considered.

Question 6 - Mitigation

Please set out any steps you will take to mitigate/reduce any potential adverse effects of your decision on those sharing any particular protected characteristic. It is important here to do a genuine and

realistic evaluation of the effectiveness of the mitigation contemplated. Over-optimistic and over-generalised assessments are likely to fall short of the “due regard” requirement.

Also consider if any mitigation might adversely affect any other groups and how this might be managed.

It is considered that the adverse effects of the proposed changes will be most keenly felt by those young people with SEND, and their families, who wish to enter further education and require transport support. Under these proposals this group of people will be required to pay a charge as a contribution to their transport support.

In mitigation the proposals take into account the impact of these charges on lower income families and include an exemption for families who are in receipt of qualifying benefits.

It is acknowledged that some families may still find it difficult to pay the charge upfront and therefore arrangements will be made to enable families to spread the costs over the year and pay by monthly instalments.

The service will proactively promote the Blind and Disabled Persons Nowcard where a learner is able to access the local bus network and is eligible for free travel after 9.30am on weekdays and for a flat rate before 9.30am. The service will also enter into discussions with local further education providers to influence the impact of the disjointed nature of college timetables on the individual learner and their transport needs. All too frequently, local colleges provide courses for limited hourly sessions over the course of a week resulting in personalised taxi transport on each separate occasion. The Council will work to influence colleges to develop timetables that take transport issues into consideration.

As previously noted, families just above the threshold for qualifying benefits may not be able to afford the charges introduced by these proposals. To mitigate against this, we will work closely with the County Council's welfare rights service to develop strategies around ensuring that such families are fully aware of the welfare benefits for which they are eligible and to maximise the take up of benefits.

Feedback from this consultation and generally will help to inform additional mitigating actions that can be introduced to lessen any adverse impact of these proposals.

Question 7 – Balancing the Proposal/Countervailing Factors

At this point you need to weigh up the reasons for the proposal – e.g. need for budget savings; damaging effects of not taking forward the proposal at this time – against the findings of your analysis. Please

describe this assessment. It is important here to ensure that the assessment of any negative effects upon those sharing protected characteristics is full and frank. The full extent of actual adverse impacts must be acknowledged and taken into account, or the assessment will be inadequate. What is required is an honest evaluation, and not a marketing exercise. Conversely, while adverse effects should be frankly acknowledged, they need not be overstated or exaggerated. Where effects are not serious, this too should be made clear.

The proposal to introduce a contribution towards the transport support provided to post 16 SEND students will produce annual budget savings of approximately £329,000 compared against a current annual expenditure of c£2.7 million.

The introduction of charges will have a negative impact on all the post 16 learners and their families who currently benefit from free transport to and from school/college who will be required to find the funds to meet the necessary contribution.

This impact will be felt, more specifically, by those families with a low income for whom the charge may not be affordable.

The introduction of the charges may result in some young people with SEND accessing the public bus network to travel to school or college which has its benefits in relation to developing a greater sense of independence and participation in public life. It can, however, also result in a young person with SEND being the subject of harassment and victimisation.

Further education has been proven to improve the outcomes for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities, supporting them to develop the skills and aptitudes to go into sustainable employment and participate in their community. Most significantly, the introduction of means tested charges for post 16 SEND students may deter families from encouraging participation in further education impacting on the long term opportunities and life chances of these young people.

Question 8 – Final Proposal

In summary, what is your final proposal and which groups may be affected and how?

Following analysis at the conclusion of the consultation, an amendment to the initial proposal has been made.

The final proposal recommends that the Cabinet Member

- a) agrees the transport policy be revised to include the introduction of a means

tested parental contribution of £475 per annum with an annual formulaic increase based on the Retail Price Index (RPI) plus 5%; and
b) delays the implementation of the new charging arrangements until 1 September 2015 so that the implications of the new SEN Code of Practice (due to be published in mid-June 2014) can be fully considered.

Question 9 – Review and Monitoring Arrangements

Describe what arrangements you will put in place to review and monitor the effects of your proposal.

The outcomes of the consultation have been fully documented and the equality analysis has been updated with the appropriate evidence which has informed the final proposals.

Equality Analysis Prepared By – Sally Riley

Position/Role - Head of Inclusion and Disability Service

Equality Analysis Endorsed by Line Manager and/or Chief Officer - Ann Pennell

Decision Signed Off By

Cabinet Member/Chief Officer or SMT Member

Please remember to ensure the Equality Decision Making Analysis is submitted with the decision-making report and a copy is retained with other papers relating to the decision.

Where specific actions are identified as part of the Analysis please ensure that an EAP001 form is completed and forwarded to your Directorate's contact in the Equality and Cohesion Team.

Directorate contacts in the Equality & Cohesion Team are:

Karen Beaumont – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Karen.beaumont@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Adult & Community Services Directorate

Jeanette Binns – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Jeanette.binns@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Environment Directorate, Lancashire County Commercial Group and One Connect Limited

Saulo Cwerner – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Saulo.cwerner@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Children & Young Peoples Directorate

Pam Smith – Equality & Cohesion Manager

Pam.smith@lancashire.gov.uk

Contact for Office of the Chief Executive and the County Treasurer's Directorate

Thank you