

Home to School Transport Policy & Post 16 Policy Statement Consultation

Feedback Analysis

Summary of Responses

649 Surveys Submitted (Total)

173 Relate to a child/young person with SEND

61 Live in an existing split village

116 Use the Spare Seat School

Response Detail

Review Area 1: For OCC to updated/refresh Policy improving wording, layout and understanding (drafts included in consultation information)

Response	No. Responses	% of Responses
Strongly Agree	236	37%
Agree Somewhat	188	29%
Neither Agree or Disagree	161	25%
Disagree Somewhat	5	1%
Strongly Disagree	17	3%
Not Sure	37	6%

Review Area 2: Proposed updated wording relating to Direct Travel Payments

Response	No. Responses	% of Responses
Strongly Agree	196	31%
Agree Somewhat	205	32%
Neither Agree or Disagree	176	27%
Disagree Somewhat	5	1%
Strongly Disagree	14	2%
Not Sure	45	7%

Review Area 3: Proposed updated wording relating to Alternative Education Provision travel

Response	No Responses	% of Responses
Strongly Agree	137	21%
Agree Somewhat	116	18%
Neither Agree or Disagree	266	42%
Disagree Somewhat	6	1%
Strongly Disagree	13	2%
Not Sure	101	16%

Review Area 4: Proposed introduction of Contribution Charging for Post 16 Travel (SEND)

Response	No Responses	% of Responses
Strongly Agree	47	7%
Agree Somewhat	85	13%
Neither Agree or Disagree	95	15%
Disagree Somewhat	82	13%
Strongly Disagree	302	47%
Not Sure	32	5%

Main comment/feedback is that it is too expensive for those families, they couldn't pay the contribution and therefore a barrier to education post 16.

Review Area 5: Exploring the continued support of Split Villages

Reducing the service – What would be the potential impact?

Response	No Responses	% of Responses
Significant Positive Impact	13	2%
Somewhat Positive Impact	15	2%

Neither Positive or Negative Impact	133	21%
Somewhat Negative Impact	97	15%
Significant Negative Impact	181	28%
Not Sure	203	32%

Main comment of reducing choice of school and financial impact on families

Withdraw the service – What would be the potential impact?

Response	No Responses	% of Responses
Significant Positive Impact	17	3%
Somewhat Positive Impact	4	1%
Neither Positive or Negative Impact	87	14%
Somewhat Negative Impact	79	12%
Significant Negative Impact	276	43%
Not Sure	176	28%

Review Area 6: Exploring Continued Sustainability of Spare Seat Scheme

Increasing Contribution – What would be the potential impact?

Response	No Responses	% of Responses
Significant Positive Impact	27	4%
Somewhat Positive Impact	31	5%
Neither Positive or	84	13%

Negative Impact		
Somewhat Negative Impact	121	19%
Significant Negative Impact	215	34%
Not Sure	156	25%

Reducing Service – What would be the potential impact

Response	No Responses	% of Responses
Significant Positive Impact	12	2%
Somewhat Positive Impact	8	1%
Neither Positive or Negative Impact	65	10%
Somewhat Negative Impact	108	17%
Significant Negative Impact	305	48%
Not Sure	134	21%

Most comments relate to the scheme is already really expensive, sometimes more than the public bus. Without it you take away education choice and unable to attend school they want to attend. Issues with public transport and accessing areas of Oxford, especially rural locations was also raised.

Response Break Down by User/Type

Review Area 1: For OCC to updated/refresh Policy improving wording, layout and understanding (drafts included in consultation information)

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Strongly Agree	5 (36%)	74 (43%)	17 (29%)	43 (38%)	236	37%
Agree Somewhat	3 (21%)	50 (29%)	19 (33%)	32 (28%)	188	29%
Neither Agree or Disagree	3 (21%)	32 (19%)	16 (28%)	30 (27%)	161	25%
Disagree Somewhat	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	5	1%
Strongly Disagree	1 (7%)	2 (1%)	1 (2%)	1 (1%)	17	3%
Not Sure	2 (14%)	12 (7%)	5 (9%)	6 (5%)	37	6%
Total	14	171	58	113		

Review Area 2: Proposed updated wording relating to Direct Travel Payments

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Strongly Agree	4 (29%)	58 (34%)	16 (28%)	36 (32%)	196	31%
Agree Somewhat	5 (36%)	51 (30%)	17 (29%)	39 (35%)	205	32%
Neither Agree or Disagree	4 (29%)	42 (25%)	18 (31%)	32 (28%)	176	27%
Disagree Somewhat	1 (7%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5	1%
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	1 (1%)	14	2%

Not Sure	0 (0%)	17 (10%)	6 (10%)	5 (4%)	45	7%
Total	14	171	58	113		

Review Area 3: Proposed updated wording relating to Alternative Education Provision travel

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Strongly Agree	2 (14%)	42 (25%)	8 (14%)	23 (20%)	137	21%
Agree Somewhat	1 (7%)	36 (21%)	11 (19%)	20 (18%)	116	18%
Neither Agree or Disagree	9 (64%)	51 (30%)	29 (50%)	50 (44%)	266	42%
Disagree Somewhat	1 (7%)	3 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	6	1%
Strongly Disagree	0 (0%)	4 (2%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	13	2%
Not Sure	1 (7%)	34 (20%)	7 (12%)	20 (18%)	101	16%
Total	14	170	58	113		

Review Area 4: Proposed introduction of Contribution Charging for Post 16 Travel (SEND)

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Strongly Agree	0 (0%)	10 (6%)	3 (5%)	21 (19%)	47	7%
Agree Somewhat	3 (21%)	9 (5%)	7 (12%)	21 (19%)	85	13%
Neither Agree or Disagree	1 (7%)	8 (5%)	5 (9%)	25 (22%)	95	15%

Disagree Somewhat	2 (14%)	12 (7%)	16 (28%)	15 (13%)	82	13%
Strongly Disagree	8 (57%)	125 (73%)	22 (39%)	22 (19%)	302	47%
Not Sure	0 (0%)	7 (4%)	4 (7%)	9 (8%)	32	5%
Total	14	171	57	113		

Review Area 5: Exploring the continued support of Split Villages

Reducing the service – What would be the potential impact?

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Significant Positive Impact	0 (0%)	5 (3%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	13	2%
Somewhat Positive Impact	1 (7%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	15	2%
Neither Positive or Negative Impact	4 (29%)	30 (18%)	4 (7%)	25 (22%)	133	21%
Somewhat Negative Impact	2 (14%)	16 (9%)	11 (19%)	16 (14%)	97	15%
Significant Negative Impact	6 (43%)	40 (24%)	33 (58%)	36 (32%)	181	28%
Not Sure	1 (7%)	76 (45%)	9 (16%)	29 (26%)	203	32%
Total	14	170	57	112		

Withdraw the service – What would be the potential impact?

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
----------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-------------	-----------

		an EHCP)				
Significant Positive Impact	0 (0%)	6 (4%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	17	3%
Somewhat Positive Impact	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4	1%
Neither Positive or Negative Impact	4 (29%)	14 (8%)	4 (7%)	18 (16%)	87	14%
Somewhat Negative Impact	2 (14%)	12 (7%)	5 (9%)	11 (10%)	79	12%
Significant Negative Impact	6 (43%)	68 (40%)	40 (70%)	54 (48%)	276	43%
Not Sure	1 (1%)	68 (40%)	8 (14%)	24 (21%)	176	28%
Total	14	168	57	112		

Review Area 6: Exploring Continued Sustainability of Spare Seat Scheme

Increasing Contribution – What would be the potential impact?

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Significant Positive Impact	2 (15%)	7 (4%)	1 (2%)	8 (7%)	27	4%
Somewhat Positive Impact	0 (0%)	7 (4%)	1 (2%)	6 (5%)	31	5%
Neither Positive or Negative Impact	4 (31%)	16 (10%)	5 (9%)	6 (5%)	84	13%
Somewhat Negative Impact	2 (15%)	23 (14%)	17 (29%)	24 (21%)	121	19%

Significant Negative Impact	4 (31%)	42 (25%)	23 (40%)	62 (55%)	215	34%
Not Sure	1 (8%)	71 (43%)	11 (19%)	6 (5%)	156	25%
Total	13	166	58	112		

Reducing Service – What would be the potential impact

Response	Young Person Using HTST	Parent Carer Using HTST (Child has an EHCP)	Lives in a Split Village	Spare Seat User	Total Final	% @ Final
Significant Positive Impact	1 (8%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	7 (6%)	12	2%
Somewhat Positive Impact	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	8	1%
Neither Positive or Negative Impact	2 (15%)	12 (7%)	5 (9%)	1 (1%)	65	10%
Somewhat Negative Impact	2 (15%)	25 (15%)	11 (19%)	6 (5%)	108	17%
Significant Negative Impact	8 (62%)	63 (38%)	35 (61%)	92 (81%)	305	48%
Not Sure	0 (0%)	62 (37%)	6 (11%)	6 (5%)	134	21%
Total	13	167	57	113		