

Annex A – Options Currently Identified

	Current Position	Potential Change	Benefits	Risks
1	<p>'Nearest suitable school' is ambiguous under the current policy and leads to conflict and challenge regarding the similar courses that appear to be available locally.</p>	<p>Greater clarification of what is considered the 'nearest suitable school', with a focus on ensuring the provision is agreed and confirmed by MKCC SEND Service from the outset.</p> <p>Based on wording used by other local authorities, an example of this which could reduce the cost of supporting access to out of area placements could be...</p> <p>Those aged 16-18 will <i>only</i> receive 'free' school travel support if they <i>attend the nearest, suitable education setting as defined/confirmed by MKCC*</i>. Applications made to other education settings (regardless of any requests for consultations from the setting to MKCC) will be deemed as 'parental preference', so the parent/carer will be responsible for ensuring the young person can access.</p> <p><i>*Course content at Further Education Locations will only be considered in relation to the <u>main qualification</u> and not vocational elements.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in travel support costs • Ensures there is clarity that without this, any application will be considered 'parental preference', meaning the parent is responsible for ensuring access. • Encourages families to consider of local provision. • Clarity from the outset of whether there are comparable provisions and courses available in MK. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult conversations/complaints/tribunals. • Potential to impact on MKCC SEND Service Resource
2	<p>The definition of who is eligible under 'SEN' criteria for post 16 transport is unclear, and decisions are usually based on previous arrangements which may no longer be appropriate.</p>	<p>Greater clarification of what is considered the 'SEN passenger', with a focus on ensuring this is agreed and confirmed by MKCC SEND Service from the outset.</p> <p>Transport support could be restricted to those who meet the criteria below and are also in receipt of the highest amount of Working Tax Credit, as per the Extended Rights criteria. e.g. based on wording used by other local</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in travel support costs • Ensures there is clarity that without this, any application will be considered 'Non-SEN', meaning the parent is responsible for ensuring access. • Support is prioritised for those with the highest level of need and the lowest income. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult conversations/complaints/tribunals. • Potential to impact on MKCC SEND Service Resource

Annex A – Options Currently Identified

		<p>authorities a definition could be added to the policy statement to say...</p> <p><i>Transport will only be considered if the setting is over 3 miles from the home or if the child has the below <u>defined</u> in their EHCP -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Long term severely restricted independent mobility, due to a physical disability;</i> • <i>Long term severely restricted independent mobility due to a medical condition resulting in severe persistent pain and/or extreme fatigue;</i> • <i>A sensory impairment resulting in severely restricted mobility;</i> • <i>Severe behavioural emotional and/or social difficulties in comparison with other children of their age. This may be linked with cognitive ability or be as a result of a specific development disorder.</i> 		
3	<p>Post 16 children are currently assessed with all transport options available, including commissioned which is the most expensive.</p>	<p>Only provide support by way of Mileage and FLTB as they are typically significantly cheaper per academic year</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential saving could be in the region of c.£400k assuming similar numbers to now, and all Post 16 children receiving Travel Support were given an FLTB. This could increase further if people all received mileage. • Families have greater ownership and control in relation to their travel arrangements. • Ensure parity across all children. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be an increase to the number of vehicles going to each school and some are already struggling with space (particularly at Slated Row, Redway, and White Spire) • Could disproportionately impact the sustainability of some of our transport providers that specialise in providing this type of transport for children with SEND.
4	<p>As per above.</p>	<p>Like the option above the default offer could be that Mileage or Family Led Travel Budgets are given unless the local authority determines another option is more appropriate. For instance, where it is</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential saving could be in the region of c.£75k, assuming similar numbers to now, and the shared routes to MK Special Schools continued but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be push back/complaints from families who have had commissioned transport for previous school travel.

Annex A – Options Currently Identified

		cheaper/environmentally beneficial for the local authority to add to existing shared vehicles (such as at special schools where lots of other children are attending). This would reduce the need to put on commissioned vehicles to Milton Keynes College.	<p>FLTB/Mileage was offered to eligible children accessing any other destinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Those with the highest level of need will continue to get the highest level of support. • Some families will have greater ownership and control in relation to their travel arrangements. • Supports preparation for adulthood by encouraging independence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents could challenge the lack of parity for children accessing different provisions.
5	Post 16 SEN passengers currently do not contribute towards the cost of their transport.	<p>Introduce a discretionary contribution for those on commissioned vehicles, or all travel support options, at the same rate as the current Privilege Fare applied to mainstream post 16 passengers using MKCC commissioned coaches. This requirement could be waived for families on low income.</p> <p>It appears many local authorities already do this.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would generate c.£80K per year towards the cost of delivering school travel support, assuming the current number of 144 post 16 children remains similar in the future, and a contribution of £558.60. • If families do not pay, the number of contracts could be reduced and this will reduce the overall cost. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political push back to introduce the charge • Complaints from families • If families do not pay, and arrange their own transport, this could increase the number vehicles going to schools who have limited space. • If families do not pay and the number of contracts reduces, provider sustainability could be impacted. Especially for London Hire and Ladybirds.
6	Travel training stopped during covid, and there is currently limited resource within MKCC to deliver this.	Focus on Travel Training for young people with SEND. This could be explored by working with special schools and specialist units of mainstream schools to identify children who would benefit in order to reduce the cost of travel support required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would help to reduce the cost of support required. • Supports independence and preparation for adulthood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited resource available in MKCC to deliver • Would be unlikely to deliver savings for 2025/6, but could support delivery of savings beyond this.